

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

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

QUESTIONS

IRRIGATION

Mr. HALL: In view of conflicting reports about the Government's intentions on diverting water from the Murray River, will the Minister of Works make a clear statement of Government policy on this matter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Following the inquiry undertaken by the departmental committee into the diversion of water, I tabled the committee's report and informed the House that the Government had adopted it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This morning I received a letter from a contractor on the Murray River who had accepted a contract to supply water for irrigation purposes to a landholder whose property was severely affected by drought conditions and who desired to irrigate so that he could carry his stock through the drought period. The letter states that, although the landholder owns a considerable frontage to the Murray River and requires a permit to do only a little irrigation, his application for a permit has been refused. Before the Government's announcement on this matter he had arranged for the purchase of expensive equipment and machinery, so that a heavy loss is involved. Can the Minister of Works say on what grounds permits are granted or refused, so that persons interested in this important matter may know the department's procedure for granting or refusing licences?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I believe the policy on the matter was made clear some time ago. The Government has agreed that, where assurances have been given by the department, water permits will be granted. If a person had gone to some expense in anticipation of receiving a permit, then a permit would be granted in that case, too.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Before the announcement on the matter no assurance was necessary, and the expense in this case had already been incurred.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Each case is considered on its merits. I suggest that the person to whom the honourable mem-

ber refers should apply to the department immediately; his case will be considered on its merits.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The letter to which I have referred states:

Towards the middle of April — authorized me to install 20 acres of permanent sprinklers on his property upstream from Cadell, the matter being extremely urgent because of the drought conditions he is suffering. The system, comprising a 100 h.p. electric pump and motor, etc., was delivered promptly and shortly after we began to hear rumours of a restriction on pumping licences, apparently reported vaguely through the *Murray Pioneer*. In my 13 years in the irrigation industry a licence has always been regarded as a formality and this has been confirmed both with my discussions with the Engineering and Water Supply and Mr. Hutchens, so why then did they not give us a fair go, and make a proper public announcement so that we can take steps to protect both ourselves and our customer? The position is desperate. How do I dispose of the material that — has paid for, and that I have also paid for, when my sources of disposal have been cut off?

This person was one of 23 applicants whose applications were considered recently and refused by the water and sewers branch of the department. He has, as the Minister suggested he should, applied to the department, and his application has been refused. Can the Minister say what further steps this applicant can take to have the matter reviewed, because he entered into an agreement when there were no restrictions and when licences were being granted to many people?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member will recall that the issue of new licences was suspended pending the receipt of the report of the committee. If he gives me the particulars, I shall ascertain from the department whether this case comes within the category I have mentioned and whether a licence can be granted if the applicant has the necessary qualification.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have referred several times to the disposal of seepage water from irrigation settlements, and some time ago I asked the Minister of Irrigation whether it was considered appropriate to get reports from the Mines Department before seepage pondage was arranged in an area, particularly if that area were adjacent to the river or in a position where the river might be affected. Can the Minister now say whether he has discussed this matter with the Minister of Mines and whether basins with a high salt content that are used for the storage of irrigation water will be examined to determine

their suitability for the purpose for which they are intended to be used?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: When replying to the honourable member, I think last week, I said that in future, when any evaporation basin was to be constructed, I should be pleased to seek the assistance of the Mines Department in connection with tests of the soil that ought to be carried out. I have received from the Minister of Mines a report that the Mines Department will be happy to provide technical advice within its competence on any areas that are referred to it for investigation. As I have told the honourable member, regarding the evaporation basin being constructed by the Renmark Irrigation Trust at Bulyong Island to replace the totally inadequate evaporation basin at block E, no tests were carried out because the soil types were similar to those at the Disher Creek basin, which were relatively impervious. However, a test will be carried out and a report made by the Mines Department in the case of any evaporation basin constructed in future.

MURRAY RIVER

Mr. CURREN: Reading in this morning's *Advertiser* a report of what transpired in the House yesterday concerning two visitors who called on the Minister of Works in his office last week, I was rather perturbed to read the following statement:

Dr. Pearson said the Murray River had been turned into a giant sewer, a fact which could be overcome if it were made illegal to dump sewage into the river.

As that is an alarming statement for a responsible person to make, I ask the Minister of Works whether he will give the House a report on the true position regarding Murray River water.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: It is already illegal to dump sewage into the Murray River (or into any other water supply source), as a result of the provisions of the Control of Waters Act, Waterworks Act, and Health Act. The unbelievable gross pollution of the big rivers of Europe and the United States of America, such as the Rhine, Seine, Thames, and Mississippi, etc., has led to their being described as "giant sewers". However, this is completely untrue of the Murray River. Minor pollution does occur at population centres along the Murray River, and this sort of pollution is unavoidable in any situation where people have access to water for recreation and primary and secondary industry. However, sewage is not dumped in the river at any of these centres and the pollution level

is so low that the natural purification which takes place in the river makes this pollution undetectable a mile or two downstream of each centre. The Engineering and Water Supply Department is aware of the tremendous importance of the Murray River as a State water resource, and its Murray River pollution control programme is directed at containing and, in fact, reducing the current low level of pollution.

The major up-river towns of Renmark, Berri, Barmera, Loxton and Waikerie have installed or are in the process of installing septic tank effluent drainage schemes with full treatment of the effluent before disposal. These schemes have been installed by the appropriate councils. The Mannum sewerage scheme has been approved and construction will commence this year. Sewerage for Murray Bridge is programmed for 1969-70. Comprehensive and complex pollution surveys have been carried out on industrial wastes from the big distilleries, wineries, canneries, dairy produce works, etc., associated with the irrigation and farming areas along the Murray River, with the result that pollution from industrial wastes is now negligible and decreasing. Generally speaking, these industries have accepted the need to protect this important water source and are very co-operative. Following long-term discussions with the department, one particular industry has now agreed to progressively transfer its works to a site away from the river bank to avoid pollution by its wastes. The statement that the Murray River "had been turned into a giant sewer" is completely unfounded. All public water supplies on the Murray River which are operated by the Engineering and Water Supply Department are continuously chlorinated.

HOSPITALS

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Last week I asked the Premier whether, in addition to public hospitals (as defined in the Hospitals Act), community hospitals that were not run for profit would be entitled to share in that portion of the proceeds derived from the sale of lottery tickets that is to be paid into the Hospitals Fund. At the time, the Premier said that, as the matter was one of policy, he would bring down a reply in due course. Has he that reply?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A number of non-Government hospitals will participate in the sums to be allotted from the Hospitals Fund, into which lottery revenue moneys are paid. When Revenue Estimates are presented

to Parliament, we intend to show separately the specific sums from lottery revenue that are paid to each of the hospitals listed in the Revenue Budget. Therefore, the honourable member may be assured that hospitals other than Government hospitals will participate in the moneys to be distributed.

PENSIONER TRAVEL CONCESSIONS

Mr. LANGLEY: Since the election of the Labor Government, several added concessions have been made to pensioner travel in country and suburban areas. As many of these elderly people are unaware of the concessions, can the Premier enlighten them and other members of the public about the pensioner travel concessions provided?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Since March, 1965, the Government has liberalized pensioner travel concessions in the following ways: first, country pensioners are able to travel at concession fares to and from Adelaide by train with no restriction on the number of journeys, the only times on which they cannot travel being certain periods over Easter and Christmas. Previously (under the Liberal and Country League Government) they were entitled to two trips a year only if they held a medical entitlement card, that is, if they received a full social service pension and had an income not exceeding \$4 a week. Now all country pensioners can travel under the terms I have stated and, in addition, when in Adelaide they can travel at concession rates on Municipal Tramways Trust buses and licensed bus services. This concession was not previously available.

Mr. Millhouse: What a lucky coincidence that you have these facts at your disposal today!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I assure the honourable member that the member for Unley, being interested in pensioners, asked me for this information, and I was happy to have it here for him. I am sorry that the member for Mitcham is disappointed that I am announcing it.

Mr. Millhouse: I am not disappointed at all.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Premier not to engage in debate when answering a question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I shall ignore the interjections of the member for Mitcham. Secondly, the metropolitan pensioners also are able to travel at concession fares on country railway services. Again, that concession was not previously available. Thirdly, all pensioners, no matter

how small their pensions, may enjoy the above concessions. Similarly, that was not available previously. Fourthly, pensioners are allowed to travel on trains and buses in the metropolitan area from a commencement time of 9 a.m., instead of 9.30 a.m., as from October 1, 1966.

MURLONG SCHOOL

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: A small school at Murlong, on Eyre Peninsula on the main road between Lock and Rudall, is not now used by the Education Department because the children from that area have for several years been conveyed to the area school at Lock. Therefore, the school has fallen into a state of disrepair. It has been somewhat subjected to vandalism, and I have been told that termites are active and that the school, as an asset, is deteriorating. Inquiries have been made by a person, who called this morning to see me, about whether the department would consider offering the school for sale, because this man considered that there might be some local interest in purchasing it for demolition. Will the Minister of Lands ascertain from the Education Department whether this school is surplus to present requirements, whether that department is likely to ask him to dispose of the school, and what procedure (I assume tenders would be called) will be adopted if the school is disposed of?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to do that. The normal procedure is for the Education Department to request my department to dispose of such a school, and tenders are then called. We often receive requests from various organizations that they be given concessions. I recollect having seen something about the Murlong school recently, and I shall be happy to obtain a report for the honourable member.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question is to the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Education (who represents the Minister of Local Government). I refer to reports that appeared principally in yesterday's newspaper, and also today, about certain irregularities that are said to have taken place in the local government elections last month. Am I to take it from the published reports of the Premier's telecasts and of statements made by other members of the Government that, even though I understand that complaints have been received from various parts of the State, no prosecutions are to be instituted?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No decision to undertake prosecutions has been made. Certain rather loose provisions in the Local Government Act make the launching of prosecutions somewhat difficult. The provisions of this Act are not as clear as those of the State Electoral Act or of the Commonwealth Electoral Act concerning offences. Consequently, we have persistently investigated these matters in order to arrive at the truth. It is clear that undesirable practices have been indulged in and we will tighten up the Local Government Act to ensure that this does not happen in future.

CEDUNA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Has the Minister of Works a favourable reply to the question I asked recently about the reticulation of water west of Ceduna?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I regret that there is little to be added to the reply that I gave to the honourable member at the deputation last year. As I said then, the scheme sought is one of considerable magnitude, estimated to cost \$540,000 and from which the return of revenue would only be about 1 per cent. Because of this low return funds could not be diverted from other urgent works to undertake the scheme. Limited capacity schemes have been seriously considered by the department and investigations have been made, but there are many difficulties, and the capital expenditure necessary by the settlers together with the operational problems involved make the question difficult to solve, and no progress has been made with regard to the scheme.

ACCOUNT PAYMENTS

Mr. McANANEY: When the Treasurer explained that he could use Loan funds for budgetary purposes he said that there was a delay in payments by the Railways Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department. As the July accounts show that payments from Loan funds are below normal for an average month, will the Treasurer say when the delayed payments will be made?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot give a precise date until the accounts come to hand. Clear statements have been made about the reasons for their not coming to hand previously, and I emphasize that last year we spent almost all the Loan funds. Some members have given the impression that we did not spend the Loan moneys; whereas in

fact we did. When the accounts come to hand they will be met, but it is impossible for me to say in advance when they will come to hand.

NARACOORTE SEWERAGE

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week about Naracoorte sewerage?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: In an interim report concerning sewerage for the Memorial Park subdivision at Naracoorte, the Director and Engineer-in-Chief has advised that the scheme is at present being revised involving designs and costs. Also, it will be necessary to prepare an up-to-date statement of revenue to enable the economics of the proposal to be considered. It will then be possible for a more complete reply to be given to the honourable member.

PORT PIRIE STATION

Mr. McKEE: Since the new railway station at Port Pirie has been used, many people have written letters to the editor of the local newspaper and editorials have appeared in it requesting beautification of the station area. Because of this interest, will the Premier ascertain from the Minister of Transport whether plans have been made to beautify the area and, if they have not, will he suggest that this action be taken?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall discuss this matter with my colleague.

WATER RATES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have received the following letter from one of my constituents:

Dear Sir. The Engineering and Water Supply rates have come. No surprise to you of course, but I have a suggestion to make. I am not opposed to quarterly rates—in many ways it is a good idea, but it will mean four cheques instead of one. With E.T.S.A. quarterly accounts, I am able to pay it at the bank. With the E. & W. S., however, it is only payable through one bank, and that the Savings Bank of S.A., which is not so convenient.

He goes on to suggest that, as with the Electricity Trust accounts, arrangements could be made, and should be made, for payment of Engineering and Water Supply Department accounts through the private enterprise banks. Has the Minister of Works considered this matter? If he has not, could it be considered with a view to the further convenience of the public? If it has been considered, what decision has been reached?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: When quarterly accounts were first mooted I discussed the suggestion of the honourable member with the department and with other Government officials. However, it was thought that such a move would be unwarranted, and that sufficient arrangements for payment of these accounts had already been provided.

HOUSING

Mr. QUIRKE: I have been told that there is a long waiting list of prospective house owners requiring finance from the State Bank and other instrumentalities other than the Housing Trust. Members have been told recently of surplus trust houses, and it has occurred to me that more money might be allocated to the State Bank and other lending instrumentalities than is at present proposed. Seeing that such houses are built individually and not *en masse*, more employment for building trade operatives would thereby be created and tradesmen from this State prevented from drifting to other States. Will the Premier consider this suggestion, if he has not already considered it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have certainly considered the amounts that should be provided to the Housing Trust and to lending institutions. There has been an increase in funds available this year, as the honourable member will see if he reads the Loan Estimates.

Mr. Quirke: Not very much.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As much as can be managed if the other things the housing industry has suggested to the Minister of Housing are to be carried out: that is, if more rental houses are to be made available, and if we are to turn from a general speculative sprawl by the Housing Trust to redevelopment and high-rise development. The latter project will depend to a certain extent on the way the Commonwealth reacts to a suggestion which was made at the Premiers' Conference and which was supported strongly indeed by other State Premiers, namely, that the Commonwealth provide moneys towards the initial planning of redevelopment projects. This will involve expenditure on high-rise developments in inner-city areas and it is not possible in these circumstances to allot more moneys elsewhere if we are to have moneys available for projects which have been widely sought by the building industry itself and which have been supported strongly by members opposite.

BEEF ROADS

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Roads a reply to the question I asked last week about the construction of a beef road in the North of the State adjacent to the proposed route of the gas pipeline?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague the Minister of Roads states that he has no knowledge of the proposal to construct an all-weather beef road alongside the gas pipeline, a report of which appeared in a Victorian newspaper.

STURT GORGE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Several times in the last few years I have asked questions about the Sturt Gorge and its being made into a reserve. Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the latest of my questions, which I asked last Thursday?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Approval has been given to the preliminary plan of the subdivision. This is subject to the reserve's being vested in the Government and not in the individual councils concerned. It is up to the subdividers to proceed further. The councils had been contacted about this matter and had agreed that the reserve should be vested in the Government. Although I am not sure, I believe that about 230 acres is involved, but I will ascertain for the honourable member the exact location and size of the area.

TORRENS RIVER OUTLET

Mr. BROOMHILL: In recent months the Minister of Works has referred to the development of the Torrens River outlet (I mainly refer to the area from Henley Beach Road to the outlet itself at West Beach), and requests have been made for the Minister to have the Engineering and Water Supply Department, which is responsible for this area, consider a beautification scheme, including the planting of trees and shrubs in the area. As I understand the department may have some overall long-range plans for this area, can the Minister report on the department's intentions in this matter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I take the opportunity at this stage to express my appreciation of the work being undertaken by the Torrens River Committee. I assure the honourable member that the recommendations made by that committee to the Engineering and Water Supply Department will

undoubtedly receive favourable consideration. As I cannot give details to the honourable member today, I will call for a report and let him know when it is to hand.

GRAPE VARIETIES

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked last week about new grape vine varieties?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Since 1964, 25 grape varieties have been introduced into South Australia and have been quarantined at the Waite Agricultural Research Institute. His Excellency the Governor recently granted approval for the introduction of another 12 varieties this year. Some of these were required for research purposes only, and it is expected that 20 of the total will be released to the industry. These include three nematode resistant rootstocks. In September this year, the first four varieties will be released to 18 winemakers and growers, who placed orders after the initial public announcement in May, 1966.

These four varieties are all low-yielding but have produced distinctive table wines in California and Europe. They are not recommended for planting in South Australia until their potentials have been tested by the wine industry and research institutions. Testing carried out so far has been concerned only with their health and not their production. The black varieties are pinot noir and gamay beaujolais; and the white varieties are sylvaner and gewuerztraminer. The first test wine from these new varieties is unlikely to be available before 1971.

UNLEY DRAINAGE

Mr. LANGLEY: Much work has recently been carried out by the Engineering and Water Supply Department in the south park lands, including the construction of an extensive drain through the area. As that drain has now reached the corner of Unley Road and Greenhill Road, will the Minister of Works obtain a report on the reasons for installing this drain and ascertain whether it will improve drainage in the Unley area?

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

FLUORIDATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I remember that in 1964 the Premier was one of the majority of the Select Committee which expressed the opinion that fluoridation simply involved the bringing of the level of fluoride naturally occur-

ring in water to the optimum level and that it was a public health measure. I was therefore disappointed to learn that his Government, now that he has—

The SPEAKER: Is the honourable member commenting?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No; I am just going to say that an announcement has been made that fluoridation is not to be introduced into South Australia at present. In view of the opinion which the Premier expressed and which he supported vigorously in 1964, I now ask him, as he was a member of the Select Committee, whether he can say why his Government does not intend to introduce fluoridation at this time, and especially whether this is because of the opinions of the Minister of Works prevailing over his.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The introduction of fluoridation into the water supply will be considered in due course. However, I point out to the honourable member that he has been assiduous in charging this Government with exceeding the expenditures of the previous Government, and this is just another instance of his asking us to spend more money.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Am I to take it from the Premier's answer that the only bar now to the introduction of fluoridation in this State is a financial one? If that is not so, what other bar is there?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. This is a matter of policy to be decided by Cabinet, which will make an announcement when it considers that fluoridation should be introduced. This Government, unlike the one in office prior to 1965, is not a one-man band.

ROAD ACCIDENTS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The road traffic toll in South Australia over the weekend was tragically high, highlighting again the problem of the carnage on our roads. On July 4, in answer to a question on notice as to what action the Government intended to take regarding this matter, the Premier said:

The Police Department will continue its efforts to promote road safety and endeavour to reduce speed and other unsafe driving by use of radar and the breathalyser. Increased patrolling will be dependent upon increases in police strength and vehicles.

As I do not know whether any more definite action is now contemplated in view of the continuing tragic toll, can the Premier say whether, since he gave that answer, further consideration has been given to the matter and, particularly, whether the Government has

any more definite and effective plans to combat this menace in our community?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. Additional recruits have been taken into the Police Force. This afternoon I gave notice that I would introduce a Bill dealing with the provision for a breathalyser test to determine blood alcohol content. If the honourable member has specific proposals to put before Parliament, then I invite him to do so. If these involve additional expenditure, then I invite him to say whence he will get the money.

RAILWAYS

Mr. CASEY: I read with some interest in the *Railway Network* booklet, which is circulated to members, about a new train in Canada known as a turbo. This is a lightweight passenger train which will commence operating at about the end of October this year, when it will be used on the Montreal to Toronto journey, the time of which it is expected to cut by one hour. I understand that a revolutionary approach has been taken in the production of this train, which is apparently cheap to operate and construct, and the parts for which are easily interchangeable, making it a good proposition all round. Will the Premier ascertain from the Minister of Transport whether the Railways Commissioner or his officers have investigated this type of train to see whether it can be used to advantage in South Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will do that.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I notice in the magazine referred to by the honourable member for Frome that the New South Wales Railways Department plans to build several double-decker railcars for suburban passenger travel because in that way the department could cope better with the mass transportation of people during peak hours. Will the Premier ascertain from the Minister of Transport whether the South Australian Railways Department plans to use similar cars?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

DAY-LIGHT SAVING

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Today's press states that the Tasmanian Government, because of the seriously dry season and the low water storages of the hydro-electric authority in the highlands of Tasmania, has decided to introduce day-light saving this summer to reduce the consumption of electricity by industry in Tasmania. Although South Australian conditions are not directly comparable with those in Tasmania, can the Premier say whether

the Government has considered introducing day-light saving in this State?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Having examined this matter, the Government has decided that there are such obstacles to the introduction of day-light saving here that we have no proposals to proceed with it this year.

THEVENARD FISHING

Mr. BOCKELBERG: In June, I asked a question about boat havens and fishing generally at Thevenard. The Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Marine both promised to obtain a reply for me. As two months has gone by and as I have not yet received a reply, will both Ministers ascertain what has happened to that reply?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: As the honourable member said, this matter involves both departments. Money for this work is provided under the Minister of Agriculture, but the work is done by the Marine and Harbors Department. Therefore, the matter must be examined by both departments. A committee has been established to discuss such matters as this. Only this morning, I received a report from the Minister of Marine informing me that another project had been examined and recommended, but it is an expensive project. At present, my department has only an Acting Director, the previous Director (Mr. Bogg) having left the department. As Mr. Bogg was a member of the committee to which I have referred, it is suggested that, as soon as a new Director is appointed, the matter will be discussed further by the committee.

SOUTH-EAST ROADS

Mr. RODDA: There has been talk of a proposal to build a highway that will bisect the lower South-East to give access to the Dukes Highway from the hundreds of Spence and Marcollat, joining the highway near Tintinara. The Minister of Lands will recall that he and I traversed part of this area about a fortnight ago. The settlers there have either to join the connecting roads at Padthaway or go to the Princes Highway at Kingston to get to the main arterial road to Adelaide. Will the Minister of Lands ascertain whether the Minister of Roads plans to construct this arterial highway through the South-East?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to obtain a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

CRAYFISHING

The SPEAKER: I make one or two observations about the notice of motion in the name of the Leader of the Opposition. In the 1966-67 session of this Parliament, the House of Assembly appointed a Select Committee on the Fishing Industry. Resolutions of the House empowered this committee to sit during the subsequent recess and also to continue its sittings during the present session. The committee is still extant, and it is referred to on the Notice Paper.

The reference by the House to the Select Committee on the Fishing Industry was couched in wide terms, and included, *inter alia*, all aspects of the survey of fishing vessels and measures necessary to ensure the proper management of fisheries' resources, including amendments to provide for licences for master fishermen, part-time commercial fishermen, and employee fishermen. It seems to me that the central theme of the Leader of the Opposition's motion, the cray-fishing industry, is a particular facet of and is completely embraced by the terms of reference of the Select Committee on the Fishing Industry.

This leads me to consider the application of the rule of anticipation in these circumstances. Our only specific Standing Order on this aspect of procedure is No. 231, which states that "no motion shall seek to anticipate debate upon any matter which appears upon the Notice Paper". This Standing Order expresses a House of Commons rule. However, in this connection Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice* (17th edition), p. 400, points out that "the reference of a matter to a Select Committee does not prevent the consideration of the same matter by the House."

Apparently, paradoxically the same authority on House of Commons practice lists as inadmissible questions to Ministers any questions dealing "with matters before a Parliamentary committee. No question can be asked regarding proceedings in a committee which have not been placed before the House by a report from the committee."

The Speaker of the House of Commons in 1891 found himself in much the same predicament as I find myself in today in relation to the motion of the Leader of the Opposition. The Speaker of the House of Commons then said, about a member's motion seeking an expression of opinion on local taxation:

The subject referred to the committee is very much the same subject as that embodied

in the honourable member's motion. I have not thought it right to interfere as a matter of order, and to say that the honourable member would not be in order in bringing this subject forward, but I think it is my duty to call attention to a course which certainly is unusual and, in my opinion, inconvenient. The committee was only appointed two days ago, and has begun to take evidence, and the honourable member proposes by motion to ask the opinion of the House upon one of the very points referred to that committee. I know no precedent for the course which the honourable member wishes to take, but I know no precedent against it, and I think it best to leave the matter to the judgment of the House.

That quote was from the *U.K. Parliamentary Debates*, 1891, volume 351c, 934. Fear was expressed in the House of Commons at that time that to dispose of questions by referring them to a Select Committee might have the effect of closing the mouth of the House altogether. However, I sympathetically share the reservations expressed by the Speaker of the House of Commons on that occasion, but in pursuance of the House of Commons rule enunciated by Erskine May, I intend to allow the motion to be moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Our Standing Order No. 397 prohibits the disclosure of evidence given to a Select Committee before it is reported to the House and, in allowing the Leader's motion to be proceeded with, I am not unaware of the inhibiting effect Standing Order No. 397 may have upon the debate. On balance, and in the words of the former Speaker of the House of Commons, "I think it best to leave the matter to the judgment of the House."

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I thank you, Sir, for your advice and the consideration you have given to this matter, and I now move:

That in the opinion of this House immediate State Government action is necessary to preserve the crayfish industry in the south-east of South Australia, and as an initial step all commercial crayfishing boats in this region should be licensed as a means of conserving crayfish resources, and thereby bringing stability to this important industry.

My attention was first drawn and has been continually drawn to this matter by a member of another place who represents this area, the Hon. R. C. DeGaris, M.L.C. Several times, in speeches in another place, he has been concerned about the future of the crayfishing industry, which is situated and based on South-Eastern ports. As I had been invited to inspect the shore installations and to meet

fishermen at their home ports to discuss with them local problems with which they were concerned, several weeks ago I accepted this invitation, interviewed the fishermen and was given the story of their problems by people engaged in this industry.

Whilst I did not undervalue the previous reports that had been given to me, the value of my assessment of the dangers to the industry were sharpened by the facts presented to me and by the reports of the fishermen. During an interesting first day I talked with fishermen at Kingston, Robe, and Beachport. I congratulate the people engaged in this industry on the type of representatives they had elected to speak for them, and on the interest they had in the preservation of their industry, as I was much impressed by their attitude.

As a result of the three meetings I had on this day, I realize that fishermen are certainly a non-political race. When I discussed their problems, they made no bones about the fact that, for many years, their requests had gone unheeded by both the previous Liberal and Country League Government and by the present Labor Government. There was no question of their taking sides about who should have done something for them: both Governments were criticized.

Mr. Burdon: I think they told you 29 years, didn't they?

Mr. HALL: I hope the member for Mount Gambier is aware of the facts that were presented to me. The fishermen were willing to present them to anyone.

Mr. Burdon: They said they had waited for 29 years for the previous Liberal Government to do something, but it had not done it.

Mr. HALL: I hope that this debate will continue today and that the Minister, who has to consider this matter, will treat it as urgent. Although it is not possible I would prefer to finish the debate today, but I know that Government members may wish to consider this motion, and make a proper reply by placing their views before the House. I hope that, in the interests of all concerned, the debate will terminate next week so that an expression of opinion can be obtained.

Before I was interrupted I was speaking of the meetings in the South-East. From these meetings, I gained a good idea of the problems experienced in the industry. It is interesting to look over the industry and see how important it is to the individuals engaged in it, and

to South Australia. I was told that there has, for many years, been a local crayfishing industry off the South-East coast of South Australia, and that it has supplied the Australian market since before 1940. When the American market for the high-quality crayfish tails obtained off the Australian coast opened up, it resulted in an upsurge in crayfishing activity and in prosperity for this industry on the coasts of South Australia and, more important, under the terms of this motion, in the South-East fishing ports of South Australia.

This industry has become an important export industry, not only for South Australia but for Australia as a whole, and today it is a very efficient industry. A visitor cannot but be impressed by the fine fishermen of the south-eastern coast ports who engage in this form of production. I was extremely impressed with the high quality of their boats and gear, and the way in which they maintain them. Without doubt, those fishermen, like all primary producers, are cost-conscious and realize that they must preserve their tools of trade. They are attentive indeed in maintaining their equipment in first-class order, both for reasons of safety and of cost advantage. Although I have not had an opportunity of seeing them handle their vessels at sea, I believe that the fishermen in these ports are first-class seamen and that they handle their equipment well and efficiently.

One thing I have learned from my meetings with cray fishermen, both on my first visit and last Friday, when I attended the ports of Grey (formerly Southend), Carpenter Rocks and Port MacDonnell (I have visited all six ports and talked with about 200 cray fishermen along the coast), is that the natural resource on which this industry is based is becoming seriously depleted. Members know that the area of continental shelf off our coast is large. It can be found in the two main gulfs of South Australia, off the west coast of Fyre Peninsula, off Kangaroo Island, and off the South-East. We have a large area of continental shelf varying in width from the coast depending on location. Crayfish are not to be found on all coastlines: they are confined to certain suitable areas on the floor of the continental shelf. It is therefore impossible just to look at a map and say that a certain area is a crayfish-producing area.

There is an increasing number of boats, and the area of fishing is becoming more limited. As can be seen from the results obtained by

fishermen, there is a decreasing catch for each man and for each boat. The fishermen charge the Government with having neglected them in their appeal for licensing of members who may enter the industry and in their appeal for pot limits. The men in the industry do not limit their criticism to this Government, but extend it back (depending on the individual) for a number of years. They are also critical of the department's request for information. Last year many questionnaires seeking yields of various boats were sent out to the fishermen. The fishermen said, "Give us a limit first on those entering the industry as an emergency measure, and then we can consider research in its proper perspective." They were critical of the fact that no limit had been placed on those entering the industry in this State.

They were also critical of the lack of expenditure on fishing havens, slipways and jetties. The Government stands condemned today in its approach to works that are of major importance to the South Australian fishing industry. When one compares the expenditure of this Government with that of the Playford Government, one finds that in its first two years between \$60,000 and \$65,000 has been spent on fishing havens. That figure is well below the average of \$105,000 which obtained for the last eight years of the Playford Administration.

All these things are today prompting criticism from the fishing industry, as the demand for havens, slipways, jetties and landing ramps grows increasingly. However, this is really a minor point to the fishermen: their great worry is the exhaustion of the crayfishing reserves. I have been supplied with a comprehensive list of yields obtained by one fisherman who has been engaged in fishing from Port MacDonnell for some years. Although I do not want to mention his name, his letter is available to any member who may wish to peruse it. The gentleman who supplied these figures is one of the most reputable fishermen to operate from Port MacDonnell. The statistics show that in the year 1949-50 he averaged 23 lb. of crayfish for each craypot lift. I am sure this represents a Utopian dream of crayfishing at its best. I will give the House the yields, so that members may have an idea of the decreasing drop in yields obtained by the fisherman. I will also indicate how many pots he is using, as this will give an idea of how the decrease in yield has affected the number of pots being used. The figures are as follows:

Year	Pots	Average lift (lb. per pot)
1949-50	38	23
1950-51	36	17
1951-52	45	15
1952-53	40	18
1953-54	46	13
1954-55	69	9
1955-56	69	7
1956-57	74	6
1957-58	57	8
1958-59	41	10
1959-60	45	9
1960-61	41	7
1961-62	52	7
1962-63	60	6½
1963-64	71	5
1964-65	Not known	4
1965-66	Not known	3½
1966-67	Not known	2

These statistics are consistent in the trend they indicate.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: Have you the overall figure for the full year?

Mr. HALL: That is a different matter, to which I shall refer directly. I have heard that the owner of one boat is using 200 pots, obtaining the same quantities today as he obtained, say, 10 or 12 years ago. Although he is working at least double the number of pots that he was previously working, I point out that the average pot yield is much lower nowadays. Having asked fishermen at meetings in Kingston, Beachport and Robe what they thought was their present average pot yield, I was told by one group that it was 2 lb. and by another, 3 lb. It was the consensus of opinion that today's figures were much lower than those of past years.

We know that many investigations into the crayfishing industry are necessary; at present we are probably merely scratching the surface in regard to what is known of the habits of crayfish, their grounds, and the annual yield which is available to our fishermen from those grounds. It is of the utmost urgency that investigations be commenced and continued in the future; it is also urgent that the present position be not allowed to deteriorate. Before investigations commence properly, I believe that urgent action is necessary to prevent the wholesale entry by outsiders into this industry. I wonder how many members are aware of the number of people intending to enter the industry today. I was told by one group of people (who, between them, operated 10 boats in the industry) that they intended to use four more boats next year. Of course, as long as the industry remains uncontrolled,

that will be the pattern: the numbers of people entering the industry will greatly increase and the numbers of crayfish will be depleted much faster than they can be replenished. In fact, I was told at Kingston that one of the fishing grounds to the north-west of that port was no longer fished commercially because it simply did not yield a sufficient catch. On the other hand, I was told that grounds that had been fished out prior to the last war had regenerated exceedingly well during war-time, when much less fishing had occurred.

Mr. Casey: How long does it take a crayfish to mature?

Mr. HALL: I am not certain; I am told that it takes two years for a crayfish to reach a reasonable swimming size. Some years would be involved in its reaching full size, and from information that has been given to me I estimate that it must take at least four or five years.

Mr. Hudson: Do you favour the carapace measurement?

Mr. HALL: I am not qualified to comment on that, although from what I have been told I believe it is the only infallible measurement. I believe that it is easy to stretch the tail of the crayfish to obtain the extra quarter inch or so that may be required by the authorities. The carapace measurement was certainly put to me as being the necessary one to use today. I am concerned at the rapid decrease in yields that fishermen are at present experiencing. Having sought information about the difficulties encountered in Western Australia, I received a letter from the Western Australian Minister of Fisheries, part of which states:

As a first step scientific research was intensified and accelerated, but pending publication of the scientists' findings other measures were considered necessary. To reduce the pressure, or rather to ensure that the pressure would not be increased, it was decided that no boat which was not engaged in crayfishing at February 28, 1963, would be permitted so to engage after that date, although an exception was made in the case of any boat already *bona fide* under construction. It was further decided that no boat could be replaced (except it be under 25ft.) unless it were lost or declared to be unseaworthy by the appropriate authority. In the case of a boat less than 25ft., it was in the interests of safety agreed that it could be replaced by a boat not exceeding 25ft. These rules were introduced so that the efficiency of the fleet would not be unduly increased, as it was felt that in its then condition it could not stand up to much more efficient fishing. There were also some socio-economic overtones in that decision.

I gather that the Western Australian Government acted without implementing the scientific advice that was available to it: it acted merely on information concerning the yields that had been greatly reduced. I am told that the yield dropped in about two years in Western Australia from 21,500,000 lb. to 15,000,000 lb. I think that decrease would be comparable to the one that has been outlined by the fishermen of our South-Eastern ports. The crayfishing industry is, of course, a valuable one for South Australia. In 1964-65, 4,900,000 lb. of crayfish was caught, valued at \$2,800,000; in 1965-66, 6,060,000 lb. was caught, valued at just over \$3,500,000. As the total value of fisheries in South Australia in 1965-66 was \$6,250,000, it can be seen that the value of the crayfishing industry is more than half that total.

This industry is indeed important to South Australia. It is significant that the total yield has been increasing while the yield of each pot has fallen. That clearly demonstrates that the number of pots used has greatly increased as has the number of fishermen engaged in the industry. Obviously such a situation must come to a stop somewhere, otherwise the industry will be loaded with boats and the source on which the fishermen depend will be reduced. If the industry is to survive, obviously there must be some control. It is obvious, too, that people who are constructing boats so that they can engage in this industry and those who are already engaged in the industry reputedly must be allowed to carry on. Obviously, no Government could say to a person investing in a boat that he must not use it for crayfishing. We must act in good faith with those who are spending money to engage in this industry. Therefore, we must do something soon if we are to curtail the increase in the number of boats on the slips to be used in this industry.

It has been estimated that between 200 and 300 boats operate off the South-East coast. Our main objective regarding control should be conservation: we should not set out to establish a monopoly group. We should try to conserve the crayfish on which this industry depends. Conservation has taken place in Western Australia, which has an industry four times the size of that in South Australia and crayfish grounds many times the size of those in South Australia. Conservation also applies in Tasmania and Victoria. South Australia has three types of closed season and there are two legal limits as to the size at which a crayfish can be caught. We should not wait until

all the detail about carapace measurements, boat surveys, pot limits and so on has been worked out before we do something: we should do something now, because the season will soon commence. If we wait until all the current investigations are completed it will be too late. If the Government is to introduce controls to operate next season it must act soon or it will not have time to introduce them before the next season commences.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: When does it start?

Mr. HALL: On November 1.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The boats are being equipped now?

Mr. HALL: Yes, they are being maintained and renovated.

Mr. Millhouse: So there is some urgency about getting something done.

Mr. HALL: There is a great urgency. It would be difficult indeed for the Government to impose controls when the season is under way.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: What is to stop the Government from acting now?

Mr. HALL: Nothing. In the last few weeks the Government has put through a regulation concerning fishing at Port Kenny.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: There was no urgency about that.

Mr. HALL: I believe the Government should act quickly and institute controls to operate in the next crayfishing season. People interested in this industry know that controls regarding entry to it are just around the corner. If controls are not instituted before this season commences, many people will try to get in before the door is closed.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What controls do you advocate for the coming season?

Mr. HALL: There must be control on the number of boats entering the industry. I have already stated the points made by fishermen. On the South-Eastern coast there is an efficient fishermen's association. Therefore, it is not for this Parliament or this Government to set out details of the controls to apply in this industry.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You are getting out of it.

Mr. HALL: I am not getting out of it. This Party believes that wherever possible an industry should remain in the control of those persons engaged in it. I believe an advisory committee or council should be formed of representatives elected by fishermen in these

ports. A region should be decided on. I do not know whether the Minister opposes control of industry by people in it.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I do not.

Mr. HALL: We believe that as far as possible the control of the industry should be left in the hands of those participating in it.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The Government wants a socialistic scheme.

Mr. HALL: Members opposite are in some doubt about the control of the industry. When I look at the Government benches I am reminded of a fished-out crayfishing ground, barren of all reserves. I believe that the advisory council of local fishermen should advise the Minister, first, as to the extent of the region and, secondly, as to the number of pots that fishermen should be allowed to carry on their boats. That is all I am prepared to recommend definitely at this time. I have already been asked about the carapace measurement and I have given an opinion on it, but I do not wish to discuss that matter or the matter of surveying boats. However, I believe boats must be licensed.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The Government made a regulation pretty quickly regarding the Murray River.

Mr. HALL: Yes, it shut the door quickly in that regard. I recommend that the amateur be not excluded from this industry and that he have a licence for a limited number of pots. Some fishermen say that the amateurs should be prevented from fishing.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Would you allow those with a limited number of pots to sell the fish?

Mr. HALL: No. I am not qualified to say what the limit should be, but I have suggested that it be three pots. However, some fishermen have told me that that is too many.

Mr. Burdon: How many dropnets would you permit?

Mr. HALL: I am not familiar with that but I am told that an amateur can obtain the crayfish that he needs with a dropnet. I have recommended that an amateur be limited to three pots, and I hope that the member for Mount Gambier does not want me to vary my statement. The cray fishermen were interested to receive that document on blue paper as a basis of argument and discussion. I told them that we were not laying down a strict rule but I also told them that we must start somewhere. No South Australian Government has yet faced that responsibility.

Mr. Jennings: This Government did face the responsibility, because it appointed a Select Committee.

Mr. HALL: I was not permitted, Mr. Speaker, to develop that argument. The member for Mount Gambier will not find many fishermen on the south coast who are dissatisfied with the Opposition's non-involvement with that committee.

Mr. Broomhill: You are joking!

Mr. HALL: When I have explained our attitude at meetings, I have not been criticized about it. I stated that the sittings of the committee would extend to an extremely lengthy period. Even now the committee is being used as an excuse for not taking action that ought to be taken urgently. I have also told the meetings that the Minister was using his old ploy, as he had done in the case of his first most restrictive proposals, by saying that the fishing industry should not be a political matter.

Mr. Curren: You are saying it should be.

Mr. HALL: I told the fishermen in no uncertain terms that everything discussed in the House was political, and they accepted that explanation, which was a proper one. We are not going to be taken as minority representatives on a committee and inveigled into Government matters with which we may not agree. I also said that, if the report was a sensible one, we would support it to the hilt. We are not playing politics in the way members opposite do. However, in this period in the meantime, the committee and the sittings of the committee are inhibiting the finalizing of matters that ought to be dealt with urgently. Members have copies of the document and I hope that they will debate this measure quickly.

Mr. Hudson: This is not a Bill: it is a motion.

Mr. Coumbe: Nobody said it was a Bill.

Mr. Hudson: You are not trying to tell us that, if this motion is carried, control will be automatic, are you? Legislation will still be needed.

Mr. HALL: How members opposite change: when their motions on social matters are carried, they are regarded as instructions to go ahead with legislation; whereas, if that is done by this side of the House, it is not an instruction. We know that this matter is urgent. I have put to the House the facts as submitted to me by an overwhelming majority of the fishermen in South-Eastern ports and I have outlined the drop in the pot yield. We are

not saying that that industry should be frozen so that only present participants should be allowed to remain. We say that licences ought to be issued while the industry is being dealt with. Further crayfish resources are likely to be found. We know that crayfish are known to exist overseas on the edge of the continental shelf. Who knows what may happen in the breeding grounds and in the field of regeneration of grounds? In the next year or so a critical position will arise if control is not exerted. That would be bad for the cray fishermen and for the industry in general and any delay ought to be prevented.

Mr. Burdon: This critical situation was put to your Party 10 years ago.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture) moved:

That this debate be now adjourned.

Motion carried.

Mr. HALL moved:

That the adjourned debate be made an order of the day for Wednesday next.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works) moved:

To strike out "next" and insert "September 20, 1967".

Mr. Hall: What is the meaning of this? It is a private members' day. If that is the position, no pairs will be given in this House.

Mr. Millhouse: This is what they have wormed out to hold us up.

Mr. Lawn: Go down the Grange and drown yourself.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I appreciate the remarks that you made, Mr. Speaker, and the difficulty in which you found yourself when calling on this matter for debate. You reminded the House that a Select Committee had been appointed and given wide powers to inquire into the industry. There is a Standing Order—

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I understand that one Standing Order provides that the motion for the adjournment cannot be debated.

The SPEAKER: The motion for the adjournment has already been carried. The question before the Chair now has relation to the date of the resumption of the debate. That can be debated only as to the matter of time.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am submitting that the debate should be adjourned until September 20, because Standing Order 397 provides:

The evidence taken by any Select Committee of the House, and documents presented to such

committee which have not been reported to the House, shall not be disclosed or published by any member of such committee, or by any other person.

That Standing Order prohibits five members on this side from taking part in the debate on the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition. The terms of reference in the motion are so wide that they could not take part in the debate without referring to the evidence.

Mr. Millhouse: How can anyone else take part in the debate?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member can take part in any debate because he talks without saying anything. It would be improper for this debate to continue, as it would mean a loss of freedom of speech by members. I urge the acceptance of the amendment.

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is "That the word proposed to be struck out stand part of the motion."

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the Leader. Obviously, the real reason why the Government is amending the motion is not because of the Standing Order but because it happens to find this matter embarrassing and wants to avoid facing it.

Mr. Hall: Because of its inaction.

The SPEAKER: I remind members that the debate is limited to the question of time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: And it was to that question that I addressed myself. The Leader said that there was a measure of urgency in this matter, but the Government, during private members' time, is deliberately delaying consideration of this matter for five or six weeks.

Mr. Ryan: How terrible!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes it is, and a disgraceful thing to do. It is disgraceful on the facts and merits of the case. It is done because the Government is embarrassed and wishes to avoid debating the matter. It is too silly for the Minister to say that members of the Select Committee will be debarred from debating it. On my calculations there are 15 other Government members, including the Premier, capable of debating it. Why cannot the debate continue with those 15 members, if no others?

Mr. Lawn: We waited 29 years; why not five more weeks?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is traditional that on Wednesday afternoons private members' business is conducted.

Mr. Ryan: Who is embarrassed now?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In my time in the House (and I have taken part in debates on

private members' matters) the convention always has been that a private member who moves the motion is in charge of it—in charge of when the debate continues and whether or not it is adjourned. Why is that convention being disregarded by the present Government?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member is not discussing the question of time.

Mr. Millhouse: You don't want to hear me, either.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask all honourable members to have regard to the fact that this debate concerns time only, and is limited in scope.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My point is that the Leader, who is in charge of this motion, regards the matter as urgent and wishes the debate to continue next Wednesday. This matter, being private members' business, can come on only on a Wednesday. The invariable practice in the House has been (for at least 12 years anyway) that a member in charge of business is entitled to say when it will continue. That happened when the Liberal Government was in office and, until now, since the Labor Party came into office.

The SPEAKER: I am being most tolerant on this question. When other Speakers have been in a similar position, honourable members have not had the latitude that I have allowed today. However, I intend that it should not be extended, and the debate will take place on the question of time only.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I protest on two grounds. First, this is a measure of urgency, but the Government is deliberately denying the Leader the right to continue. Secondly, this is the first (and I hope it will be the last) breach of the convention that a private member is in charge of his business.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): It seems that the Opposition's contention is not relevant to the situation. You, Sir, in concluding your opening remarks (which, I am sure, all members respect) said that you allowed the debate to commence but that the matter was in the hands of the House. That is correct. The member for Mitcham has suggested that we are taking the debate out of the hands of the Leader, but I remind him that this motion could have been disallowed by the Chair.

Mr. Millhouse: It was not.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: That's the point.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The Chair ruled it in order.

The SPEAKER: I ask members to maintain decorum. Much time is being used, but members must address their remarks to the question of time.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I am developing this point: you, Sir, said that this matter was in the hands of the House. It has been said that this is a matter of urgency. The Minister in charge of the House has suggested that the debate be adjourned to September 20, and this would give ample time before the crayfishing season commenced on November 1.

Mr. Hall: Rubbish!

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: It is all right for the Leader to say "rubbish", but he has already had his say. The Minister in charge of the department should reply to this motion. Would anyone deny that? For me to reply to the Leader I would have had to use information that had been placed before the Select Committee.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: And placed before you for a long time.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: And before the honourable member before it was placed before me.

Mr. Ryan: For a long time, too.

The SPEAKER: Honourable members shall maintain order, and the Minister address himself to the question of time.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I respect your thoughts on this, Sir. I am addressing myself to the question of time, and suggest that September 20 will allow ample time for a decision to be made by the Government. To reply, I would need information that had been placed before the Select Committee. I have it, and because of this the debate should not take place until I, at least, could present the other side of the picture from that presented by the Leader.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): By this unprecedented manoeuvre of the Government in taking charge of private members' business and trying to adjourn the debate until September 20, the Government is clearly trying to get out of some difficulty. The House knows that the Government could have made up its mind without appointing a Select Committee. Now, it will wait until September 20, but about that time someone will move that Government business take precedence of private members' business. Then what happens to private members' business? There are several Wednesday afternoons to which we are entitled in the next few weeks, and the Government is using its

numbers to take those afternoons from us, simply because it does not like the question. I protest vigorously.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): The unprecedented manoeuvre is the moving of a motion in this House which is designed specifically to muzzle the responsible Minister and the members of the Select Committee. Under Standing Order 397—

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Stick to the point.

Mr. HUDSON: This is the point. None of the members of the Select Committee or the Minister responsible for the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department would be able effectively to debate the matter without breaking Standing Order 397. The member for Alexandra is not in a very good position to talk about urgency: as Minister of Agriculture, he regarded the industry as so urgent that he did nothing about it.

Mr. HALL: Mr. Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am afraid I will have to name members if they will not listen to the advice from the Chair and the demand from the Chair that this debate be limited to the question of time. Did I see the Leader rise to a point of order?

Mr. HALL: I was drawing your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the width of the debate caused by the member for Glenelg canvassing the subject matter of my motion.

The SPEAKER: I am doing my best to keep the debate within bounds and within the provisions of the Standing Orders. I ask for the co-operation of all members on both sides to help me do just that.

Mr. HUDSON: I am sorry if I transgressed your ruling in any way, Mr. Speaker. Members of the Opposition have suggested that this debate should proceed immediately because this is a matter of great urgency. However, urgency is in the production of legislation to be passed by this House and agreed to in another place so that it can become the law of the land, and members opposite are well aware of the fact that that process takes time and that it will not commence until the report of the Select Committee comes in. September 20 will give the Select Committee time.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: No.

Mr. HUDSON: The honourable member wouldn't know; he is not a member of the Select Committee.

Mr. Ryan: He resigned from it.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. HUDSON: I thank you, Sir, for your protection from uninformed interjectors. The date of September 20 will enable the Select Committee to finalize its report. It has been a lengthy task, and the committee has had an extensive number of meetings. I am debating the adjournment date of September 20 and saying that the extra few weeks will be necessary for the Select Committee to finalize its report and bring it before Parliament. Members of the committee have been working very hard on this matter.

Members interjecting:

Mr. HUDSON: It is all very well for the member for Gumeracha to chuckle: he just would not know.

Mr. Ryan: He didn't do anything for 32 years.

Mr. HUDSON: When the report of the Select Committee and the minutes of evidence are placed before Parliament, every member will, I am sure, be impressed with the amount of work the Select Committee has done and the territory it has covered.

Mr. Nankivell: It went into recess for two months.

Mr. HUDSON: It did not: it has not been in recess at all, and therefore the honourable member's interjection is not true. What is more, he should know it is untrue. Members of the Select Committee have been treating this matter with all urgency, and the report will come before Parliament.

At 4 o'clock, the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the motion before the Chair to be dealt with.

Motion carried.

Mr. HUDSON: To conclude my remarks, I sum up by saying that the Government, the members of the Select Committee, and the responsible Minister have been treating this matter with all urgency, and, when the report of the Select Committee is presented to Parliament and the legislation introduced, I hope that the urgency that the Opposition suddenly sees in this matter (just because the Leader got inveigled into a trip to the South-East) will be effectively demonstrated to the House. I hope the Opposition will co-operate fully in passing the necessary legislation to see that the fishing industry as a whole, not just the cray-

fishing industry, in South Australia is fully and properly looked after.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): The motion of the Leader of the Opposition is that this matter be adjourned until next Wednesday, which is the normal private members' day for dealing with matters that private members believe should be discussed in this House. However, the Minister has moved an amendment: to adjourn the debate to September 20. Therefore, we are discussing whether the House will continue its discussion on this important matter next week or whether there will be a break of six weeks before it will again be considered. I do not want to transgress your ruling with regard to time, Mr. Speaker, because the questions of time and of the importance of this matter are really bound up together.

The SPEAKER: I remind the honourable member that I do not intend to allow a debate on the general question.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am merely saying that I do not intend to debate the general question, but it is bound up with the question of time. The crayfishing season normally opens on November 1, so that any arrangements for the season must be concluded some time before that date, because every member knows that, not by a miracle, the boats are all assembled on November 1 to go out, and action must be taken before then. If the industry is to operate under a new code by November 1, obviously unless many people are to be put to an unjust and unjustified expense they should be able to know as soon as possible of any new rules that will govern the industry. One cannot alter the whole basis of an industry by bringing in a Bill which becomes operative on November 1, and still expect the industry in those circumstances to avoid substantial loss. I think the Premier, who by now must have a fairly wide knowledge of the problem of implementing measures, will realize that, if a measure is to apply to this season, it must be dealt with promptly. That is the whole basis of the Leader's motion; he did not criticize the Select Committee; he did not deal with extraneous matters, but merely stressed the necessity—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has made his point; I ask him now to confine his remarks to the motion.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am dealing strictly with the necessity to have

this matter dealt with at once. Are we to go to sleep for six weeks—

Mr. Ryan: You went to sleep for 32 years!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD:—and suddenly wake up and impose on an industry a new set of conditions that will be difficult and completely revolutionary to the industry?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member knows very well that what he is saying is well outside the scope of the debate, and I ask him to confine his remarks to the motion.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: With all due deference to you, Sir, I point out that the time factor comes well within this debate. The Minister suggests that on September 20 the Select Committee will have brought in its report and that the Government at that stage (and not before) will be able to say something about the matter. That will leave only one week in September and four weeks in October to design the legislation, introduce it and have it considered in both Houses, and subject the industry to a completely new set of circumstances. If I have any knowledge of fishermen, I believe that they will have many differing views about this legislation. Why must we put off the debate for six weeks? It seems that we must do that merely because the Minister and honourable members opposite do not wish to debate the motion next week. I believe they do not wish to introduce legislation that will become effective this year.

The SPEAKER: That has no relation whatever to whether the debate be adjourned to next Wednesday or to a future date. I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the motion.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: September 20 is the date to which the Minister says the matter must be adjourned, and it is obviously a date designed to prevent legislation being implemented this year. We want the legislation this year, not next year.

Mr. Langley: You could have had it 32 years ago.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Honourable members know that if the matter is adjourned to September 20 it will be impossible for the Government to have the legislation passed. I have listened with some interest to statements about how soon the Licensing Bill is to come into force, but it takes time. The Minister has been doing his utmost to get the legislation into an acceptable form which he can recommend to the House and which will become law. This particular legislation will

contain all sorts of prickles. I strongly oppose any delay that is designed to kill the issue this year.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): Rip Van Winkle yet lives!

Mr. Millhouse: Can't you do better than that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has just addressed the House with a great sense of urgency. The proposal is that this debate be not postponed until September 20, but that it proceed for the next couple of weeks. The thesis that the honourable member then put to the House is that that will result in our having legislation to be introduced this session, that is, if the debate goes on next week and the week after because, knowing how the Opposition deals with these measures, it would not be disposed of next week.

Mr. Millhouse: The Leader said he would like it disposed of today.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He knows perfectly well that it cannot be disposed of today, and it could not be disposed of next week, either. He knew perfectly well at the outset that this motion was certainly not designed to introduce legislation within the time that the member for Gumeracha suggested it could be introduced. The member for Gumeracha knows that, because he has been in the House for a long time; he knows how these things work. He is not fooling anybody in this House; I do not know whether he thinks he is fooling the fishing industry but, if he thinks that he is, I think he will find that he is mistaken.

We have had this afternoon an unprecedented proposal before the House that there be immediately debated a matter that is being investigated by a Select Committee of the House, which will report within the period for which the Minister has asked that the matter be adjourned. If the debate goes on within that period, the matters which are placed before the Select Committee in evidence and which are essential to any discussion of the merits of this matter, cannot be put before the House. How in the world can we properly dispose of the measure at that particular time, without the information that has been put before the Select Committee?

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: It would be totally unfair to me.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Indeed, it would be totally unfair to the Minister, who is the one Minister in 40 years who has done anything about this. Suddenly, after

this enormous lapse of time, the matter is so urgent that it has to be dealt with next week.

Mr. Hall: What will the fishermen say about that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I know what they say about the Minister and about members who represent them, and I also know what they say about Johnnies-come-lately who go down for one day's fishing in the area. The urgency about which the member for Gumeracha has throbbed to the House is a lot of "my eye". In fact, this matter will be dealt with this session by this House and it will be dealt with on the basis of proper information given to the House in due course. I welcome the interest that honourable members opposite are displaying, hoping that that interest will be sustained at the time the Select Committee's report comes before the House.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I am conscious that you, Mr. Speaker, have not over-ruled the moving of the substantive motion. Therefore, I am not involved in considering any ruling by you as to when the matter should be next discussed in this House. The move to have further discussion suspended until September 20 is purely a Government move and is not supported by anything in Standing Orders providing that it must be so adjourned. Therefore, because the Government has said so, we are not to discuss this matter.

Mr. Clark: The Speaker left the matter in the hands of the House.

Mr. HALL: The honourable member should know that the affairs of the House are in its control as long as the Speaker does not over-rule this by saying that the House is transgressing Standing Orders. We are not supposed to canvass the reasons behind the motion because that impinges on the subject matter. The Government will use its power to prohibit discussion next week, even though this afternoon we finished the debate on my original motion before the time normally allowed for Question Time had expired. At 3.45 p.m. I moved that the debate on my motion be adjourned until next Wednesday. We could have involved the House in a longer Question Time or we could have kept the debate on my motion going until 4.30 or 4.45 p.m.; yet we chose to end the debate at 3.45 p.m.

I point out that I was asked by fishermen whether I could move this motion so that the matter could be discussed urgently. This wish was expressed to me by fishermen at the meeting I attended at Port MacDonnell.

Therefore, it is not the will of the Opposition that is being defeated: it is the will of the fishermen (those people whose industry is in jeopardy) that is being thwarted by the Minister's amendment, which has been supported by the Premier and all other members of the Government Party. The need for urgency in this matter is being flung in the faces of fishermen in the South-East. The member for Mount Gambier can smirk all he wants.

Mr. Burdon: Have a look at your back-benchers and see what sort of a joke they think this is.

Mr. HALL: I would not have considered that the member for Mount Gambier would joke about this matter. The need for urgency has been impressed on me by those engaged in the industry. I believe that the need for urgency is therefore relevant to discussion on the day on which this debate will be resumed. At the meeting at Port MacDonnell, fishermen asked me how I could make an approach to the Government on the matter. I told them that my Party was not in Government at present.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable the Leader not to canvass that matter because it is the substance of his original motion and we are not going over that ground again. The only matter before the House at present is the question whether the House, in its wisdom, shall adjourn this motion to next Wednesday or to September 20.

Mr. HALL: I did not intend to widen the terms of this discussion. I was merely pointing out that the fishermen at Port MacDonnell were concerned with getting this matter dealt with urgently, and I think this impinges on the question now before the Chair. Two matters are involved in this discussion: the crayfishing industry and the tradition of the time allotted to private members in this House. Freedom of speech in this place has suffered today. It is suffering because the Government does not desire to have this matter discussed and will use all the power at its disposal to see that it is not discussed until some time in the future that is more convenient for the Government. If the matters that the Opposition raises (whether or not they are distasteful to the Government) are to be treated like this and if the minority groups in South Australia, which we represent during private members' time, are to be disregarded, then the Government can look forward to receiving no co-operation from the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think that two statements made were a reflection on the Chair. One was that freedom of speech had suffered and the other was that the rights of minorities had not been upheld in this House this afternoon. Regarding the Chair, I want to say that I carefully considered what was placed before me concerning the rights of minorities and concerning the precedents established and the rulings given in other Parliaments, and I had considerable doubt whether or not this motion was in order, but on balance I gave the benefit of the doubt to the minority.

Mr. HALL: I should like to say that none of my remarks was directed at you, Sir, as Speaker in charge of the House. I should like to draw your attention, Sir, if I may respectfully do so, to my initial remarks when I said that I recognized and appreciated that you did not say that my substantive motion was out of order and that you left it for the House to decide. I apologize if, in the heat of debate, I seemed to direct my remarks at you in any way. I intended to direct my remarks at the Government. I believe I said earlier that I appreciated the consideration you gave to this matter and, as you have said, you clearly stated that this was a matter to be decided by the House. I appreciate that and, if you think that any of my remarks reflected on you, I withdraw them unreservedly. My remarks were directed at the actions of the Government.

The House divided on the amendment of the Hon. C. D. Hutchens:

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

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

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried; adjournment motion, as amended, carried.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 2. Page 997.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): This Bill provides a further interesting exercise for the House. The recent history of Parliamentary discussion of the setting up of a public accounts committee is

that in 1965 the member who has introduced this Bill moved that, in the opinion of the House, it was desirable that a public accounts committee be established to carry out duties identical with those set out in this Bill. The Government then introduced a Bill (No. 21 of 1965) which provided for the setting up of a committee on which the Legislative Council would not have representation or power to refer matters to the committee. The second reading explanation was given but no further progress was made, the reason being that much Government business could not be accomplished in that session, which, nevertheless, was the longest session for many years and the session in which more Bills were dealt with than in any other session in the history of the Parliament of South Australia. It was impossible to deal with all matters with which Parliament wished to deal. The then Treasurer said in his second reading explanation:

It has long been the policy of the Government that there should be a public accounts committee. It is considered that such a committee could perform a useful function.

The circle of financial control by Parliament cannot be completed until there is a public accounts committee, and the Government's opinion is that there should be such a committee. The member for Albert in 1966 moved a motion that was in similar terms to the one that had been moved in 1965. The amendment moved at that time was that the duties of the committee be those set out in the previous Bill: the rights of the Legislative Council to reference and reports were removed from the terms. The point was that the Upper House, which has only limited powers in respect of money Bills, should not exercise a voice on such a committee.

That is a very firm view of the Government. The Upper House of this Parliament has no place in the circle of financial control of Government expenditure. The House of Assembly is the House that grants supply and the House in which matters with which a public accounts committee should concern itself are debated. It is from this House that any public accounts committee should be appointed and it is to this House that any such committee should report. The motion was passed but, because of the Government's legislative programme last year, it was impossible to deal with the matter further. It was not in the Government's legislative programme for this year: although the Government considers that the appointment of a committee is desirable, there is insufficient Parliamentary time in

Government business time to enable the matter to be dealt with. The Bill before us is in such terms that a public accounts committee could not operate, as the honourable member knows, because there is no provision for expenditure.

Mr. Nankivell: That was omitted. The Bill could be amended.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. It will be amended in Committee to provide a Bill similar to that which the Government introduced previously. While we are prepared to spend money for the purposes of a public accounts committee, we are not prepared to have members of the Legislative Council involved in such a committee. In consequence, while the Government will support the second reading of the Bill, it intends to amend it to provide for a committee of members of the House of Assembly only. If we pass the Bill we will await its fate in another place, and if another place is prepared to take a different view from the view it took previously we may have a public accounts committee in South Australia. I, and all Government members, think that this would be a good thing.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support my colleague for taking the initiative in this matter. A difference of opinion exists between the Opposition and the Government concerning representation of the Legislative Council on the committee, but as we have a bi-cameral system of Government the Legislative Council has virtually the same powers as the House of Assembly, and its members should be represented on the committee. It is essential that such a committee be appointed. The Budget and other financial documents are prepared poorly, so that it is difficult for the general public to understand how the money is voted and where it goes. This committee could call expert accountants to ensure that the financial statements of the State were prepared in a new and better form.

The Auditor-General reports on the accounts to Parliament, but nothing further seems to be done. When this Bill was introduced previously, several members opposed it because they suggested it would slow down the business of the Government. However, that would not be correct. It has been suggested that leading public servants would not give advice or make a decision if such a committee were appointed, but if the public servant were not prepared to do this he should not be in that position. To appoint such a committee emphasizes the essence of democracy, because the direct representatives of the people (at least on this side)

bear their responsibility to those who elect them and, as back-benchers, we should have some responsibility in checking the activities of the Executive. It is the responsibility of members of Parliament to ensure that all financial matters are properly investigated.

This committee would benefit many departments because it would inquire into the affairs of the State and ensure that financial documents were prepared in such a way that they were understood by the general public. I know of no reason why this committee should not be appointed: a similar one works successfully in Victoria with representatives from both Lower and Upper Houses, although in that State the Upper House does not have as much power as the Legislative Council has here. After it is amended, the Bill should be accepted by all members.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): As I have done previously, I oppose this legislation. The appointment of such a committee is wrong, certainly for this Parliament, although it may be justified in other Parliaments and in other situations. For instance, it may be justified in the Commonwealth Parliament, although I have reservations about that. The Commonwealth Parliament has a wide influence, but its various departments are often widely spread with a potential waste of time and money, and this type of committee may be useful in these circumstances. However, I do not have much faith in such a committee even in such a field. Such a committee can inquire into special matters but not into every special matter each year. In practice it may be many years before a Government department is inspected by this committee.

Mr. Nankivell: It is better to get it some time than not at all.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: If such a committee is not handled properly it can produce a bad effect on the Public Service. I do not suggest that, if such a committee were appointed here, it would be handled improperly. We hear over and over again that members of Parliament are political: obviously we are politicians and, as members of a public accounts committee, we would be asserting ourselves in the form of a Royal Commission on any matter we chose to investigate.

I was invited to see the Commonwealth Public Accounts Committee in session when it sat here some years ago, and I was most disturbed by what I saw. The committee

was investigating the affairs of an industry which had been in the charge, in some respects, of a Commonwealth department. I received my invitation to attend as a member of Parliament, and some accountants also attended. Representatives of these industries had evidently been invited as well. The sitting provided them with an entertaining afternoon: they saw a Commonwealth public servant, whose efficiency was investigated, being questioned. My sympathy was with him, because he appeared to be a good, honest officer. He was questioned for several hours (not that I stayed there all the time) very ponderously by the committee members who asked him a question, gave a mini-lecture on the value of the Public Accounts Committee, and then continued asking him further questions. It was not a comfortable situation for him. It appeared to me to be one of the most pointless investigations I had seen.

Obviously there must be times when investigations can produce good results, but this obviously was not one of them. At times the Commonwealth committee has humiliated Government servants by publicly cross-examining them. If we want vigorous, self-reliant public servants, we should encourage, not discourage them. At present the Public Service is divided into departments and a Minister is responsible for each department. The Minister is available if anything goes wrong or if the work of his department is questioned. That is an accepted principle and one of the bases of democracy. In my experience, the Public Service takes a pride in seeing that it does not let the respective Ministers down and, on the other hand, the Ministers do their best to see that their departments are efficient. If a mistake is made, the officers hear about it from the Minister. This Bill intrudes an entirely new situation into the existing system of Parliamentary control.

The greatest advantage of a public accounts committee is that it gives its members a chance to learn more about public finance. They can better inform themselves from information they receive and, if that was all it was going to do, there would be no harm in it. However, that is not all, and that is not a sufficient reason to set up a committee. It does more than that because it allows the members of the committee to interfere in a marked way with decision-making within the Government. It is the Government's job to govern between elections and, if it fails, the Government goes out at the next election. That principle is sound.

Between elections, the Government is responsible to Parliament, which can vote it money or refuse to do so. Again, it can force the Government out. This is a well tried system, so why should we suddenly intrude a new factor whereby public servants can be publicly humiliated? This must occur occasionally, and it will discourage the display of initiative rather than encourage it. I do not think much of this proposal at all. The 59 members of this Parliament represent about 1,000,000 people (it may not represent them fully because the Commonwealth Government has certain powers over those same people). I said last year, at page 1574 of *Hansard*:

At present we have 39 members in the House of Assembly and 20 members in the Legislative Council.

I remind members that the Government's amendment removes from the Bill any reference to the Legislative Council. I then said:

Of those 59 members, nine are Cabinet Ministers; one is the President of the Legislative Council and one is the Speaker of the House of Assembly; one is the Chairman of Committees in the House of Assembly; four are Party Whips (these are important posts in themselves); and two are Leaders of the Opposition in their respective Houses. Now it is scarcely conceivable that any of those 18 members could be selected for membership of a public accounts committee. Then we have a number of important Parliamentary committees. Without intending any disrespect to the Printing Committee and the Library Committee, I point out that those committees are not so important as the larger ones, so I shall mention only the latter.

Apart from the 18 members who are Ministers or who have other positions in Parliament, we have the Public Works Committee, consisting of seven members; the Land Settlement Committee, also with seven members; an Industries Development Committee, consisting of five persons of whom four are members of Parliament; and a Subordinate Legislation Committee, with six members. Therefore, there are 24 members on these committees. To my mind, the 18 members that I mentioned first are disqualified from holding other positions, and the work performed by these other 24 members on committees is onerous enough in itself to disqualify them from membership of a public accounts committee. Therefore, it means that there are only 17 left out of the 59 from whom the members of such a committee could be appointed.

We have only to establish one more committee and every member of the Parliament will have a job; probably several members would have more than one job, and that would be an absurd situation. If the public accounts committee wished to sit as a commission to investigate everything, it could fill in every

hour of its members' working life. Obviously that could not be done. The committee would be forced to select what we might call the odds and ends of inquiries on which to concentrate. I do not believe that the public accounts committee would help the Public Service, the public, or the Government of the State. Its only possible benefit might be to help committee members understand public finance.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): Members will recall the motion before the House last year dealing with this matter, and I think this Bill is merely an extension of that motion. A public accounts committee is essentially a British institution, although I think that, in fact, the House of Commons borrowed the idea from the Canadians. The committee was first mooted in the House of Commons in 1862 and in 1886 Mr. William Gladstone, speaking to the Exchequer and Audit Departments Bill said:

When the House voted money it parted with it for certain and it then passed under the control of the financial department of the Treasury, and was distributed amongst various organs of the State all over the world. The accounts were then made out and sent permanently to the Board of Audit; but the last portion of the circle remained incomplete until the Committee of Public Accounts had done its duty. It was not till then that it could fairly be said that the office of the House, as the real authoritative steward of public moneys, had been discharged.

A little later in that debate, Sir George Bowyer said:

In the whole system the great difficulty which had struck the committee on public moneys was this. There was a control over the issue, but when the money was issued there was no control at all; so that between the issue and the audit the Treasury could do just what it pleased with the money. The control over the issue was a constitutional control; and the control by the audit an administrative control.

Mr. Quirke: That is not the way it is here, though.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: No. As most members know, the House of Commons has had a public accounts committee functioning for many years but I understand that it is made up of members from both sides of the House and represented in roughly the proportion of the two major parties (the Government and the Opposition) of the House of Commons. However, that committee differs from other public accounts committees overseas—

Mr. Nankivell: And in Australia!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes: a senior member of the Opposition is the Chairman of that committee. In the Australian context that

would be most unusual, and I doubt whether any Australian Government would seriously consider making such a move. Great Britain's present Prime Minister has made his name in politics by his work on the Public Accounts Committee. As the member for Alexandra said earlier, many senior civil servants can be greatly embarrassed by interrogations to which they are subjected at the hands of a public accounts committee. Indeed, Mr. Wilson built up his reputation at the expense of many senior British civil servants. It is easy for the chairman of a public accounts committee to sit in his place as the master interrogator, and it is difficult for servants of the Crown to protect themselves. I support the second reading.

Mr. HUDSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

GAS

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Hall:
(For wording of motion, see page 844.)

(Continued from August 2. Page 1013.)

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I had almost completed my remarks last week when, because of the time factor and other business to be dealt with, I obtained leave to continue. I know that the member for Glenelg is keen to tell us all about the nitrogenous fertilizer factory to be established at Wallaroo.

Mr. Hughes: You invited me to tell you about it, too, which I am going to do.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I should like to hear what the honourable member has to say about that factory. I was interested to hear the member for Glenelg say in the House yesterday that this matter had reached such an advanced stage that it was almost a reality. It is good to see that the honourable member, after having been overseas, especially to the United States (that home of capitalist enterprise) has brought home with him the goods in the form of a large lump of American capital, know-how, and willingness to set up a nitrogenous fertilizer factory in South Australia. I am delighted that the place chosen for the factory is Wallaroo: Perhaps within a few years' time farmers in my district will be able to buy nitrogenous fertilizer from that factory.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I oppose the motion. I should like to remind the House of the substantive content of the motion, namely, to refer the whole matter of the natural gas pipeline to the Public Works Committee for inquiry and report and to report in particular on the following matters: first,

the costs of construction of the direct easterly route and an alternative western route adjacent to Spencer Gulf; secondly, the potential for gas usage in the centres of Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Pirie, Wallaroo, Peterborough and Clare; and, thirdly, the economic effects on the above centres and their ability to attract further industries if natural gas were available to them. As we are all well aware, this is merely an arrant piece of political opportunism advanced by the Leader of the Opposition. Nothing surprised me more when I returned from the United States, particularly after having spoken to representatives of the Bechtel organization in San Francisco, to find out that the Opposition was still carrying on about the route.

The Premier last Wednesday afternoon gave the lie completely (for good and all, I hope) to this motion and to any question that the easterly route was not to be preferred. He was able to show that at all stages it was cheaper (if it were desired to supply Port Augusta and Whyalla) to build a pipeline on the direct route and extend the lateral branch to Port Augusta and thence to Whyalla than to bring the 18in. pipeline the extra distance down the westerly route. It was cheaper to do it that way (to economize on the length of the 18in. line and to extend the length of the lateral), even assuming that there was a demand for natural gas to meet in Port Augusta and Whyalla. As all members know, at present no significant demand for natural gas can be demonstrated in either of those two towns. Honourable members opposite are trying to tell us that we should waste the time of the House and take the risk of seriously delaying the whole project (and perhaps risk putting it in jeopardy) in order to refer the matter to the Public Works Committee, which is not an expert committee in relation to this sort of project and which, to my knowledge, has not undertaken a demand study of natural gas or of any other product. I do not know of any demand studies that it has undertaken.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: That committee is just as expert as the committee set up to inquire into the fishing industry.

Mr. HUDSON: Apart from me, I should think that the intelligence of my colleagues on the Fishing Select Committee is such that in a short space of time they have become expert indeed on the fishing industry and would be able to stand the Public Works Committee a good start any day of the week, even if the member for Alexandra were added

to it. However, it would be a complete waste of time, for any reason other than for Party politics, to refer the matter to the Public Works Committee. The member for Alexandra shakes his head; I am incapable of understanding why he does that. It has been proved to him many times that the eastern route is the most economical and that only if that route is taken can we be sure that the project will get off the ground. If the project does not get off the ground nobody will have natural gas. The member for Alexandra knows this. Is he prepared to tell the House that the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited will contract for large quantities of natural gas in Whyalla? Will the B.H.P. Company in Whyalla alter its method of making pig iron by installing the latest type of equipment that would use natural gas?

Mr. McKee: That company has never made an approach about natural gas.

Mr. HUDSON: It has indicated to the Government that at this stage it does not even contemplate using natural gas. There is a good economic reason why it will not do so and that is that the shipping of coke from Port Kembla and Newcastle to Whyalla is virtually costless to the B.H.P. Company because backloading space is available in the ore carriers owned by the company and, if it is not used to carry coke from the eastern ports to Whyalla, it will not be used at all. That means that the cost of coke to the B.H.P. Company in Whyalla is virtually identical with the cost of coke in Port Kembla and Newcastle. On that basis, the company has installed equipment specifically designed to use coke in order to transform iron ore into pig iron. That process, as a by-product, produces significant quantities of manufactured gas, which is used as fuel in the rest of the company's operations.

Mr. Burdon: If the ships did not carry coke they would have to cart something as ballast.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. On some occasions the cost of coke in Whyalla, because of the avoidance of carrying ballast, might be a little cheaper than the cost in Port Kembla and Newcastle. That is possible. As the member for Alexandra knew about these matters, why did he not say to the Leader, "Look, mate: you are sticking your neck out; this is such a stupid motion that you will have your head chopped off time and again"? I do not think the Leader could have shown his speech to the member for Alexandra, because the member for Alexandra would not have permitted

him to waffle on about a steel industry in Whyalla that could use natural gas. I do not think members opposite discuss these matters amongst themselves; certainly no common sense was applied in the wording of this motion. The leader, who has little support from other members of the Opposition, is prepared to put in jeopardy the whole project and also to put in jeopardy a branch line to Wallaroo.

Mr. Quirke: That is the unforgiveable sin.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, and I will explain why to the honourable member shortly. The gas available from Gidgealpa and Moomba is a clean but very dry natural gas. The quantity of liquid hydro-carbons that will be obtained from the gas will not, in general, justify the development of petro-chemical industries. We cannot expect natural gas in South Australia, of the type we have at Gidgealpa and Moomba, to produce a really significant petro-chemical industry in this State. Any petro-chemical industry would be a large user of natural gas, to such an extent that the availability of natural gas in a particular place at a reasonable price will determine the location of that industry at that particular place.

Apart from petro-chemical industries, natural gas can be used to produce ammonia or as a fuel. I shall leave aside for the moment the case of an ammonia fertilizer plant. Where natural gas is used as a fuel it is usually not a significant percentage of costs. The information I was given in the United States of America showed that the availability of natural gas a fuel cheaper than other alternative fuels, where it was just a fuel and not a feed stock, was not a critical question in the location of an industry in one place or another. The critical question (and this was referred to time and time again) were access to markets and raw materials and the availability and cost of labour. The fuel costs in manufacturing glass are lower if natural gas is used, but that economy in fuel costs is not a critical question in moving an industry closer to a source of natural gas. Similarly, natural gas is generally a cheaper fuel to use in cement production. But, again, that factor was not critical in determining the location of the cement industry. For cement production it was much more important to be close to the market. The one significant instance where natural gas of the type we have will represent a great proportion of the costs is the production of nitrogenous fertilizers, where natural gas, or

pure methane, is not used merely, as a fuel but is also a basic feed stock in the production of ammonia. It is a basic material.

When we examine the question of the location of a nitrogenous fertilizer plant, I suggest it is no accident that the American syndicate bought land at Wallaroo because, if we want to site a plant to economize on freight and still serve the main agricultural districts of this State and at least provide some possibility of exports to Eyre Peninsula, it is difficult to think of a site with the advantages of Wallaroo.

Mr. Quirke: What about Riverton?

Mr. HUDSON: What port is that near? If we want to serve Eyre Peninsula, which is now becoming more and more important in the grain production of this State, we need to be close to a port. Further, the scale of operation of a nitrogenous fertilizer plant is particularly relevant, and it may need to be close to a port to be able to export to overseas countries as we may be forced into a situation of producing on a scale much larger than that necessary to meet the local market. If we are contemplating the production of nitrogenous fertilizers in South Australia and want a location that will best serve the main agricultural grain-growing areas of the State, Wallaroo is a location from where we can export to Eyre Peninsula and from where we can best serve the areas of Yorke Peninsula, the Mid North and so on.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: In which areas of the State would you expect a demand for these fertilizers?

Mr. HUDSON: Initially, we can expect the demand in the grain-growing areas. Ultimately, the irrigation areas may develop a strong demand for nitrogenous fertilizers—certainly a greater demand an acre than would be justified in grain production.

Mr. Quirke: We need only 4 lb. a tree.

Mr. HUDSON: But compared with a maximum application of 50 lb. to the acre in grain production, the application to each acre in irrigation areas would be high.

Mr. Quirke: How many cubic feet of gas would be used in producing a ton of sulphate of ammonia?

Mr. HUDSON: I will come to that. If the honourable member cares to wait, I will go into the economics of the production of anhydrous ammonia, urea, ammonium phosphate and ammonium sulphate. While I was in the United States, Mr. Bridges at Jackson arranged for me to visit the Mississippi Chemical Company's anhydrous ammonia

plant at Yazoo City. Members opposite who profess to have the farming areas of this State at heart may be interested to learn that that plant is run as a farmers' co-operative. Many members opposite are pleased to support the idea of farmers' co-operatives—or, at least, they are not prepared to state their opposition in public. However, this plant at Yazoo City, which supplies anhydrous ammonia only to farmers who are members of the co-operative, has been a huge success. It built up to a level of production of 300 tons a day but it has just installed a 1,000 tons a day plant which is now running and which is a single-stream plant. As a matter of fact, 1,000 tons a day plants are now becoming common in the United States. There are plants in existence now that achieve further economies by producing at the rate of 1,500 short tons of anhydrous ammonia a day.

I come now to economies of scale in ammonia production because they are particularly relevant to the establishment of a nitrogenous fertilizer industry in this State. While in Mississippi, I was able to get a complete run-down of the costs of production at the Mississippi Chemical Company's plant at Yazoo City; and while in California I was able to visit a further fertilizer plant at Stockton, run by Best Fertilizers, and get more or less complete information on their costs of production. In addition to that, I spent a day with the Industrial Division of the Bechtel Corporation, which, I suppose, has had more experience in the construction of anhydrous ammonia plants than any other company in the world. It has complete details of the relative costs of production in operating a small plant of, say, 150 tons a day and in operating a large plant of 1,000 or 1,500 tons a day. It is clear from the information I was able to get that, as the size of the plant increases, the main economy achieved arises, first of all, from a more economic use of power.

This comes about because, once a scale of 600 tons a day is reached, centrifugal compressors instead of reciprocating compressors can be installed, and with that rate of production power costs per ton of anhydrous ammonia can be cut by a factor of 20. With a plant producing 150 tons a day, the electricity power costs will be about \$5 to \$6 a ton of anhydrous ammonia. With a rate of production of 600 tons a day, which enables a centrifugal compressor to be used, the power costs will be reduced to about 30c a ton of anhydrous ammonia. In the United States

the price of anhydrous ammonia varies a little over the whole country but it is about \$90 a ton in Mississippi, and about \$80 a ton in California. But, from the increase in capacity that has taken place in the United States in the last year or so, where costs of production of anhydrous ammonia have been reduced to below \$20 a ton in the very large plants, it is clear that we can expect a substantial reduction in the price of anhydrous ammonia in that country. As economic production gets under way here, with the use of natural gas rather than naphtha, the same kind of price reduction can be expected. Because of the availability of subsidy in Australia, possible dramatic price reduction could take place. Assume that in an ammonia plant capable of producing 150 tons a day, natural gas costs 30c a thousand cubic feet. In such a plant in South Australia, the natural gas costs, calculated at 30c a thousand cubic feet, would be about \$9 a ton, covering use both as a fuel and as a basic feed stock. Electric power costs would be about \$5 or \$6 a ton. The cost of water for the boiler and as make-up water for cooling would be about 60c a ton. The use of catalysts and chemicals in the process would add a further 30c a ton. Depreciation on such a plant would be about \$10 a ton and other costs, such as selling, wages and management costs, would be about \$5 a ton, so, a plant such as that, which is typical of those that I have seen operating in the United States and have had discussions about, ought to enable anhydrous ammonia to be produced in South Australia at about \$30 to \$31 a ton, excluding allowance for return on capital as part of the cost.

Mr. Nankivell: What is the price of the gas?

Mr. HUDSON: It is 30c a thousand cubic feet. In a 600 tons a day plant the cost of natural gas may be slightly higher, because a centrifugal compressor, although economizing in the use of electric power, uses more natural gas as fuel. There is a substitution of natural gas for power. Therefore, the cost of natural gas in such a plant as that would probably be about \$10 a ton and the power cost would be about 30c a ton. The cost of water would be 60c a ton and the cost of catalysts and chemicals 30c a ton. However, the cost of depreciation would be reduced from \$10 a ton to about \$6 a ton. Therefore, the second large economy comes in the capital cost of the larger plant.

Mr. Quirke: Is such a plant a large user of premium water?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. A plant producing 150 tons a day would need about 2,000 gallons of water a ton, which is about 100,000,000 gallons a year.

Mr. Quirke: Is the water exchanged or wasted?

Mr. HUDSON: I am giving the total net use of water, having regard to the loss of about 4 per cent or 5 per cent in make-up water in the cooling system. Water is used as feed water and for cooling. In the cooling process the water wastage depends on wind, temperature and other conditions.

Mr. Quirke: But it is the same water, is it?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Is the product sulphate of ammonia?

Mr. HUDSON: No, I am speaking about only anhydrous ammonia. I realize that anhydrous ammonia supplied in a gaseous state, as is done in the U.S.A., would not be suitable in grain production here. We would need to convert it to urea and, most probably, to ammonium phosphate or treat it in a plant that enabled production of anhydrous ammonia in combinations of urea, ammonium sulphate and ammonium phosphate.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I wanted the cost of fertilizer, as we know it, produced in an anhydrous ammonia plant.

Mr. HUDSON: It is produced as urea. At a cost of about \$31 a ton for anhydrous ammonia, the cost of urea would be about \$26 or \$27 a ton. I am sure members opposite will appreciate that this is a profitable industry. That is one of the reasons why the Americans are interested in it. Any person who established a nitrogenous fertilizer industry in South Australia would have an extremely good business and would dramatically alter fertilizer production and agricultural practice methods in South Australia. Naptha is currently being used in Australia instead of natural gas. The cost of natural gas was \$9 a ton in the production cost of \$31 a ton, or 30 per cent of the total costs. In the larger plants it can be as high as 60 per cent of total costs, but economies are effected in power and capital because of the use of natural gas. The state of the refinery industry is such that the price of naptha is relatively high and this has an appreciable effect on the overall cost of production.

American companies are considering and constructing plants that will produce 1,500 tons a day at a production cost of \$15 or \$16 a ton. I was told that the cost

of production, including allowance for depreciation, at the Yazoo City plant, which I saw, was a little more than \$20 a ton American, or about \$18 a ton Australian. Because this plant was selling anhydrous ammonia and because much equipment was involved in the injection of this into the soil at fairly high cost, the product was selling at \$90 a ton when I was there. There will be a dramatic reduction in the price of nitrogenous fertilizer in the places where these large plants are being established.

Mr. Quirke: What state is the anhydrous ammonia in? Is it liquid?

Mr. HUDSON: In the gaseous form it was at one time stored under pressure. However, in the more modern plants it is stored as a liquid under refrigerated conditions, and this effects an economy in production because of the elimination of expensive capital equipment that would otherwise be needed to keep the gas under pressure. Again, in the Yazoo City plant some of the economies in production cost have risen from the storing of the anhydrous ammonia in a liquid form. This helps in connection with transport and distribution to farmers.

Mr. Curren: Is the price \$90 a ton injected into the soil?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, in United States currency. That is the final cost to the farmer. In the case of this particular company, which is a farmers' co-operative, the cost to the farmer would be less than \$90 American a ton, because of a rebate.

Mr. Quirke: Does the farmer have his own equipment?

Mr. HUDSON: Some do.

Mr. Quirke: Don't the manufacturers provide it?

Mr. HUDSON: In some cases, but farmers have ancillary equipment. When I came back from Yazoo City I talked to Mr. Bridges that evening, and he asked me what I thought of the ammonia plant there. I told him how impressed I had been by the organization of it as a farmers' co-operative, and Mr. Bridges had a twinkle in his eye as he said, "Yes; I think we might have made a mistake in showing you that." He arranged for me to see their chicken operations, as he called them. He claimed—and I have no reason to doubt his word—that it was the biggest chicken factory in the world; it was at Morton, just outside Jackson, Mississippi, where, on average, 100,000 chickens a day are processed. Up to 120,000 chickens a day

can be processed. Every day over 100,000 new chickens are born, and 100,000 chickens are put through the factory. I went through this factory and all I can say is that I am glad I do not have to work there.

In considering the establishment of a nitrogenous fertilizer plant in South Australia, it is clear that initially, because we will have to serve mainly the grain-producing areas of the State, there will not be a significant demand for anhydrous ammonia, so the industry will have to convert the anhydrous ammonia into urea, ammonium phosphate and perhaps ammonium sulphate, depending on the particular practices that become established or the practices which the firm concerned can encourage farmers to establish in the adjacent agricultural areas. I think we have to recognize that in the establishment of such an industry there must be much co-operation between the people concerned with the running of the industry and the farmers who will use their product, because extensive plant is involved in each stage of the productive process.

Mr. Ferguson: This would take some time, wouldn't it?

Mr. HUDSON: I think so. Extensive plant is involved in converting the anhydrous ammonia to urea. In a plant with a capacity of 150 tons of ammonia a day, a further investment of \$3,000,000 to \$3,500,000 is necessary in going a stage further and producing urea. Similarly, if we are to produce ammonium phosphate or ammonium sulphate as well, then further capital investment will be involved. Of course, we will not be able to use the plant at close to the designed capacity, so whoever establishes such an industry needs at each stage to have a fairly good idea of the likely demand for the various ammonia products, so that he can economize on his capital investment as far as possible.

Mr. Ferguson: Wouldn't there be some trial and error?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. With respect to soil deficiencies and the needs of the area, some rough judgment must be made of the kind of agricultural practice that would be most effective. For example, we know that anhydrous ammonia is 83 per cent nitrogen, urea (which is the solid fertilizer) is only 46 per cent nitrogen, ammonium sulphate is 21 per cent nitrogen, and that ammonium phosphate or di-ammonium phosphate is 18 per cent nitrogen and 46 per cent phosphorous. In view of the nature of the soil a significant amount of production of ammonium phos-

phate is likely, but the combinations produced depend upon the particular agricultural area in which production is taking place. Of course, a tie-up is necessary between the industry and the farmers; otherwise, serious mistakes will be made at the investment level about the scale of operations in the ammonia plant, in the urea plant, and in the ammonium phosphate and ammonium sulphate plant. That is why this plant at Yazoo City, which was run as a farmers' co-operative, particularly impressed me.

It seems that in some respects if we can get that kind of arrangement operating in South Australia for this kind of purpose it will have considerable value not only because of the greater co-operation that will arise between the farmers and the fertilizer producers but also because the main beneficiaries from lower production costs of fertilizer will be the users of these products, and ultimately, therefore, the prices of the products will be affected and all the people of this State will benefit.

I think it is fairly clear that, because of the nature of the gas we have at Gidgealpa and Moomba, it is only in the nitrogenous fertilizer field that the location of an industry will be determined critically by the availability and price of natural gas. In almost any other industrial use that we will have for the pure methane that will be produced (with almost negligible liquid hydro-carbons) the fuel cost, with natural gas as a fuel, will be a relatively minor proportion of total costs, and therefore the availability and price of natural gas will not be critical in the location of industry. Industry will be located in particular places for other reasons, related mainly to access to markets and raw materials, and the availability of labour.

I understand that, technically, it is a relatively clean gas in that the sulphur impurity is negligible. However, there is a significant amount of carbon-dioxide in the gas at Gidgealpa and Moomba, and in the form in which it comes out of the ground it has a British thermal unit equivalent of only 930, and the producers (Delhi-Santos) will be installing plant at Gidgealpa and Moomba to remove this carbon-dioxide. So, the b.t.u. equivalent of the gas that will be delivered to Adelaide through the pipeline will be more than 1,000, and the carbon-dioxide will be almost entirely removed. This will involve expense, but we are unlikely to be involved in expense in removing sulphur (which would

be necessary in the case of a dirty gas). The gas at Gidgealpa and Moomba is a dry gas but it is also a relatively clean gas.

I think it can be clearly established that at present we can expect the establishment of a nitrogenous fertilizer industry that will be an important user of natural gas—on my estimation, a plant with a capacity of 150 tons a day would use 4,500,000 cubic feet of gas a day, or 1.6 billion cubic feet a year. With a 300 tons a day plant, the usage is 9,000,000 cubic feet a day or 3.2 billion feet a year. With a larger scale plant still, say a 600 tons a day plant, and using the centrifugal compressor, which economizes on the use of electric power and increases the use of natural gas, we could expect to use about 20,000,000 cubic feet of gas a day or some 7 billion cubic feet a year.

A nitrogenous fertilizer plant on any scale would be a large user of natural gas. I have already indicated my reasons for saying that I think whichever way we look at it the most suitable location for this will be Wallaroo, for it is best suited with respect to the availability of natural gas and deep water shipping facilities, as well as from the point of view of economizing on freight to the surrounding farming districts.

Mr. Quirke: Would you use sea-water as a cooling medium?

Mr. HUDSON: This was investigated, and in fact sea-water is used in the production of fertilizer in parts of Africa, where only very little fresh water is available and where it costs a huge amount to get the necessary fresh water even to use as feed water in the boiler. If sea-water is used for cooling, an additional capital cost is involved, quite apart from the cost of pumping that water. On a per ton basis, the cost of pumping the sea-water would not be great, but the additional capital cost involved in installing the equipment necessary in the use of sea-water for cooling would work out at about \$1 a thousand gallons, and at that rate it is cheaper to pump the fresh water, even to Wallaroo.

If we have fresh water and can pump it even 100 or 200 miles, it is best to use the fresh water. We would have to get to a very high price for fresh water before it would pay us to use sea-water for cooling. It is only in these very arid parts of the world that are close to the natural gas source, for example, Algeria, where there is no ready fresh water supply available, that it still pays because of the

cheapness of the natural gas to produce there and use salt water for cooling.

The point I wanted to establish particularly is that a nitrogenous fertilizer plant that serves a particular area has some degree of protection from interstate or oversea competition in that freight is an important element in the overall cost of production of fertilizer. As we know, in the existing fertilizer market in Australia industries tend to be located in areas serving their own districts. In general, there is an agreement among the firms as to their areas, and this situation is perpetuated because each particular producer of fertilizer has a freight protection for his own area. A smaller scale plant of 150 tons a day in Wallaroo would have a cost of production of, say, \$30 a ton, but if we could go to 600 tons a day we would reduce the cost of production to a little over \$20 a ton, which is quite a substantial reduction. On my estimation, the local market in the main grain-producing areas of the State could, within the space of a few years, sustain a 150 or 200 tons a day plant but it could certainly not sustain a 600 tons a day plant. Any people wishing to set up production at, say, Wallaroo and having to decide on the size of the plant would have a fairly critical decision to make. If they go significantly over 200 tons a day they know they have to export to other States of Australia and possibly to Japan and India.

If a manufacturer goes for the establishment of a 600 tons a day plant (and this is conceivable), he is going to get his cost of production down to \$20 a ton but roughly only one-third of his product is going to be sold within the local market; the rest will have to be exported. Such a manufacturer would be getting to the level where he would have little difficulty in exporting on a competitive basis overseas. I know that the interests who will probably establish a nitrogenous fertilizer industry in South Australia are concerned with the possibility of exports. On the other hand, we have to consider this: what happens if a 150 tons a day plant is established in Wallaroo and some other organization establishes a 600 or 1,000 tons a day plant in the western part of Victoria? Is the freight difference between western Victoria and Wallaroo (and our main agricultural areas) sufficient to sustain a cost of production difference of the order of \$10 a ton? If that freight difference is sufficient, that is all right, and a manufacturer here could go to the smaller scale operation, but if the freight difference is not sufficient he has to go

in for a larger scale operation and fight for an export market in the other States. One way or the other, there will be some economical level of plant established that will give a sufficient local market and a sufficient degree of protection in that local market to ensure a sound and profitable base for operations.

I turn now to the vital question in the current issue. If we go the western route, with no initial demand for natural gas from Port Augusta or Whyalla or Port Pirie (and the Leader of the Opposition certainly produced no evidence that there was a demand in those areas), we are increasing the capital costs of the construction of the pipeline and increasing the annual costs in the form of depreciation and interest by an amount of some \$200,000 to \$250,000 a year. If the initial demand in Adelaide for natural gas in the first year is 10 billion cubic feet, that decision to add 30 miles to the pipeline by going the western route would add 2c to 2½c a thousand cubic feet to the cost of gas in Adelaide and would probably make it uneconomical for the Electricity Trust to use natural gas as against fuel oil.

This is why the Opposition's argument can be taken to put the whole project in jeopardy. If the longer route is adopted and it is found that no demand exists initially for natural gas in these towns, we load on to the price of natural gas the additional costs of depreciation and interest. If Adelaide takes in the first year only 10,000,000 cubic feet, we are loading 2c to 2½c a thousand cubic feet on to the cost of gas, and any advantage over Victoria that we may now have in our price structure (or likely price structure) will be lost. If the initial demand were as high as 20 billion cubic feet a year (and that would be unlikely), the load a thousand cubic feet, as a result of the longer distance, would be 1c to 1½c.

However, we can recognize another point, as well as recognizing the increase in the price of gas that is in the Leader's thoughts, by considering also that, if we put up the costs of the pipeline authority in the first year, a surplus, or depreciation funds, may not be available for reinvestment in a branch line to Wallaroo, and we may jeopardize the provision of gas at the earliest date for Wallaroo. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with suggested amendments.

[Sitting suspended from 5.59 to 7.30 p.m.]

LOAN ESTIMATES

In Committee.

(Continued from August 8. Page 1139).

Highways and Local Government, \$1,500,000.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I refer to the line "South-Western Suburbs Drainage" in so far as it concerns my district. Colonel Light Gardens is only a small area, not financially strong. My complaint is that so far Colonel Light Gardens has had to contribute financially to this scheme but it has received no tangible benefit from it. The member for Edwardstown (Hon. Frank Walsh) and I agree that something should be done there, because flooding is bad in the Garden Suburb, particularly in the south-western corner, which is in the District of Mitcham—along Goodwood Road, near Springbank Road and further on south to Daws Road. There is flooding near View Street on the eastern boundary of Colonel Light Gardens and it is impossible for Mr. Sellars (Garden Suburb Commissioner) to do anything to alleviate the flooding independently of the work that has to be done under this scheme. I have several times approached the Minister of Local Government on this, because the flooding is more than a nuisance to local residents: it damages their properties. However, no alleviation is possible until work can be done as part of the scheme. When is it likely that work will be done to benefit Colonel Light Gardens in particular?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I cannot give the honourable member any detailed information about when work specifically benefiting Colonel Light Gardens will be undertaken but I will inquire and get a reply for him.

Mr. COUMBE: I refer to the line "Metropolitan Drainage—Other" under Highways and Local Government. For some years some metropolitan members have been urging the establishment of a metropolitan drainage authority. I am pleased that \$200,000 is

allocated to this line. The scheme in which I am particularly interested is a joint one between the Hindmarsh, Enfield and Prospect councils. This had almost reached completion two years ago and we thought we would be able to get it to the proposed authority. However, the Minister of Local Government has now announced that all such schemes must go before his department, and a scheme of priorities will be worked out. Some fairly large and extensive drainage schemes have to be worked out.

I appreciate the idea of priorities, but how will they be determined? Will they be based on need or on whether schemes can be tailored to fit in with the amount of money available? Of course, any scheme estimated to cost more than \$200,000 must go before the Public Works Committee, as the south-western suburbs and Henley and Grange drainage schemes did. A council may have an urgent project but, because other major schemes are ahead of it and absorb much money, it may have to wait for some years before its needs can be met. Will the Treasurer explain how the priority scheme will work and how councils will be able to plan ahead with their schemes?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Priority schemes will be worked out in the same way as other such schemes are, urgency and the proposed expenditure both being taken into account in fixing priorities. It is not an "either/or" proposition: both things must be looked at to ensure that the most urgently needed works are done first, within the money available. It is not expected that there will be an immediate call on funds beyond what is provided because, although some schemes have been under discussion, few are at a stage where work can proceed immediately. The Government's difficulty with the metropolitan floodwaters drainage authority was that, although some vague scheme was evident in a docket discovered some time after the Labor Party took office (it had to be searched for) to which councils were supposed to have agreed, when detailed proposals based on that scheme were put to the councils we could not get their agreement.

A draft Bill was circulated amongst them but we could get no effective agreement from local government to proceed in this way. So, instead of being able to set up the metropolitan drainage authority, we had to take the next best expedient and say to the councils, "Very well; you prepare your schemes, either jointly in certain areas or severally, whichever way seems best to you; then come to us and, if

we approve them and agree to come to the party, we will give you \$1 for \$1." That seems to be the best way to get things moving in this area, since the councils that the honourable member has mentioned have already gone a long way with their scheme. I think they would be high on the priority list.

Mr. COUNBE: After that reassurance, I refer now to the council's financial position in this regard. As I understand it, the Government will subsidize \$1 for \$1 and the councils will have to arrange their own finance. In other words, the past position will not now obtain. The councils were in the past able to borrow some of their money from the Government. Will the Treasurer give an undertaking that, when councils apply to borrow under semi-government authority (if they wish to do so), the Government will facilitate any arrangements that may have to be made in this connection?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Naturally, we shall endeavour to assist councils in their loan raisings for agreed works. They are in a somewhat better position than previously because the limit for the Loan works of semi-government authorities was raised at the last Loan Council meeting, without the authority of the Loan Council being needed. The limit has now been raised to \$300,000.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Do they still require fresh Treasury approval?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, except where we are involved in the matter.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: So that any council can, without Treasury approval, borrow provided it complies with the Local Government Act?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Mr. Coumbe: Up to the overall limit?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Up to \$300,000. If a council required our assistance, Treasury approval would be needed.

Mr. LANGLEY: Damage is being caused to houses in the lower parts of my district because of the flow of water from the higher areas, such as Glenunga and Burnside, and also from drains. One of the difficulties about the North Unley drain is that water cannot get away and, although it is all very well to provide drainage facilities in higher districts, I should like the Treasurer to comment on the possibility of an approach being made by the Government to councils in order to formulate a scheme that will obviate hardship now being caused.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Provision was made in a draft Bill for all councils in higher areas from which water was draining to be responsible for a portion of the costs of drainage work in the lower areas. However, we could not get agreement among councils, even among those in the lower areas, about legislation or about the participation of councils in the authority. Because of this, we have had to take action that I do not think will completely overcome the difficulty. It has been possible to get councils in the foothills areas to contribute towards the cost of work in lower areas. An example of this is the agreement of the Burnside council to co-operate in the carrying out of work on Second Creek. The Government has made available an additional \$1,000,000, which does not require to be matched by councils, to enable the south-western suburbs drainage scheme to proceed more quickly.

Mr. SHANNON: The Public Works Committee, in its report on the south-western suburbs drainage scheme submitted last year, recommended that more effective supervision be exercised in the spending of Government funds on any similar project. We said that this supervision should be provided for in any future legislation. It was obvious to the committee that this project had got out of hand and at one time there was confusion about the stage of the scheme that was being dealt with. We limited the Treasurer's obligation under the scheme to the original amount of about \$700,000, because we did not consider that the Government should be responsible for something that was not its fault. I think the difficulty arose because the authority concerned was not the constructing authority. Does the Government intend to take cognizance of what appeared to the committee to be the best way of dealing with expenditure by councils on behalf of the Government?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not think we can do more at present than we have done in co-operating with councils on this scheme, although we do not think that this is the ideal scheme. We preferred another but we have not been able to get agreement with councils.

Mr. McANANEY: Does the Government intend to withdraw the sum made available by the recent amendment to the Morphett Street Bridge Act?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government intends to act in accordance with the legislation, as passed.

Mr. McANANEY: Will that money be used for any specific purpose?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The disbursement of Loan money, including that provided in the Morphett Street Bridge Act Amendment Act, is dealt with in the table.

Line passed.

Lands, Irrigation and Drainage, \$1,295,000—passed.

Woods and Forests, \$2,000,000.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The position in the Woods and Forests Department is not satisfactory. First, the timber being produced is not being sold and we are not dealing satisfactorily with forest areas or purchasing sufficient land for the continuation of the programme followed in the past. I am concerned that the size of the area to be planted to forest this year is smaller; this provides a strange contrast with what other South-East interests are doing in their forest areas. I recently attended a meeting of a forestry company and I was delighted to hear that it had a large expansion programme. Unfortunately, it appeared to me that the major part of this programme was to be carried out not in South Australia, but in Victoria, although this company has always been associated with the South Australian forestry industry.

Secondly, we are not developing all the subsidiary industries which I believe our unique position in Australia gives us the right to expect. More firms should be using the forest waste to manufacture cardboard and other paper products, such as tissues, which are being produced to some extent in the South-East. We are not using the whole of the amount of waste products from the forests that is available. Today, Australia has to import much paper pulp, and it urgently requires local supplies of it.

We were disappointed in the past when MacMillan Bloedel and Powell River Limited pulled out after it had agreed to come to South Australia, had actually purchased land for a factory, had got to the stage where a major project was under active consideration and had worked out the type of product to be manufactured. Its reason for pulling out was that Australia was proposing to make a free trade area agreement with New Zealand, and it was possible that the cheaper New Zealand forest products would compete freely with Australian manufactured products. However, this fear did not materialize and I believe that the time is ripe to see whether we can get other firms interested in what I believe would be a valuable

secondary industry, a large employer of labour, and a concern that would use thinnings from Government and private forests.

Although we have had only partial success in this matter, two firms have been established, and they have proved valuable to the economy of the area near Millicent. I am referring particularly to the thinnings, and the chips that can be produced from such thinnings. Such an industry could meet the rapidly growing demand for certain material throughout Australia. I suggest that the original negotiations with MacMillan Bloedel and Powell River Limited be re-examined in order to see the result of the surveys taken throughout the private forests, such as those belonging to Southern Australian Perpetual Forests Limited and Softwood Holdings Limited. These companies agreed to make their thinnings available to a common producer.

The Kimberly-Clark Corporation joined with Australian Paper Manufacturers Limited in establishing a tissue plant, the second plant established in the Millicent area, so success is possible. At present much waste material is being used purely as fuel for a small subsidiary power station established to get rid of it, but this is an uneconomic use of the material, although it is preferable to dumping it.

On the last figures I saw, 40,000 acres of forest land was unplanted, but since then at least 14,000 acres has been planted, leaving an area of less than 30,000 acres unplanted. Further, the area of suitable land that can be acquired is strictly limited. Perhaps the Treasurer's officers can suggest suitable areas to be acquired so that our forestry programme can be stepped up. Will the Treasurer again investigate this matter to see whether some of the firms mentioned in the docket would be interested in establishing here?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I intend that the Industrial Development Branch should conduct a number of feasibility studies with the Woods and Forests Department on the development of industry based on our pine plantings. The docket will be examined, along with others. My information is that if that particular project were to proceed it would take up so much material that Apcel Ltd. and Cellulose (Aust.) Ltd. would be out of business. We could not provide them with the material they needed. On present indications the expansion of existing industries in the South-East is likely to come very close to using up the available thinnings in the foreseeable future. Naturally, we want to see that any conceivable industries

ancillary to the pine plantings will be established. I assure the honourable member that the studies will be undertaken.

Mr. FREEBAIN: The Treasurer indicated that 6,000 acres would be planted this year. The Australian Forestry Council, which comprises State and Commonwealth Ministers, was mentioned in the 1964-65 Annual Report of the Woods and Forests Department as follows:

One of the Council's most important initial decisions was that Australia should aim for an overall planting rate of softwood timbers of 75,000 acres per year (which more than doubles the present planting rate). Detailed investigation of the practical application of this decision was made by the Standing Committee, and at its next meeting in February, 1965, the Council adopted these proposals, and agreed that a case for financial support should be presented to the appropriate Commonwealth authorities. It can be confidently expected that a favourable decision in this matter will be of real ultimate benefit to forestry in South Australia.

I understand the Commonwealth is making a small financial contribution, and I notice that 6,000 acres is rather less than one-twelfth of Australia's plantings. Why is the target not higher?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Forests: Because I have had close relations with this matter, I should like to explain the situation. South Australia was the first State to establish man-made forests. In the 1920's, particularly about 1924, this State took advantage of a large sum that was made available by the Commonwealth Government for man-made softwood plantings. This meant using land in the high rainfall areas, of which South Australia has limited areas in the South-East, in the Adelaide Hills, and, to a lesser extent, in parts of the North. The Labor Government has been most active in purchasing all the land it possibly could at Land Board valuation, but this was not a much land as the Government needed.

At the first conference I attended in New Guinea it was evident that South Australia would not take part in the scheme, because it was claimed that we had used up all the land that was available for softwood plantings, or we had just about reached saturation point. This was a developmental programme, and some of the other States had quite large areas of Crown lands in high rainfall areas. However, I insisted that South Australia should have some share in the scheme, and it was finally decided that interest-free money would be made available for new plantings in excess of 4,500 acres. This will apply for five years.

I am hopeful that a large area of land might become available that the Government could purchase. The Commonwealth Government will not lend its money to be spent on land at excessive prices. South Australia's share in the scheme is somewhat less than that of Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland. These States, which have Crown lands available, are now benefiting from being late in the field. However, I am pleased that we are participating and we will continue to promote our interests in this matter. Although there is a lull with regard to the sale of timber, I consider that it will be of short duration. The stockpiles that have accumulated could be quickly absorbed with the expected improvement in the building industry. With the continued growth of companies like Apcel and Cellulose, the Government expects to use up all of the available thinnings, in addition to other logs. The new debarker and chipper plant to be installed at Mount Burr will ensure that we get the greatest advantage out of this.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I thank the Minister for his detailed reply. The Australian Forestry Council refers to an annual target of 75,000 acres. Does the Minister know whether this target has been achieved?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: It has not yet been achieved, but that is the aim over a period of some years. The last information I had was that any early acceptance of this full scheme was not likely. It is a target that the whole of Australia will be aiming to fulfil, and on the records presented by the other States it is expected that in time it will be fulfilled.

Mr. BURDON: The honourable member for Gumeracha (Sir Thomas Playford) referred to the future supplies and usage of pine. I think the honourable member would appreciate that when he was negotiating with a Canadian firm some years ago the idea was that possibly some of these supplies would come from debarked logs. The sawmills are now starting to install debarkers. The private forestry people will also be debarking logs, so in time to come all off-cuts from the logs will be turned into chip form for utilization by the pulp mills. It is envisaged that this will be taking place soon. The Mount Burr mill is installing the first debarker. This is the way in which supplies to the pulp mills in the years to come will be built up.

Regarding companies going over the border into south-western Victoria, this is necessary for the expansion of the industry both in that part of Victoria and in South Australia because

of the non-availability of land in the Lower South-East. Most of the land in the 25-30in. rainfall area has been taken up. Some of this land was purchased in the early days, probably at only about 50c an acre, whereas suitable land today would cost 100 or 150 times as much as that. Also, it is very scarce and it is not coming on the market. As a result, it has been necessary to take up land in south-western-Victoria.

Most of the supplies available for pulping purposes are now being used by Apcel and Cellulose Limited. Very little material is left for pulping purposes, and there is a fairly tight programme between the Woods and Forests Department and the mills for future supplies. I know (and I know it regrettably) that there is a hold-up in the sale of some products from certain mills. However, I know from my previous connection with these mills that this has happened before. For instance, it happened in 1954-55 and in 1960-61. These seem to be cycles that occur. We can relate these slack periods, with rising stocks on hand, to credit squeezes imposed by the Commonwealth Government. However, in 1961, when there was a problem in the sale of timber in the Lower South-East, the Mount Burr sawmill was being reconstructed and was out of production. At present we have three sawmills operating.

The member for Gumeracha in the last few weeks in this Chamber has referred to the situation in the case trade. Nobody regrets more than I that there has been a decline in the case trade. The people in the various packing areas, such as in the Murray River centres and in the Murrumbidgee Irrigation Area, have changed over from the traditional wooden case to the Bruce box. Cartons and Bruce boxes have made inroads into the traditional case trade. It would be difficult to force people to use wooden boxes. The Mount Burr and Nangwarry mills are virtually on board production today. In the past these mills produced huge quantities of cases. At one time they produced 6,000,000 to 7,000,000 cases for dried fruit exports from the Murray River districts, whereas today I doubt whether they would be able to dispose of 250,000 cases; it has practically all been taken over by the carton trade. There has been a stepping up in relation to creosoted posts and poles for the Postmaster-General's Department, as well as salt-treated posts and poles for various agricultural purposes.

Mr. Nankivell: What about laminations?

Mr. BURDON: Yes, quite a bit of that is going on. I would be happy and proud to show the honourable member some of the things done with lamination in the Mount Gambier district. We are in a changing phase in sawmilling today, because we are moving away from wooden cases to cardboard cartons. As so often happens in a transitional stage, this is creating some problems. Unfortunately, there is today a fair amount of stock on hand. I know that the officers of the department and everybody else would like to see these stocks diminish as soon as possible, because they are tying up badly needed revenue that this Government (and indeed any Government) would like to get its hands on.

I am not making excuses for the Woods and Forests Department. However, I believe it has to go all out in various methods, whether it be salesmanship or technological improvements, or even sending officers overseas, to see that its sawmilling branch is kept abreast of all the latest techniques for utilizing forests of the South-East.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: As I have said, the purchase of land is not keeping pace with the plantings that are taking place.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: We've just about kept even in the last couple of years. We don't know how long we can keep this up.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: That is the question. Obviously, land will become available from time to time. A small committee was formed within the Government some time ago to investigate the possibility of encouraging private plantings and of overcoming objections to operating private forests (the main objection relating to Commonwealth taxation). Much suitable land exists for private forests, particularly in the South-East, and landholders, without planting in a big way, could nevertheless contribute to an accumulatively large total of softwood plantings. I believe that the only way in which a landholder will avoid income tax problems is to spend a certain sum annually, which may even things out. Does the Minister still favour the idea of private forestry?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Forestry Council has considered two types of private forestry: one relates to what the honourable member has outlined, and the other relates to companies, such as Southern Australian Perpetual Forests Limited and Softwood Holdings Limited. The private landowner (he may be a grazier or farmer) who holds land in the higher rainfall area should be encouraged in this regard, rather

than the larger private companies that would be competing openly in the purchase of land. I strongly support the idea of encouraging the private individual in this matter. The policy that I have adopted (it is similar to the policy that existed before I took office) is that the first move should be made by the Commonwealth Government in respect of an income tax adjustment. The only consideration that would appeal to the private person here would be an adjustment by way of succession duties over a number of years. In addition, of course, the landholder's income would be boosted through the sale of his timber at a later stage. Plantings would represent an additional asset by providing a fine shelter belt for stock and increasing considerably the value of a property.

Mr. BURDON: I have already referred in this Chamber to a discussion that I previously had with a New Zealand tree farmer, who informed me that a satisfactory arrangement had been reached in his country between the Government and the private tree planter that included probate and taxation considerations. As it is forecast that in 20 or 30 years' time a severe shortage of timber may occur, now is the time to prepare for additional plantings. In the future, the plantings of private landholders in areas of up to, say, 15 acres may represent a significant proportion of South Australia's forests. As this matter is of vital importance to the whole of Australia, our farmers must be encouraged to increase plantings. I have been assured that the present New Zealand system is proving satisfactory.

Mr. Quirke: Do you know what it is?

Mr. BURDON: I do not have the latest amendments to the agreement with me but it has provided for the taxation of this product for some years; there are also separate probate concessions for areas under afforestation. I hope that eventually a satisfactory arrangement will be reached between this State and the Commonwealth in these matters of probate concessions and taxation. Our problem is that we have to deal with two Governments, whereas New Zealand has only one Government and a Parliament with only one House. As a State, we should pursue the policy I have been speaking of. I have been told of plans that some industries have in the South-East. The market for Australian tissue paper is continually rising. Five years ago Australians were using only 15 per cent of mill production of tissue paper products, compared with a much larger percentage used by the Americans. The demands for paper

tissues, sheeting, serviettes, etc., are gradually rising, but we have a long way to go to get the other 85 per cent used.

Our mills must be assured of more materials, with our increasing population. I know of one mill with an intake of materials that will be doubled in 10 to 12 years' time. I hope this increasing demand for mill products will inspire those responsible for the purchase of land to see that every effort is made in that direction, further to decentralize the timber industry in the Lower South-East. All our State Governments have played a significant part over the years in producing what we have today in the South-East, which is the envy of sawmills and timber producers in other parts of Australia. We can be proud of the dedicated officers who have served the forestry industry so well in South Australia over the years. We must have the latest know-how and technical knowledge and, if we are to progress, our officers must gather that knowledge from New Zealand, America or the Scandinavian countries.

Let no-one be complacent about afforestation, because we are facing big problems. The member for Gumeracha has been interested in forestry throughout his career; he has seen great progress. He must be proud of the development that has taken place. During his time in office, our officers went overseas, and I hope that practice continues. I remember what took place in Mount Burr in 1931, and later in Nangwarry in 1947 or 1948. That mill was built during and just after the Second World War. To the everlasting credit of the officers of the Woods and Forests Department, it became an efficient mill, although it was originally put together with bits and pieces. Mr. Keith Ingram, who recently retired, saved the Woods and Forests Department of South Australia in more ways than one. He did more than anyone else to improve the department. After the Second World War private mills entered the industry and they have done a good job. Softwood Holdings Limited in Mount Gambier has one of the best mills in Australia and produces extruded products, particle board, and their new sawmilling line is an extremely modern one. I hope that the Minister will do everything possible to further the industry, particularly in relation to pine planting in the South-East and the acquisition of land. Every encouragement should be given to private persons to extend the radiata pine industry.

Mr. RODDA: As I said in the Address in Reply debate, a farmer on suitable property

in the South-East could profitably devote 10 per cent of his land to pine plantings. I hope to start a pine-growing project on my property next year. I ask the Minister to give encouragement by making available adequate supplies of seedlings. I also ask that some of the allocation made for employees' houses and other buildings be spent on houses opposite the mill at Nangwarry, which is one of the finest mills in the Southern Hemisphere. I am sure that the encouragement of private afforestation in South Australia will compensate for the lack of arable land that we have.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I assure the honourable members who have spoken that we shall do everything we can to help anyone who embarks on a programme of pine plantings. I understand that adequate supplies of seedlings are available; indeed, we have been able to supply a quantity to New South Wales. Our nurseries in the South-East are well maintained and a large quantity of seedlings is grown each year. Earlier in the year, because of lack of rain, we were concerned about a programme to plant 6,000 acres. I was particularly concerned because of requests I had made to the Commonwealth and other Ministers. However, we have received the rain and I have now received information that the target will be reached. There may be a shortage of plantings in the northern forests because of the low rainfall, but the quantity involved will be negligible overall.

I also point out that the amount that would be gained from succession duty remission would be negligible compared with the gain made in regard to income tax payments. A person may not benefit because income may not be coming in at the time a sale is made. The member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda), by his zeal and enthusiasm, is showing the way in developing his property. There has been mention of the pulp situation. The growing use of paper towels, tissues, and so on, has caused the situation to change from that which obtained when Sir Thomas Playford, as Premier and Treasurer, was negotiating with an American firm. Representations have been made to me by Apcel that in future that company will need more chips or roundwood for pulping. So, with the Cellulose factory and Apcel and the particle board factory, it is not only the Woods and Forests Department that is in this: it is a joint scheme with the private companies and it has been perfectly evident that there has been close co-operation between the department and the others engaged in softwood plantings. We know of the development that has

taken place at Snuggery in connection with Apcel. This timber will, when the programme reaches that stage, take up all the slack in respect of the pulp.

I think we all regret the slackening in the fruit case trade. From the economic viewpoint, the case trade was the least attractive of all the business of the Woods and Forests Department. However, the mills of the department and private enterprise have done a great service to the fruit-growing industry of this State. For a long time they subsidized this industry, and it is rather odd to see that some of the people in the industry are changing over to other types of container: This makes me wonder.

Regarding the apple-growing industry, the member for Gumeracha said the other day that although cardboard boxes were dearer and not as good, in his opinion, as the timber boxes, people in the industry were choosing the cardboard boxes because they claimed that they were better suited for packing. If the member's statement is correct, it is a wonder to me that the industry itself does not instruct its co-operatives to use the pine boxes. However, competition being what it is, everyone has the right to use the type of container he chooses.

I still like the timber boxes and I know that some merchants who handle fruit prefer them, and they are in a position to request this, because they are in the trade. Some time ago, when the Citrus Organization Committee and its packaging subcommittee decided to switch over to the Bruce boxes for export, I laid down a condition that they were to leave the local market free to choose the pine box, the cardboard container or the Bruce box. However, we find that the packing sheds themselves are setting the pattern for the type of box that is to be used and consequently these circumstances are outside our control.

Line passed.

Railways, \$5,800,000.

Mr. CUMBE: I refer first to the lines under "Railway Accommodation". In the past I have asked questions about work being done at the Islington railway workshops, because of the many constituents of my district who work there. I have asked these questions to see whether the level of work is being maintained in those workshops. Recently the Minister of Transport said that certain contracts for railway work there would shortly be completed and it was likely that tenders

would be let for other work; this is very good. The Loan Estimates state that for 1966-67 \$5,600,000 was provided and \$4,814,609 actually spent. How was this figure arrived at and why was only this sum spent? In the previous year \$5,600,000 was provided and only \$370,000 was estimated as repayments.

This year the sum provided for railway accommodation is \$5,800,000, which is a \$200,000 increase over last year and which I presume will only take care of the rises in costs that have occurred because of award increases and greater costs of materials on the capital side. I am pleased to see that we have \$600,000 as the estimated repayments this year. Does this mean that at Islington we are doing work for other authorities, such as the Commonwealth Railways, possibly under the standardization agreement?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The reason why the amounts did not reach the estimate last year is simply that certain railway contracts did not come to debit, for the reasons I have previously given. This necessarily makes some difference to the total expenditure previously. Those commitments will be met within this year, but the continuing contracts undertaken will also be fulfilled.

Mr. Coumbe: Will the same level of work be maintained?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Mr. Millhouse: I take it, from what the Treasurer has just said, that the \$800,000 expected 1966-67 commitment has now been transferred to 1967-68.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot give the precise figure, but I have given the details before.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Treasurer canvassed the progress of work on the conversion to standard gauge of the narrow gauge line from Port Pirie to Cockburn and that appears, from what he said, to be proceeding satisfactorily. For a very long time it had been hoped to make some progress in the construction of a railway line from Port Augusta to Whyalla. No reference is made to that and, because I presume this is still regarded by the Government as important, I should be glad to have some information from the Treasurer on this. I mention two matters rather closer to home: the first concerns the Overland, which is still a good train, although by no means new now. I am confident that if there were a dining car or at least a buffet car on the train it would be far more popular than it is

today. I understand from my friends in the Railways Department that the present dining car weighs about 20 tons and, if it is hitched on to the train, a couple of other coaches must be removed, so it is impracticable to use it, even if it is up to modern standards. This matter has been raised from time to time and the answer has always been that we could not afford it. I am sure that this is the sort of answer the Treasurer will give, as it will be in line with the answers he has given in the last few days. Over a period the provision of a dining car or buffet car on the Overland would pay for itself in increased patronage, etc.

The "red hens", which are used on the suburban lines, are not equipped with blinds, and in the hot weather the summer sun is most oppressive when it streams through the windows. In the past the Railways Department has stoutly resisted any suggestion that blinds should be fitted to the windows of these trains. It has been said that the tinted glass in the windows of the trains is to guard against the glare. Will the Treasurer use his influence with the Railways Commissioner to see whether something cannot be done.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The construction of a line from Port Augusta to Whyalla, would necessarily involve an agreement with the Commonwealth Government, and submissions have been made by me to the Government on this and many other railway construction matters.

Mr. Millhouse: You still regard this as important?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, it is one of the important matters about which I wrote to the Prime Minister specifically concerning railways. I have not had a report on the dining car since I became Treasurer. I have not had any information that would indicate that the Overland is in any way unpopular; indeed, at many periods of the year it is difficult to obtain bookings on it. I do not know that the provision of a dining car would mean that more passengers would use the Overland. I think rather less would use the train, given the necessity of pulling it up the somewhat steep gradients in the Adelaide Hills. However, I shall investigate the matter, and I will ask my colleague for information concerning the fitting of blinds in the "red hen" trains.

Mr. COURCE: I am still awaiting the information I sought some three weeks ago concerning the railway from Port Augusta to Whyalla. Quite apart from the obvious national asset this would provide in the State, it would provide employment in the area and give a very

valuable opportunity to the Islington railway workshops once again to tender for some of the rolling stock and the construction work. The railway workshops at Islington has a very fine set-up, and it has tendered for contracts for other States of the Commonwealth. If the Minister makes another submission to the Commonwealth Government on this, I should like him to take into account this aspect, in addition to the obvious national import.

Mr. HEASLIP: For some time I have been trying to ascertain whether the Gladstone-Wilmington railway will fit in with the standardization of the Port Pirie to Broken Hill line. I understand that the Government does not know, but it is still negotiating with the Commonwealth Government in an endeavour to obtain some agreement regarding this line. The people north of Gladstone are most concerned about this matter, because they could be completely cut off from the Broken Hill to Port Pirie line, which is being standardized, and from the 5ft. 3in. line running south from Gladstone. I understand that much of the Wilmington-Gladstone line has been or is being re-laid with new sleepers, and that these sleepers are only long enough to take the present narrow gauge line. This indicates to me that it is not likely that the line will be standardized for many years. I should like some information from the Treasurer about the future of this line.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I notice that \$77,000 is allocated for 10 hopper waggons for the 5ft. 3in. gauge lines and \$32,000 for seven hopper waggons for the 3ft. 6in. gauge lines. For some considerable time I have been raising the question of the manufacture for the Railways Department of hopper bottom trucks for the cartage of bulk grain. Can the Treasurer say whether this is the type of hopper waggon the department envisages? If it is, I must express disappointment that such a small amount is being allocated for this very important project. It should be realized that a quicker turn-round of trucks and the consequent quicker delivery of grain to the terminal ports would result in the department's earning more revenue.

Unfortunately, because of the drought the present year will not be a heavy grain year. However, hopper bottom trucks would last for several seasons. A year or two ago, when we had a wheat harvest of 53,000,000 bushels, farmers were queueing up with their trucks at terminal ports. Some of the silos became full because of insufficient rail movement, and many farmers by-passed the silos and carted the wheat

direct to the terminal ports. This meant a loss of revenue to the railways. Some railway systems realize the importance of this matter; New South Wales has gone fairly considerably into the question. I urge the department to consider as quickly as possible the manufacture of hopper bottom trucks for conveying bulk grain to terminal ports.

Mr. HEASLIP: I asked a question about the future of the Gladstone-Wilmington line, and I cannot understand why no reply has been forthcoming. Surely this is the time to seek information, and that information should be available now. I ask the Treasurer to give me a reply.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I meant no discourtesy to the honourable member. I regret that at the moment I do not have a reply for him. I thought the honourable member would have understood that I would get this reply for him, and I shall do so.

Mr. HALL: Several weeks ago I asked a question of the Treasurer concerning the allocation of land that I believe is now vacant (or will become vacant) at the old sewage farm adjacent to the Islington railway workshops. Plans have been announced regarding the possible use of this land. One interested organization inquired of me recently about the possibility of obtaining some land in this area, but I could give it no information. I understand that the venue of the additions to the Institute of Technology has been altered and that these additions are now to be placed at The Levels at Pooraka. Has the Treasurer any additional information about whether or not all the land has been allocated? If he does not know this, can he say quite definitely the types of purpose for which it will be allocated? For instance, will it all be used for Government purposes?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not possible at this stage to say exactly what the planning for the old sewage farm will be. We have had to hold plans in abeyance pending the report of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study, which has indicated that its report could conceivably affect this area. If the Leader has any persons who are interested in land in this area for industrial development, he should put them in touch with the Industrial Development Branch. We would certainly be able to give those people all the necessary information.

Mr. HALL: For some time a promise has been made that a new railway station would be built at Parafield Gardens. I have asked questions on this matter several times, and

the last answer I received last year was that it would be commenced in 1966-67. I have not yet been able to ascertain whether this work has been started. This is only one of the many matters involved in the railway construction programme for 1967-68, but I would be grateful if the Treasurer could obtain an answer for me. This is a newly-developing area. Many hundreds of new Housing Trust houses have been sold and a number have been let. Also, a good number of private dwellings have recently been constructed. Therefore, there is now a sizable community that depends very much on public transport for mobility in getting to work and also for the general convenience of the district. Therefore, I should be grateful if the Treasurer could inform me whether this station definitely will be built this year. The people in this area are getting a little tired of the promises that are taking so long so far to fulfil.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall get the information for the Leader.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: I refer to the narrow gauge railway lines on Eyre Peninsula. Considerable improvement has been effected to the Cummins-Kimba line, but there has been very little improvement to the Cummins-Thevenard line. Although I do not use the railways myself, I sometimes wonder how the train crews manage to travel on them. I think they are in more danger travelling on the railways when they are carrying a load behind them than are some of our boys in Vietnam. Can the Treasurer assure me that work will be continued on the Cummins-Thevenard line until it is in reasonably good order?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will certainly refer the matter to my colleague.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I referred during the Address in Reply debate to the necessity for continuing the policy of converting to standard gauge lines, so that Adelaide would be connected to the standard gauge and so that South Australian industry would begin to derive some real benefit from the overall standardization programme. Besides its ultimate railway value, the work would have a good employment value. Can the Treasurer indicate the present stage of negotiations with the Commonwealth Government in respect of the link between Adelaide and Port Pirie?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A clear undertaking has not yet been given by the Commonwealth Government, but I have written to the Prime Minister recently about the matter.

Line passed.

Marine and Harbors, \$2,135,000.

Mr. FERGUSON: I am pleased that \$600,000 is provided for the commencement of work on bulk loading facilities at Giles Point, although I am disappointed that provision is not made for completion of that work. Edithburgh used to be an outport for grain on the southern end of Yorke Peninsula, and enjoyed the privilege of a 1c a bushel differential. Indeed, I do not think it is well known that Edithburgh used to be rated as the third most important port in South Australia. However, when bulk handling was introduced by the South Australian Wheat Board at Ardrossan, Edithburgh lost its privilege as an outport, with the result that the differential applying there rose from 1c to 8c a bushel. The people of Southern Yorke Peninsula, who were concerned about this matter, immediately set about having an outport established there; they first tried to have Edithburgh re-established as a deep sea port but it was considered by the Harbors Board (as it was then) that it would cost almost \$2,000,000 to provide a deep sea port and that Edithburgh would not have been suitable, anyway.

However, as it was established that deep water existed at Giles Point, about six miles away from Edithburgh, and that Giles Point would be capable of berthing bulk carriers, the previous Government referred the matter to the Public Works Committee in 1964. The committee reported that cerealgrowers on Southern Yorke Peninsula would have to provide a sum to cover the capital costs of installing the bulk loading facilities, and that an extra burden of 2.5c a bushel would have to be applied. It also recommended that, if the port were to be self-supporting, there would have to be an annual output of at least 100,000 tons. From figures that I have obtained from the wheat and barley boards, I point out that, in 1964-65, receipts on Southern Yorke Peninsula (which would be served by Giles Point) comprised 1,310,000 bags of barley (about 93,000 tons) and 140,250 bags of wheat (11,500 tons).

As that total is considerably over the 100,000 tons to which the Public Works Committee referred, I believe that the installation of bulk loading facilities at Giles Point is justified. It has been established that an area of 250,000 acres on Southern Yorke Peninsula is not yet developed; therefore, on a conservative estimate, if 200,000 acres of that land were developed and 100,000 acres cropped annually, producing six bags to the acre, there would be an increased output of 1,800,000 bushels

(about 40,000 tons). It can therefore be seen that the quantities recommended by the Public Works Committee will be achieved. I believe that the establishment of deep sea loading facilities at Giles Point will provide considerable security to cerealgrowers on Southern Yorke Peninsula; indeed, it will provide an incentive for them to clear the estimated 250,000 acres of land and bring it into production. The South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited has announced that it has accepted a tender for the construction of a terminal silo at Giles Point to accommodate 1,500,000 bushels. C.B.H. expects to be able to receive into its terminal silo grain from the 1968-69 harvest. I hope it will not be long before a further sum is placed on the Loan Estimates so that the deep sea loading facilities can be established and completed at Giles Point in order that the co-operative, having received grain into its terminal silo, will be able to use the facilities established there for the benefit of the growers of southern Yorke Peninsula.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I support the member for Yorke Peninsula. This is an important project that we have been advocating for a long time. It is pleasing that \$600,000 has been placed on these Loan Estimates for the Government's share of the harbour facilities. The co-operative has already let the tender for Giles Point and it will spend between \$600,000 and \$700,000 before Christmas of this year on its share of the harbour installations. The southern end of Yorke Peninsula is developing rapidly. With an improvement in the soil conditions there, that area will produce much more grain than hitherto, so this terminal port will provide much more income to the grain producers since they will be saved the long haul to Ardrossan.

The growers there are delighted that a start is being made at long last. Only this afternoon I had discussions with some representatives of that area, who expressed pleasure at the proposed expenditure of \$600,000 this year. Of course, that is not the total Government expenditure required to make this a going concern: more than twice this amount will need to be allocated next year to complete the terminal. Will the Minister of Marine ensure that every effort is made to have supplementary money available to get the Marine and Harbors Department works completed, or at least to ensure that they are not

delayed for lack of funds? As it is, it will be well after 1969 before grain can be shifted from Giles Point. In the meantime, the co-operative's part of the programme on land will be completed. We can visualize having to store grain at the harbour until it is taken away by ship. If provision is not made next year for completing the department's works, it may mean that we shall have to take some grain from the silos, transport it to Ardrossan and ship it from there. We can hold it for a certain time but, if the next harvest is promising, obviously something will have to be done about moving the grain already in the silos, which means double-handling charges. Will the Minister ensure that supplementary money is made available to keep this project going?

Mr. HALL: I refer to fishing havens and the low expenditure on them last year, when, although \$40,000 was approved, only \$20,155 was spent. Expenditure on fishing havens in the last two years has been low compared with that of the Playford Administration. Some tables I have show that in the last eight years of the Playford Government an average of \$105,000 was spent annually, while in the first year of the Labor Government \$42,000 was voted but actual payments amounted to \$46,682. In the second year actual payments amounted to \$20,155. So that the total payments were about \$67,000 for the two years, which is still only a little over half the yearly average of the Playford Administration. So the emphasis placed by the present Government on fishing havens is lamentably weak. The only conclusion that one can draw from these reports is that we in South Australia have completed our work on fishing havens. However, we have only to speak to the fishermen to discover that this is far from being the case. We still need great support for the fishing industry, which is so important to the State. It brings in about \$6,000,000 annually, and we depend on that prosperous industry to bring us export earnings.

The industry is worthy of better treatment than it has received under this Government. Can the Minister of Marine explain why there was such a fall in expenditure under this head? In my recent visits to the fishing ports in the South-East, I happened to be on the Kingston jetty where the department is carrying out extensions and enlargements at the seaward end of the jetty. At first, I thought this was desirable. I was told, however, that this was not what most of the fishermen required. I said to them, "Why don't you make your

best case to the Marine and Harbours Department and, if necessary, the Minister?"

They told me then that the department's representative had been to Kingston at a particularly slack period when few fishermen were around and had got the signatures or the approval of one or two fishermen for the department's plans for the extension of the seaward end of the Kingston jetty. I was told and saw for myself that these extensions lengthened the jetty, whereas many fishermen said that they wanted an addition, not an extension. It is too late for recriminations about that work and I do not blame the Minister for what happened. However, I ask him to take up with the department to ensure that the provision of facilities for fishermen is thoroughly canvassed so that what is provided will be what they want. Although the amount provided this year is inadequate, it is an improvement on the miserable amount of \$20,000 spent last year. I ask the Minister why only half of the amount of \$40,000 voted last year was spent.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Marine): Regarding Giles Point, my department is dealing constantly with the co-operative, and the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott) will recall a discussion that we had at Thevenard on one occasion about our intentions. At that time the co-operative was gratified and satisfied that we were doing the best we could. The Marine and Harbours Department regards this as an important project and wants to finish it so that the deepening of the Thevenard channel can be proceeded with.

When the Leader of Opposition referred to the average expenditure on fishing havens, slipways and jetties, he omitted to say that an extraordinary amount was provided in one year for the Lake Butler slipway. I am amazed that the Leader does not know the facts about the work at Kingston. One of the reasons for the expenditure of a reduced amount last year was the cessation of work on the Kingston jetty. After we had started the work, we received a request from the fishermen's association. We then ceased work to consider the association's changed requirements. We then made a second attempt to meet this request.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The proposal was changed three times.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes, the work was delayed at every attempt and, because of this, it was impossible to spend the amount of money allocated for the year. We were approached three times on the matter.

The secretary of the association met the Minister of Lands (who represents the district) and myself and I said, "I will give you a week to make your mind. Go back and we will do what you want, provided you understand that this is the last change that we will make." Now it is said that we have not made the best effort to meet the requirements of the fishermen! How unfair can anyone get?

Furthermore, when I was at Kingston on another matter, I inspected the job with the representative of the fishermen. Could a Minister have done more to meet the requirements of the fishermen? If the secretary and president of the association come to me, is it not reasonable for me to expect that they represent the majority of fishermen? We had not been able to get them to make up their minds about changes and because of that we said, "This is it. Make up your mind this time and there will be no changes."

Mr. HALL: Obviously, the Minister has dealt with these particular people on numerous occasions and I leave the remarks at what he has said. Regarding his reference to expenditure, I took the last eight years of the Playford Administration's term simply to give a 10-year period when the two years of the present Government's term were added. I do not know what the figures were beyond 10 years ago. I firmly believe that the high expenditure to which the Minister has referred was about \$260,000.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It was about \$346,000, spread over a couple of years.

Mr. HALL: I can be corrected if I am wrong, but I think the vote in that year was about double. The addition of about \$100,000 in one financial year can make a difference of, at the most, from \$12,000 to \$14,000 in the total for those years and we are still left with an average of about \$90,000, excluding large individual payments. The Minister's remark does not excuse the expenditure of an average of about \$33,000 a year.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: This was spent on slipways, and that is not a recurring cost.

Mr. HALL: Surely the Minister cannot say that there is no need to assist the industry.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Of course there is a need.

Mr. HALL: The Minister's remark about how the money was spent is irrelevant. The fact remains that this Government, in its first two years in office, spent on fishing havens about one-third of the amount spent by the previous Administration.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The provision for fishing havens appeared as a single line on the Loan Estimates in 1956 or 1957, when I was Minister of Agriculture. There was always a problem about determining priorities for havens. A special provision was made whereby the details of plans were prepared by the Minister of Agriculture, but the money was to be voted to the Minister of Marine and he was to be the constructing and maintaining authority. The purpose was to enable the Minister of Agriculture to allocate money according to his ideas of priorities. I think the first vote was \$140,000. The level of expenditure can be gauged from the work we did in those years. For example, we built a slipway at Robe, a winter haven at Port MacDonnell, and we improved other South-East ports. We also made major improvements at Port Lincoln, so I agree with the Leader's statement that the level of expenditure under this line has fallen drastically in recent years. I know of many coastline projects that have been discussed a great deal but have not received attention: I am referring to the major project at Port Lincoln.

The total allocation to the Marine and Harbors Department this year is \$2,055,000. It is a tragedy that a department that is directly concerned with the trade and commerce of this State should be reduced in its total expenditure to \$2,000,000, which is at least \$1,000,000 below the level of expenditure that the Harbors Board was generally allocated in the years when I was Minister. A few months ago I asked the Minister for a list of those projects falling within the control of this department that had been recommended by the Public Works Committee. The list can be seen in *Hansard*, page 479, and I think that there were six or seven projects on which no action had been taken but which had been approved by the committee.

Also, I should like the Minister to tell me what is happening in regard to the investigations into deep water ports in South Australia. Two committees have worked on this matter. One committee submitted a report in which the major item was a recommendation that three super ports be established in South Australia at Port Adelaide, Ardrossan and a port on lower Eyre Peninsula. At an interview with the Minister the people of lower Eyre Peninsula requested that the order of priority for the establishment of these ports should be revised because of the growing demand that facilities on lower Eyre Peninsula should have priority over any such facilities at other ports.

Of course, the work at Port Adelaide was proceeding and it is still continuing. The Minister agreed to the extent that he was willing for a small inter-departmental committee to inquire into the relative merits of Arno Bay, Port Neill and Port Lincoln, or at least the relative merits of a lower Eyre Peninsula port and Port Lincoln. This committee took evidence and, I presume, has not yet completed its investigations because as far as I know no report has been issued. Can the Minister tell me what stage has been reached in these investigations, when we can expect to hear from the committee, and when he will be able to state the Government's policy on this matter?

C.B.H. is concerned about getting on with the establishment of sufficient facilities at outports and at inland stations. It wants guidance from the Government about the programme that should be followed. Many farmers believe that the emphasis of the co-operative should be on country sidings rather than on terminal ports. The United Farmers and Graziers on lower Eyre Peninsula and on the north-west side of Eyre Peninsula have said that they want more storage. These matters are rather obscured by the lack of certain knowledge concerning the Government's policy in respect of these ports.

The Minister has given some information about this, but I still do not know the Government's real intentions. Is the Government to be satisfied with a local port for ships operating between Adelaide and Melbourne, or is it doing anything about the interest expressed by the people who are considering operating these particular types of ship between Northern European ports and Adelaide and who have expressed the view publicly that they are interested in making Adelaide their headquarters port for Australia? This matter ought to give the Minister serious concern. He ought to be in the forefront of negotiations and inquiries, realizing, as I believe he does, that it is a matter not only of a terminal for a ship but also of the involvement of an organization with huge capital resources. It is recognized that where such people set up their headquarters they continue to make further investments, and associated industries in Europe are certain to follow such investments with other investments, which could mean valuable increases in the industrial activity of this State. This is an opportunity we cannot neglect. Are we to have two terminals in Adelaide for container ships? Are we to build now or make arrangements for the United Kingdom consortium to lease land in our inner harbour and to set

up its handling gear, and for commerce in Adelaide to direct its flow of goods through this inlet and outlet? If the proposals of the Skandia consortiums materialize, are we to have another terminal at Outer Harbour? If so, I am at a loss to know why we should need two. One area, where this activity could be grouped, would be adequate. At Outer Harbour there is ample room for an undertaking of any size. Adelaide is far better served for this activity than is any other port in Australia: Sydney is already overcrowded; Fremantle has become almost impossible; and the port of Melbourne is already severely congested and is being extended by artificial means. However, Adelaide has a natural resource that ought to be promoted as one of its natural assets. I am afraid we are not really doing what we should be doing. I am concerned about this matter, because it is of far-reaching importance to the commercial development of this State. I should like to know what the Minister has to say about the aspects I raised yesterday and again tonight.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: First, dealing with the committee's investigation in respect to the ports on the lower portion of Eyre Peninsula, I can say that the committee is still in operation and that I took steps only last week to see whether I could obtain from it an early report. As soon as it is to hand, I shall advise the honourable member and this Chamber of its nature. Regarding a containerization terminal at Outer Harbour, I cannot add to what I said yesterday. The honourable member perhaps will be delighted to know that following his comments yesterday I contacted the Director this morning and told him that I wanted to read to him the comments made by the honourable member yesterday and that I wanted to talk with him on Thursday about them.

It will be seen, therefore, that those matters will be discussed in the light in which the honourable member raised them yesterday. At present the plans to meet the immediate future are for a container service in the inner port. Also, we are planning for the development of a more efficient and effective terminal in the Outer Harbour area as soon as practicable with a view to capturing oversea trade. We are dealing with the consortium in an effort to see whether we can make this a terminal port, and we have not given up hope. As someone said yesterday, we are chasing the matter all the time. The Director is very busy dealing with other harbour

authorities. I agree that at our harbours we have the land available, the open spaces for the provision for roadways, and all that kind of thing, and I assure the honourable member that we will not be missing any opportunities in this matter. I shall be getting a more detailed report soon, and I shall advise the honourable member when it is to hand so that the particulars can be made available to this Chamber.

Mr. HALL: I am pleased to hear the Minister say that he has in hand planning to develop a terminal port in South Australia eventually. I was under the impression that initially containerization in South Australia would be handled by only one company. That was the intention, of course, until a few months ago. I understood that this company would be responsible for two lines operating between Europe and Australia. What will happen to the Eastern trade if this, too, becomes containerized and the lines that handle this are outside of the company that will be handling restricted lines through to South Australia?

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: The committee will be looking at that matter.

Mr. HALL: I accept the Minister's assurance. That is a most important aspect of trade, particularly to South Australia. The latest statistics show that Japan is now our biggest customer. I hope that we will be using all our endeavours, both nationally and through individual private firms, to develop diverse trade with what is known as the Far East—the area to the north of Australia. It is essential that this State does not lose any share of this trade because it is not equipped to handle the wares that come in containers from shipping lines other than those catered for through the terminal that will be established at Gillman. I accept the Minister's assurance that the report of the committee will ensure that there is satisfactory future planning in this regard.

Line passed.

Engineering and Water Supply, \$29,800,000.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Treasurer said that \$100,000 was provided to continue the construction of a pipeline from Chandler Hill to Heathfield to give a water supply in the Stirling-Crafers area. Although this, of course, is in the district of the member for Onkaparinga, it has a particular interest for me because a number of people living west of Waverley Ridge, which is the dividing line between the Districts of Onkaparinga and Mitcham, are waiting for a water supply. The Minister of

Works has said that the supply to this area will depend on the completion of the scheme to which I have referred and that, until that district east of the area in which I am particularly interested is properly served, nothing can be done about my area.

Each summer the residents to the west of Waverley Ridge have their hearts in their mouths because of the bush fire danger, quite apart from the inconvenience of not having an assured supply, and each summer we hope against hope that the water will come, but so far it has not. I ask the Minister when this scheme will be finished and, therefore, when the area west of Waverley Ridge will be reticulated.

The Hills area of the Mitcham District has for a long time wanted sewerage. Ever since I have been a member I have complained about the lack of sewerage and asked that we have it. The latest information we have is that it will eventuate in the late 1960's or in the 1970's. The Minister has said that the sewerage of the Hills area depends on the reconstruction of the sewerage system in the south-western suburbs. I see that \$614,000 is proposed for reconstruction of sewers and that \$274,000 of this is for the south-western suburbs. I ask the Minister when that work will be finished and, therefore, when the department will be able to proceed with the sewerage of the Hills areas in my district.

I, in common I think with every other member, have accepted the contention that the Chowilla dam is absolutely essential in the interests of South Australia's further development, and I still accept that. I was perturbed, however, as everybody was perturbed some months ago, when it was discovered that tenders were much higher than had been expected. I am still perturbed when I read in the Treasurer's explanation the reference that he has made to this topic, because from this, unless the words are entirely misleading, the future prospects for the dam are by no means settled.

The Government remains confident that the current examination will show the great advantages of Chowilla and that the other States and the Commonwealth will give the project their full support.

Of course, the word may be "confident" but the implication behind it is that it may not happen and that we may not get the support of the other States. He continued:

In the expectation of an early decision to proceed, the Government is providing in these Estimates for a contribution of \$2,500,000 . . .

It is obvious from that that it is by no means certain that the Chowilla dam project is continuing. If we accept that it is essential to our future development, this is serious. The fact that even the Treasurer has seen fit to couch his references to the Chowilla dam in these terms gives rise to great alarm on my part. Can the Treasurer or the Minister of Works say when a decision is likely to be made on these things? When will the recommendations of the Engineering and Water Supply Department go to the River Murray Commission? When will the decision be made to go on with this work? If it is not to proceed, we shall have to look for something else, which will undoubtedly mean fresh delays and waste of money, because much work has already been done on the project.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get reports for the honourable member about the Waverley Ridge water supply and the sewerage of the hills area, to see whether we can give him a more precise forecast than hitherto. The River Murray Commission is to meet on August 11, when a reassessment of various parts of the Chowilla dam project to see whether modifications are possible that would mean a lighter call upon Loan funds than the original tenders would suggest will be made. We shall know more about the situation after that meeting.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Treasurer give me details of the work at the Hackham treatment works for which \$70,000 is allocated?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not sure of the details that the honourable member wants, but I will ask for more detailed information than we have provided in the Loan Estimates.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Can the Minister of Works give me more information about the \$40,000 allocated for the hundreds of Boothby and Roberts, the \$40,000 for the hundred of Mamblin, and the \$59,000 for Streaky Bay? What will that money be used for? Also, when will the tank be built at Pimbaacla? I understand the material is on the site. Will the tank be ready for the coming summer?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works): It is hoped that the tank will be ready for this summer, but to get the water into it is another matter. I can supply the honourable member with details of the other items by letter.

Mr. NANKIVELL: There are three matters relating to country water districts on which

I seek further information. An amount of \$90,000 is allocated for Bordertown and, although I understand that that refers to supply in that town and possibly to the provision of another pumping station, I cannot find any information about it in the statement. Another matter about which I am concerned is the listing of the Narrung-Point McLeay scheme as a joint project. Various projects have been discussed in relation to the supply of water for Narrung township and Point McLeay Mission during the last three years. I was under the impression that these two places would be dealt with separately and that an agreement had been reached with the council about supply for Narrung independently of supply to Point McLeay, which will not now need a scheme as elaborate as was at first proposed. The secretary of the Narrung Progress Association telephoned me this evening and asked about the position because local people were getting over-anxious, as she put it, and were proposing to install a separate scheme of their own. Such a proposal, of course, could mean that the Narrung township scheme would be placed in jeopardy. I ask the Minister for information about these matters.

Another matter that I have discussed over many years is the Taillem Bend to Keith water scheme. I am disappointed at the Treasurer's statement that this scheme will be discontinued because money is required for more important purposes. I differ with him about what is more important. Assistance may be sought from the Commonwealth in terms of the Commonwealth's special proposals, but I doubt that the scheme would qualify for such assistance. A total of \$448,000 is provided and we have not been told whether an amount is allocated for a separate domestic water supply for the township of Keith. The Minister agreed at a meeting at Keith to try to provide an interim scheme for that town to meet requirements until the major scheme was completed and he said that money would be available for it and that work would proceed with reticulation if the supply were found to be satisfactory.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The amount allocated for Bordertown is certainly for extensions. However, I do not know the details and shall obtain them for the member. Regarding Narrung water supply, I am of the same opinion as the member, that it was to be a separate scheme. I think I am correct in saying that satisfactory arrangements have been made with the council and the parties concerned.

Mr. Nankivell: They haven't told the people that, and that is worrying them.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall call for a report on this matter and advise the honourable member either by letter or by an answer to a question in this House. Yesterday the honourable member spoke to me about the sum allocated to the Tailem Bend to Keith water supply, and I told him then—and I have not had time to check it—that I believed that a considerable proportion of it would be used for the pumping station and the town supply, because the reticulation part of the Keith town supply would be a part of the Tailem Bend to Keith scheme. I am following this matter up with the Minister of Mines in connection with the testing programme, and I regret to say that difficulties have been experienced in respect of sand strata. There are indications that there should be a good supply of water for Keith and I shall honour my promise to the Keith people that, as soon as a supply is assured, we shall get on with the work.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Works on May 22 set out details of the South Coast sewerage scheme and the Happy Valley sewerage scheme. A further statement was made on what would be covered in this scheme, but no order of priorities was given. I should like to know more about the cost, the priorities, when the reference will be made to the Public Works Committee, and the target dates.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be happy to obtain reports on these matters. This is a big scheme and it must of necessity be done in parts.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: In connection with the Warren water district I see that \$26,000 has been allocated to the Watervale project this year. Can the Minister of Works say when his department intends to commence this scheme and can he let me have a more specific breakdown of the two larger items in the Warren water district allocation (the items for \$63,000 and \$95,000)? Most of the Warren district lies within the District of Light.

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

Mr. HEASLIP: The \$20,000 set aside for a water supply project at Jamestown and Booleroo Centre is a very small amount, but we are in trouble at Booleroo Centre regarding extensions. When the main went down it was sufficient for Booleroo. Can the Minister say

whether this \$20,000 is in respect of a booster pump to boost the supply?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes.

Mr. QUIRKE: I am happy that Watervale is to receive a water supply. Some time ago it was intended that water would be taken from a 1,000,000-gallon tank at Clare to supply Leasingham, Penwortham and Sevenhills, but the people along the line thought that, because of wet conditions, they did not need a reticulated supply. Although I realize that they are to blame for their present situation, they now need a supply. A plan was prepared containing full details previously. Will the Minister investigate the matter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes.

Mr. BURDON: For Mount Gambier water supply, \$110,000 is provided. Can the Minister obtain for me a break-down of that amount?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: For the Warren water district, extensions, services and minor works have been allocated \$63,000. Can the Minister say whether the small extension at Neales Flat, which involves four or five farmers, is included in that allocation, and indicate what progress his officers have made on this scheme?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall have inquiries made and let the honourable member know the result.

Mr. RODDA: The sum of \$80,000 is allocated for waterworks at Naracoorte. On two occasions last year in Naracoorte, I think in Robert Street where building is proceeding, people were without water on their building sites. I must say, in fairness to the Minister, that when I have made representations to him he has had his department make these connections very quickly. The same thing has occurred in the Memorial Park allotment area, and when representations have been made the department has, with equal swiftness, connected the area. Houses are now being built in Memorial Park, and temporary pipelines have been laid across unsold holdings, but some other provision will have to be made when these blocks are sold. Can the Minister say whether in this amount of money it is intended to extend these mains to provide a permanent supply of water when these blocks are built on? There seems to be some confusion about the matter, and I am sure that as the situation exists now I shall have to make further representations to the Minister and this piecemeal connection will continue. Could the Minister give me a breakdown of the \$80,000 for Naracoorte and also of the \$10,000 for Penola?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I think I gave a report recently regarding the Memorial Park.

Mr. Rodda: That was on sewerage.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: We want to put in an effective water supply. I shall get the breakdown and let the honourable member have it, possibly by letter.

Mr. FERGUSON: I refer to an amount of \$157,000 for further water reticulation on Yorke Peninsula. Initially when a water scheme was taken down through the centre of Yorke Peninsula it did not provide for any reticulation in the Minlaton district or in parts south of Minlaton: the main was simply taken straight down through to Yorketown and Edithburgh. Subsequently, the expenditure of about \$900,000 was approved for 50 miles of further water reticulation in the southern part, but this takes reticulation only as far as Brentwood (west of Minlaton) and Sunbury, which is about five miles west of Yorketown.

Regarding the rest of the Peninsula, the Warooka area is provided with a reticulation scheme from the Parawurlie Basin, and it has been established that there is another water basin in the hundred of Carribie. This water basin would provide a water reticulation scheme for the area I mentioned when I was speaking on another item earlier this evening. I have asked the Minister for a report on this water basin. I hope that eventually this area at the southern end of Yorke Peninsula that remains to be cultivated will have a water scheme from the Carrabie Basin, and that one day a sum will be provided on the Estimates for this to be done.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Minister of Works, in reply to a recent question asked by the member for Eyre about the Lock-Kimba water scheme, said, in effect, that application had been made to the Commonwealth Government in regard to the allocation of moneys for rural water extensions. I believe that the Commonwealth Government intended to make \$50,000,000 available to the States over five years. I am not sure whether the grant was to apply to such schemes as this one, but I presume that it was. However, the grant will result in the States receiving \$10,000,000 a year, of which South Australia may reasonably expect to obtain 10 per cent, or \$1,000,000. That will not take us far, and I believe that, if the people in my colleague's district are to have any lively expectation of having the scheme implemented, they must have some better foun-

ation on which to base their hopes. Will the Minister elaborate briefly on this matter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Although I think it is difficult to understand what is meant by the Commonwealth Government's proposals, I point out that officers of both the Treasury and the Engineering and Water Supply Department believe that, if we cannot obtain money for the Kimba scheme the Commonwealth's proposals are not "dinkum".

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I thought it related more to the Water Resources Council.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: First, we asked the Commonwealth whether it would receive submissions in regard to the Kimba water supply and the Tailern Bend to Keith main. The Commonwealth indicated that it would, because it asked for further particulars. Having supplied the Commonwealth with further details about both schemes, I am hopeful about Kimba. When visiting Kimba about a fortnight ago I was impressed by the attitude of the farmers in the district. Although some still have feed for their stock, their troubles result mainly from the lack of water. I can see that there is an absolute necessity for action to be taken in this regard, and I assure the honourable member that I will leave no stone unturned to see that something is done about the Polda-Kimba scheme.

Mr. NANKIVELL: As the Minister of Works will know, Bordertown has accepted a common effluent system, as opposed to a deep drainage system. This type of sewerage is becoming fairly common in the country as it is economical, from all points of view, except where noxious effluent has to be dealt with. At present, the money for all this comes under the Local Government Act by debenture, the council being permitted to raise money and get it back by striking a special rate for the people served by the scheme. Has consideration been given to providing money for this type of scheme under this head rather than leaving it to the local council to find the money as it can and to finance those projects under the Local Government Act?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. At the moment I cannot make any announcement of new policy on this, but we shall examine it.

Mr. HALL: I refer to an earlier scheme to supply water eventually to the Two Wells and Virginia areas. At present, water is available to a certain section of the Two Wells area, but the mains supplying this area are overloaded and temporary measures have been

taken to relieve that overloading by certain strategic replacements. The Minister of the previous Government responsible for this department promised in this Chamber that a scheme would be instituted to serve this area, and particularly Virginia where underground water is becoming difficult. It was to be reticulated in this new area for household and stock purposes. I refer the Committee to a question I asked on June 15, 1965, of the Minister at present holding that portfolio. I said:

On December 15 last an answer was given by the previous Minister of Works to my query concerning the eventual water supply to Virginia. In part, that reply stated:

"Further to the undertaking given in my reply in the House on August 20, 1964, Cabinet has now approved the expenditure of £93,000 as the first stage towards providing a reticulated water supply to the Virginia area and improving the existing supply at Two Wells. As indicated in my earlier reply, this initial stage forms part of a comprehensive plan which has been prepared by the Engineer-in-Chief and involves the enlargement of mains in the Two Wells area and extending the supply to Virginia. The whole project is estimated to cost £306,000, and if approved would be carried out over, say, a period of five years. It is not possible to indicate just when a start can be made on the laying of the new 26in. main, because the shortage of steel plate makes pipe delivery dates uncertain. It is hoped, however, that it will be possible to make a start towards the end of the present financial year."

From that reply by the previous Administration it was obvious that a start was being made on the eventual supply of water to Virginia. Can the Minister of Works assure me that that policy will be continued, with the object of bringing a departmental water supply to Virginia at the earliest possible time?

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: I can give the honourable member an assurance (similar to the assurance I gave a few moments ago) that with any contract or promise given by the previous Government in the nature of work to be done, every endeavour will be made to honour such an assurance. It is unfortunate, however, that I have to report that the engineering, water and sewers programme is not running to schedule. A number of big works approved for 1964-65 will not be started during that period. Those things cannot be explained without going into much detail. However, I assure the honourable member that the scheme he mentioned will proceed at the earliest possible date in accordance with the assurance that he received from my predecessor.

The facts are that, in 1965-66, \$180,000 was allocated for what is after all part of the scheme—the duplication of the main from Sandy Creek to Gawler. That was a start to the scheme referred to by the previous Minister and in the present

Minister's assurance that the work would proceed. Although duplication would serve more than that area, it was an integral part of the Two Wells and Virginia scheme. In 1966-67 an amount of \$40,000 was allocated for the Sandy Creek to Gawler branch main, which I understand has been completed. Nothing in the allocation for this year for the Barossa water district can be assumed to have any effect on the fulfilment of the promise made. It seems that the scheme is no longer current and I ask the Minister to say what are the Government's intentions about the assurance given in June, 1965, that the scheme would proceed and also to say why the scheme has not been proceeded with and why there is no allocation for it this year.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Many country areas need a water supply and priorities are determined in accordance with the degree of urgency. It is interesting to note that in 1966-67 we spent \$5,549,000 on metropolitan water supplies and \$7,723,000 on country water supplies.

Mr. HALL: I thank the Minister for his answer. However, it is very little satisfaction to people who have been given an assurance. It is the type of answer that we may expect to be given to a group of people approaching the Minister about the allocation of priorities.

Mr. QUIRKE: The town of Clare is in the throes of planning for a septic tank effluent disposal scheme, which is badly needed. Although a septic tank is completely efficient when properly used, disposal of the effluent presents a major problem when the effluent drains on solid rock or on an immeasurable depth of hard clay. The result is that in many cases the effluent runs out of the properties and down the street, but this cannot be helped. Septic systems are compulsory in Clare; the people must get rid of the effluent, and they do so, although there are some objectionable centres. Clare had a priority for deep drainage but it was constantly swept away because of the urgent necessity—which I admit—for treating the watershed of the Adelaide metropolitan water supply before anything else. This has left Clare without priority for many years hence.

Also, the Government said it would do the surveys free through the Public Health Department if the people waited until their turn came round. There was a long wait, so the council decided to pay for its own survey. Had the town been sewered the people would have paid one rate for the whole installation, but now,

having done it themselves, they have to pay the whole of the cost of the installation. In a case where a survey has been made by private engineers, I believe the Government should consider at least recouping the councils for the cost of such a survey. These people are helping themselves, and the position is urgent. In view of the fact that Clare has to pay \$160,000, this is not a big sum to request—it would be only \$5,000 or \$6,000. The survey would have been free if the council had waited, but it took the initiative because of the prevailing conditions.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This will involve a new departure in policy, but the matter will be examined.

Mr. HALL: A sum of \$3,200,000 is allocated for the Bolivar treatment works. Can the Minister say whether this will be sufficient to carry the work far enough ahead to eliminate the stench that sometimes emanates from the works?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The odour can be stopped only when the third stage has progressed sufficiently far, and I believe this sum will be sufficient for that purpose.

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister ascertain for me the works that are being carried out at Encounter Bay, Strathalbyn and Milang?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes.

Mr. HUGHES: The sum of \$467,000 has been allocated for the Beetaloo, Bundaleer and Baroota water district, \$100,000 of which is for extensions, services and minor works. Some work needs to be done on the mains in and around Moonta Mines. Can the Minister say whether this work will be included in the minor works?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am confident that I will be able to give the member a satisfactory reply.

Mr. HALL: The sum of \$20,000 has been allocated for the water supply at Coober Pedy. Can the Minister obtain information whether this expenditure will mean that the distillation plant will be connected or that the tanks that hold the water distilled from the plant will be connected with the larger storage tank about one mile from the desalination plant?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes.

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister say whether there are any plans to use the effluent from the Bolivar treatment works for irrigation purposes, in view of the water shortage in the area?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: There are plans, and we are negotiating with a number

of people to provide effluent water for irrigation purposes.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Some time ago an extension of the Pata water scheme was placed before the department. I cannot see any reference in these Estimates to this matter, but I hope that when the time is ripe the department will consider proceeding with the extension of this pipeline, as proposed some time ago.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I assure the honourable member that this scheme is under consideration.

Line passed.

Public buildings, \$23,650,000.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wish to speak on the subject of hospitals, particularly regarding the two new general hospitals which have been canvassed for so long but which have not come to anything. I base my remarks on the item, "Preliminary investigations and design, \$100,000", just in case there is any trouble about that.

Mr. Casey: I thought you got the explanation last night.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Unfortunately, I was not here to hear the Treasurer. I have heard a bit about it, and I have read it through a couple of times. Had I known that he was going to reply so eloquently I certainly would have stayed. What I have read of what he said has pricked me into saying a couple of things about these hospitals. He said last night that the Government at the last election said it was vital that we have in the metropolitan area two additional general hospitals. Then he went on to deal with the question of the teaching hospital to be co-ordinated with the faculty at Flinders University and a hospital at Modbury. The difference between the emphasis in the policy speech on this matter and the emphasis the Treasurer put on it last night is rather interesting. He said last night, of course, that nothing could be done about a teaching hospital at Flinders until the Universities Commission had looked into the thing.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Why is this?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is what I want to know. He said that nothing could be done about it until the commission had looked into the matter and had given its approval. After that, the money would be forthcoming from the Commonwealth Government. It appears that we are to be dependent on the decision of the Universities Commission before this hospital can proceed. But what did the honourable

gentleman's predecessor say in his policy speech? This is what he said about the hospital at Bedford Park:

Labor's proposals provide for a general hospital at Tea Tree Gully of 500 beds and a teaching hospital for the south-western districts of 800 beds. This must be at or near the university area at Bedford Park, and to provide for sufficient doctors this teaching hospital must be erected without delay.

Those words were uttered in February, 1965.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Nothing was said then about the Universities Commission.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No. The hospital had to be erected without delay, said Mr. Frank Walsh (as he then was) in February, 1965. But what did the Treasurer say last night when he tried to reassure the Committee on this matter? Having said that the matter had to go to the Universities Commission, he added:

But we have made all provision for that submission, so that at the earliest possible moment that hospital will be commenced. We have the land, the plans and the submission to go to the commission. So at the earliest possible time that that hospital can conceivably be erected by any Government, it will be. But the Treasurer did not say when it would be erected.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It will be in time to provide for the clinical years of a teaching faculty at Flinders University.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What the honourable gentleman has just said is literally true, but it is literally true because the university is waiting on the decision before it starts the faculty of medicine. In fact, what the Treasurer has said is true but, in fact also, delay is occurring, because the university will not start the faculty until it knows when the hospital is to be ready. That is the vicious circle in which the Government has involved us in this matter, and it is no good the Treasurer's saying what he has just said. We are putting up now with delay after delay on a hospital that we know is essential.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Rubbish! You really do talk the most utter and arrant nonsense. You say it is essential and urgent; what did your Government ever do about it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not presume to speak for this side of the Chamber. I used the words that the Treasurer's former Leader used in referring to this—"and to provide for sufficient doctors". The implication is that we needed a greater supply of medical practitioners, and this would require a faculty of medicine.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Well, don't we?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course we do. The words used were, "this teaching hospital must be erected without delay". How far have we progressed in two and a half years? This vaunted reform Government is going to bring in so much reform that by the time the elections come the record it will put before the people of South Australia will be such as to leave in the shade everything done by the Playford Government in 27 years! What progress have we made on this hospital that the Government said was required to be built without delay? We have got nowhere at all with this hospital, and the honourable gentleman knows it. I have been told recently by my friends at Flinders University that the university is waiting on the hospital before it sets its medical faculty going, and even if the project were to start now it would be about 10 years before any medical practitioners would graduate and register to practise in this State.

Mr. Hudson: Who is this authority at Flinders University?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Someone well known to the honourable member, but I will not mention his name. I defy the honourable member to deny what I have said. This is the position concerning the south-western suburbs hospital, and it is an absolute disgrace to the Government. Of course, that is not the end of it because we are told that this is not even to be the next hospital built; the next hospital is to be this jolly thing at Modbury. From what the honourable gentleman said last night, we find that this particular hospital is going according to plan: "There is on these Loan Estimates within the general line enough provision to cover my being able to meet the site works," etc. Of course, the only plan we have had so far is a sign which the Treasurer's publicity officers have stuck up on a block of land out there. This was the hospital to be built, according to the policy speech of February, 1965, and the Government, to help its member in Barossa, says that the hospital will take priority over the one in the south-western suburbs. As I have said, I think the delay that has occurred at Flinders University is a disgrace, and it is compounded many times when the Government has the hide to say (and to stick to it) that it will build the Modbury hospital first.

One further matter arises from the Treasurer's remarks last night. He said that he is going ahead with the site plans for this hospital and that he thinks the general line is enough to allow him to do so. That general

line (and this is the one on which I am basing my remarks at the moment) under "Hospitals" provided \$100,000 for preliminary investigations and design. I do not know whether the honourable gentleman is saying that neither of these hospitals will cost more than \$200,000. I do not think that even he or his silliest supporter could say that. If that is not the case, what authority has he to go ahead with the general design of these hospitals? Section 25 (1) of the Public Works Standing Committee Act states:

After the first day of July, nineteen hundred and twenty-eight, it shall not be lawful for any person to introduce into either House of Parliament any Bill—

(a) authorizing the construction of any public work estimated to cost when complete more than one hundred thousand pounds; . . .

unless such public work has first been inquired into by the committee in manner provided by this section.

That amount is now, of course, \$200,000. Undoubtedly, within the measurable future, the honourable gentleman will introduce a Bill giving authority for this particular line. It should not and cannot in the terms of the Public Works Standing Committee Act, because these projects will cost well over \$200,000 each, so that what he said in his speech last night is absolutely contrary to the provisions of this Act. He should not do this.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: He is not going to do it; he will give a certificate that he will not do it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That makes it even worse. Then this whole thing is a bungle, for political purposes, from one end to the other. The result is that after 2½ years of a Labor Government and within six months of the next election we have not one thing done towards either hospital. I do not want to argue against a hospital at Modbury but I do argue strongly in favour of a hospital in connection with Flinders University. This was acknowledged by his own Party 2½ years ago. I emphatically protest against the delays that have occurred there, against the way in which the Treasurer and his Government have played politics over this and against what he apparently intends to do, which is contrary to the provisions of the Public Works Standing Committee Act.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Having listened to the phrenetic hyperbole of the honourable member for the last few minutes, I wonder whether he should not perhaps himself seek some medical advice.

Mr. Millhouse: There is no need to be insulting.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Frankly, the honourable member's perfervid imagination is so fantastic that it leaves one mouthing in speechless frenzy. He says that nothing has been done about these hospitals. Apparently, we have not bought the land—because he says that nothing has been done. The Playford Government, of course, had no sites for hospitals; it did not have a line on the drawing board. From 1953 onwards, when I was in this Chamber, the member for Glenelg at that time got up to ask what was happening about a hospital at Oaklands. Nothing happened about it. There was no proposal whatever for a teaching hospital. What this Government did on assuming office was immediately to set about getting land for the hospitals and setting up planning committees to see to it that the plans for these hospitals were properly evolved. If the honourable member has no idea (and obviously he has no idea) about the needs in planning for hospitals and the time it takes to get everybody involved in a teaching hospital to agree to the form of that hospital and the facilities that are to be put into it, then I suggest that, before he gets up here and throws himself around in such a frenzy, he ought to find out. All that he has done this evening is convince anyone who knows anything about this matter of his utter ignorance. We assume from what he has said that he considers it a disgrace that this Government has not got some plans through without getting the approval of everybody involved, including the authorities at Flinders University, and slapped up something without getting any money for it from the Universities Commission!

Mr. Clark: Then, if you did that, he would criticize you for it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course he would. If we had built the Flinders University without first getting money from the Commonwealth, the first person to have said, "Why haven't you got money from the Commonwealth?" would be the member for Mitcham.

Mr. Millhouse: Why didn't Frank Walsh say that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Because it is not necessary for the Leader of a Party, in an election policy speech that has to be delivered within a limited time, to spell out that the way in which a particular item will be financed is through the Universities Commission.

Mr. Millhouse: It was a pretty unqualified statement.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course it was, and that was perfectly all right, because it would be assumed by anybody with any ability or with average intelligence that people listening would know what would be the position. The reason why the hospital had to be near Bedford Park, if not on the site itself, is obvious and if the honourable member had done his homework he would know that otherwise we would not get money from the Universities Commission for it.

Mr. Millhouse: Why are you giving Modbury Hospital priority?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not a question of giving priority to Modbury Hospital. A submission does not need to be made to the Universities Commission in the case of that hospital and, as it is a smaller hospital, it is possible to get the planning work done on it quickly. The honourable member does not want to exercise his intelligence on this matter: all he wants to do is to play politics. Although this Government has done a darn sight more in the whole hospitals area than the Government he supported for years did, although we acquired and prepared the land for two major hospitals and, although the previous Government had not been prepared to do anything about a teaching hospital, all that the honourable member has been able to do is get up and say that nothing can be done. He knows that what I am saying is true and he is trying to use the Hitler technique of saying this kind of thing to the people. If this is the kind of morality that the honourable member cheerfully produces from time to time to the people of South Australia, I think the people will want to know more about the basis on which he makes public statements.

Mr. SHANNON: Through my office on the Public Works Committee I have had something to do with hospitals in South Australia, not only in the metropolitan area but elsewhere as well.

Mr. Hudson: It takes a long time.

Mr. SHANNON: That depends a good deal on who is called in to advise about what should be provided in a teaching hospital, and I give a word of warning to the Treasurer. I, as Chairman of the Public Works Committee, suffered the so-called experts during an investigation into the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Perhaps I am doing these people an injustice, because they are experts in their own field.

However, when it comes to planning a hospital they have only one idea: "What can I have in my department, where will I have it, and how will it operate?" They have no regard to how the overall hospital is to operate. Such a plan was presented to the Public Works Committee.

It will be necessary to build a teaching hospital in conjunction with the Flinders University. I am not criticizing the Government because it has not yet been built, because I understand the situation. The preparation of a workable plan for a hospital is almost as important as the remedial work that will be done there. A hospital is a very big undertaking and can be very expensive if it is not properly planned. Fortunately, the Public Buildings Department officers had been overseas and had investigated this matter, and they were competent. The committee said to them, "We want you to forget all about the many negotiations that have taken place and to look upon the Royal Adelaide Hospital site as 17 acres of vacant land, and we want you to give us a design for a hospital that will work." This was done, and the committee after much investigation decided to adopt the plan presented to it by the Public Buildings Department, and the Government is now implementing it. When the whole project is completed the hospital will be as good as any in Australia of a comparable size.

I am pleased to see that there is a line in the Loan Estimates in respect of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. This hospital is out of balance in respect of the provision of important specialized departments that every teaching hospital must have. The committee made recommendations about its bed capacity, and this problem will be remedied to some extent by the new additions. The committee agreed to the plan presented by the Public Buildings Department. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital was designed for a greater bed capacity than that which was provided at first; this greater capacity is necessary in order to match the required specialized services. I admit that the planning was not as good as it could and should have been for the additional beds now to be provided. However, when the new wing is attached, it will be a very good hospital from the point of view of administration and working. I believe it will compare favourably with the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

Where medical personnel are being trained, only a certain number of units of 10 or 12 students each can operate and do their clinical work effectively. In the original planning there were seven such units at the Royal Adelaide Hospital

and three at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The committee decided to recommend to the Government that it should split the 10 units that were operating prior to the building of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, six to the Royal Adelaide Hospital and four to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It will take some years for another teaching hospital to be built to handle the training of medical personnel at the Flinders University. Immediately the people training in the medical course at the Flinders University have reached their clinical years, they will have to go to either the Royal Adelaide Hospital or the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The Hospitals Department should plan ahead, in relation to the training of medical personnel, for the next 10 or 12 years.

Mr. COURCE: I make a plea to the Government that the teaching hospital at the Flinders University be proceeded with before the hospital at Modbury. As a member of the Public Works Committee for about 10 years, and in private life as a member of a hospital board and of similar bodies, I have some knowledge of the planning of hospitals. Like other members of the Public Works Committee, I have come across the problem of rapidly changing designs of hospitals, some of which are out of date almost before they are completed. I am also aware of the problem of making submissions to the Australian Universities Commission on this matter. I realize it is essential that this be done.

Although it has been suggested that there could be some delay in this, it is my experience that some supposed delays are not nearly as great as one sometimes expects. I know we have to go to the commission for approval of standards and so that the commission can see that the correct facilities according to its requirements are provided, and I agree with this. The first essential, of course, is that we want the money. The plea I make is based on this premise: we want more doctors in South Australia and we want them urgently.

Mr. Millhouse: Absolutely.

Mr. COURCE: We have heard the member for Onkaparinga say that we are at present training doctors in groups at the Queen Elizabeth and the Royal Adelaide Hospitals. If a hospital at Modbury is built first, this will not provide one more trained doctor in this State. Not only do we want more doctors, but we certainly want more nurses and other assistants. Taking into consideration the particular location of Modbury and the hospitals in the surrounding areas, I believe that if this hospital became a physical entity we would immediately

have the problem of getting enough doctors to operate there. I believe also that we would have the problem of getting enough trained sisters and nurses in the hospital. We would certainly not have enough patients to fill a hospital of the size envisaged by the Government.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Are you assuming that we are going to build the whole hospital in one stage?

Mr. COURCE: As I understand it, the Government has said that ultimately this will be a 500-bed hospital. I do not know how many beds the Government is planning to build first, but I had assumed that the hospital would be built in stages and that this would be a progressively expanding project. I do not know how many beds it is planned to build at this stage, because no reference has been made to the Public Works Committee.

Mr. Shannon: The problem that revolves around this concerns the service departments that ultimately have to serve the completed hospital.

Mr. COURCE: That is so. Recently, a hospital with which I am involved conducted a survey of its surrounding areas. I refer to the Northern Community Hospital at Prospect. We found that this hospital was catering for most of the maternity cases not only in the immediate northern suburbs but in many of the north-eastern suburbs, including a large part of the Modbury and Tea Tree Gully areas. We carried out this survey before we built an extra maternity section. We are currently planning further expansion, and we are catering for this problem. This to some extent applies to the Lyell McEwin Hospital at Elizabeth, which is over the hill (geographically, of course) to the district to which I am referring.

I suggest seriously to the Government that there could well be a problem in staffing this hospital with doctors and nurses, and that possibly there would not be enough patients to fill it. It would be advisable to proceed first with a teaching hospital. This point has also been put to me very seriously by a number of doctor friends and acquaintances of mine practising in and around Adelaide. These doctors have said to me (and I qualify my remarks by pointing out that they do not live in the Modbury and Tea Tree Gully area, where the doctors may have a different view) that they do not desire a hospital at Modbury at this stage; they want a new teaching hospital, so that more doctors will be trained.

While the erection of a hospital at Modbury is desirable, I believe that the area is being adequately catered for at present by other hospitals there. Although a hospital must be erected in the area eventually, it should be delayed at present and funds should be made available to match the Commonwealth Government's grant, in order to get the teaching hospital under way. I make the plea that the Government should not proceed with the Modbury Hospital purely for political purposes but that it should proceed with the teaching hospital so that more doctors will be trained.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I realize that the honourable member is perfectly sincere and I thank him for his suggestions. However, his submission that the erection of the Modbury Hospital is in some way likely to delay the erection of the teaching hospital at Flinders is not correct. The forward planning of the Public Buildings Department has taken into account the Loan funds to be made available for both these projects, and the one will not prevent the other. The Flinders teaching hospital is in no way being delayed by work in relation to the Modbury Hospital; it will be commenced at the earliest physically possible moment. We intend to proceed with this as an urgent work, because the Government has continually pointed out that we cannot continue with what had evolved under the previous Government, namely, the practice of turning away so many people from entry to the medical school.

The Government, during the planning stages, has been forced to revise its estimate of the number of beds to be provided in the first stage of the Modbury Hospital, simply because it became clear that the original estimates by the Town Planner as to the escalation of population in that area were being exceeded. In consequence, by the time the first stage was completed, we would be below the projected adequate bed level that the Hospitals Department considered would be required in the catchment area for that particular hospital. Therefore, it is not a question of going slowly there; at the present rate of expansion of population in that area a hospital will be urgently required by the time the first stage of this hospital can be completed, and we shall then have to press on with the second stage immediately in order to cope with the expanding population in that area.

Mr. Coumbe: How many beds will be provided in the first stage?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not wish to make forecasts at this stage until there has

been a submission to the Public Works Committee. It is not proper for me at this stage to reveal the plans in relation to this matter.

Mr. Millhouse: What you have said means nothing, then.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member always says that everything we say means nothing; if anything is ever achieved in this place he always ignores it and goes on to refer to something else, because he is not able to criticize the Government about it.

Mr. HEASLIP: I remind the Treasurer of the Labor Party's policy speech, in which it was stated:

Labor's proposals provide for a general hospital at Tea Tree Gully of 500 beds and a teaching hospital for the south-western districts of 800 beds—this must be at or near the university area at Bedford Park—and to provide for sufficient doctors this teaching hospital must be erected without delay.

That statement was unqualified and was made almost three years ago. Nothing has happened since then. Will that promise ever be honoured? Promises made now will not be kept. For instance, the completion of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital will cost \$8,600,000 but the provision for that hospital this year is only \$120,000. How long will it take to build that hospital at that rate? Nothing has been done there yet, and the other two hospitals have been forgotten. Nothing has been done about the training of medical students at Flinders University. How will they be trained? They will have to go somewhere else. Another line refers to the Strathmont Hospital. This is what the Labor Party said about the mentally sick people before the election nearly three years ago:

The Labor Party is most mindful of the work being performed by Dr. Cramond and commends him for his insistence upon the Government for the provision for the care of the mentally sick. His task would have been much easier had the Playford Government paid attention to the recommendation of Dr. Birch in 1950, when he was Director-General of Mental Health and when he reported to the Government that an additional infirmary hospital was needed, but here again the Government failed in its obligation to the people.

The reference to the Government that failed is the Playford Government, and we have been hearing much about the failure of that Government to do things in 30 years in office. The Labor Party also said:

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

The Playford Government referred the Strathmont Hospital project to the Public Works

Committee, which recommended it. Preliminary investigations were made about three years ago but the present Government has done nothing for these mentally sick people, despite its promise. It is the duty of the Opposition to criticize the Government and I criticize the Government now for seeing fit, after three years, to provide on the Estimates the huge amount of \$130,000 for a project that was estimated to cost \$6,400,000! Not one sod has been turned on the site. When will that work be finished? The Labor Party was elected for only three years and it has failed to honour its promises. This also applies to other projects here.

Mr. HALL: Apart from the fact that these promises were made during the Labor Party's last election campaign, we must consider the effect they have on the people. A proposal was made by the Playford Government to erect a hospital on a subsidized basis in the area of Modbury and Tea Tree Gully, and the people in the area have been concerned, since the Labor Government came to office, about when its alternative scheme will materialize. I remind members how far the initial scheme had gone before the Labor Government came to office. I wish to quote from an article in *The Leader* dated May 20, 1965; referring to the Tea Tree Gully District Council, it stated:

In July, 1963, council gave consideration to the need for a district hospital An approach was made to the previous Government for assistance and a subsidy of £2 for £1 was promised. A site was selected on the Golden Grove Road, comprising of 10 acres. This was recommended by the Director General of Medical Services (Dr. Rollinson) as suitable for the purpose. The proposal at that stage was for the immediate erection of a 40 to 60 bed hospital which could, at a later stage, be used as a maternity wing and that eventually a 400 bed hospital would be built on the site by the Government, he said. The land was purchased at a cost of £15,000 with £10,000 of this amount made available by the Government of the day.

Mr. Shilcock said that in November, 1963, the firm of Cheesman, Doley, Brabham and Neighbour were appointed as architects for the project and were instructed to prepare the necessary preliminary plans for a 42 bed hospital which would be capable of expanding to a 60 bed hospital when required.

Assistance was given in the preliminary discussions by two leading Adelaide specialists, Drs. Aitken and D. Beard, together with the Council Medical Officer of Health, Dr. C. T. Ross. Discussions were also held with officers of the newly constructed Millicent Hospital and finally plans were drawn which were acceptable to the Minister of Health's Department.

In a letter dated August 27, 1964, the Chief Secretary advised that the budget for the current year had been finalised and was fully

committed. However, if some expenditure would be incurred before June 30, 1965, on which subsidy would be payable, the Chief Secretary indicated that he would take the matter up with the Treasurer with a view to making available the necessary funds. Advice was also sought by the Chief Secretary as to when the building would be commenced.

In a letter dated September 9, the Chief Secretary was advised that the estimate for the building was £236,000 and that this price included the cost of the nurses home as well as the hospital. The architects advised that the building operations could commence in May or June of 1965.

That is an important date. Continuing:

This allowed for the normal period required to prepare detailed plans and specifications and the calling of tenders. He said this meant that, apart from architects' fees, it was not likely that any substantial amount of expenditure would be incurred before June 30, 1965, on which a subsidy would be payable.

Council's share of the cost was to be financed by way of a loan from The Savings Bank of S.A. and all necessary formalities had already been finalized. The architects are currently completing the preparation of detailed plans and specifications, said Mr. Shilcock. During the pre-election period the present Government indicated in its policy speeches that urgent consideration would be given to the building of a 500 bed hospital at Modbury.

"This is of vital concern to council and therefore we are most anxious to learn of the new Government's policy with regard to this matter," he said.

Can any member opposite justify the delay that has occurred?

[Midnight]

The hospital would have been built and in operation in that district. It might not have been to the liking of the present Government, as it was to be a subsidized hospital, but the district would have had the benefit of a hospital. The Government said that it had better proposals, but in three years it produced nothing but excuses. Yesterday, the Treasurer said that he could not put money on the lines because the Public Works Committee has not reported on the project, but has he referred the plans to the committee? Of course he has not, because he said they have not been drawn. The Government stopped the operations that were in hand to put a hospital there, and this makes the omission doubly serious.

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Rocky River stated that the Opposition had a duty to criticize. It also has a duty to criticize honestly and constructively and to inform itself of the true position. It also has a duty, in dealing with facts, not to present a

phony case with phoney indignation, as a certain member for the Opposition is very fond of doing. So far as the south-western districts hospital is concerned, if members opposite were really genuine in their belief that we should have more doctors, then the first act of the Hon. Frank Walsh when he became Treasurer would not have been to sign the docket to purchase the land across the South Road from the Flinders University. The purchase of the land proved difficult; it had to be compulsorily acquired.

Mr. Shannon: It was done by negotiation.

Mr. HUDSON: I know there were some difficulties. The Mines Department conducted a survey and discovered that there were certain difficulties regarding the use of the land and that danger would have been involved should a multi-storey building be erected. This entailed an approach to the Flinders University last year and early this year to arrange for the transfer of land, so that suitable land on the Flinders University site could be used for the hospital and land on the other side of the road could be exchanged for it.

Does the member for Mitcham really suggest that we should go ahead with the teaching hospital at Flinders University without having the approval of the Universities Commission? Does he really suggest that the Flinders University should go ahead with the employment of lecturing staff for a medical faculty without having had the approval of the Universities Commission?

Mr. Millhouse: I merely based my remarks on your Party's policy speech.

Mr. HUDSON: The honourable member said he was basing his remarks in part on what was said by someone connected with the Flinders University. The honourable member knows full well that no decision by that university can be made in relation to a medical school until it has been approved by the Universities Commission, and no submission has yet been made. The Playford Government did nothing about trying to get such a submission made. The honourable member knows perfectly well that until that submission is made we cannot go ahead.

Mr. Millhouse: The Playford Government at least established the Flinders University.

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Mitcham is shifting his ground, because he knows he has been caught out on the facts. He seems to be trying to tell the members of this Chamber that this is a hospital which should already be up to about the 15th storey. He knows full well that his indignation was phoney and

that his criticism was destructive and ill informed. He is treating it as a joke now because he had us all on and wasted the time of the Committee in doing so. Let me tell members, because this is of some relevance, what happened in relation to the University of New South Wales. That university, wanting to establish a medical school, approached the then Premier (Mr. Cahill) about taking over the nine-hole golf course immediately adjacent to the university, and between the university and the Randwick Repatriation Hospital. The idea was to build a medical school on the golf course and to turn the hospital into a teaching hospital. Mr. Cahill said, "Yes, we will do it", and the Government of the time agreed. However, the member for Randwick (I do not know whether his approach was similar to that of a certain member opposite) kicked up a tremendous fuss, as did the Randwick council, about the taking away from the people of a golf course for the purpose of building a medical school.

I hate to relate that the Government then changed its mind and said, "Well, instead of having the medical school adjacent to the university we will build a medical school at La Perouse near Prince Henry Hospital". The Universities Commission was brought to Sydney to investigate that proposition. It had a look at Prince Henry Hospital, five miles away from the university, and at the site of the golf course, and it said, "If you build a medical school at Prince Henry Hospital you will not get any money from us, but if you take over the golf course and put the school there we will support you." The Government then had to change its mind again and get a site close to the university so that the medical school and the hospital could be integrated in the life of the university.

To cap off the story, the Randwick council then held a referendum of ratepayers on the issue, and that referendum supported the Universities Commission's ideas by a four to one majority.

Mr. Millhouse: You ought to have told Mr. Frank Walsh all this before the last election.

Mr. HUDSON: This was made clear in Labor policy before the last election. It was the Labor Party's adjusted policy prior to the last election (I had a hand in bringing about the change) that any teaching hospital had to be immediately adjacent to the Flinders University. That was the reason why Frank Walsh, in one of his first acts as Treasurer of this State,

signed the minute to negotiate the purchase of that particular piece of land. It is not true that nothing has been done; much has been done in relation to planning.

Mr. Heaslip: What?

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Rocky River just simply does not know what has happened; he does not want to know; if he were told, he still would not know; and even if he knew he would not admit that he knew. The arrangement that now exists in relation to the use of the land for the hospital will mean the erection of a medical school, and this will enable students who attend that medical school to be integrated fully into the life of the university. The medical school will not be an institution separate from the university, and the teaching hospital will also be integrated with or so close to the university that students who are trained in their hospital years will have no difficulty in moving from the medical school to the hospital; they will still be a part of the ordinary university and take part in its ordinary life.

Mr. Heaslip: When?

Mr. HUDSON: There was a document in circulation when this Government came into power which I saw, which I understood had been prepared under the previous Government and which envisaged the first graduates coming from a second medical school no earlier than 1980. I understand that was the planning of the previous Government.

Mr. Millhouse: What is your estimate?

Mr. HUDSON: I think that the best we can hope for, unfortunately (because the previous Government never paid attention to the need in the community for doctors), is that new medical graduates will come from a second medical school in 1975-76.

Mr. Heaslip: Why make the promise three years ago?

Mr. HUDSON: We said that we would commence to build it. The previous Government had done nothing.

Mr. Heaslip: Have you started?

Mr. HUDSON: I give up with the member for Rocky River. I have already explained what has gone on so far; he knows that planning has gone ahead.

Mr. Heaslip: That's been going on for years.

Mr. HUDSON: He knows how long planning took in relation to certain other projects, for example, the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and he would know how long the planning took in relation to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. We promised to proceed with this project, and that is what we have been doing. When the

submission is made to the Universities Commission and approved, the whole planning of the medical school and the teaching hospital can go ahead without any further hindrance.

Mrs. BYRNE: Unlike the member for Mitcham, I was here last night when the Treasurer gave his assurance (when winding up the debate on the first line) that the Government had made financial provision to cover and meet the site works of the major general hospital to be built at Modbury. I think the reason for the outburst of the member for Mitcham and other members opposite is that they were delighted when they noted that no reference had been made in the Loan Estimates to the Modbury Hospital or the teaching hospital to be built at Bedford Park. Then, of course, they were really taken aback when they heard the assurance given by the Treasurer. Of course, the reason for this outburst is that naturally members opposite, although they are trying to give the impression that they want these hospitals built, do not really want them built, purely because of political reasons.

The member for Mitcham and other honourable members have said that nothing has been done. That charge has already been dealt with by the Treasurer but I do not think it matters if they hear it again. The Government acquired the land for the Modbury Hospital on September 30, 1965, but the member for Mitcham said that the only thing out there was a sign on the land. Yes, it is there, but the honourable member apparently has not been there recently; otherwise, he would have noticed heaps of dirt from excavations made by the Mines Department when testing for foundation strengths, which proves that something is taking place. This preliminary work is necessary.

Then the member for Torrens referred to the staffing of the Modbury Hospital, stating that he did not think it would be able to obtain trained sisters and nurses. For his information, let me tell him that already people in the district who are trained sisters and nurses have been getting in touch with me and inquiring whether they can have the positions when they are available. Their names have been put on a list and forwarded to the Hospitals Department. The honourable member further stated that he thought the hospital at Glenelg should be built first because, for one reason, the catchment area for the Modbury Hospital was not large enough, so it was not required at this stage. The Treasurer has stated that already the preliminary plans have had to be altered because the population in

this area has escalated to a greater extent than the Town Planner anticipated. Therefore, it is necessary for this hospital to be built at Modbury—and the sooner the better, because it is urgently needed.

Further, a doctor telephoned me complaining that he could not get an urgent case into the Lyell McEwin Hospital, and I have had expectant mothers contact me, worried that they would have to go a long way to the nearest hospitals—which, of course, are the Northern Community and the Lyell McEwin hospitals. The Leader of the Opposition cited an article by the Clerk of the Tea Tree Gully District Council to the effect that a scheme was under way for a district hospital. That is true, but the site for that hospital was too small and, when the Hospitals Department looked at it, it observed that it was bounded on two sides by a creek and on the third side by a hill; therefore, expansion could not take place. Had this hospital been built, it would have been inadequate for future needs.

That is why it was much better for a Government hospital to be built as planned. The assurance has been given that it will be built. I should not like this Committee to get the impression, from the article by the District Clerk, that the Tea Tree Gully District Council does not want the Government hospital. Although I have not the article with me, I could produce an article written by the Chairman of the council earlier this year in which he said that the council supported the action of the Government in building a Government hospital in that district.

Mr. SHANNON: I am disappointed that provision has not been made for a women's gaol. I could not agree more with the statement by the former Treasurer (Hon. Frank Walsh) that he intended to demolish the old Adelaide Gaol. The Public Works Committee investigated a project for a women's gaol on the prison farm at Yatala and, although we slightly altered the plans submitted, I did not consider those alterations to be sufficiently drastic to cause the authorities to lay the project aside. That plan gave an opportunity to segregate some of the unfortunate types that are at the gaol from other prisoners who, although they have committed offences, do not misbehave in the same way. It is undesirable that all prisoners should be accommodated as they are now and I hoped that the rather modest expenditure for a women's gaol might have been provided for.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I listened to the statements of sweet trust that the member

for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne) placed in the Treasurer's remarks about the Modbury Hospital. I hope to put a different complexion on those remarks. If the honourable member becomes disillusioned because of what I say, I am sorry, but I shall recite the facts. Last night the Treasurer attacked criticisms from this side of the House about the Modbury Hospital. He said that it was not true that nothing had been done, and that there were no means with which to do anything. He said he did have a fund to use for purpose of getting on with this hospital. I say that that is not correct and he knows it is not correct.

True, the Public Buildings Department has a certain sum that it can use to pay the salaries of architects and draftsmen who are preparing preliminary plans and estimates which are essential in order for the Public Works Committee to have preliminary discussions about a work. This can be done without a line on the estimates relating to it, but it is illegal for the Treasurer or any Minister to introduce into Parliament any project that is estimated to cost more than \$200,000 without prior recommendation on the matter by the Public Works Committee.

Once the Public Buildings Department officers begin preparing the detailed plans and bills of quantities and cost estimates, their salaries are chargeable to the Loan project concerned. So, the Treasurer would need to have a line approved on the Estimates before the detailed work of the Public Buildings Department officers could commence. Sometimes, of course, it is necessary for the detailed work to be let to an outside firm, but the same position applies in this case. In any case, if the Treasurer could get round all this—and I say that he could not legally do so—he has no money on the Estimates for any work on the hospital.

If the Treasurer thinks there is any work on the proposed hospital's foundations going on, it is going on illegally. If he has hidden away an amount of money in the Estimates which is not clearly disclosed and he is holding it in reserve for this project later this year, it will surprise me. If this is so, then some urgent works have been left out that ought to be included. These proceedings are laid down in order that works may proceed. I therefore suggest that the Treasurer's statement of last night was misleading to the extent that he does not have a fund available to him with which he can do any real work on the erection of this hospital.

Mrs. BYRNE: Recently a constituent told me there were insufficient kidney machines in this State. Can the Treasurer say whether any consideration has been given to the purchase of new machines for the people who need them to keep themselves alive?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain this information for the honourable member.

Mr. CLARK: The sum of \$10,650,000 has been allotted to the school buildings line, which includes new schools at Madison Park, Smithfield Plains, and major additions to the existing school at Salisbury. Provision is made for six typing rooms at a cost of \$76,000. These are to be erected at, among other places, Elizabeth, Gawler and Salisbury High Schools. The sum of \$80,000 has been allotted for a craft centre at the Elizabeth Boys Technical High School. I am pleased that these additions and new schools are to be erected in my district, and on behalf of my constituents, I thank the Treasurer.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On all scores, I can say to the honourable member that it is a pleasure.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I very much regret the increasing frequency and bitterness of the personal attacks made on me in this House by members on the Government side, and especially by my old friend, the Treasurer. It distresses me that he should see fit to answer the points that I make in this way. The last thing I wish to say about hospitals is that we have heard a good deal tonight about the difficulties of planning and the time it takes to plan hospitals. It is ironic when one compares the protestations in this Chamber over hospitals with the speed with which the Government has gone ahead with the plans to increase the size of the Highways Department building at Walkerville. Apparently the same difficulties did not present themselves in that case.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Was this project referred to the Public Works Committee?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I do not believe it was. The Government went straight ahead and got over all its difficulties of planning, etc. Like the member for Gawler, I always give praise and thanks where they are due.

Mr. Clark: That is the only similarity.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am happy to agree with the honourable member on that. I am glad to see that something is to be done about the Adelaide Juvenile Court. I see that \$34,000 is set aside here for this purpose. This is not quite what the honourable gentleman

led us to expect when last I asked him about this matter. He said then that he hoped the Commonwealth Government would do something, because it had acquired the land for a Federal court and therefore it was not worth doing up our own poor little old building. However, I am glad that something is being done, because the accommodation at the present Juvenile Court is most undesirable. I should like to know from the Treasurer what is to be done and what has happened to the plans of the Commonwealth on this matter.

The last matter I desire to raise is under the line "Office Accommodation, Victoria Square". My friends in the Public Service tell me that there is much perturbation about the allocation of accommodation in the new Victoria Square building, because it is said that the Treasurer is asking for three whole floors in the new building for the Premier's Department and this has thrown out altogether the planning by other departments which had believed and hoped that they would be accommodated in the building but which may be pushed out or pushed into some smaller area if the Treasurer persists with his demand. I ask him what the plans are for accommodation of departments in the new building at Victoria Square, particularly how much will be allocated to the Premier's Department, and when it is likely (I think it is early 1968) that the departments will be able to begin moving in.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am afraid that the honourable member's informants in the Public Service seem to have told him as much rot as usual. There is no truth whatever in the suggestion that the Premier's Department will require three floors in the new building.

Mr. Millhouse: How much are you going to have?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Part of two floors, but the Chief Secretary's Department, the Parliamentary Draftsmen and the officers of the Attorney-General's Department are also going to be accommodated in that space.

Mr. Millhouse: All in those two part floors?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In those two floors. The final plans for accommodation have not yet been completed; they are still under discussion with the Public Service Commissioner as to the best allocation of the building. As to a precise date for the moving in, this is expected to be somewhere about the end of this year.

Mr. Millhouse: What about the Juvenile Court?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Repairs will be made to the existing building, and it was intended that some alterations be made to provide additional space in the building immediately next door to the existing building, which has been acquired by the State. Since the Commonwealth Government has asked for the whole of that site facing King William Street south of the old Industrial Court Building, I have said that if it wants this site we will agree to its being made available on condition that it goes ahead at the earliest possible time with a Commonwealth court building there.

Mr. Coumbe: It will pay for this, will it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. It does want the Commonwealth court building to be there. Originally it was suggested that it co-operate with us and share in the cost of a joint building on that site. However, the Commonwealth prefers to have a building of its own. We have sufficient space in the area that we have now acquired there for the development of our own court facilities. In view of the projected establishment of a Commonwealth court, our own future developments in that area will not need to be as extensive as at one time it was thought they would be. Regarding the Commonwealth building, a planning committee consisting of the Commonwealth department, the Master of the Supreme Court and officers of our own Public Buildings Department has been set up to deal with activities in that particular area.

Mr. HUGHES: Before referring to the Wallaroo Hospital, I must say that I regret that the member for Mitcham is taking exception to the remarks made; he is apparently accepting them as being personal.

Mr. McKee: He is a bad loser.

Mr. HUGHES: It may do his ego some good if I point out to him that a rumour has been circulating that, because the present Leader will be a failure at the next elections, it will be necessary to have a fresh election for a Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Millhouse: That's wishful thinking on your part, you know.

Mr. HUGHES: That is the reason why the honourable member is hopping up and down like a yo-yo.

Mr. McKee: He is a very strong aspirant.

Mr. HUGHES: In fact, the rumour is circulating freely in this building among the honourable member's colleagues. I have been closely associated with the Wallaroo Hospital (for which \$45,000 is allocated in the Estimates for additions) for about 16 years. I have been

connected with the hospital's advisory committee; it is not a board, and it does not administer finances, but it has wide powers just the same. For some time, the committee has been concerned about hot conditions experienced in the upper floor of the hospital during the summer months and it has endeavoured to have the Hospitals Department, in conjunction with the Chief Secretary, make money available for the air-conditioning of wards on the upper floor, as well as for the provision of a new autoclave and sterilizing area. As I think that these requisites were estimated to cost about \$45,000, I should like to know whether that is why the sum is provided in the Estimates. When I first came into Parliament the western wing of the hospital was actually leaving the main building. Being concerned about this, I raised the matter on various occasions but received no response.

However, having pressed this matter in the Chamber one day, I point out that it was not long before \$46,000 was made available for underpinning the hospital. I am sure that, if that sum had not been provided at the time, the western wing would have become completely severed from the main building. Although I approached the Government on various occasions, it appeared to ignore it. I do not blame the then Director-General of Medical Services, because I know he was most concerned about it. Then one day I exposed the Government for what it was in allowing this comparatively new building, erected in 1942, to fall into disrepair. The following week the money was found and the hospital was underpinned. Perhaps the Treasurer will give me an answer later.

I commend the Government for the interest it is taking in the Wallaroo District Hospital and the community hospitals in my district. The Kadina hospital is at present closed (through no fault of the Government) and an attempt is being made to reopen it. The Government is being generous in assisting in re-equipping that hospital, which should be reopened to cater for emergency cases. This Government has also been generous with the Moonta Jubilee Hospital. During the centenary celebrations of the finding of copper, some money was raised for that hospital and the Playford Government was asked to subsidize the building of a new wing. I led a deputation to the former Chief Secretary in that connection. It was strange that, although I represented the district and led the deputation, the reply was sent by telegram.

It was timed to coincide with a special function then being held at Moonta.

Mr. Ferguson: Was the Chairman of the hospital board at that time a man named Ferguson?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. Mr. Ferguson was the Chairman of the hospital, although he is not now. I also have vivid recollections of another Mr. Ferguson. The Moonta Jubilee Hospital was trying to obtain the services of an architect to have plans and specifications drawn and tenders called, and the Government of the day said that it would grant a subsidy for the work. I was a member of the Opposition at the time. It was necessary for the hospital to have the sum involved taken over to the next year's Loan Estimates and the member who just interjected was critical about that sum at that time.

Mr. Ferguson: I was helpful.

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member was not helpful. He was a member of the Government and he cannot deny that he was critical. Later, I had to go to the former Chief Secretary's office, because representations had been made by someone who had found that the member for Yorke Peninsula had queried the matter, and it was suggested that the money be not allocated for that purpose.

Mr. Ferguson: That was a rumour.

Mr. HUGHES: No. I can produce a document containing advice to the Chief Secretary not to proceed to make money available for the building of a new wing. That was brought about only by the criticism about the carry-over of the money. The honourable member will be sorry that he asked whether Mr. Ferguson was Chairman of the hospital board. When I was in the office of the then Chief Secretary (Sir Lyell McEwin), I pleaded with him. I reminded him that he had promised the people that the money would be made available and that that promise had been substantiated by the then Treasurer when he attended a ball at Moonta. After that reminder, the grant was allowed to continue.

I admired the former Chief Secretary for his statement that he did not like going back on his word and that he would be prepared to make the subsidy available. However, it was a long time before the hospital obtained the services of an architect to do the kind of work involved. I am not boasting, but I point out that I helped in this regard. About seven years ago it was not easy to find architects to go to the country to undertake this type of work. In fact I obtained a draftsman's assistance free of cost to start

this going. Of course, once an architect was brought in he was entitled to a percentage, and he did a good job. I am just as concerned about the hospitals in my area, such as the small community hospital that gives fine service to the Moonta people, as some members are concerned about the Queen Elizabeth and the Royal Adelaide Hospitals, which also give fine service.

Mr. McAnaney: Why are you stopping the hospital at Modbury?

Mr. HUGHES: I am not stopping it, and the honourable member will not, either. The Playford Government started to make progress payments on the new wing of the Moonta Hospital and the Labor Government continued to do so, and both the Moonta people and I appreciate it. Certain requests were made of the Playford Government which it was not prepared to meet, but the Labor Government came to the aid of the Moonta people.

The Wallaroo Hospital is used by a wide circle of people and, since the Kadina Community Hospital has not been able to function, the Wallaroo Hospital has been adequately catering for the Kadina people, because for the first time in a long period there is a full staff there. At present, the nursing staff at the Wallaroo Hospital consists of 28 nurses and 11 sisters, including the Matron and the Deputy Matron (these figures were given me only recently), and I wish to say how much I appreciate the work that they and the domestic staff do. I know that the hospital advisory board also appreciates the work of the staff. The Wallaroo Hospital would have been in serious difficulties at times had it not been for the married sisters living at Wallaroo who have made their services available to the hospital. These sisters have their own homes and families, yet they are prepared to forgo the comforts of family life in order to give service to the community. They are angels of mercy.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is no reference in this line to angels of mercy.

Mr. HUGHES: Some members opposite are laughing, but I do not consider this to be a laughing matter. However, I notice that the member for Gumeracha is not laughing. He has had wide experience throughout this State and he, too, realizes the good work carried out by the married sisters in hospitals in this State. I am quite serious when I refer to the work carried out by the nursing profession, particularly the very sterling work carried out by sisters that are married and living in country areas.

I am very pleased to see that an amount (not a great amount) has been provided for the Wallaroo Hospital. I am confident that this provision will result in the patients in that hospital receiving a considerable benefit. I made inquiries some time ago about the likely cost of the two items I referred to earlier, and the estimate given was about \$46,000, whereas the sum of \$45,000 has now been provided.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Will that completely air-condition the hospital?

Mr. HUGHES: No, we are not asking for the whole of the hospital to be air-conditioned; we are merely asking for air-conditioning in the upper wards.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Is this sum inadequate?

Mr. HUGHES: No. An estimate was taken out previously by a reliable authority, and air-conditioning has already been installed in certain single rooms and in the nursery. This sum will apparently cover the cost of installing the additional air-conditioning required. Will the Treasurer ascertain whether that is so?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Mr. HALL: I am pleased that the member for Wallaroo is satisfied with the allocations under this line for his district and that he has received a favourable reply from the Treasurer. Before referring to the school-building programme in general, I should perhaps warn the honourable member not to listen to rumours in so many unlikely places; he has already heard other rumours in a place at the end of the corridor in this building. He should know that many of the rumours are circulated merely for the purpose of playing politics. The rumour concerning my leadership and the availability of my seat is completely false. I advise the honourable member not to peddle these rumours in the Chamber, because they work both ways. In fact, there is a current rumour in South Australia that the Labor Party is to give the Treasurer a safe seat for the next election to ensure his continuity of office.

Members interjecting:

Mr. HALL: I am not saying that is correct: I am merely demonstrating that any number of rumours are circulating in South Australia, and the member for Wallaroo can place any construction on them that he chooses. The actual expenditure last year on school buildings was about \$10,757,000, whereas the estimated sum was \$10,640,000. The proposed expenditure this year of \$10,650,000 is about the same as that proposed last year but about \$100,000

below last year's actual expenditure. I believe that building costs are about the same this year as they were last year, although one would expect a rise in costs over a number of years and, therefore, less to be accomplished by providing an equal sum.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: In some instances there are distinct savings.

Mr. HALL: I know that, with the renovation of a certain large building in the metropolitan area, the actual cost was more than 20 per cent below the architect's estimate. So the Treasurer is right when he says that savings can be made; but we have had two years of the same expenditure. Does the Treasurer believe that this school-building programme will provide adequate accommodation for all those children needing it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. In fact, we shall be providing some schools in areas where previously there were none. For instance, we are providing for the Musgrave Park school. For many years children there have been requiring education, but no school has been available. However, with the normal school system, we anticipate that this school-building programme will cope with expansions in school enrolments and will enable us to accommodate all those children seeking school accommodation in South Australia.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I draw the Committee's attention to some things that have been said about hospitals. On a number of occasions the Treasurer, perhaps not intentionally, has criticized the previous Liberal Government's hospitalization programme. The hospitalization we are now enjoying in South Australia is, almost without exception, that provided by the Liberal Government. I examined the Loan Estimates carefully last year but could find provision for no additional accommodation. When the Liberal Government assumed office in 1938, the Loan Council provided for South Australia the magnificent sum, for all purposes, of \$16,000. Moneys raised from internal sources were also spent to the extent of \$3,400,000. That was the total Loan programme provision for the State, but that was not the worst part of it. We were then engaged in a war and suffered all sorts of building restrictions: we were not allowed to use building materials or men or to undertake any important project. Ten years later the total Loan programme moneys provided by the Loan Council, including repayments, amounted to \$23,000,000; 10 years later again, such moneys amounted to \$52,000,000.

An amount of \$52,000 was provided in 1958, when we had to undertake extensive water and electricity reticulation. I remind the Treasurer that the promises that were made by his Party at the last election have not materialized.

I shall now speak for a district that cannot speak for itself in this Committee. Port Augusta was scheduled to have a hospital, which was absolutely necessary in that district. However, that hospital had to stand down, because in the order of priority Port Pirie and Whyalla were given precedence. However, the Public Works Committee considered the Port Augusta project, amended the plans, and brought in a favourable report about 18 months ago. Nevertheless, there is no sign of this hospital being provided. If a Liberal and Country League Government had been returned at the last election, that hospital would have gone ahead as scheduled. I ask the Treasurer whether any money will be provided this year for that hospital, which is not the subject of an approach to the Commonwealth.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is certainly not completely forgotten. I shall get a precise date for the member.

Mr. McANANEY: Only \$1,000,000 more is set aside for public buildings than the sum provided last year even though Loan funds have been greatly increased by a benevolent Commonwealth Government. We have had a drop-back in building in South Australia. It is disappointing to see this lack of interest in the building industry by the Government, and I believe that the Government is definitely playing politics when it proposes to start four hospitals so that it can say it has started them. It is bad business to start too many things at once. I understand that the Commonwealth Government offered to contribute toward the Strathmont home for retarded children. One would think that, if the Government wanted to help the building industry in this State, it would concentrate on this hospital so that it could receive the Commonwealth's contribution. On almost every line we see contributions from the Commonwealth Government, and this would be another opportunity of receiving such a contribution and at the same time assisting the building industry.

Line passed.

Other Capital Grants and Advances, \$13,700,000.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In connection with university and advanced education buildings, I wish to say that earlier this evening I found

in my chambers the annual report of the Flinders University for 1966 in which I noticed a reference to the projected hall of residence. This matter has been raised here before and it is notorious that the plans for it are sitting in somebody's drawer at Flinders University waiting for the "go ahead". Part of the report states:

With the approval of the Australian Universities Commission, the university proceeded with the planning of the completion of the library and of the hall of residence to house 200 male students, which had originally been planned for completion in 1966 but had been postponed through lack of finance. It was expected that the construction of these projects would proceed in 1967.

This merely confirms what my friends at Flinders University have told me that everything is ready except for the fact that the Government is not prepared to come to the party. I am disappointed that the hall of residence is not to proceed.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Is there to be any subsidy from the Commonwealth?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We have been into this matter before; I think the subsidy would have been available if the Government had been prepared to go ahead with the project, and at the same time employment would have been provided for people in the building industry. It is common ground between both Parties in this place that an increase in such employment is most desirable now.

The other matter I wanted to mention arises out of the line "South Australian Housing Trust". I have already expressed regret that I was not here last night to listen to the Treasurer's reply to the debate on the first line. I have been interested to see his reply to the remarks that I made about housing and the attention that I drew to the figures supplied by him with regard to Housing Trust building in this State. I see that he has made an apology and said that Housing Trust building programmes are long term and, therefore, if there is any change in the pattern of development, it takes some time to modify the pattern of building. He entirely missed the point I made yesterday when I emphasized that the Housing Trust building programme had become worse rather than better in the last few months. I do not blame the Housing Trust or the Minister when he took office for taking some action to change the pattern of building. What I regret is that conditions in South Australia have so changed that the pattern that was foreseen by the Housing Trust has not come to pass. This is the point

I made. I used the Housing Trust and the fact that there were over 600 houses completed but vacant as an illustration of the parlous state into which we have fallen.

The very fact that the Treasurer, as soon as he assumed office, said that he would take action to change things shows that he himself realized that his predecessor had let things slide into a mess in South Australia. On Tuesday I referred to empty houses at Elizabeth and said that I had been told by a friend of mine in the Postmaster-General's Department that houses were vacant. I was challenged by the Treasurer and by his offside, the Government Whip, to name the streets. I said I was not prepared to give names, and I did not know the names of the streets, but yesterday I sought further information and I am now able to give some information. The conversation I had with my friend took place two months ago; it may be that my recollection of his words was faulty and that he did not say whole streets in Elizabeth were vacant but that he said that very many houses in Elizabeth were vacant.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You said whole streets were vacant.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is so. Let me now tell the Treasurer the information I collected yesterday morning—and this will be of particular interest to the member for Gawler. I invite him to get up and say whether or not I am right. My friend tells me that, if anything, things are worse now than they were a couple of months ago when I last spoke to him. To use his phrase, "things are still going downhill". He tells me that the areas affected are Elizabeth West and Elizabeth Field, which are particularly hard hit. He told me there were at least seven houses vacant in Rosewarne Crescent, Elizabeth Field, at least three vacant in Lawson Street, and he mentioned Peachy Road which, I understand, runs through Elizabeth West to Elizabeth Field. He said that there were many houses vacant in that street. He could not give me the name of the street, but in one street every family on one side had gone back to England. This is the state of affairs that has been described to me, and I mention those streets to substantiate what was said yesterday. He also told me that all over Elizabeth one could see "For Sale" notices on houses in which the owners have a substantial equity. In other instances there are the houses that were bought or were being purchased on a \$100 deposit, and in those cases people have just got up and left. They have abandoned the

equity they had in their houses, even though in some instances they had made improvements to the properties by putting down cement drives and so on.

I am told that, under the rental-purchase agreements these people have with the Housing Trust, the trust has the first option to buy the property back if the people want to leave but that in fact the trust is not prepared even to look at these houses to buy back, and the people have had no alternative but to walk out. This is the state of affairs that obtains at Elizabeth, and this is the illustration I give of the very serious situation that has developed in our State. I give these figures and facts in answer to the challenge of the Treasurer and the member for West Torrens, and I am confident that they entirely substantiate what I have said about the housing problem in South Australia. They confirm, of course, the figures that have been given by the Treasurer himself at intervals of about six weeks with regard to the vacant Housing Trust houses in South Australia.

Mr. HALL: I draw attention to something which is contained in the statistics in both this year's and last year's Loan Estimates programmes and which I believe the Treasurer has not explained. Last year a programme was outlined in the Loan Estimates whereby the Housing Trust would make progress on 5,734 units. I note that this year progress work is to be done on 4,661 units. This is a reduction of more than 1,000.

On looking at the reductions, one finds that there are about 500 less rental-purchase houses and about 1,000 less houses for sale but that there are to be 200 more rental houses and about 200 more flats. We have heard announcements by the Treasurer that there is to be a rather drastic change in policy in the operations of the trust. In fact, some quite prominent publicity has been given to this change in policy. However, apparently there are to be only 200 more rental houses and 200 more flats, whereas we have a drop of 1,500 in the number of rental-purchase houses and houses for sale. I note that these figures refer to progress: they are not approvals or commencements. However, when this figure is spread over a year and compared with the previous year it surely must mean a substantial drop in the number of units that are to be completed, and it would seem to me that if the rental-purchase houses and the houses for sale are reduced so drastically the increase in rental houses and flats should be more than

400 as given in this programme. Can the Treasurer indicate the reason for this?

I note also the continued mention of Elizabeth and Salisbury. Of course, these areas are very different in regard to the distance that the residents have to travel to work and to enjoy city amenities. It is said that 479 houses will be built in the Elizabeth-Salisbury area on a rental basis.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It is over 1,000.

Mr. HALL: If progress is to be made on 1,000 houses in these areas, I shall be interested to know what extent the programme will be divided between the Salisbury and Elizabeth areas. Can the Treasurer say whether building on the northernmost limits of Elizabeth is to continue, and will he explain the small increase in rental units (both in flats and houses) in relation to the large drop in the number of rental-purchase houses and houses for sale?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The figures reflect two things: first, we have changed the emphasis in housing from the northern areas to flat development and to building in the southern areas of the city, and we have, so far as possible, tapered off contracts in the Elizabeth area. Some contracts, however, have been let on long term in the Ingle Farm area and, in consequence, it is not possible to taper those off. In some areas to the north of the city, building occupation goes on quite rapidly but in some areas of Elizabeth this has not been so. While a number of houses are still available in this area it is, of course, unwise to continue building, provided we can economically scale off contracts there. On the other hand, there is a considerable demand for houses in the industrial estates in the district of the member for Alexandra, and there will be increasing concentration on houses there.

At the same time, I point out that the unit cost of high-rise development is higher than the figure for cottage houses. While this means that there are greater costs within the Housing Trust's budget, high-rise development of this kind imposes a lesser burden on other areas of the State's Loan programme, because it means a lesser demand for new schools, extensions of water services, roads, electricity, and the like. Inadequate provision has been made for rental houses for some considerable time but, whereas purchase houses can be coped with by private undertakings in South Australia, the low cost Loan moneys need to be turned to rental housing for people in lower income

groups who seek housing accommodation, for which there is still a considerable waiting list.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My analysis of figures does not seem to bear out what the Treasurer has said. For example, he has said there is a greater emphasis on rental houses. The figures show, however, that, of the 1,806 houses for rental, only 479 are anywhere near the metropolitan area. There are none in what is classified as the metropolitan area but there are 479 in the Elizabeth-Salisbury area, the balance of them being in country areas, about which I am not quibbling. But, although there is a demand, not necessarily wide, for rental-purchase houses in country towns, there is no provision for any such houses, according to these figures. The bulk of the empty houses in the Housing Trust's possession at the moment are in the northern and western Elizabeth area. It is unfortunate from every point of view that there should be any empty houses at all; nevertheless, there are. I will not go into the reasons for it because they are only too well known to members opposite.

Notwithstanding the Treasurer's comment that there is some reduction in the areas where there are surplus houses, we still find that the total number of proposed rental, rental-purchase, sale, and cottage flats in the Elizabeth-Salisbury area is 1,087, whereas in the metropolitan area there are no rental houses; but for rental-purchase, sale, cottage flats and flats the total is 961. I presume the metropolitan area includes Ingle Farm. There is a strong demand for housing in that area newly opened up by the trust. It is convenient for transport services. The Government should give some attention to the tidal basin scheme and provide suitable houses, which would be ideally placed and in close proximity to employment. In view of the number of vacant houses held by the Housing Trust, the Treasurer in this document and by his frequent public statements about revitalizing the building industry by means of Housing Trust activities has overstated the housing position.

My comment about Ingle Farm disposes of the Treasurer's argument about the trust's being committed to long-term contracts. I assume that the 124 flats for the metropolitan area are the ones that he has referred to as high-rise flats. There is a clear contradiction of policy here. If the trust is to devote more of its resources to housing of a modest type, high-rise flats do not fit into that picture. I challenge the Treasurer to produce a document

from the trust that shows that high-rise accommodation can be built at a cost within the range of the type of people he has said it is the trust's policy to house.

Mr. HALL: I assume that plans for high-rise flats would have to be prepared and that some months would elapse before construction was begun. The only provision that can relate to this is that for 124 flats in the metropolitan area. If the Treasurer is thinking in terms of high-rise flat development as it is known in other States, this amount would not provide one large complete unit. Can the Treasurer say whether provision is made for high-rise flat development?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, it is, in the line relating to flats. However, at present I cannot give specific details about exactly where these flats will be built or about how many will be built. The plans are not yet completely concerted on this matter.

Mr. HALL: I have heard that the contents and fittings of some trust houses are to be reduced in standard, that some trust houses will be built with only the barest of essentials in them. It would be a mistake to reduce the standard of houses that we have been able to build more cheaply than they can be built in other States. Can the Treasurer assure the Committee that this reduction will not be made?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have given no directions on policy that would lead to a reduction in standards.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Earlier I referred to the hall of residence at Flinders University and I thought the Treasurer would have seen fit to say when work on the hall was likely to be commenced. I ask him again whether he would do this.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The latest that the hall of residence can be commenced is in the next triennium. Whether it will be possible to commence it before then is a matter that is currently being examined by the Government.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: When I spoke yesterday the Treasurer interrupted me and invited me to watch television last night for some dramatic announcement that he proposed to make on the building industry in South Australia; I was dealing with housing at the time. Unfortunately, I did not have the opportunity to watch the telecast but I have looked in the *Advertiser* this morning and I guess he had in mind the announcement that Adelaide is to

be the base city for the space project of the United States of America. If this is, in fact, the announcement, I am disappointed that the project is not something bigger than this, something which would help the building industry to a greater extent. I ask the Treasurer whether I am right in assuming that this announcement is the big announcement that he invited me to listen to, and I ask him how many houses will be built under this scheme.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot tell the honourable member how many houses will be built under the scheme because I have been enjoined by the Prime Minister not to say.

Mr. Millhouse: Is it the big announcement?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It will be a very considerable number of houses; I cannot say more than that.

Mr. Millhouse: Say 10 or 20?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I assure the honourable member that it will be several multiples of that.

Mr. Millhouse: Is that good?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Nothing that is ever announced by this Government is, according to the honourable member, good enough. I assure him that the building workers employed on this very considerable number of houses will think that it is an important announcement.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was led to believe by the Treasurer that this would be something really big and that it would be the answer to our building troubles in this State, but apparently it is not.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know why the honourable member persists in deliberately misunderstanding what is said in this Chamber, but he is doing so. At no stage did I say that any project I would announce would be the answer to the troubles of the building industry.

Mr. Millhouse: You invited me to watch your telecast.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member asked me for some indication and I said that here was one example. If the honourable member does not think that this is of any use to the building industry he should consult the members of that industry.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I did not say it would be of no use: I expressed disappointment that it was not something of a more substantial nature.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, \$940,000—passed.

Grand total, \$82,560,000, passed and Committee's resolution adopted by the House.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to authorize the Treasurer to borrow and expend moneys for public works and purposes and to enact other provisions incidental thereto. Read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 2.4 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 10, at 2 p.m.