

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, September 13, 1967

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

QUESTIONS

EGGS

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of August 31 about a letter I had received from Mr. Yoannidis of Mount Gambier?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Some time ago I had a request from the Chairman of the South Australian Egg Board for the police to investigate the affairs of Mr. Yoannidis at Mount Gambier. My first action was to refer the matter to the Crown Solicitor, who sent back certain advice which was then referred to the Chief Secretary who sent it on to the Commissioner of Police. In a minute to the Chief Secretary was a request that the Commissioner of Police consult with the Chairman of the Egg Board from whom he should take directions. Since the question was asked, I have received from the Chairman of the Egg Board the following letter, which I think will explain the position:

I refer to the comments made by the Hon. D. N. Brookman, M.P., in respect of Mr. S. G. Yoannidis of Mount Gambier. The firm of G. N. Yoannidis & Sons, of which Mr. S. G. Yoannidis is a member, made application for a producer agent permit on June 27, 1952, which was granted on July 23, 1952. This permit was cancelled at the request of the firm on January 20, 1956. The reason given for the request for cancellation was: "Prices not in proportion to overhead expenses, and that the firm intended to produce meat birds."

Since that time Yoannidis claims to be trading exclusively at an interstate level. The board's inspectors have not been able to satisfactorily establish the extent of local marketing conducted by the firm of G. N. Yoannidis & Sons. As Yoannidis obtains supplies of eggs from local producers, the board had reason to believe that he was engaged in some local trade in the Mount Gambier district. It was on the basis of this opinion that an investigation by the Police Department was requested. In view of the involved nature and extent of Yoannidis's transactions, locally and interstate, it was inevitable that the inquiries should lead to Victoria. The board has not yet received a report on the investigation. No other producers in the area appear to be involved in practices that require any special attention. The board is responsible for the expenses involved in this investigation.

The honourable member will see that this is not a personal vendetta against Mr. Yoannidis.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: One of my constituents has written me about the price of eggs and has enclosed this extract from the *Advertiser* of August 28:

The South Australian Egg Board yesterday announced reductions in the wholesale prices of two grades of eggs. Large and ungraded eggs will be 2c a dozen cheaper. The new wholesale prices are: large eggs, 56c a dozen; standard, 50c; small, 43c; and ungraded, 43c. The prices include the cost of packaging following the introduction from today of a non-returnable carton. The price reduction in two grades follows a seasonal increase in production.

If I give the letter to the Minister, will he consider the matter referred to?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: At a meeting convened by the Egg Board at Murray Bridge some months ago, I believe that the Chairman of the Egg Board (Mr. Williams) said that about 50 egg farmers in this State were not paying the C.E.M.A. levy; at least, the Chairman knew of 50 farmers who were not paying the levy. Will the Minister ascertain from the Chairman of the Egg Board whether these 50 farmers are still not paying the levy?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: On March 14 last I asked the Minister of Agriculture about the survey of poultry farms being conducted by his department to assess the costs involved in the egg industry in the last financial year. As the Minister promised to let me have a report, and as it is now six months since I asked that question, will the Minister let me have this information?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I have not received a report on this matter but I will follow it up for the honourable member.

WALLAROO HOSPITAL

Mr. HUGHES: The present geriatric ward at the Wallaroo Hospital was located some distance from the other part of the hospital, as an isolation block, when the hospital was erected. During the last 12 months the ward has not been used as an isolation ward but has been serving a useful purpose as a geriatric ward. However, two sections at the back of this ward are open to all the elements. I inspected the hospital about six months ago in company with an inspector from the Public Buildings Department and the inspector said that he would undertake to have carried out the work of covering in these sections with glass. Since then another inspector has been

responsible for work in this district. Because of the urgency of the work, will the Minister of Works refer the matter to the Public Buildings Department so that the work may be carried out as soon as possible?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I know the locality and appreciate the difficulties being experienced by people who have to be accommodated in the area to which the honourable member has referred. I shall certainly take the matter up with the Public Buildings Department and ascertain whether action can be taken.

PORT PIRIE CHANNEL

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to the question I asked yesterday about the widening of the Port Pirie channel?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have received the following report from the Director of Marine and Harbors:

The work to be undertaken in connection with the widening of the channel at Port Pirie to provide for the safer handling of the larger class of vessels calling at that port is:

1. Widening the western side bends at starboard hand beacons 6, 7 and 8 by 40ft. and widening the bend at No. 11 starboard hand beacon by 50ft. at an estimated cost of \$67,000.

2. Widening the channel on the east side abreast of the end of the new No. 10 berth, at an estimated cost of \$18,500, and

3. Demolition of the four existing starboard hand beacons Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 11 and replacement in new positions with four steel structures, at an estimated cost of \$30,000.

The total estimated expenditure is \$115,500.

MORGAN-WHYALLA MAIN

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Recently, I noticed that the Engineering and Water Supply Department was calling tenders for the construction of substantial water storage at Whyalla. Can the Minister of Works say whether the duplicated main from Morgan to Whyalla is now completed and delivering water to Whyalla? I know that some problems were associated with the section of main across the gulf, but I assume that these have been solved. Further, will the Minister ascertain (that is, assuming the main is completed) the total capacity of the main to supply water to Whyalla and Iron Knob, and the quantity of water consumed by these two localities during the year ended June 30, 1967?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: From the last report I received I have assumed that the main is completed and delivering water but, as I am not sure of this, I will inquire. I cannot

answer the latter part of the question now, but I will obtain a report and inform the honourable member when I have it.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES

Mr. NANKIVELL: Recently, at the South-Eastern Local Government Association meeting it was suggested that certain council officers were unhappy about the standards required of them for testing weights and measures, and it was implied that the department was trying to take over this work from councils. Can the Minister of Lands say whether he is satisfied with the present services provided by councils for testing weights and measures, or whether his department intends to take over this work?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member would be aware that an Act was passed early this year repealing the previous Weights and Measures Act, and certain requirements for inspectors were provided. Also, the Act provided that councils, if they so desired, could request the Minister to take over this activity from them, and several councils have made such a request. I state categorically that the department does not desire to take over this function from councils. Indeed, we would be pleased if councils continued what they have been doing in the past in this field. The additional requirements for inspectors are not difficult, but I fear that some inspectors employed by councils are making too much of a problem of these requirements, and of the extra training and sitting for tests prescribed by the Act. Every assistance has been offered to the inspectors by the department: schools have been organized and, subsequently, a test paper will be set for them. I assure the honourable member that I have examined the test paper, and it is not difficult.

Mr. Quirke: Could you pass it?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am certain I could, and that will give the honourable member some idea how difficult it is! I think members will agree that it is necessary to maintain present standards, particularly if councils are to render a service to the public pursuant to the Act. Protection exists for both the consumer and the trader although, strangely enough, when dealing with weights and measures we find that it is not always the consumer who loses: in fact, it is almost invariably the trader. As I have said, protection exists for both parties, and I think that, when councils and their inspectors realize that it is neither the desire nor the intention

of the department to take over this function but, rather, to assist them in every possible way in order to meet the Act's requirements, the inference that the department wishes to take over this function will be found to be completely incorrect.

WATER RESTRICTIONS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In this House on August 31 last the Minister of Works, in reply to a question asked by the member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner) said, amongst other things, that unless suitable rains were received there would be restrictions: there must be. As I understood that answer, the Minister was dealing with water restrictions during the coming summer. However, as the Premier is reported in this morning's paper to have said that restrictions may not be necessary in the metropolitan area this summer, this seems to be a contradiction of the statement made by the Minister of Works. I therefore ask the Minister (as he is in charge of the supply of water in this State) whether he agrees with the opinion expressed by the Premier and, if he does, will he say what has occurred since August 31 to change the outlook on this matter in South Australia?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: This matter is being considered at the moment by Cabinet, and I expect a decision soon.

Mr. Millhouse: Can't you answer the question?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: If the honourable member does not want to hear me further, I shall not continue.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As I understood the purport of the Minister's answer, it was that certain matters were being considered and that a decision and announcement would be made in due course. As this is a matter of great public concern (and I apologize if I put the Minister about while he was replying earlier, because I realize the embarrassing situation in which he has been placed), can the Minister say when he will be able to make an announcement on the matter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I deeply appreciate the co-operation we are receiving from the public. I have said previously in the House that water restrictions, if they are to be introduced, will not be introduced before October 1. I cannot say when I shall be able to make a statement on this matter.

Mr. HALL: Can the Minister say whether the bores situated in certain parts of the metropolitan area will be activated to supplement metropolitan water supplies during the coming summer?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The 37 bores in the metropolitan area will commence operating on October 1.

COUNCIL FRANCHISE

Mr. LANGLEY: I was pleased to read in today's *Advertiser* that many people had returned their Legislative Council enrolment forms. The Premier's action in this matter has therefore been successful. However, although many houses are jointly owned, members of the fairer sex have not received such forms. As most of the applications received thus far have now been dealt with, and as I have received many inquiries in this regard, will the Premier consider sending additional forms to women whose names are already on the Assembly roll?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is difficult for us to prepare a further computer programme dealing only with the possibility of the joint ownership of property. However, some other measures have been put in train that I think will solve this situation in the foreseeable future.

GAS

Mr. COUMBE: As the Natural Gas Pipelines Authority was set up some months ago and has been meeting regularly since, will the Premier ascertain how far it has progressed in its deliberations, and especially when it expects to recommend calling tenders for the construction of a pipeline?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall ask the Chairman for a report.

FERTILIZER

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked some time ago whether the Agriculture Department had made any research into the need for, and use of, nitrogenous fertilizers in the agricultural districts near Wallaroo?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Chief Soils Officer reports:

Since 1956 experiments with the use of nitrogen fertilizers have been carried out on wheat in most cereal districts in South Australia. This work is continuing. Under present farming systems, nitrogen fertilizers result in economic yield increases only in certain specific circumstances.

The following criteria are favourable for economic returns from nitrogen fertilizers:

(1) Good Rainfall: Economic returns from added nitrogen were rarely obtained where the growing season (May-October) rainfall was less than 10in. Growing season rainfall greater than this occurs in most of the area serviced by Wallaroo in 50 to 70 per cent of seasons.

(2) Soil Type: Sandy soils are more likely to be nitrogen deficient than heavier types.

(3) Intensive Cropping and Lack of Legumes in Pastures: In most of the district in question it is possible to grow medics or clovers in rotation with cereals. Where at least one good legume pasture is grown between each cereal crop a nitrogen deficiency is unlikely. However the nitrogen level may be reduced at times when pasture years coincide with seasons of poor clover growth.

(4) Absence of Fallowing: Available nitrogen is increased by fallowing, and responses to added nitrogen are less likely on fallowed land. There is a trend away from fallowing in many districts, and this may lead to some increased demand for nitrogen.

In general, there does not appear to be an immediate large market for nitrogen for cereal growing. The proportion of crops within the district supplied from Wallaroo which would benefit economically from added nitrogen under the present cropping systems, probably does not exceed 10 per cent, or about 20,000 acres. At 23 lb. N per acre (50 lb. urea or 1cwt. sulphate of ammonia) the total requirement would be less than 5,000 tons of urea annually. This quantity might be increased by the following factors:

(1) Introduction of new varieties of cereals more adapted to high soil fertility.

(2) Adoption of more intensive cropping practices.

The extent and rate of these developments cannot be readily predicted, as they will depend on a number of factors, including the relative returns from grain and pasture.

GOOLWA FERRY

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Social Welfare, representing the Minister of Transport, a reply to my question concerning the Goolwa ferry?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: My colleague reports that the Railways Department has not received a request from the District Council of Port Elliot to divert the railway line around the northern side of Goolwa. However, this proposal is one of the alternatives that is under active consideration by the department in connection with the problems associated with the possible duplication of the Goolwa ferry. At this stage, the problems have not been resolved, and it is expected that a little time will elapse before this will be done.

MATRICULATION COURSES

Mr. QUIRKE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked recently

concerning matriculation courses in country high schools?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Careful consideration has been given to the needs of eight additional country high schools for the establishment of a fifth-year matriculation class in 1968. As in the past, headmasters were asked to estimate the number of students likely to enrol, the interpretation of students likely to enrol being as follows:

(1) Stating their intention to enrol.

(2) Likely to qualify in the 1967 Leaving for promotion in at least five subjects.

They were also asked to take into account students likely to enrol from outside their own school. These estimates have been reviewed, and note was also taken of the likely continuity of such a class. It is clearly not sound policy to establish one on the strength of a boom year.

Account has also been taken of new developments in secondary schools among which is an increasing desire by the parents to keep their children at school for a fifth year with or without matriculation as an aim. Finally, it has been necessary to consider the availability of staff for matriculation and senior work generally in 1968. Apart from the requirement of teachers of appropriate qualifications to take such work, each new class would mean an addition of about 1½ teachers to a school staff. Bearing in mind all these factors, I have approved of the establishment of fifth-year matriculation classes at Clare, Naracoorte and Waikerie High Schools in 1968. These classes are strategically placed additions in the Mid North, mid-South-East and Upper Murray to those already established in country areas.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I have previously asked a question about a matriculation course at the Bordertown High School. When the Minister was replying to the member for Burra, he omitted to mention Bordertown as a school at which a fifth-year matriculation course was to be established this year. I understand that there are 43 students in the present class and that recently 26 students indicated their interest in a fifth-year matriculation course at Bordertown if such were available, and their intention to take the course. However, I know that some of these students would not go elsewhere to matriculate. Can the Minister indicate the minimum number of students required to set up such a class, assuming there will be continuity? Further, is Bordertown far from

meeting this quota, and was the information I have now given fully considered when the departmental assessment was made?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I understand that the decisions on the three schools I mentioned earlier, as well as the decisions on the other schools on the list, were made after a most recent survey, having regard to the conditions that I outlined in my reply. I should think that all the aspects that the honourable member has raised were considered. One or two schools on the list had more students likely to attend than had Bordertown. That is the only information I can give the honourable member at present. I consider that the matter has been thoroughly examined recently and that is the best that can be done in the circumstances.

FODDER SUPPLIES

Mr. HALL: During the weekend, I was approached by a constituent who runs a number of dairy cows. He expressed to me his concern at the possibility of a shortage in reserve fodder supplies necessary to feed his dairy herd and other herds in the district during the coming summer. He asked me what was being done in this regard. Is the Minister of Lands aware that throughout much of South Australia a shortage of fodder supplies will be a problem, a problem that will be more severe for those who have dairy herds than for those with sheep, because sheep can be bought and sold more easily than dairy cattle? Is the availability of reserve fodder supplies being investigated by the committee set up to examine methods of drought relief? If the matter is being investigated, when will an announcement be made about it?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Of course, as the matter to which the Leader has referred is well known to me and to the committee, it will be investigated, for it is realized that, although in some areas there may be sufficient (if not ample) fodder available this year, the problem will still exist largely next year owing to the effects of this season. As the Leader knows, the relevant legislation provides for the payment and transport of fodder, and that matter will be dealt with in due course. However, as investigations are far from complete at this stage, when a decision is made I shall be happy to inform the Leader.

RAILWAY CROSSINGS

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Minister of Social Welfare a reply from the Minister of Transport to my question of August

3 about the modification of railway crossings in the Morphett Vale and Reynella area that are now surrounded by houses rather than by empty paddocks?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Minister of Transport reports that conditions at level crossings in the Morphett Vale and Reynella area bear a close resemblance to those in other developing sectors of the metropolitan area and in many country townships. The hazard is common to all. It is not proposed to undertake any comprehensive programme of modification. Where local governing authorities desire to effect changes in road alignments, the South Australian Railways Department will co-operate in accordance with established practice. No objection will be raised to any application by a local authority to the Road Traffic Board for the erection of "stop" signs at such crossings. With regard to the second part of the question, which referred to the guard rails on wing fences, the Railways Commissioner reports:

The Railways Commissioner is obliged, under the South Australian Railways Commissioner's Act, to fence specified lines and to maintain those fences in good and effective condition at all times. Legislative action would be necessary to remove this obligation, but this might not necessarily relieve the Railways Commissioner of his existing liabilities at common law. A great many unpublicized accidents occur when a motorist loses effective control of his vehicle when approaching a level crossing and crashes into the wing fence. Were the fence of less robust construction, the motor vehicle, after crashing through it, conceivably would come to rest on the railway line, thus introducing a hazard to both the motorist himself and to the train passenger.

At the same time, these wing fences do act as a guide to the motorist, who might wander from the road pavement. It is apparent that the essence of the matter is the steel post adjacent to the railway track and to which the wing fence is attached. It is pointed out, however, that any strainer post, whatever its composition, must of necessity be strong, and I am unable to envisage any appreciable difference in the secondary damage that would ensue after the initial collision between the vehicle and the train if this post were constructed of different material. There is also the matter of obstructions at low level, such as the roadway itself and the cattle pit or grid. These themselves contribute substantially towards the injuries sustained, but for the very reason of their existence are not looked upon with such suspicion as are the posts.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I appreciate the reply that I have been given, and understand that this report was prepared by the Railways Department. Although a reasonable report, it expressed only the point of view

of that department. Irrespective of whether steel posts protect the railway lines, they are obviously extremely damaging to vehicles involved in some types of collision. I cannot enumerate how many types there may be, but the posts have a completely devastating effect in some cases. Will the Minister ask his colleague to obtain a report from either the Road Traffic Board or the Police Department on the effect of these posts in case of collision?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Some years ago I objected to this type of solidly-constructed post, because I considered that it was most damaging to motor vehicles involved in collisions. Although I have not altered my opinion, I emphasize that the Railways Commissioner is placed in a most invidious position at common law. However, I shall ask my colleague to review the matter.

GRAIN CHARGES

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As the Minister of Marine knows, the costs of moving wheat or other grain in bulk from sidings or country silos to the point where the grain is free on board ship fall into three parts, two of which are under the control of the Government and one of which is controlled by South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited. The first of the three charges is rail freight from country silo to the terminal. That is charged by the Railways Department and paid direct by the farmer. The second charge is the cost of providing silo storage, maintaining the storage, and working the wheat through the silos. That cost is provided by the co-operative out of tolls that it collects from members and charges that it collects from non-members. The third charge is the cost of moving the wheat from terminal silos to the ship. For this work machinery is provided by the Marine and Harbors Department and the department levies a charge on the Australian Wheat Board. About three years ago I considered this charge and found that, because of the greatly increased quantity of grain being shipped from outports in this State, a reduction of the charge for this service through the then Harbors Board was possible. If my memory is correct, about the end of the crop year in 1963-64 a reduction of a half-penny a bushel was made. That reduction operated for the 1964-65 season and has operated since. In view of the fact that, since I considered the matter, the pressures on outports have continued to be heavy in regard to the movement of grain, with the possible exception of the position at Port Adelaide,

will the Minister now examine the accounts of the Marine and Harbors Department in regard to this charge and ascertain whether a further reduction could be made?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I appreciate the honourable member's question. I admit frankly that I have not considered the matter but, the honourable member now having raised it, I shall have it investigated.

STAMP DUTY

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Premier a reply to my question about the compulsory issue of duty stamps when accounts are paid?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There are two rates of stamp duty on receipts. For \$10 or over but less than \$50 the duty is 2c and for \$50 or over the duty is 5c. In the case of a payment of \$10 or over but less than \$50, a receipt is compulsory only if the person making the payment asks for one. The payee commits an offence if, after being asked, he refuses to give a properly stamped receipt. In the case of a payment of \$50 or upwards, a receipt is compulsory whether the payee is asked for one or not. The payee commits an offence if he refuses or omits to give a properly stamped receipt. If, in the case of a payment of \$50 or over, a receipt has not been requested, it is a sufficient compliance with the Act if the receipt is made out and properly stamped notwithstanding that the receipt is not sent or delivered to the person making the payment. In such a case the payee is required to hold the receipt for two years, except, of course, where the receipt is made out on a cheque which was received in payment. The provisions for compulsion do not apply to those receipts which are not chargeable with duty under the Act.

IRRIGATION

Mr. McANANEY: Earlier this afternoon the Minister of Works gave notice of a motion concerning the application of the Control of Waters Act to certain parts of my district. Although people in the district knew that this action would be taken, several people who are now constructing irrigation schemes are concerned about the consequences. Will the Minister indicate the procedure that must be followed to apply for a licence? So that these people will know where they stand, will the Minister say when the controls will operate?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I appreciate the urgency of this matter, but it is wrong for people to assume what will happen. The motion will be submitted to both Houses and,

subject to its being passed, a statement will be made about the conditions. We are concerned about the water rights of people along the Murray River and, following the inquiry in the upper reaches, we hope to be able to issue a statement that will assist the people there and those in the honourable member's district.

NARACOORTE WATER SUPPLY

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week concerning the water supply at Naracoorte?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports that the Director of Mines has been asked to examine the proposed new bore sites and advise as to their suitability. The suggestion made by the honourable member has been passed on to the Senior Geologist of the Mines Department who will be visiting Naracoorte next week and who will, while there, further investigate these bore sites.

BORDERTOWN RAILWAY YARDS

Mr. NANKIVELL: On July 13, in reply to a question I asked about the Bordertown railway yards, the Minister of Transport said that the reason for not carrying out phase 3 of the construction there was that it would place an undue strain on the available work force of the Railways Department in that area. At that time the cost was estimated to be \$10,000 and this did not seem to be the main reason for not proceeding with the work. As I understand that reorganization of the works programme for the section of railway line between Tailem Bend and Serviceton has been considered, will the Minister of Social Welfare ascertain from the Minister of Transport whether this will result in the work at Bordertown being proceeded with, despite what was said on July 13?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall obtain a report from my colleague and inform the honourable member when I have it.

CHOWILLA DAM

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yesterday, during his reply to a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier vigorously defended the action of the South Australian representative on the River Murray Commission in not sticking out against the deferring of the Chowilla dam project. However, I notice that in this morning's paper the honourable gentleman is reported as saying that in certain

circumstances South Australia will take action under the agreement to enforce our rights. The report of his statement is as follows:

Whether the Government would seek legal redress would depend on the outcome of the current investigations by the River Murray Commission and decisions by the Governments concerned following the findings.

Can the Premier say how long he expects it will be before these investigations are carried out and a decision is made? Further, what type of proceeding has he in mind should that be necessary?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As to the first question, I expect it will be a few months, and the exact period is not certain yet. There are differing estimates as to the latter, and I intend neither to pull nor to telegraph my punches.

MINIMUM RATING

Mr. McANANEY: A Local Government Act Amendment Bill recently dealt with in the House provided for certain concessions in the minimum rate charged by councils where land is divided by council boundaries. However, I know that one council is charging the minimum rate on each assessment of adjoining land and that municipalities also are charging the minimum rate in respect of each adjoining block within a council area. On the other hand, some councils have told me that, because they do not think they have the right to do so, they are not applying the minimum rate for each block or assessment. I think the contentious point relates to the occupier of the land concerned who in the legislation is defined as "any person who either jointly or alone has the actual physical possession of any land to the substantial exclusion of all other persons from participating in the enjoyment thereof". Will the Minister representing the Minister of Local Government obtain a clear interpretation of "occupier" and notify councils accordingly?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take this matter up with my colleague and try to obtain a report for the honourable member.

SCHOOL SUBSIDIES

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I recently asked about school subsidies?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I assume that the honourable member's question seeks information as to when subsidy allocations for 1967-68 will be made known to schools so that they may arrange their priorities for spending the allocation. The Education Department has

just notified schools of their allocation following the presentation to Parliament of the Estimates. Requests for subsidies are made under two separate categories, namely, ordinary and special subsidies.

When schools are notified of their allocation, the amount provided under each of these categories is specified. On receipt of this information by the schools, items of a general nature, such as library books, teaching aids, and sports equipment, etc., may be purchased without further reference to the department. For projects involving construction work, site plans, detailed plans, and specifications, at least three quotes must be submitted for consideration. If for any reason negotiations are protracted, a school committee is not penalized in any way. Once the proposal has been approved and a subsidy has been provided for it, the department's commitment will be met.

MURRIE ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Concerning the winding up of the Murrie Royal Commission, the Minister of Education was kind enough yesterday to say that when the Commissioner's report was received it would be made public. I remind the Minister that on July 6 last, when I asked him about the terms of reference concerning matters of principle, he replied:

The South Australian Institute of Teachers will make submissions to me in the same way as it has done to the Minister of Education over the years. I am sure that by discussion we shall be able to satisfactorily solve the matters that concern the South Australian Institute of Teachers, the Education Department, and the Minister.

In other words, instead of there being an open and public inquiry on these matters, submissions were to be made to the Minister. As more than two months has now elapsed since that time, will the Minister say whether the institute has made submissions to him and whether as a result of those submissions he has made any decisions? If he has made any decisions, I ask whether they may be communicated to this House.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Discussions have taken place between the Director-General and me, as Minister, and the institute concerning certain matters. When decisions are made I shall be pleased to make them public, and the House will be notified.

SIREX WASP

Mr. RODDA: I notice in today's *Advertiser* another siren wasp infestation has been discovered at Port Adelaide. Bearing in mind

the infestation that was discovered about two months ago, I point out that this is a disturbing matter to the forestry industry, although it is indeed fortunate that these infestations have been discovered. Has the Minister of Agriculture anything to report on the fresh outbreak?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: My attention having been drawn to the article in today's press concerning the matter, I noticed that every precaution had been taken and that a departmental officer had immediately quarantined and fumigated the area concerned. Although this matter is worrying, it is fortunate that the waterside workers are so vigilant in this regard and have a particular interest in the matter. I noticed in the press report that the Conservator of Forests had thanked the men concerned and I, too, must add my thanks to the men, for without their vigilance we could be in serious trouble. I will try to ascertain the origin of these infestations and, if a specific area is involved, representations may have to be made to ensure that there is no recurrence.

WISANGER RESIDENCE

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on July 20 about whether his department was prepared to buy a house occupied by a teacher-driver at Wisanger on Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The house at Wisanger occupied by the teacher-driver from the Kingscote Area School has been inspected by an officer of the Public Buildings Department who reports that because of design, type and method of construction, the residence could not be brought up to present-day accepted standards and maintenance costs would be high. The estimated cost of repairs and improvements is \$4,250 which, combined with the purchase price of \$3,000, led the Public Buildings Department to recommend against purchase. In the circumstances, no action will be taken by the Education Department to purchase the residence. However, the department is grateful to the residents at Wisanger for providing the house for the teacher-driver and would appreciate its continued availability for this purpose.

NEWTON PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mrs. STEELE: As the Minister of Education knows, he is to open the Newton Primary School officially on November 6, although it has been operating for about a year. The school committee is most anxious to proceed

with the development of the school grounds and, in particular, with the levelling and watering of a school oval. Its members would like to have this work completed before the Minister visits the school, although I am afraid that that appears to be impossible. However, in August last year the committee members wrote to the department, setting out the details and asking for an initial advance to enable this work to be proceeded with, (I might say that this school is on a main road and visible to the passing public.) However, the only communication committee members received was a reply, dated seven days after they had written, informing them that the matter had been referred to the relevant officer in the Public Buildings Department. As nothing further has transpired, I have been asked by the members of the committee to make representations to the Minister of Education. I therefore ask whether he will call for a report, if he has not the facts at the moment.

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

WINDY POINT

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I welcomed the answer the Minister of Immigration and Tourism gave me so readily yesterday about his plans for the future development of Windy Point. I noticed that later, outside the House, he gave more information about this matter, including the statement that applications could be lodged with the Deputy Director of the Tourist Bureau. Can he now say for how long applications will be open and when a decision is likely to be made as to the successful applicant?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I am not sure how long applications will be left open, I will ascertain that for the honourable member. Then I will have a better idea of when we shall be able to announce the name of the successful applicant and to say what proposals for the development of this area are contemplated.

BUILDING ACT

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked several weeks ago regarding the Government's intention to introduce, this session, legislation to amend the Building Act?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot recall the honourable member's question, but I will see whether a reply is available.

STATE BANK REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the annual report of the State Bank for the year ended June 30, 1967, together with balance sheets.

Ordered that report be printed.

JUVENILE COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Courts Act, 1966. Read a first time.

WATER REQUIREMENTS

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. G. G. Pearson:

(For wording of motion, see page 1722.)

(Continued from August 30. Page 1731.)

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works): It has been realized since the 1850's that water is this State's greatest need. With this in mind, the Engineering and Water Supply Department has, over the years, planned to meet the need not only of the present but of the future. I shall give a few general statistics to help indicate the department's development. At the moment the capital value of departmental works is \$221,919,000. The metropolitan consumption for 1965-66 was 27,685,000,000 gallons—a lot of water. The record daily consumption of 216,100,000 gallons was registered on December 28, 1965. The average daily consumption for 1965-66 was 76,000,000 gallons; the average daily consumption a head was 105 gallons; and the population supplied with water in the metropolitan area was 724,000. Regarding country areas, the consumption for 1965-66 was 12,875,000,000 gallons and the population supplied was 291,000. From these figures, it can be seen that over 90 per cent of the population of South Australia has a reticulated water supply.

Nobody knows better than the member for Flinders that officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department in this State have applied, and are still applying, themselves to meeting the future needs of the State for water. With determination and sincerity in their endeavours, they have achieved, and are achieving, results which have won admiration from a large majority of people. By saying a large majority, I am possibly putting it a little conservatively. However, it is regrettable that in their darkest hour (which has come about because of circumstances beyond their control)

there are those who, for purely Party political reasons, are prepared to sabotage the progress of the State by stabbing the officers of the department in the back, and who intend to drain those officers of their life's blood and tie their hands behind their backs: that is the purpose of the motion we are asked to consider.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Absolute rot!

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member should be an authority on absolute rot.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I think you should apologize for saying what you've said. You are completely out of character and I think you do yourself the greatest discredit.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: If the honourable member will listen to me, I think I shall prove that he is out of character. I deplore that a matter such as water supply should be treated as a political gimmick. Since I have been Minister of Works, I have never played politics on public works. I have addressed meetings at Keith, Coonalpyn, Ceduna and Kimba that have been attended by hundreds of people. I defy anyone to say that I played politics at those meetings; on the contrary, on being invited to do so, I made it clear that I refused to be involved in such a practice. However, today I regret that I am obliged to do this. I am left no alternative because the member for Flinders, while pretending to be non-political, made the most vile political speech this House has ever heard.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Is that the best you can say to a genuine motion?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I submit that the motion is not genuine, as I will prove. The member for Flinders, with malice aforethought, made statement after statement knowing full well that those statements were incorrect. He knows that the Engineering and Water Supply Department has an internal programme to meet the needs of the State in this respect up until the year 2000. He knows also that for good reasons this must remain an internal programme. To say that I am disappointed in the honourable member is putting it far too mildly. Presently I shall show that today and for years past all that the proposed committee is supposed to do by authority without responsibility has been done by the department, which is responsible and which, in co-operation with other departments, has done a mighty job. I shall examine the real purpose of some of the remarks of the member for Flinders. He said:

It is my purpose here not to make political criticisms of the Government, but to look fairly and squarely at the position in which we are now placed and try to avoid a recurrence of the present position.

When he said that it was not his purpose to make a political criticism of the Government, whom did he think he was kidding? His speech was blatantly Party-political, Party politics being the sole purpose of the exercise. He referred to his trying to avoid the recurrence of the present position. This is a drought year in which we have experienced the worst run-off into catchment areas for more than 80 years. Not one word have we heard about how the proposed committee intends to prevent droughts. How do we meet the circumstances of a drought, which affects the whole catchment areas of reservoirs and of the Murray River, without at least some minor difficulty? Of course, Chowilla dam would help in this respect, and I will deal with that matter later. The member for Flinders then made the following statement in his so-called non-political speech:

In 1959, which was a year of extremely low rainfall, and in which climatic conditions and the rainfall pattern were much the same as they are this year (indeed, they were rather worse if anything because the drought was more widespread), the Playford Government was able to get through the summer without imposing water restrictions (at least no water restrictions were imposed in that year in the metropolitan area). That was because we recognized early the prevailing circumstances and commenced to pump water full-time through all the mains, particularly the Manum-Adelaide main, much sooner than the Government commenced pumping this year.

I am afraid one cannot win on pumping. Last year we pumped water, starting at a similar time and following a programme similar to that of this year, only to see water running over the spillways later in the year. Of course, that could happen again this year and, if it did, the Government would be charged with wasting money.

Mr. McAnaney: Did we say that last year?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Of course, up until this time, 1959 was not a worse year than this year regarding rainfall in the catchment areas; nor has the pumping programme been in any way less effective this year than it was in 1959. In fact, if we had pumped from June 1, this year we would have had possibly 700,000,000 to 900,000,000 gallons more water: therefore, the improvement in the position would have been slight. This year the full run-off of 9,800,000,000 gallons was expected and

pumping was planned with that in mind. Today there is a deficiency of 7,000,000,000 gallons to be made up out of reduced losses. If we had started pumping on June 1, we would have reduced the deficiency by 900,000,000 gallons. However, I draw attention to the hopeless position this year caused by the drought, which is beyond the control of man. The honourable member said the Government should have started pumping much sooner this year, but he was careful not to say when we should have started. No, that would not have fooled the public as he was trying to do.

Mr. Rodda: I don't think he was trying to fool the public, was he? I thought he was facing the situation.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The member can think that if he likes. I am stating a fact. Surely no-one other than a fool would start pumping as early as April 1. If we had done that, the savings would have increased to 3,000,000,000 gallons but we still would have had a deficiency of 4,000,000,000 gallons. How can one win in a circumstance like that? The honourable member for Flinders, in his so-called non-political speech, made a mouthful about what the Playford Government had done in 1959 compared with what this Government was doing in 1967-68. Of course, he was careful to make the statement with complete disregard of the facts. I have had the pleasure of giving the facts to the House following a question asked by the member for Glenelg.

Mr. Millhouse: It's a pity you didn't give some today.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member would not understand them if I did.

Mr. Millhouse: Oh, that's rude.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have given facts today, and I will give more. The member will have his opportunity to try to show that they are not facts.

Mr. Millhouse: I'll accept your invitation if you aren't careful.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I do not intend to be careful: I intend to state the truth.

Mr. Millhouse: Why don't you tell us about water restrictions in South Australia next summer?

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable the Minister to address the Chair.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I think what I have said previously is worth repeating so that it will sink in. When did part-time pumping start in 1959 and 1967? In 1959 pumping from the previous summer ceased on April 9 and recommenced on June 1. In 1967 pumping was continuous. In 1959 full pumping with three units commenced on June 8. In 1967 the pumping rate was progressively built up to full pumping with four units on July 16. I state clearly that three units were operating in 1959, compared with four operating today. The following quantities of water, stated in millions of gallons, were pumped in the months of June, July and August in 1959 and 1967:

	1959		1967
June	1,393	June	857
July	1,516	July	1,938
August	1,630	August	2,040
Totals	4,539		4,835

It can be seen that the pumping in 1967 was in no way less effective than had been the pumping in 1959.

Mr. Hudson: It would be shown to be more effective if one took the count for earlier months.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes, but I want to be conservative. These figures show conclusively that the statement made by the honourable member for Flinders was false and that it was intended to deceive. I shall now

deal with Chowilla. The honourable member said:

In spite of the breakdown of operations at Chowilla, I think it is apparent to any impartial observer that over the last two and a half years the project as a whole has lost momentum. The keenness with which the investigation and preliminary works were pursued in the three or four preceding years was not maintained. We ran into many problems which I believe a greater degree of initiative and drive could have prevented. If we had maintained concentration on the project, I believe we could now have been well on the way to having the dam constructed.

That statement was designed to indicate that there was a deficiency on the part of the Labor Government in regard to Chowilla. It was a strange statement to be made by a man who had been a member of a Government that had approved of an agreement that provided what was seemingly an escape clause, at least as far as some people in other States were concerned. Let me say now loudly and clearly that the Government is certain that no alternative proposal would provide benefit to South Australia equal to the benefit to be derived from Chowilla. There have been rumblings about the Murray River, but I have watched the position carefully. In order to ascertain what was the real attitude of the people concerned, I took the trouble to read the River Murray Commission's report for the year 1965-66. It suffices to read this extract from the Auditor-General's Report:

Construction works: In compliance with clause 32 of the agreement (as amended), cost of construction is borne equally by the contracting Governments (the Commonwealth, New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia). Each of the Governments contributed \$644,000 during 1965-66 and, from inception of the scheme to June 30, 1966, each Government has contributed a total of \$12,236,391.

One would have thought from that report that there was little reason for being concerned. However, I was aware that there was reason for concern and I watched the position. The bombshell came recently. Following a report of the River Murray Commission early in August, the Government was aware that the construction of the Chowilla dam was vital to the future growth of South Australia. We therefore requested the earliest possible meeting of the Prime Minister and the Premiers of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia, in order to arrange the early resumption of the construction of the dam, as originally agreed. This decision was made at a Cabinet meeting and the Premier immediately telephoned the Prime Minister from the Cabinet room with this request, whereupon he was asked to put his proposals in writing, which he did. To date, however, no meeting has been arranged. Is this not the fullest first action in accordance with common decency that could have been taken? I said "first action": I assure the House that more will be forthcoming in keeping with the code of decency, if we do not hear something soon.

We mean to get Chowilla dam for South Australia, and the people of this State can be assured that we will not deal in character assassination by statement or by implication,

such as we read in *Hansard* of August 15, when the Leader of the Opposition said, "We are not willing to accept the assurances of Sir Henry Bolte and Mr. Askin." This is a reflection on the honourable gentlemen with whom we have to deal. On the same day the member for Flinders, when referring to a slug of salt water released from Victoria, said:

But if anyone wanted to sabotage the whole scheme at this moment there could not have been a better way.

We believe that this is not the attitude to take. We believe there is a correct attitude and that we will not get anything by abuse. Proper procedures are available and they will be followed, as the Premier said recently and repeated today. The proposed committee can serve no purpose that is not being served at present, and I draw the House's attention to a statement made by the member for Flinders in an endeavour to hide the sins of the Liberal and Country League Government, of which he was a member. I quote from *Hansard*:

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not have to tell the Minister the problem that the people in the District of Eyre are facing today in regard to a water supply in and around Kimba: he knows because he went over there, and the people treated him nicely. They were not tough on him.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Minister was not tough, either!

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: He wasn't, either.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The quote continues:

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: He was not in a position to be tough. I am inclined to be a bit cross with him on this matter. This project has been before this House for some years, and the Government ought to get on with it. I make no apology for saying that, because nothing has prevented the Government from proceeding with the project. I make another comparison between this project and a problem tackled by a previous Administration. In 1959, we were faced with a water supply problem on Eyre Peninsula, when it was obvious that there was not enough water to meet the needs of stock that were served by the existing mains. I went to the then Treasurer (Sir Thomas Playford) and told him that, whichever way we worked out the sum, we would be 400,000,000 gallons of water short to satisfy the needs of stock in that area that summer. The Treasurer asked, "What do you propose to do about it?" I said, "We have two possibilities, one of which is harnessing the Poldia Basin." He asked, "How much will it cost?" and I replied, "\$1,000,000." He asked, "Have you got any money?" and I replied, "We have allocated some money for the re-laying of the Tod River trunk main, but that will have to wait in the circumstances."

I thank the honourable member for part of his statement. It is amazingly true that the harnessing of the Polda Basin would cost about \$1,000,000, but the Polda-Kimba scheme was estimated to cost about \$2,600,000. I suppose this information is of no importance to the honourable member, but the Government intends to spend between \$250,000 and \$300,000 to help these people solve the difficult water problems. I point out that the honourable member said that nothing had prevented the Government from proceeding with this project. He also said, "We have allocated some money for the re-laying of the Tod River trunk main, but that will have to wait in the circumstances." What the Deputy Leader did not say was that the Tod River trunk main was neglected to such an extent that much financial assistance must now be made available. It was so neglected by the L.C.L. Government that it was said to be the only place in the world where people had learned to weld steel to concrete.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: If you had done as much in your two and half years as we did I would not be blaming you, but you haven't done anywhere near that, and you know it.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: When the honourable member was speaking I made one interjection, and listened to him in silence. It was painful to do so, but I did it. Because of the wilful neglect of the L.C.L. Government the Tod River trunk main now requires expenditure that prohibits the Government from spending money on other necessary works that are not just as important as this main. One would think that conditions at Kimba were brand new. The report of the Public Works Committee on the Kimba Water Supply contains the following passage:

1. On December 20, 1962, Your Excellency referred to the committee for inquiry and report the proposed public work of the construction of a pipeline from Iron Knob to Kimba.

On August 7, 1963, the committee presented an interim report (P.P. No. 76/1963) finding as follows:

In view of the high cost of bringing water from the River Murray to Kimba the committee finds:

- (1) That it is expedient to defer consideration of the proposed water main from Iron Knob to Kimba.
- (2) That the investigation into the potential of the Polda Basin recommended by the committee in paragraph 4 of its report (P.P. No. 82/1962) on Eyre Peninsula Water Supply (Augmentation from Polda Basin) should proceed.

- (3) That it is desirable that an alternative scheme based on a supply for Kimba from Polda Basin be submitted for the consideration of the committee when the potential of the basin has been established.

As a result of the interim report, proposals were submitted to the committee for the construction of a trunk main from the Lock pumping station to Kimba to bring water from the Polda Basin to Kimba.

That shows that the matter has been considered since 1962. In order to show further that this is not a new development but a problem that has been with Kimba for many years, I quote the following extract from the Public Works Committee report:

During the last 10 years it has been necessary to impose restrictions on the use of water on the following occasions:

January 21, 1954, to November 4, 1954—
10 months;

May 23, 1957, to October 2, 1958—17
months;

October 1, 1959, to September 19, 1963—
47 months;

August 13, 1964, to (still current).

Notwithstanding the above restrictions, water had to be carted to the township in six of the last seven years. The total quantity carted from other water conservation points and from Iron Knob has been 5,500,000 gallons; and the cost of carting by road \$30,280.

When I was recently in Kimba, the Chairman of the District Council, addressing a meeting at which I was present, said:

We in Kimba feel that, having been subjected to water restrictions practically continuously for the past 20 years, our priority should be higher . . .

I agree that it should be higher. On February 8, 1965, the then Minister of Works (now the Deputy Leader of the Opposition) was notified in writing that the committee had reached a decision on the Kimba water supply and that it had resolved to recommend the construction of a main from Lock to Kimba. On examining the relevant dockets, I find that the proposal was referred to Cabinet on March 1, 1965, but the L.C.L. Government made no decision on the matter.

Mr. Lawn: That was before the change of Government.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes. The matter was again referred to Cabinet on March 22, 1965, and the Labor Government approved the scheme to proceed at a cost of \$2,264,000.

Mr. Lawn: How many days was that after you took office?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: It was 12 days. I submit that members opposite had no intention of proceeding with the Polda-Kimba scheme and that what they did was nothing

short of a political gimmick on the eve of the elections. The Labor Government has not only approved the scheme but is doing everything in its power to obtain finance in order to commence the work. For 20 years the L.C.L. Government did nothing and showed no intention of doing anything. It achieved no results, yet members opposite criticize us because in three years we have planned the scheme and have stated that if money is available work will proceed immediately.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The good old Commonwealth! You've taken \$14,000,000 out of Loan Account, and you're relying on the Commonwealth to build the pipeline.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: In its last three election speeches the Commonwealth Government has stated that if re-elected it would implement a plan to provide about \$50,000,000 to be divided amongst the States for the purpose of establishing rural water schemes. South Australia is not the only State to take advantage of that plan. Indeed, we would be foolish if we did not take advantage of it, and we are negotiating in order to commence the Poldo-Kimba scheme. What can the committee proposed by the Opposition do that has not been done already? If such a committee were appointed (and I sincerely hope it would not be) it would merely use up much of the time of officers of the Engineering and Water Supply and Mines Departments, seeking from those officers information that would simply be transmitted back to the departments. The time and money wasted on such a committee could be much more profitably spent in developing the State's water supplies.

Mr. Langley: Did the L.C.L. Government have a committee in 1959?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: It never previously thought about a committee of this nature. I refer now to the history and function of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, that is, so much as concerns this debate. In the late 1930's an officer was attached to the Water Supply Branch to cover, amongst other things, the duties concerning the forward planning of water supply, acting under the title of Inspecting Engineer. In 1965 the position of a Project Investigating Engineer superseded the earlier position and the forward planning work became a separate branch that grew into the Planning and Development Branch. In this period a comprehensive study was made of the whole of the State's water resources, and out of that

study the Chowilla dam project was developed and a comprehensive programme of State planning undertaken. The water resources of the State were mapped in some detail and both a short and long-range forecast on water needs and availability was set out. Plans were aimed at meeting the basic requirements on both a long-term and short-term basis. An initial report covering this planning was prepared in considerable detail, and this matter is under constant scrutiny in order to keep the assumptions of development and works programmes up to date. To be perfectly honest, the latter has not been fully achieved. The augmentation of the Mannum-Adelaide scheme, to give a capacity increase of 17 per cent to 80,000,000 gallons a day, was submitted to the Public Works Committee for consideration in October, 1966. It has been shown in planning to be needed, and this is giving the department and the Government much cause for concern. All steps to ensure progress have been taken. The report shows that it is desirable to implement the Murray Bridge to Onkaparinga scheme by 1969. Early in 1966 the then Director and Engineer-in-Chief (Mr. Dridan), when giving evidence on the Swan Reach-Stockwell main, said:

Present consumption trends have led to the conclusion that it would be necessary to have the Murray Bridge-Hahndorf pipeline in operation by the year 1970 if the Swan Reach-Stockwell pipeline were not constructed. Construction of the latter pipeline could be instrumental in deferring the Murray Bridge-Hahndorf scheme, although it is difficult to assess the period of deferment. Present indications are that the sequence of construction should be Swan Reach-Stockwell pipeline, and Clarendon Dam, followed by the completion of the Murray Bridge-Hahndorf pipeline in the year 1970 or thereabouts.

I have referred to only a few of the projects planned. It is all right to say what is needed, but it is another thing to plan to meet the needs within the finance available. Any child can tell his parents what he wants, not what he needs, but a wise parent can supply only what finance can permit.

The proposed committee could easily say what was needed, but could it tell the Government what it could afford to finance? Nor would it be charged with the responsibility involved in economics or priorities. If the Opposition had the slightest chance of becoming the Government next year, it would not suggest a committee at any price. If the Murray Bridge to Hahndorf scheme was said to be needed by 1970, it would be necessary to

make an immediate commencement, and that could have a disastrous effect on the finance available to the department for capital works because it would be necessary to spend about 30 per cent of the total funds available on this undertaking over the three years. Would such a committee be concerned or even troubled to find out what finance was available? In the next few years, when the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works, the Morgan-Whyalla main duplication, and the Kangaroo Creek dam are completed, there will be a resultant easing in demand on capital funds. This will allow the Murray Bridge scheme and the Clarendon dam to be constructed quickly and economically. If the committee was to consider all these things, it would be doing no more than duplicating the work the department is at present doing. It would therefore be a costly nuisance and a brake on progress.

Mr. Millhouse: Who on earth wrote this for you?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member might have to get people to write his speeches, but I do not: I wrote this myself after long and extensive studies of the position. The total water resources of this State include 690,000 acre feet available in the Murray River. This is subject to adequate control by developmental work, for which Chowilla is favoured. Certain State developments after Chowilla might yield an additional 100,000 acre feet. An average flow of 500,000 acre feet of surface water is estimated, but high variability of the streams may limit the development to 150,000 acre feet or less. Underground water resources of 150,000 to 200,000 acre feet are being considered in association with the Mines Department and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, and some people think even greater quantities of such water are available. We have already referred to two bodies that are working in the department. At present 40,000 acre feet of effluent water is available, and this figure may rise in proportion to metropolitan consumption.

Short and long-term planning is being carried out for irrigation of usable water. There are unlimited resources of desalinated water but, because of an economic lack, it is not possible to develop these fully. In long-term planning desalination is the next stage after the exploitation of other resources. These activities show that what is proposed to be done by the suggested committee is being done and has been done for years with remarkable

results. Why should we have another committee to take evidence from existing bodies in order to tell them what they already know and have told the committee?

Mr. Hurst: And prevent their getting on with the job.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes—wisely said. In 1964 the department allowed the cessation of the activities of the Planning and Development Branch. At that stage the forward planning was transferred back to the Joint Executive Branch heads for discussion. Recently it has been determined that the Water Supply Branch should have its own active planning section for the general investigation of water resources. This is a major activity of the Investigating Engineer and his staff.

Other areas of active planning lie within the allocation and control of water quality. Considerable research has been carried out and must continue into such aspects as the distribution of Murray River waters alone. In this respect, co-operation with other departments and authorities is sought and obtained. The present committee on desalination, disposal and irrigation distribution involves three other interested departments. Water quality affects usability and acceptability of water, and planning is also being carried on by several branches of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The operation of the State's water supply system is geared to provide the best supply available from the system. This has been done with due regard to costs and involves the careful study of the resources, bearing in mind replenishment as well as demand. A moment ago I referred to the co-operation shown by, and the work of, the Mines Department. The following short report on the underground water activities of that department recently became available to me:

The search for, development and conservation of underground water supplies has been one of the major tasks of the Mines Department for many years, and the pressure on departmental resources in this field has increased sharply since the amended Underground Waters Preservation Act was implemented early in 1967. Herewith is a schedule listing departmental employees engaged full time on various underground water activities, together with the total revenue expenditure in this field in the past three years. In addition, there is a large amount of part-time work connected with underground water which has not been listed here. Major current activities in underground water are as follows:

(1) Exploration of County Musgrave, Eyre Peninsula—The search for and development of usable ground water supplies here has been actively under way for five years with

encouraging results. It is considered a further two years intensive effort is required before available waters can be accurately assessed.

(2) Great Artesian Basin—Repairs and rehabilitation of flowing bores to prevent wastage have been carried out for a number of years, and the programme will be expanded when other artesian areas, such as the Lower South-East, are included. Expenditure listed on this account is as follows: 1965-66, \$35,000; 1966-67, \$53,000; and 1967-68, \$45,000 (budgeted).

(3) Northern Adelaide Plains—Strenuous efforts are being made to conserve the over-taxed good quality ground waters of this area. The Minister of Mines has recently had much to say about this matter. The report continues:

(4) Advice and assistance to landholders throughout the State represents a substantial part of the department's underground water efforts.

(5) Groundwater resources of the Lower South-East—A preliminary appraisal to set up a full-scale investigation of the above has just commenced.

(6) Desalination of underground waters—The Mines Department has strongly supported research by Amdel into various methods of desalting bore water. Departmental expenditure here has been as follows: 1965-66, \$3,500; 1966-67, \$29,000; and 1967-68, \$36,000 (budgeted).

Therefore, to its credit, the Mines Department is progressing with this work. Following the moving of this motion, the Director of the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories wrote the following letter to the Mines Department:

In the *Advertiser* of August 30 and 31 there are reports of proposals put before the State Parliament to set up an advisory committee on desalination of water. These urge me to bring to your attention the activities of Amdel in this field. Since 1961 Amdel has had desalination investigations proceeding in the laboratories. Initially the effort was a modest one, but it has grown so that for the last two years we have had a group of two graduates with supporting technicians working full time in this field. Our investigations have ranged from relatively fundamental work to intensively practical investigations, and at present we have two small plants under study for various desalination processes. We have been supported in this work by the Commonwealth through our contracts to the Division of Applied Chemistry of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, by the State through the foresight of your own department, and by industry, in the form of an important feasibility study for an American reverse osmosis process.

Our work for the C.S.I.R.O. has had to do with development studies associated with processes introduced by Dr. D. E. Weiss, some of which have considerable novelty, but others are entirely concerned with reducing costs of known processes. For your own department we are on the one hand pursuing investigations

into low cost processes which may be particularly relevant, for example, to high carbonate artesian waters. On the other hand, we are preparing a review on desalination processes as they may be relevant to South Australia. We have been assisted by your own officers and have received the support and advice of the Engineering and Water Supply Department in the preparation of this report, which is scheduled for completion towards the end of September of this year. After touring the country in 1966, Dr. Glenn D. Havens, of Havens Industries, California, U.S.A., singled out our laboratories as the most suitable to undertake a practical demonstration and objective feasibility study of his reverse osmosis process.

The result for Australia was the introduction of the first commercial unit of this type into the country, and for South Australia the choice by Dr. Havens of Adelaide as the headquarters of his Australian activities. The group in Amdel is equipped both in facilities and personnel better than any other in this country to undertake the practical type of feasibility-demonstration study which is relevant to many situations in this State. Apart from our readiness to work in close collaboration with officers of the relevant State departments, we would co-opt other experts in this country with whom we are already in close liaison. Amdel has recently established a direct working link with the Battelle Memorial Institute of U.S.A., and through this link can establish a line of communication to the latest developments in that country. All of these facts are highly relevant to the matter at present before the House, and I trust you may be able to bring them to the attention of the Honourable Minister concerned.

This proves conclusively that bodies are working towards supplying water to South Australia at the most economical rate: it proves that these bodies are working together. Not only are they meeting the responsibilities with which they are charged, but they are also progressing towards providing a water supply for this State that will do them credit. The Mines Department has supported Amdel in that organization's desalination investigations by contributing \$3,511 in 1965-66 and \$28,982 in 1966-67, a total of \$32,493. In addition, a contribution of \$36,000 has been budgeted for 1967-68. These committees are working together. Although I dealt at some length with the activities of the State departments, I referred only to broad lines, because time would not permit me to give greater detail. I have brought to the notice of the House that four major departments have many committees functioning. The member for Flinders spoke at length about the formation of the Australian Water Resources Council. He said:

However, South Australia will not be able to benefit as much as the other States from the work of this council.

A statement of that kind makes it necessary for the House to be told of the objects and functions of the Australian Water Resources Council. Far too few are aware of the efforts being made by all Australian departments to get the best result for each State. The objectives and functions of the council are as follows:

Objectives of the council:

The provision of a comprehensive assessment on a continuing basis of Australia's water resources and the extension of measurement and research so that future planning can be carried out on a sound and scientific basis. The assessment would indicate the extent to which availability of water will be a factor in influencing future development. It would show, for instance:

- (a) areas which offer the greatest potential for absorption of population growth from the point of view of availability of unused water resources;
- (b) areas lacking in adequate water resources where special measures may be needed in the near future to provide opportunities for development.

Functions of the council:

- (a) Determine the areas of Australia where information is inadequate for the preparation of reliable assessments of water resources because of lack of measurement of precipitation, evaporation, stream flow and underground water.
- (b) Foster water resources measurement and assessment in areas where deficiencies in information are known to exist with a view to establishing records of precipitation, run-off and underground movement over a long enough period to be of value for future plans.
- (c) Provide collaboration in the broad fields of hydrometeorological research, biological research, the efficiency of engineering structures and the use of natural water courses as water conveyors with the aim of controlling run-off, decreasing evaporation, transpiration and seepage losses and promoting re-use of water.
- (d) Foster improvements in and standardization of hydrological measurement, standardization of analysis and provide a means of publication of the results of such works.
- (e) Promote education in hydrological research and engineering hydrology with the aim of increasing knowledge and the availability of trained personnel.
- (f) Further a close and continuous liaison with overseas and international activities in the field of water resources.
- (g) Provide a means of collaboration in respect of local and overseas investigations in the field of water resources, to assist such investigations and to minimize duplication.

- (h) Promote continuous collaboration between agencies dealing with the conservation of water (both surface and sub-surface) and those agencies concerned with mapping and land use, forests and other natural resources having inter-related problems.
- (i) Review water resources research activities by Government authorities and by non-government organizations with a view to fostering collaboration in such activities.
- (j) Consider matters submitted by the standing committee.

If objective (b) does not refer to South Australia, I should like to know what it does refer to. Again, item (c) in the functions of the council refers to South Australia. This council has been set up to co-ordinate the work of the Government departments throughout the Commonwealth of Australia and to advance every part of Australia in the development of water resources. However, we are being told that we must duplicate this work. The very function of the council (and this was supported by South Australia and we subscribe to it) was to prevent duplication. This committee is doing mighty work. As an example, I refer to parts of item 15, "Detailed forward estimate of availability of usable water resources", which was dealt with in this way in the report to the 1967 meeting of the council, which I attended:

(1) At its sixth meeting (April 1966) council, having considered a report by standing committee, agreed that a detailed assessment of availability of usable water resources in the longer term should be made as soon as practicable, and asked standing committee to submit an appropriate report to the council.

(2) Standing committee considered this matter further at its meeting on February 6 and 7, 1967, and reported to council that a comprehensive assessment of usable water resources would, at present, necessarily be a rather speculative project, because of the lack of reliable data, not only on water but also on potential use. Such an assessment should ultimately be made, however. Standing committee considered that in the meantime, a useful but less comprehensive study would be a State-by-State collection and collation of the results of investigations of water resources development. This would involve collection of all data available (both published and unpublished) from the appropriate State and Commonwealth water authorities by a single centralized agency, possibly the A.W.R.C. secretariat.

(3) Council agreed that, as a first step in a general assessment of water resources (surface and underground) capable of development, the A.W.R.C. secretariat should during 1967 collect and collate the results of those investigations throughout Australia which provided

useful data on potential water resources development, and prepare a report for standing committee.

(4) Following a discussion on the need for more complete information on cost-benefit analysis of water projects council agreed that the A.W.R.C. secretariat should assemble information on methods used in Australia and other countries and report to standing committee.

This work is continuing, yet we are asked to spend the State's resources on duplicating the work of this committee unnecessarily. It has long been realized that the storage and distribution of water is most important to this State. Although it is difficult to anticipate the effect of drought and flood, South Australia has every reason to be thankful and proud of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, which has and is continuing to plan for the future water resources of this State. We have every reason to be confident that future supplies will meet the demands, as they have met them in the past. The department has planned to meet the needs for the next 33 years, and there are at least five major departments or bodies co-operating in this respect in the interests of South Australia. Another committee would overlap this work, would be costly and useless. This motion is obviously a Party-political gimmick, and I oppose it because it must be rejected.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I believe that every member, at least on this side, was sorry to see the Minister of Works placed in the position he was put in this afternoon. The way in which members of his Party rushed to his support shows how touchy the Government is on the question of water supply, and how worried it is about its public image and the public reaction to its disastrous water supply policy. I think that the vicious personal attack that the Minister chose to make on a respected member of this House, who is an ex-Minister of Works, showed the Minister completely out of character. I am sure that we all, in the past (and certainly up to today), have regarded him as a courteous Minister who had never sunk to this level of personal attack—certainly not to my knowledge. The view of the motion that he took this afternoon, moved in all sincerity by the member for Flinders, was really pathetic.

Nothing could have been moved in a less partisan manner than the motion moved by the member for Flinders and seconded by the member for Torrens, both intelligent men who have had great experience in this branch of public works. This afternoon the Minister

chose to concentrate on the present water supply conditions, and thereby missed the whole purpose of the motion, which was designed to safeguard the future water supply of this State. He does his department and his departmental heads a disservice when he suggests that this motion indicts them. By his comments this afternoon and by his attack on a constructive motion, he, not the member for Flinders, is suggesting that his officers are not doing the job. His speech was an apology for the Government and nothing else.

The Minister said something about internal programmes and the various committees that are engaged in working out those programmes and ensuring that the policy of the department is carried out. We on this side are well aware that there are committees of this kind within the department: in all departments there are internal committees whose responsibility it is to advise and ascertain facts and place them before the Minister so that policy can be developed. We know that these committees exist, and all the motion suggested was that these committees and a special expert committee should collaborate and co-operate in the interest of the future water supply of South Australia. The member for Flinders suggested possible members of the proposed committee: they are all experts in the field of water conservation and water supply. It was suggested that these people should collaborate with the existing committees.

The Minister complained that a committee of this kind would be difficult to set up; that it would be difficult to find the funds for it; and that it would not know what its job was. The motion suggested to the Government that such a committee should be set up, but the Government would have to decide its responsibilities and the ambit of its deliberations. The motion, supported by all members on this side, was in the interests of South Australia, and that was its sole purport. The Minister has completely and utterly disregarded this attitude, and has made out that the motion was an attack on his department and on his administration.

Mr. Coumbe: He twisted it completely.

Mrs. STEELE: Of course. Having said that, in reply to what the Minister said, I say again how much I regret that he took the stand he did. Probably no-one in this Parliament is better qualified to move this motion than is the member for Flinders, an ex-Minister of Works, who

for seven years guided this department and identified himself closely with its activities and its policies. Perhaps no-one has been more closely associated with many of the major developments of water supply and reticulation in South Australia than has the member for Flinders who, when moving the motion, had in his mind the technical documents that he would have studied during the years he occupied the office of Minister of Works, and also would have clearly in his memory discussions that he had with senior members of the department.

It is of value to any Parliament to have such a person available, and to scoff and scorn at the advice that he gave to this House was a disgraceful act on the part of the Minister. Anything the member for Flinders speaks about in this field should be treated with much respect. Obviously, the Government is touchy about the question of water supply, and the people of the State must realize how much confusion is present in the ranks of the hierarchy of the Labor Party. It is no wonder that people are confused about the true position in this present crisis.

I was in London when I first heard that the Chowilla project was likely to be turned down and, naturally, as a South Australian, apart from being a member of Parliament, I was dismayed, because I knew how important it was to South Australia that this project should be completed, so that a huge volume of water could be impounded and be available to the State. After reading the newspapers available to me in the office of the Agent-General in London, it seemed to me that the Government was not taking the strong steps that it should have taken to safeguard the interests of this State. Neither did it seem to consider how much money had already been spent on preliminary works associated with the scheme. Similarly, it seemed to me, when I heard the news in London, that we had too easily handed over to the Victorian Government extra offshore territory, giving Victoria greater opportunity for the exploration for oil under the sea. It seems to me that in these two fields the Government has lightly handed over the birthright of South Australia.

The provision of water was always considered by the previous Government to be of prime importance; the supply was always kept ahead of development and, on the advice of its senior officers, the Playford Government exploited every available site in order to conserve water. I have always understood,

as I am certain every member has always understood, that the State's water supply was secured until the early 1970's at which time the Chowilla dam would come into use, and that at that stage, with the exception of some minor sites that might be developed for water services, South Australia would have reached the limit of its capacity to conserve water within its boundaries. The provision of cheap water to industrial undertakings has always gone hand in hand with the State's development and has been one of the most important means of attracting industry to South Australia. Indeed, it is imperative that the ready availability of water should continue and that supplies should be increased, if South Australia is to compete with other States that are much more generously endowed with natural resources.

For that reason, if for no other, the motion of the member for Flinders should commend itself to the House. I repeat that the honourable member spoke in the interests of South Australia and not for one moment in a partisan manner, and if members take the trouble to study the motion they will be quite unable to detect in it anything that is of a partisan nature. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe), who spoke in some detail of the technical aspects associated with water desalination, had obviously undertaken much research into what was taking place in Australia today as well as in oversea countries. I learnt much from what he said about this aspect and about the sites at which he said processes were being investigated. The honourable member referred also to smaller-scale projects that were already operating to the advantage of people receiving this type of water supply. I understand that over the years the cost of desalination has fallen, and a dry continent such as Australia is, of course, in a special position to benefit from the application of such a process. I learned from the honourable member's speech that a plant was already in use at Coober Pedy, and that plants were operating at a sort of pilot level in some of the other States.

Mr. Casey: Whereabouts?

Mrs. STEELE: There are some in Western Australia, at Northam and at Rottneest Island. I recall that years ago Dr. J. C. Bradfield, who designed the Sydney Harbour bridge, sincerely propounded a scheme to conserve the waters of the inland rivers. I recall, too, when visiting the Snowy Mountains, hearing the scientist, who was in charge of

research and experimental works associated with the authority, expound a theory concerning the underground explosion in the centre of Australia of some sort of atomic device that would have the effect of providing a vast underground reservoir into which the waters of the inland rivers could be fed, so that in **time of drought these waters could be used** for irrigation and domestic purposes. One has only to travel through the Northern Territory to see the use made of waters that have been dammed and reticulated and to see what can **be grown under favourable conditions** in the arid interior of Australia. During the last war the army was able to maintain at Northern Territory camps a supply of vegetable produce by using river waters that were conserved for the purpose. Many methods remain to be explored within this dry continent in order to conserve water, and the conversion of salt water into something fit for human consumption would bear further examination.

Mr. Coumbe: It was announced today that the United States was going to install some more plants in the Middle East.

Mrs. STEELE: Yes, in order to augment what already exists there.

Mr. Casey: How do underground storages in Central Australia affect South Australia?

Mrs. STEELE: I was referring not specifically to South Australia but simply to the many methods of conservation that had been undertaken in various parts of the world. These could well be studied with a view to their application in South Australia. I said that desalination was one of the schemes suggested to conserve water in Australia's interior and, indeed, I believe it is particularly applicable to South Australia. I know that officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department have closely studied this process in the past, but that present costs are almost prohibitive. As we well know, South Australia has the poorest natural water resources in the Commonwealth, so that for our future continued development we should be experimenting with desalination now in order to make use of new discoveries before our water conservation programme is at rock bottom. The membership of the committee suggested by the member for Flinders is a good one, because it comprises experienced and able former senior officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department—experts who over a long period have been associated with every major development in water conservation in this State.

These people know what difficulties can occur and are conversant with the problems that will have to be solved if we are to provide an adequate water supply in the future. I believe that the Government cannot do other than follow up the suggestions made by the member for Flinders. I was interested when the Minister in summing up referred to the activities and composition of the Water Resources Council, quoting at length the aims of that council which, of course, has a national application. Although the Minister related the aims specifically to South Australia, that was not, of course, the object of the council. South Australia has not been well served by the national water committees, when we consider the situation in which we find ourselves today as regards Chowilla alone. It is time that South Australia set up its own special committee to examine South Australia's interests alone and not in relation to the whole of the Commonwealth. I support the motion, and I hope all members (including those on the Government benches) will follow suit.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): There is not the slightest doubt from his reaction that the Minister of Works is a guilty man, because he has gambled with South Australian water supplies and lost. There are indications that the Government and the Minister intend to gamble again, by procrastinating about restrictions. They are saying that, if the public does the right thing and does not waste water, restrictions will not be imposed. That appears to be the tenor of the Government's argument although one would suspect from the Minister's answers today and during the last several days that there is dissension between Cabinet members regarding this. It appears obvious from his reply that the Government is divided on whether it should gamble again. So far it appears from public pronouncements that it will do this and say to the public, "You have to look after the water supplies". The corollary is that, if it cannot supply the water, the Government will blame the people for not observing self-restrictions. That is obviously its tactics, if it agrees with this point and resolves its dissension.

The Minister does not like facing up to the penalties of losing the gamble and it is obvious that he is unprepared in thought and deed for the emergency that has arisen here because of the drought. He has shown great strain today and has chided the mover of this motion and the House for playing politics. He said

he had never played politics with public works, but no Minister in this House has played politics with public works more than he has. One has only to refer to a recent announcement that was made when work was ordered to restart on the Taillem Bend to Keith main (a project begun by the previous Administration and stopped by this Administration). The stopping of this work was severely criticized by the Opposition. What did the Minister say when the work was restarted? He said it was restarted at the request of the member for Murray (Hon. G. A. Bywaters) and one other member.

Mr. Millhouse: The member for Murray is in some electoral difficulty, isn't he?

Mr. HALL: Yes. Is it not playing politics when the Government stops work started by a previous Administration and then restarts it? Nothing could be more dishonest or political than that.

Mr. Coumbe: Why was it timed like that?

Mr. HALL: To rescue the Minister of Agriculture from his electoral difficulties. Who is playing more politics with regard to hospitals than the Minister of Works? Two hospitals have been promised for three years, but not one cent has been provided on the Estimates for them, yet the Minister is a member of the Government. The member for Glenelg, the Government's famous back-bencher, gave a long apology yesterday for the Government's inability to build them in the promised period. The Government has played politics, and will continue to do so. It has been unable to carry out its programme of capital works because it has used the capital funds of the State to meet Budget requirements, and nothing could be more political than that. It has failed to face up to the demands made on Consolidated Revenue and has run to the Capital Account screaming, "interest payments are running the State into trouble", yet it has used capital for non-returnable assets. Nothing is more political than that.

It is futile for the Minister, under the strain of the public accusation mounting against him for his failure to provide adequately to meet this emergency, to blame the Opposition for being political. If he falls down in his job it is political, because someone else could have done better. I say without hesitation that the Liberal and Country League Administration has shown by its record that it has looked after the State's water supplies and needs much better than has the present Administration.

Mr. Hughes: Your record put you where you are.

Mr. HALL: The member for Wallaroo is pretty good at pipelines. He keeps them as far from his own district as he can, especially if they happen to convey gas. What happened in 1959-60? The member for Glenelg was happy to ask the Minister for a comparison between that year and the present. On October 27, 1959, metropolitan reservoirs held just over 6,000,000,000 gallons. Today, taking into account the usage since the figures were last given, they would be about 12,000,000,000 gallons.

Mr. Hughes: What has that got to do with it?

Mr. HALL: It has everything to do with the honourable member's interjection. He asked for our previous record, and I am giving it to him. If he wants it, he should listen. The requirements for the metropolitan area have, by the Minister's own statement in the House, risen since that time from 23,000,000,000 gallons to 31,000,000,000 gallons, or by 35 per cent. We were 6,000,000,000 gallons behind in 1959, and therefore we are 2,000,000,000 gallons worse off today by comparison with usage.

What has the Government done in regard to pumping in the three crucial months of June, July and August? **The Minister had the effrontery to use the figures today and compare this year's pumping with that of 1959.** He said that, in those same three months in 1959, 4,539,000,000 gallons was pumped compared with the 4,835,000,000 gallons pumped in 1967 (an increase of 296,000,000 gallons, or 7 per cent). The demand has increased by 35 per cent and yet at this crucial time of decision making, when the Government has to assess the future prospects of water supply in this State, it has deliberately chosen to increase pumping by only 7 per cent. It could have increased it more, but it did not: it chose this figure. Why has the capacity of the pipeline been increased since 1959? Is the answer so that it could be left idle in times of emergency? Apparently it is. We had the main capacity and we did not use it, although looking back to 1959 we can see that we should have used it. Any comparison of the relative capacity and needs in the metropolitan area between now and 1959 would have forced even a computer to record that this water should be used. However, such a comparison did not force the Government to do so. The Minister

said (and I think the Premier said it, too) that this must be balanced with the finances of the State. Is that the reason why the Government did not pump? Is this to be another instance where the Government's failure to manage its business will affect the people? Today the Minister said that pumping from bores in the metropolitan area will begin on October 1. I suppose the Minister is leaving that pumping until then because he is not ready to have it commenced now. Why is he ignoring the lesson of 1959? Either he is gambling again on an improvement in weather conditions or the pumps are not ready.

Mr. Hurst: A change is working up.

Mr. HALL: If he is gambling a second time on a change in the weather, the result of the second gamble will be about as good as the result of the first. I say that the Minister has gambled and lost. He is under strain, as he demonstrated in the House today, because he faces the consequences of losing the gamble he took in failing to pump sufficient water in the crucial months of June, July, and August. Knowing that the demand in the metropolitan area had increased since 1959 by 35 per cent (and they were his own figures), he arranged to increase pumping in those three months by only 7 per cent, although the holdings in the reservoirs compared with those of 1959 showed that we were in a worse position than we were in 1959. The Minister has failed to face up to this situation. Although we started behind scratch in comparison with 1959, he refused to use the additional main capacity available. He deliberately chose to take a risk, his gamble failed, and we now have insufficient water supplies for the coming season.

At one stage the Minister even said that he did not have power to work the pumps. As the Government delayed to carry out some necessary work at the new power station at Torrens Island, this makes the Minister even more culpable.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: I didn't say that: I said that power was not available.

Mr. HALL: That will do me; if the Minister wants to put two meanings into that then it is all right with me—it means only one thing to me. It is the Minister's responsibility to see that power is available to work pumps that must increasingly bear the load to provide the metropolitan area and many country areas with water. Nothing else that has happened

has emphasized more the need for a committee to examine water supply than the case to which I have just referred.

The Government had the experience of 1959 to guide it and it even had a computer to analyze the situation. It must have realized that what was being done was less than what was done in 1959. It failed to use the extra capacity of the main. It has failed to activate the bores in the metropolitan area at this stage. If anything has demonstrated that our criticism over recent years is justified it is the great mis-management in this case which will become evident to the people of South Australia. I support the motion to appoint a committee to investigate various aspects of water supply, a matter that has become urgent because of the Government's failure.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I fully support the motion. I do not intend to be political other than to reply to the Minister of Works, who became most political in his speech. I believe a lack of power is the reason that pumps in the western districts are not being used at present. The electricity supply in South Australia is strained to the limit. The serious mishap that occurred at the Torrens Island power station may have been purely accidental. However, it is not the first mishap that the Electricity Trust has had in the last year or two. Departmental inquiries are conducted into these matters the findings of which are kept secret. Departmental inquiries are also held into matters affecting the Railways Department. I believe independent inquiries should be held. I admit that, in connection with the mishap at Torrens Island, legal aspects may prevent an independent inquiry being held immediately but such an inquiry should be held at some stage. This is not an isolated instance, and I have heard it said by people working for the trust that an independent inquiry should be held into these matters.

The Minister said that certain bodies in South Australia were doing work connected with water supply. Those facts should have been publicized so that we could have had a little more knowledge of what was going on in this respect. The Government has employed many public relations officers, but they are not telling the people what the departments are doing. They are selling individuals, such as the Premier, and are not doing a very good job because they do not have good material on which to work. However, as they are employed and paid for by the people of South Australia, they should give

information to those people rather than provide the material we hear with regular monotony on television.

What are the facts about the Murray River, which is the life blood of South Australia in regard to water supply? We have found out that the River Murray Commission does not have control regarding the polluting of the river in other States. I have the following report of a statement by a member of the Commonwealth Parliament about the upper reaches of the river:

He said this requested the Federal Government to introduce legislation to give power to the River Murray Commission over tributaries, creeks and drains that disposed of effluent into the main stream of the Murray. At present the commission had no such powers, and was in no position to properly control the quality of water to be used by fruit growers, etc., along its banks. One factor responsible for the deferment of the major Chowilla dam scheme was high salinity caused by irresponsible disposal into the Murray.

One reason given for the delay has been the need for inquiry about salinity. Nature has not brought about these circumstances; they have been brought about because of neglect by man. The report continues:

It was alleged at the present time that Barr Creek, near Kerang, was pouring effluent at 1,000 parts a million of salt into the Murray. The flow was of such a rate that the count in the River Murray below that point was up to 750 grains a million. This was the slug of salt water that had been referred to frequently over the last week or two. Along the bank below Swan Hill, four or five pumping stations were putting highly saline drainage water into the River Murray—some of it up to 500 grains a million. At Robinvale there was at least an attempt by the Victorian Government to discharge some of its drainage water into billabongs and creeks.

In the Sunraysia area, some of the drainage from Redcliffs went directly into the River Murray. At Lake Hawthorn, the outflow from drains was at the rate of 5 to 6 cusecs and this highly saline water was concentrated in an evaporation pan. As evaporation occurred this water became even more saline. At some times of the year this highly saline water leaked or was put back into the River Murray.

The stupid part of this situation was that it would do considerably less damage if it were pumped straight into the River Murray in the first place. At Mildura two gypsum washing plants used water from the Murray to wash their copi crystals.

At a time when New York was experiencing the biggest drought in its history and water restrictions were in operation, millions of gallons of water from the top tributaries of the Hudson River was flowing past the city. That water could not be used because, although

it was originally fresh, it had become polluted by man in the higher reaches. That kind of pollution is happening in the Murray River at present. The report continues:

This water then went back into the river at approximately one cusec rate and at 200 grains a million. There was an ancillary problem here, in that this action also contributed to silting up of the river at that point. At Curlwaa all the drainage went back into the river. At Coomealla there were some pans, and some water was put directly back into the Murray. In South Australia, from Wentworth to Mannum, there was no return of drainage water into the River Murray.

We must commend South Australia's departmental officers and also the present and previous Governments for having looked after South Australia's interests so far as control is concerned. However, the neglect that has caused pollution in the upper reaches of the river is disastrous. Lake Alexandrina is up to barrage level and water is going over even on calm days. In a period of three days of north winds much more water would be wasted. I have been trying to find out why this water is in the lake when the storages in the Upper Murray are so low. It seems to me that we should find the answer on this matter.

I have lived at the end of the Murray River for most of my life and have seen millions of gallons of water wasted. I read in the *Advertiser* that 8,000,000 acre feet of water came to South Australia in a normal year. That figure seems high, but nevertheless the commission has said that about 350,000 acre feet will be available for diversion. Surely we must think again on this matter. Although I have not accurate figures of the storages in Lake Alexandrina, I know that far more water is held in the lower reaches of the river than would be held in Chowilla dam. Investigations should be made to determine whether use can be made of that water without depriving landholders around the lake of their riparian rights. Most things that become of value are said to be crackpot ideas when they are first suggested.

Mr. Clark: Do you want the water to run uphill?

Mr. McANANEY: I once had an argument with a man about that and he told me that water did run uphill because land at the Equator was 14ft. higher than at the South Pole. Perhaps the member who is so smart in interjecting may be able to correct that statement if it is wrong. Consideration ought to be given to the storing of water in areas such as the poorer stony district around Kanmantoo so

that that water can be gravitated to the plains in time of need. The report about the use of the Murray River water was made by three well qualified officers. However, I have said previously that five people accustomed to irrigation practice or even five primary producers would not comprise a good committee, because there would not be a diversity of opinion. In the same way, excellent though these officers may be as individuals, the constitution of the committee is such that there is not a diversity of opinion. The correct use of Murray River water requires much planning. At present many irrigation schemes are being implemented, perhaps because landholders think water restrictions will be imposed and also because of the drought. If the Murray water becomes saline Lake Alexandrina, or part of it, could have a reasonable degree of salinity. Consequently, much forward planning is necessary.

Water considered salty at Renmark would be relished in the lower reaches of the Murray, where we can use water with a salt content of 250 grains to irrigate lucerne; such saline water would burn trees elsewhere. If the lake had water with a salinity of up to 100 grains, such water would be of great value and would enable hundreds of milking cows to be carried on the surrounding land, whereas such water would be rejected elsewhere. It is in this field that constructive planning is essential, but I doubt whether it is taking place at present.

I should also like to refer to the great amount of evaporation that takes place in the lakes. I point out that Lake Albert is comparatively shallow; indeed, much of it is very shallow. I think there is a main channel extending down the middle of the lake, and I know of many estuaries only 3ft. or 4ft. deep. If evaporation was reduced, more water would be available for irrigation. Although many committees have been set up, I doubt whether any committee would have worked along these lines and looked 30 years ahead. An article in the *Advertiser*, headed "Water Conservation Project for New South Wales", states:

Plans for a massive \$1,200,000,000 water conservation project affecting every major river and tributary in New South Wales were announced tonight.

This announcement emphasizes that less Murray water will reach South Australia when these projects are operating. I know that they are not included in the calculations of the River Murray Commission, but much of this

water did reach South Australia, particularly in the summer months, when it was very valuable around the lakes. The article continues:

The project is one of the largest of its kind ever devised and will take 25 years to complete. It is expected to increase the State's rural economy by \$300,000,000 a year. Mr. Beale also announced an initial five-year plan costing \$261,500,000.

He said this short-term programme would entail the construction of 10 dams and 48 weirs. Completion of the overall plan in 25 years would depend on the participation of the Commonwealth Government, which would be asked to contribute \$497,250,000 in grants and loans.

Here we see a State that has planned ahead; I do not say that this is not happening to some extent in South Australia, but the public should be told of the position here. We know that the Australian Water Resources Council is doing much work in co-ordinating the efforts of the various State bodies, and the Commonwealth Government is advancing \$50,000,000 over a period towards financing a survey of water resources. This survey will assess how much water is available in Australia, but I very much doubt whether it will deal with some of the suggestions I have made. As I have suggested, consideration of such suggestions should be the responsibility of a committee.

Regarding the question of underground water, I think there was a plan on the schedule of the Mines Department 18 months ago to put down a test bore in the Langhorne Creek area, where the water table has fallen considerably. I was recently informed that money was not available to the Mines Department to do this work, yet this Government, whilst using Loan moneys for purposes previously financed by Budget allocations, has reduced the allocation to the Mines Department, with the result that such work cannot be carried out. The Government must accept responsibility for this.

Little publicity has been given to the question of remedying the underground water position. Recently somebody told me that outside Berlin there is a shaft a few yards square where millions of gallons of water are being diverted. There are so many committees; there was a committee to inquire into the use of the Bolivar effluent. It has been stressed how valuable water is in the northern plains, and we must remember that restrictions have been imposed on the landholders there.

Mr. Casey: What would the honourable member do with the water?

Mr. McANANEY: That is such a simple question that I shall leave it to the honourable member himself, because I think even he could answer that question.

Mr. Clark: How would you keep it safe?

Mr. McANANEY: The Government is not even taking notice of the committee that told it how this water could be used. I point out that it is flowing out to sea whereas it could be used on the northern plains. I was one of the first to start irrigating from Lake Alexandrina, and I dug one of the first channels with a shovel; so no-one can say that I do not know anything about irrigation. Nobody has suggested that the water should be used for drinking purposes, but I refer honourable members to an article, published in the *Readers Digest* some time ago, which states that various States in the United States of America are using effluent water, even for swimming.

At present a diversified committee, the members of which have knowledge of irrigation and water conservation, is needed. From what the Minister of Works has said, the Government is to proclaim conditions under which people will be allowed to use the waters from the Murray River. People constructing irrigation schemes do not know what is to happen and, up to the present, no information has been available to them. As costs rise in Australia it is becoming difficult to export our primary produce and beef is the only profitable export at present. All these matters should be considered, but they are not being considered by the present Government. I hope that Government members interested in primary production will support the motion, as I do, because it affects and is important to, every section of the community.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): After listening to Opposition members, I realize that none of them has spoken to the motion. We had a political speech from the Leader of the Opposition: "When did the Government start pumping from the Mannum-Adelaide main? It should have done it earlier. We shall be short of water"—and so on. The member for Burnside spoke about water resources throughout Australia and referred to the opinion of a Mr. Bradfield, I think, who had the theory that the rivers on the north-east coast of Australia should be diverted inland. It seems to me that all the chatter we have heard is not related to the motion.

I was surprised when the member for Flinders moved it, because it emphasized that he was the Minister of Works in the Playford Government. I will never understand what prompted him to move in this way. He knows, and has told me so many times, that the department has collated information for many years and has already planned for a water supply for this State for the next 33 years. The member for Torrens expressed concern about the water supply in the Virginia area, and the member for Stirling criticized the Government for restricting market gardeners in that area.

Mr. McAnaney: Wait a bit: stick to the facts.

Mr. CASEY: That is what the honourable member implied a moment ago.

Mr. McAnaney: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. CASEY: The Playford Government introduce the Underground Waters Preservation Bill, which was passed by both Houses but never proclaimed. When the Labor Party assumed office it realized that the supply of underground water would become a problem. The Virginia area was one of the few sites near Adelaide that could be used by market gardeners, but their supply of water had to be limited. On the advice of experts the present Government proclaimed this necessary Act. I was pleased that the member for Torrens said that the Mines Department had no alternative but to protect the small quantity of water available for the people already producing, in this area, vegetables for the Adelaide market.

What will happen if this Act is not policed? Obviously, there will be indiscriminate boring and pumping of water, so that eventually salt will enter the basin. That would be a calamity, because it would cause market gardeners to go out of production. In America today the consumption of water is expected to increase to about 15,000 gallons a minute. This estimate was made by the Federal Government in America. That country, which probably has more problems than we have in this respect, is endeavouring to use every conceivable method of conserving water.

As mentioned by the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe), one of the latest developments in America is in the desalting of water. We have thrashed this question out in this House for many years, but at the present time desalting is not a practical proposition in South Australia. The member for Flinders knows this. I heard him say something along those lines in this House several years ago when this

matter was raised, and he has had the advice of departmental officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department who are keeping in close contact with desalting methods throughout the world. The whole purpose of this motion is to set up a committee of retired engineers from the Engineering and Water Supply Department to look into this matter. However, those men have already done that; they have collated information over the years on this very thing, and there is no point in this motion because all that information is readily available. Therefore, what is the sense of it? We know the capabilities of our water resources in South Australia, and Lord only knows we do not have many. I have already referred to the small underground supply in the Virginia area. Of course, the biggest source of supply is the Murray River.

This brings me to the question of the Chowilla dam, which is an absolute necessity. For members opposite to say that we have done nothing in this matter is completely nonsensical. Several years ago, when we were in Opposition in the House, we moved a motion to force the hand of the Commonwealth Government regarding the standardization of the railway line between Broken Hill and Port Pirie. I recall that I seconded the motion. The Government of that time supported it, and it became a unanimous decision of this House. Some time ago a move was made regarding the Chowilla dam, but on that occasion we did not receive the same co-operation from members opposite as we gave to the Government of the day on the standardization motion. Both of these things are very important to South Australia.

Mr. Heaslip: What more could we have done?

Mr. CASEY: An attempt was made to make political capital out of it. Even after the motion was carried in this House, questions were still being asked by the Leader of the Opposition about this very thing.

Mr. Heaslip: That was because we could not get any information about it.

Mr. CASEY: That is ridiculous. The present Government, when in Opposition, did not carry on in that fashion regarding the question of rail standardization.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The Government of the day gave the Opposition a chance to move its motion, but in regard to Chowilla members of the present Government prevented us from moving our motion.

Mr. CASEY: I do not think this Government can be accused of ever preventing free speech in this Chamber.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: A Ministerial statement took priority over everything else, and the Opposition was not able to move its motion.

Mr. CASEY: I thank the honourable member for his interjection. However, I point out that Government members and the Ministers on the front bench have said several times that they have never prevented the Opposition from introducing legislation, nor have they ever prevented free speech in this Chamber.

Mr. Hall: What about the motion in respect of fisheries?

Mr. CASEY: Let us get back to the present motion. Many suggestions have been put forward regarding the future water resources of this State. I should like to tell members opposite what progress is being made overseas, particularly in America, with the desalting of water. The latest report from the Office of Saline Water in Washington states that on August 9 last year a start was made on what probably will be the biggest saline water plant in the world. That plant will operate in conjunction with an atomic power station. Of course, we cannot think along these lines because the cost is absolutely prohibitive.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: The entire resources of that nation are behind it.

Mr. CASEY: Yes, it is a Federal undertaking. The fact that that country has set aside about \$60,000,000 for a start on such a project, which is to be undertaken over a period of years, indicates just what that country is prepared to do in this matter. We can watch that experiment with interest, and no doubt as a result of the money being spent in other parts of the world we will ultimately derive some benefit. We cannot ever hope to spend that amount of money on this kind of thing, not in our lifetime, anyway. As part of the plan, America is to build an atomic power station capable of generating nearly 2,000,000 kilowatts, which means that it will be as big as the Torrens Island power station eventually will be, and in conjunction with that there will be a 150,000,000-gallon a day saline plant in operation.

This plant will be able to produce water fit for domestic use at a cost of 25c a thousand gallons. The cost can be kept down to that figure only because of the size of the plant being used, for this is what determines the economics of converting saline water to fresh

water. America is trying to get some sort of sanity in this question of the desalting of water in plants around the 1,000,000 gallons a day mark. Although a breakthrough has not yet been made, according to the report I mentioned America hopes to have a substantial breakthrough during the next two years. Technology has advanced to such a stage that the authorities there are completely hopeful of breaking through not only in the reverse osmosis aspect of desalting water but also in other fields. But of course the cheapest method known today is the distillation method, which is at present being used at Coober Pedy. I have often commended the Engineering and Water Supply and Mines Departments for the way in which they have progressed with this scheme. The first of its kind in South Australia, this scheme is proving satisfactory in the area. Because of the cooler winter months its capacity has decreased, but the principle has worked so well that I foresee other country centres converting brackish water by means of this method. Getting back to the actual motion—

Mr. Millhouse: About time, too!

Mr. CASEY: I have been speaking to the motion but, of course, the honourable member is so wrapped up in his own importance that he does not give anyone else any credit.

Mr. Quirke: Give it away!

Mr. CASEY: If the honourable member tells the member for Mitcham to pull his head in, I shall give it away. First, officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department are quite capable of fulfilling the function that the member for Flinders seeks to create. Secondly, those named to form the committee are ex-departmental officers whose knowledge and experience have already been used by the department. Thirdly, South Australia's natural water supplies are lacking because we have only a limited underground supply that is suitable for domestic or agricultural purposes. The vast quantities of underground water that exist in the North of this State are not much use; artesian water, which contains too much soda, is unsuitable for cultivating any type of vegetation. This water can be used only for stock, and even stock must become used to it. I oppose the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I was disappointed in the speech made by the Minister, not only in the way he delivered it but in the line he took. He rejected the motion for reasons that I find difficult to accept. The real

reason why I was disappointed in his speech was that he showed a narrowness of outlook and a lack of foresight that I believe to be downright alarming. The only case he could make out to oppose the motion was one based on detail and on a defence of his own actions since he has been a Minister. We know that, although the Minister prides himself on being urbane and unflappable, he is, in fact, one of the touchiest of the Ministers.

Mr. McAnaney: That's saying something!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Anything that has the slightest smack of criticism of him brings forth an immediate reaction. I remember only too well that a few weeks ago, when a couple of medical practitioners called on the Minister, he would not even talk to them; he had called them quacks beforehand and, because they refused to shake hands with him, he called the police. If that was not the example of a touchy Minister at his touchiest, I do not know what it was. We had another example of that today in what he said. This is a big matter and something that concerns the future of the State, at least for the rest of this century, which is about as far ahead as we can look.

But before I get on to the size of the matter, I wish to raise two other matters that really arose during Question Time today: one was the way the Minister refused to give any information about water restrictions, or their likelihood, in this State during the coming summer—another example if ever there were one of the touchiness of this Minister. I said I sympathized with the difficult position in which his own Leader had put him, because the Minister said in the House on August 31:

If the necessary rainfall is recorded there will be no restrictions.

There has not been any rainfall to speak of since then. The Minister then said:

I admit that the position is causing grave concern but the worst metropolitan run-off for 80 years makes the present position serious. Unless suitable rains are received there will be restrictions: there must be.

And yet the Minister having said that (and this was not the first time that he had said the same thing; we all sympathize with him, although we blame him in part at least for what has happened), his own Leader came out yesterday and said that voluntary restrictions may be sufficient. This was an embarrassing situation for the Minister to be in, and one can only imagine what conversations must have taken place between the Premier and his Deputy.

Mr. Coumbe: Conversations?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We do not know; I say that we can only imagine what took place, although looking across the Chamber it is not difficult to see. This is an important matter on which all people in this State are entitled to have the facts at the earliest possible opportunity. But what do we get today? The Minister who is in charge of the department having deliberately said one thing on a number of occasions and his Leader having said another thing, we get an absolute refusal from the Minister, whose responsibility it is, to say anything today about this serious situation. He says there will be a decision in a few days but when asked when that will be he says that he does not know. This is a laughable situation into which we in South Australia have fallen. Whose voice are we to accept on this matter—that of the Minister of Works whose responsibility it is, or that of the Premier who has apparently gone behind the Minister's back, spoken without his knowledge and refused to say on what facts he bases his information? This is one thing about which I complain strongly indeed and about which the people of this State will also complain.

The other matter (and in the long run it is perhaps even more serious) is the blank refusal by the Premier this afternoon to give any information at all about the Government's plans concerning the Chowilla dam project. What do we find that he does? Yesterday, with some heat, the Premier defended the action of Mr. Beaney (our representative on the River Murray Commission) in giving away this project and agreeing to its deferment. In the House the Premier was inclined to blame us for even suggesting any other course of action, and yet what do we find him doing when he gets out of the House? He says this State will take legal action on the matter. I may say that I think we should have taken a stronger line at the commission, and I think we should take legal action now if it is necessary. But what do we find when we ask him today? We find that he has no idea when this legal action will be taken because he does not know when the decision upon which it hinges will be taken. This means that we are simply wasting time in South Australia on a project which, it is agreed on all sides, is of vital concern to the future of us all. When we ask him further what legal action is contemplated, he gives a smart answer and refuses to say what he has in mind.

When Sir Thomas Playford was Premier he did not hesitate, when he thought it was in

the interests of this State, to take legal action, but for some curious reason the present Government talks strongly from time to time but does not live up to its words when it comes to sticking up for the rights of this State. We have seen it happen time and again. This is a prime example of not doing as much as could be done at the negotiating table for our future welfare. This is not good enough. I hope the Minister of Works will be able to exert some influence upon his leader. Goodness knows, it is difficult enough to tell him anything, but we hope the Minister will be able to do something along this line.

Having complained about the absolute refusal of the Government to give information on two matters vital to the future of this State, both of which concern water—restrictions in the near future in South Australia and the Chowilla dam project (or whatever may take its place if it is not to continue in the longer distance)—I should like to turn to the broader picture; but this is probably an appropriate stage at which to ask leave to continue my remarks. Accordingly, I do so.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

SAN JOSE SCALE

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford:

(For wording of motion, see page 684.)

(Continued from July 19. Page 685.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): An amendment has been made to the regulation setting out the definition that was necessary to make the regulation operative. In those circumstances, I now have no objection to the regulation and, therefore, ask leave to withdraw my motion.

Leave granted; motion withdrawn.

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

THE BUDGET

The Estimates—Grand total, \$277,989,000.
In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 12. Page 1860.)

THE LEGISLATURE

Legislative Council, \$41,011.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): The debate on the first line of the Estimates gives a member an opportunity to discuss the position of the State generally. This will probably be my last opportunity in this place to say a few words in that respect. At the outset, I say that, although many problems confront us in South Australia, I am not

one of those who believes that the end of everything is in sight and that we face economic problems that we cannot overcome. I remember when this was a completely primary-producing State and when, if we had a dry season, we were immediately confronted with an enormous unemployment problem.

I remember when the price of primary commodities fell below production cost and we had not .6 or .8 per cent unemployment, as we have now, but about one-third of the bread-winners in the State unemployed. That happened at a time when the Commonwealth Government took no responsibility whatever for unemployment relief. At that time the State had no secondary industries and we received assistance of \$6,000,000 which represented the whole Loan programme for the State. However, we won out from that position in a way that was a credit to the people of the State. Within 20 years, the State had developed industries, improved and made much more effective its rural production, and enticed many people here as new citizens. Indeed, we had reached the position where the Commonwealth politely asked us to refrain from applying for special assistance, because the Commonwealth considered we no longer needed it and could stand on our own feet. Therefore, I do not see a dismal economic future from which there is no escape.

The tremendous upsurge in Western Australia is significant for South Australia, because it places this State close to the centre of things. Western Australia is definitely going places: it has enormous natural resources in the way of mineral deposits and at present it is developing about 1,000,000 acres of agricultural land each year. In those circumstances, far from being on the outer rim of development in Australia (as was the position 20 years ago), South Australia is slowly but surely becoming more of a central State with the advantages that accrue to such a State. I believe the people of South Australia have inherent qualities that have probably been developed because things have not been easy in the past (having things easy does not necessarily develop the character). The fact we have had to fight for our way of life has developed in South Australian people an initiative, enterprise and self-reliance that will stand the State in good stead in face of the competition it will receive in the future.

This afternoon, the State's water supply was debated. In the short term, undoubtedly we are in a difficult position. As I live in the rainfall catchment area of the Adelaide hills,

I know that this year we have not had at any time a good, saturating rain that would have enabled any substantial quantities of water to be taken into the reservoirs in the hills. Although we all hope that one of the depressions slipping away to the south will take a more northerly course, even 3in. or 4in. of rain, although it will help, will not provide the sort of intake that will solve short-term water supply problems.

I do not believe that voluntary restrictions will help much. As I have been in the unfortunate position in which the Government now finds itself, I know that voluntary restrictions lead to all sorts of problems. One type of person will strictly carry out every conservation measure he can. On waking up in the morning he will forgo his shower but, on going outside, he will see four or five sprinklers in his neighbour's garden; this causes him to react violently. I point out that voluntary restrictions impose hardships on conscientious people, whereas those who are not very conscientious and who are not inclined to listen to what is requested of them go almost scot-free. I doubt that that solution will pay off.

I think it is within the terms of the Budget debate to deal with the River Murray Commission, the Murray River waters, and what is implied in the restrictions being imposed. I consider that the difficulty about the River Murray Commission is not as urgent at present at the difficulty with which we are faced in regard to our catchment areas. However, the problem is a much more difficult one for the future. The new agreement, which was arrived at in 1963, was the subject of much conflict among the Governments of the Commonwealth, South Australia and the other States concerned. Whatever we may hear on *Four Corners* about Sir Henry Bolte's being the originator of the Chowilla dam scheme, he had to be persuaded for a long time before he finally accepted and supported the scheme.

Although our Government was on the best of terms with the New South Wales Government at the time, New South Wales was loath to accept the scheme. That State could not see any advantage in it and it came in only after we had got the Commonwealth to agree to provide New South Wales' share of the money. It was unfortunate that the decision was made about the delaying of the Chowilla dam project, and it was unfortunate that our commissioner supported the delay. I think the Premier will realize that our future position has been seriously prejudiced and that we have

given away something unnecessarily. The Premier spoke about the alternatives that were open to the Government, such as flying in the face of providence, defying the other States, resorting to arbitration, or agreeing to delays. He said that the last would be much more advantageous to the State. However, we are supported by an agreement that has been ratified by the three other Governments. I venture to suggest that, if our commissioner had stood fast, the Commonwealth Government could not have repudiated the agreement. If Mr. Beaney had said that we wanted the agreement to go forward in terms of the legislation, the Commonwealth would have allowed the project to go on.

There is no suggestion that the conservation of 5,250,000 acre feet of water in the Murray Valley is not of immense national value. The only objection that has been raised about the project is that the total cost is more likely to be \$60,000,000 than about \$30,000,000, which was originally envisaged. This country can provide \$60,000,000 for an opera house and it can provide enormous sums (and I am not criticizing this) for the Snowy Mountains project. The Snowy project will provide the Murray Valley and the Murrumbidgee River with an additional 1,000,000 acre feet a year. It will not provide electricity more cheaply than it can be provided by other means. The electricity undertaking probably operates at only 25 per cent efficiency because of the lack of water. It was well recognized by Sir William Hudson and others who sponsored the Snowy scheme that the big asset that would result from it would be an additional 1,000,000 acre feet of water that had been flowing into the Pacific Ocean. The cost of that scheme is probably about \$600,000,000, yet the Chowilla scheme would have provided as much water in time of necessity.

The estimated cost of the Chowilla project was not prohibitive and was to be borne by the four Governments. Our cost would have been about \$15,000,000 over four years. As a matter of interest, we have been spending more than that on the Morgan-Whyalla main. The 8,000 miles of trunk mains that this State has built in the last 10 years or 15 years depends on the initial source of water being secured to us. Not much has been said about the effect of the restrictions being imposed on us by the commission and it is rather difficult to get complete data. However, information readily available shows how embarrassing the restrictions will be. I was not surprised to

hear this afternoon that a proclamation was to be made under the River Murray Waters Act. Under the proposed restrictions we are getting a total of 291,000 acre feet, which is supplemented under the Control of Waters Agreement by sufficient water to take care of evaporation in the main stream of the river from where it comes into South Australia to the barrages at Goolwa, but it does not provide for evaporation in Lake Alexandrina and Lake Albert. The enormous quantity of water lost to us from those lakes has to be made up from the 291,000 acre feet.

The latest report of the River Murray Commission for 1965-66 shows that the total diversions in South Australia were 350,000 acre feet. The water to be provided seems to be at least 50,000 acre feet less than the quantity we took out of the river in that year. We all know that this year's rainfall is much less than it was in that year, and if it required 350,000 acre feet last year, plus the quantity necessary to balance the evaporation from the lakes, it is obvious that, with the quantity of water to be provided this year, it will be difficult to meet our requirements. Perhaps some circumstance may arise in the large catchment areas of the river that would make additional water available to the commission, but it is now September and statistics do not support that view. New South Wales and Victoria are in difficulties, and I appreciate their position because I was involved in this matter.

As there has always been an extremely friendly and cordial atmosphere in the commission's administration of the Act, I have known South Australia to relinquish some of its rights to assist the other States and we have received similar courtesies. However, I believe that the water is not available this year to enable that sort of thing to happen. New South Wales and Victoria will each receive 486,000 acre feet. Last year the diversions in Victoria were 2,500,000 acre feet and it made contributions from its tributaries of 1,800,000 acre feet, resulting in net diversions of 748,000 acre feet. If that quantity is to be reduced to 486,000 acre feet there will be no surplus to enable Victoria to make concessions to South Australia except by imposing restrictions on development in that State. In New South Wales the position is worse. Last year the diversions from the river were 2,083,000 acre feet and its contributions through the tributaries were 1,134,000 acre feet, with a net use from the river of 948,000 acre feet.

If that State's figure is reduced to 486,000 acre feet the quantity available will be heavily reduced. Obviously, neither New South Wales nor Victoria will be able to, or will be inclined to, forfeit much to meet the South Australian position.

Some works of the commission cause me concern. When the agreement was drawn up South Australia insisted on having a provision that demanded that restrictions should be called on under certain circumstances. That is included in the Act of 1963: the provision was strenuously opposed by Victoria and New South Wales but, ultimately, South Australia succeeded in having this clause included. If it had been strictly followed the position in South Australia today would have been better than it is. The provision can be disregarded by agreement of the commission and it seems that it has been so disregarded, and this may have caused some of our present troubles. The Government and this Parliament should have insisted that this provision was followed scrupulously. We are able to do that, because the Act states that it shall be done unless there is a vote of the commission against it.

Mr. Coumbe: Has it to be unanimous?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It is not a formal matter. We can insist on its being done, and it should have been done in the past. Paragraph 16 (c) adds the following new subclause:

After the Chowilla reservoir has been declared to have become effective for the purposes of this agreement the discharge from the Hume reservoir and the Chowilla reservoir shall be regulated to provide a reserve of water in storage for use in dry years, that reserve to be fixed from time to time by the commission and drawn upon at the discretion of the commission.

The following words are important:

... but the quantity of water so held in reserve shall not be less than 2,400,000 acre feet on April 30 in any year, of which not less than 800,000 acre feet shall be in the Hume reservoir unless it is otherwise decided.

Paragraph 17 (2) (a) provides:

... prior to the Chowilla dam having been declared to have become effective for the purposes of this agreement, when the quantity of water held in the Hume reservoir and the Lake Victoria storage falls to 1,000,000 acre feet or less, unless the commission resolves that it is not necessary to do so.

Therefore, we see that the commission has an obligation and that if the quantity of water (after the Chowilla dam has become effective) falls below 2,400,000 acre feet, restrictions must be declared immediately unless a resolution is passed to the contrary. At present,

until the Chowilla dam becomes effective, restrictions must be declared when only 1,000,000 acre feet is held, 800,000 acre feet of which is to be held in the Hume reservoir. The last report of the commission seems to indicate that those provisions have been disregarded—provisions that protected South Australia, in that the restricted quantity would not be so low as to place us in an impossible situation.

The other States do not want restrictions declared; they have the absolute right to their tributaries and can, in fact, probably be storing water in their tributaries at the same time as the River Murray Commission may be obliged to declare restrictions. The other States are not interested in declaring restrictions unless they are in the position of not being able to carry on. Page 4 of the report, which I think is available to the Minister and from which, in fact, I think he quoted today, states:

Restrictions on the River Murray: on November 4, 1965, the commission, after reviewing its probable resources for the season, decided pursuant to clause 51 of the River Murray Waters Agreement to declare a period of restriction from November 1. This was the first period of restriction in the commission's history. As required by the agreement, the commission determined the available water and its determination was kept under close review throughout the period of restrictions. The final determination of available water from the Murray River resources was 1,863,000 acre feet and the allocations to the respective States were: New South Wales—five-thirteenths = 716,000 acre feet; Victoria—five-thirteenths = 716,000 acre feet; and South Australia—three-thirteenths = 431,000 acre feet.

The report then states (and these are the words to which I draw the Minister's attention):

The period of restriction was terminated on May 17, 1966.

The commission's report shows that at that date there was 535,000 acre feet of water in the Hume reservoir only, and that was still 300,000 acre feet below the minimum of 800,000 acre feet prescribed in the agreement. Concerning Lake Victoria at the same time, the report states:

From late October it was drawn down to reach a low point for the year of 212,700 acre feet early in April.

The commission does not give the schedule of the monthly quantities concerning Lake Victoria, but the quantity in the lake was about 200,000 acre feet. When these restrictions were lifted, South Australia's figure was about 300,000 acre feet below the quantity specified in the agreement as the minimum

quantity that should be allowed at a time when restrictions should not be applied. One might say, "Why apply restrictions when winter is approaching," but when restrictions are not applied Victoria, New South Wales and the River Murray Commission must ensure that considerably large quantities of water enter South Australia, and at that time of the year the water would have been much better stored in the upper reaches of the Hume reservoir.

This was something for which South Australia fought, and I do not know why the commission set the matter aside so lightly. It would have to be set aside with the concurrence of this State, and I say advisedly that that position must be closely watched in the future. As I see it, the position in South Australia this year will be one of grave difficulty. Another matter will have to be closely watched in the future: for the first time we were able to have included in the new agreement a suggestion that the water coming into South Australia should be of reasonable quality, and provision was made concerning water for dilution purposes. This, unfortunately, is not very positively stated and I personally have never been able to determine whether dilution water counts as part of our restriction quota or not, although I believe it does. South Australia's problem concerns what happens to the water after it enters the State. The inclusion of the clause relating to the dilution of water in the agreement meant that statistics had to be kept of the quality of water at various parts of the river. These statistics are worth studying because, from the moment the water reaches South Australia, it deteriorates even if no salt or seepage water comes into the river: evaporation affects the quality of the water. These statistics show that in July, 1965, at Lock 9 the river contained 141 parts per million of solids; in August, 161; in September, 167; in October, 126; in November, 210; in December, 295; in January, 1966, 252; in February, 353; in March, 192; in April, 165; in May, 182; and in June, 279. Although that water was not completely satisfactory for all purposes, it was, nevertheless, satisfactory water. However, in February, when the water had 353 parts per million of solids at Lock 9, it had 502 at Blanchetown and 509 at Walker's Flat. The statistics show that one reading at Goolwa was 1,297 parts per million of solids.

Although I know that it is not precisely the same water, I shall quote the statistics for the month of July as the river flowed through South Australia. In July, 1965, at Lock 9 the water had 141 parts per million of solids;

at Lake Victoria, 173; at Berri, 345; at Lock 3, 333; at Waikerie, 469; at Morgan, 511; at Blanchetown, 528; at Walker's Flat, 584; at Mannum, 636; at Murray Bridge, 669; at Tailem Bend, 659; and at Goolwa, 609. Therefore, the quantity of solids in the water had increased four times at the lower parts of the river. More attention should be given to this matter. Water that comes into South Australia in future will definitely be inferior to what we have had up to now. The diversions of the river taking place legally in Victoria and New South Wales under the agreement will mean that the average volume of water coming into South Australia will decrease by 33 per cent in the next 20 years. Everyone knows that it is a low river after a high river that presents the most problems regarding seepage water.

We have good grounds indeed for asking the River Murray Commission urgently to re-open this matter. The agreement does not state that the Chowilla dam must be completed before the new ratio provided under the agreement comes into effect: the new ratio comes into effect after a declaration, which can be made by the commission at any time after work on the dam has commenced. So far \$5,000,000 has been spent on the dam, so nobody can deny that work has commenced. Clause 44 of the agreement states that at any time after the commencement of the construction of the Chowilla dam the commission may declare that the dam has become effective for the purpose of the agreement. The moment that the commission makes that declaration, instead of being entitled to a fraction above three-thirteenths of the waters, South Australia will be entitled to one-third.

When the deferment of work on the dam was being considered, I do not think it would have been unreasonable for South Australia's representative to say that South Australia would not agree to the deferment unless this State was given an allocation of one-third of the water whilst the deferment operated. If the other States had not agreed to that, South Australia should have immediately invoked the provisions included in the Act and taken the matter to arbitration. The Act states that, where there is any dispute as to the carrying out of the agreement, the parties can ask the Tasmanian Chief Justice to arbitrate. However, the position now is that the work has been deferred and this State has agreed to that deferment. I have heard with interest that the Premier is considering whether he should try to enforce his rights through a writ

to the High Court. However, what sort of case can we submit? Will we ask the High Court to take out a writ against us, for we have agreed to the deferment? Unfortunately, by agreeing, we have given to New South Wales and Victoria privileges that automatically cut down considerably our water supply in this period of restriction. Before this agreement operated New South Wales and Victoria had no rights in the Murray River and its tributaries above the Hume dam, except those rights conferred by the agreement, but all the tributaries below that dam (and some magnificent streams, such as the Ovens River are involved) were to be the property of the States until they reached the Murray River, when they became the property of the commission. If this period of restriction had occurred before the legislation operated, the commission could not have prevented our receiving three-thirteenths. Paragraph 17 (7) of the schedule to the amending Act provides:

The States of New South Wales and Victoria shall each have the full use during a declared period of restriction of all tributaries of the River Murray within their respective territories below Albury, and shall have the right to divert, store and use the flows thereof and the right below the confluence with the River Murray of any such tributary to use each month in a declared period of restriction from the River Murray, in addition to the share of the available water to which each of the said States is respectively entitled under subclause (6) of this clause volumes equivalent to those arriving at the place of diversion during that month as a result of contribution by each such tributary.

In other words, when the water of the Ovens River went into the Murray River, an equivalent quantity remained the property of Victoria, which could use that water in addition to the quantity provided under the restrictive quota.

Mr. Nankivell: The same applies to the Goulburn River.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: A similar position applies in New South Wales. Those States got much advantage from the agreement. The real advantages that we got were the Chowilla dam and the alteration of the quota. However, both of those are now in abeyance. What confidence will anyone have about establishing a large industry, particularly a water-using industry, in South Australia if from time to time we are to be subjected to restriction? It would have been competent and proper for South Australia to have said to the River Murray Commission, "If you want to consider the matter further, at least do not deprive South Australia of the very slight

increase in quota that will take place in the period of restriction that is coming on." After all, the commission had already had two investigations. If New South Wales and Victoria had not agreed (I am confident that the Commonwealth could not have disagreed), we could have said, "Our cause is right. Why not take the matter to adjudication as provided in the Act? Why do we have to run away from ensuring our share of the river?"

The delay is an extremely sad business for South Australia. This afternoon the Minister of Works said that 90 per cent of our people depended upon water provided by the Government. Of that number about 66 per cent depend upon water from the Murray River. We shall have to look beyond Chowilla, because New South Wales and Victoria still have an entitlement to share the benefit of that dam. The completion of the Chowilla dam would mean that in a period of restriction we would get as much water as we now get under our normal allocation.

Mr. Nankivell: Will it guarantee us the 450,000 acre feet suggested?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Under our present allocation, we are entitled to 1,252,000 acre feet, of which about half is provided because of evaporation, so at present we have about 600,000 acre feet of water assured to us.

Mr. Nankivell: It is to be 291,000 acre feet this year.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In terms of population and development, we should allow for irrigation of another 70,000 acres on the Murray River and a population increase of 1,000,000 in the next 25 years. We cannot overlook the possibility of building an exclusively South Australian dam at Teal Flat, although problems may be associated with this project. I doubt whether this State can afford to lose in evaporation from Lake Albert about the same quantity of water as we normally use in the city of Adelaide. It would be to the advantage of landowners if we constructed a reticulated trunk main to allow irrigation schemes to continue instead of allowing this water to evaporate from such a large area.

The financial position must be considered carefully, and I am sorry that the Government has granted an additional week's leave to public servants, although I do not overlook the value of public servants to this State. I know the part they play in its administration; I know how much any Government relies on

them for advice and assistance; and I know that they are trained men, many of whom are dedicated to their work. However, the proposed additional leave will cost the State about \$1,750,000 a year and will set up a chain reaction that will make it difficult for industrialists to compete with other States in which this leave is not a feature of the economy of those States. This is a premature action: because we do not have the money we will have to rely on trust funds to provide it.

I believe that South Australia can provide for its industrial workers conditions as good as those available in any other Australian State. We have industrial disadvantages that we cannot ignore—distance from markets and transport costs—and if we load our industries with charges that are not common to all States, industrial development will slow down and industries may migrate from South Australia. At the Royal Show I spoke to a proprietor of a firm that started manufacturing in Adelaide and had been successful. He told me that business was remarkably good but, although the firm wished to expand (and to do it in this State), because of the economics of the proposition it would be necessary for the new factory to be established in another State. This industry has given good service, has won markets in other States, and exports a considerable quantity of goods, but the sole reason for its move is economic. It is loyal to South Australia but will have to start a branch elsewhere.

Industries in this State have to compete not only on the Australian market but also on the world markets. We should try to conduct our affairs so that we do not establish an atmosphere that automatically makes industrial relationships difficult for these firms. I support the first line.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): I, too, support the first line. I wholeheartedly say "Thank you" to the member for Gumeracha, and I am sure I would be speaking for all members when I say that he gave us the benefit of his experience and quoted facts that were worth hearing. In the main his speech was non-political and constructive, and much could be learned from it by members on both sides, particularly Opposition members. I am sorry I shall not be able to make that type of speech. With the exception of the speech from the member for Gumeracha, the speeches of Opposition members have been intensely political and not constructive. No doubt, some of my remarks will be regarded as political. First, I congratulate the Treasurer on producing his first

Budget. I wish at this juncture to thank the former Treasurer (Hon. Frank Walsh) for what he did for the State in presenting the two previous Budgets. Tonight, I congratulate the present Treasurer on the way in which he delivered his recent Budget speech and on the general impression that he has made not only in this Chamber but outside it since he was honoured by his election as Treasurer of the State. I believe that he has built up a fine image in the State, and I compliment him also on his tactics and general demeanour inside the Chamber.

Mr. McAnaney: Now you're stretching it. Mr. Nankivell: You won't get that chairmanship; it's already promised.

Mr. CLARK: I commend the Treasurer for the restraint he exercises, for the method he sometimes has to adopt in dealing with questions asked in this place, and his skill in answering the clever questions.

Mr. McAnaney: And evading them!

Mr. CLARK: I admire also his patience when answering asinine questions and questions that are asked particularly by certain members—

Mr. McAnaney: What about Dorothy Dixers?

Mr. CLARK: I have heard that term but have never received an explanation of its meaning. I always thought Dorothy Dix was an elderly lady who answered the questions of the lovelorn. If the honourable member had trouble with that Soviet lass whom he met some time ago, I suppose Dorothy Dix probably gave him any advice for which he may have asked concerning that situation. I admire the way in which the Treasurer chops off the heads of certain questioners on the other side of the Chamber and how neatly and politely he does so. What a pity it is that those heads seem to adhere to the bodies that rise on subsequent occasions always for the purpose of asking the same type of question. Questions are asked for one of three purposes: some for political purposes, some for the purpose of seeking publicity (usually at the expense of the Minister concerned), and some for the genuine purpose of seeking information.

Perhaps a trophy is offered for the gentleman who asks the most questions during the session. Although I personally ask questions only when I wish to know something, I have no doubt at all who would win such a trophy. If a trophy were also offered for the person who asked the silliest questions, one particular member would receive both trophies, making

it a double. One particular question has amused many people throughout the State, although some people have even been annoyed by it. This would be the champion question of the session and concerns, of course, the cleaning of Ministerial cars. The first stage of the question was: "Are Ministerial cars cleaned?" to which the reply was "Yes"; then followed: "If so, by whom?" to which the Treasurer's reply was, "By the respective Ministerial drivers"; the next part was, "Is such cleaning carried out regularly?" and the reply was, "Yes"; next came, "What is the cost of such cleaning?" to which the reply was "Nil"; and then followed, "Why are they cleaned?" I should have thought the Treasurer would then say, "Because they are dirty," but, answering the question politely, he merely said they were cleaned for "appearance and preservation". Finally, the honourable member concerned asked whether it was proposed that such cleaning continue and the reply was "Yes".

I have a vague idea that there was some connection between the cleaning of Government cars and the cleaning of school windows, although that is perhaps something that only a legal luminary could answer. These questions, which were asked by the member for Mitcham, have gained him not fame but, I should say, notoriety and, to use a term that came to light in the Chamber only yesterday, I believe they may have been asked merely as a political ploy. Members may be surprised to know that an increasing interest is being shown in what transpires in this place, and there is an increasing interest in reading *Hansard*. However, such questions seem to me to be designed to waste time and, if that is so, they are wasting the time (and therefore the money also) of the people of South Australia. Every day we hear many useful questions asked by members on both sides to obtain facts about which we all want to know.

I want to say something about the tactics of the Opposition since the retirement of Sir Thomas Playford as Leader. Yesterday, the Leader said (and he said it in an irate manner), "I am becoming annoyed at the Government's suggestion that every Opposition criticism is a criticism of the economy of this State." He then went on to suggest that the attitude of members on this side was a political ploy—whatever that is.

Mr. Jennings: They are pregnant with ploys.

Mr. CLARK: I think it was to do with "ploys" and not "pirls". An Opposition is entitled and has an obligation to criticize a

Government. However, yesterday the first two speakers in this debate gave a typical example of what have become the tactics of those who, I suppose, are the leading lights of the Opposition—the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Mitcham. I listened to both speeches and then I tried to listen to the member for Stirling, but he was not speaking loudly enough for me to hear him and I gave him away. I regretted doing that because I thought he was going to talk about a political ploy: he may have, but I missed him. The two speeches yesterday proved the point that the Leader's complaint was, in fact, not a just complaint at all, because he made a speech full of criticism and offered not one suggestion (nor did the member for Mitcham who, as usual, followed him) about how to improve the position in South Australia, presuming, of course, that it needs improvement. I strongly believe that the Opposition should be capable of not only knocking things down, but of offering suggestions on how to build them up. I think Sir Thomas Playford did that when he spoke, but the two gentlemen who opened the innings for the Opposition yesterday certainly did not.

Yet the Opposition is supposed to be an alternative Government. How on earth can Opposition members convince people outside this Chamber that they are prepared to be an alternative Government when in this place they can do nothing but criticize? Of course, the member for Mitcham is the only member I know who can be political all the time, even when asking a question. Yesterday, those two gentlemen proceeded to knock down everything the Government has done without offering any remedy. Surely that is not Liberalism (it is not Socialism either): it appears to me that when people knock things down and replace them with nothing it is pure anarchism. Not only members on this side believe that the Opposition is knocking things down without offering any solution—a large majority of the people in South Australia (indeed, most of the general public, I should think) believe the same thing. To use the Leader's own word, which he was so fond of yesterday and which the member for Mitcham grabbed out of the air, I believe that what those two gentlemen said yesterday was a pitiful, pathetic, painful, putrid, political ploy.

Mr. McAnaney: Speak up.

Mr. CLARK: I am sorry if the member for Stirling cannot hear. I advise him to move down to one of the empty benches in front of

him, where he will have the benefit of hearing, if not understanding, my remarks. After all this political ploy that is being used, it is not us that are deploying the ploy (or whatever you do with a ploy), it is the Opposition that is doing it. I think that over recent years a number of undesirable things has crept into this place.

Mr. Jennings: They are all sitting opposite.

Mr. CLARK: I was not suggesting that, perhaps "things" was the wrong word to use: perhaps I should have said "practices". I do not suppose that anybody takes any notice of unwritten laws, but I can remember the time not long ago that it was the unwritten law in this place (and even amongst members of Parliament there are sometimes ethical standards that we observe) that members other than the Leader of the Opposition should not persistently ask questions about places outside their own districts. The former Leader of the Opposition (Mr. O'Halloran) rather chided me when I did that more or less in ignorance. However, it seems to me that amongst certain members (the member for Mitcham in particular) it has become the recognized thing to do. I do not know whether he has been appointed by the Leader as the ambassador at large to South Australia, but he certainly acts in that direction.

The latest act of the knockers' league in this direction has been the attempt, which was not very successful, to knock the city of Elizabeth and the people who live there. I have a strong recollection that, when I was a younger member and was making what I thought was a powerful speech urging the Government of the time (and I have urged this ever since) that more industry should be encouraged to go to Elizabeth and pointing out that the width and breadth of industries at Elizabeth was not as wide as I would have liked it to be (I said that I feared too many people were employed in the motor industry and kindred smaller industries in the area), Sir Thomas Playford said, "Don't rubbish your own district." At that time I was hostile and annoyed because I was not attempting to rubbish my district. I thought I was attempting to do something for my district that was necessary and that I was fighting for something that was necessary there. I thought of this matter again when, peculiarly enough, I found the Leader of the Opposition (who has every right to do it) and the member for Mitcham (who apparently, if he has been appointed ambassador, has a doubtful right to do it) suddenly

becoming interested in my district, which apparently, in my experience, they have never heard of before.

Mr. McAnaney: Why have you stopped speaking about Elizabeth?

Mr. CLARK: If the honourable member listens, he will find that I am speaking about the city of Elizabeth right now. My experience in regard to Elizabeth has been rather odd. One of the chief planks of our platform at the by-election at which I was elected to represent the District of Gawler in 1952 was opposition to the establishment of "the satellite town north of Salisbury", as Elizabeth was known in those days. We believed then that the establishment of Elizabeth did not represent true decentralization. We advocated that, if a large city was to be established, it should be located farther from Adelaide.

A few years after I was elected, I found Elizabeth and Salisbury were included in the District of Gawler. The Government of the day realized that, with the industrial growth of Salisbury and Elizabeth, it would lose the District of Gouger. Therefore, it took those towns out of that district and included them in the District of Gawler. The Government at that time realized that, although the move would make the District of Gawler safe, it would also make the District of Gouger safe. A year or two later, when it was realized that the District of Barossa was becoming unsafe for the Government, the Government introduced an electoral Bill and the intention was to take Elizabeth out of the District of Gawler and tack it on to Modbury and Salisbury. However, at that time the Government and the Opposition had equal numbers and the Bill did not pass. The present member for Barossa now represents that district very ably.

Since I have represented Elizabeth I have done everything possible for that district. The large industrial development that has taken place there has not been sufficiently diversified. In the main, Salisbury and Elizabeth depend for large industry on the Weapons Research Establishment and General Motors-Holden's. I do not think anyone would argue that the motor-body industry throughout the world does not have its ups and downs. In Australia, where the motor industry has not been favoured by the Commonwealth Government, to put it politely, we have tended to have more downs than ups. Many of the smaller industries in the area are ancillary to G.M.H. I am not

for one moment rubbishing G.M.H.: I think that the establishment of the industry there was the best thing that happened to Elizabeth.

I hope that further large industries will be established so as to give employment without involving employees in excessive travelling. Of course, I realize that there is difficulty in doing this. A Government member realizes these things much more than does an Opposition member. Government members find things out by bitter experience. I know that it is not easy to persuade industries to establish outside the metropolitan area and I am delighted that we have so many industries in Elizabeth. I shall read from the latest *Quarterly Notes* issued by the Housing Trust, because the information may be of value to the House. It sets out what industries have been established in Elizabeth. The Chairman of the trust states:

Further industrial development can be expected in both industrial estates as Australian and overseas manufacturers assess the advantages of establishment at Elizabeth. There has been continuing enquiry from service industry and manufacturers for small sites in Westport Road, Elizabeth West, an area designed to provide industrial sites of up to one acre at reasonable prices, and in a similar area, Bayer Road, Elizabeth South few sites remain. In the two industrial estates of Elizabeth South and Elizabeth West the following overseas and Australian based companies are now established. Many of these companies manufacture for the Australian market and in some cases the overseas market.

Southern Industrial Estate:

Acme Rotary Broom Co., Australian Liquid Air Pty. Ltd., Bliss Welded Products Ltd., Broons Containers (S.A.) Pty. Ltd., Bruce Jones Pty. Ltd., A. Burton & Son, Capital TV Services Co. Pty. Ltd., Central Districts Auto Salvage and Accessories, Comtel International Pty. Ltd., Dawn Engineering, Electric Control & Engineering Ltd., Elizabeth Auto Repairs, Elizabeth Bakeries Pty. Ltd., Elizabeth Construction Pty. Ltd., Elizabeth Radiators, Ernest Wirth Pty. Ltd. and associated company Kentish Clothes Pty. Ltd., General Motors-Holden's Pty. Ltd., Kennett Constructions Pty. Ltd., Kenwood Peerless Pty. Ltd., L. B. Stockdale Pty. Ltd., Little Para Printers, Lovell's Drinks, Nursery Tyre Service (Elizabeth Pty. Ltd.), Nursery Supplies (Elizabeth) Ltd., Pinnock Manufacturing Co. Ltd., Precision Maintenance, Ready Mixed Concrete (S.A.) Pty. Ltd., Sand & Loam Distributors Pty. Ltd., Schrader-Scovill Co. Pty. Ltd., Scopic Metal Products, Static General Engineering Co. Pty. Ltd., Texas Instruments Australia Ltd., Transway Services Ltd., Tubalco Pty. Ltd., Viborcrete Products, Wadlow Ltd.

Western Industrial Estate:

Cable Makes Australia (S.A.) Pty. Ltd., G. G. Beck, James Hardie & Co. Pty. Ltd., Mayne Nickless Ltd., Metal Manufacturers (S.A.) Pty. Ltd., McDougall's Gift Store,

Pyrotechnics Pty. Ltd., South Australian Battery Makers Pty. Ltd., Towmotor (Aust.) Pty. Ltd., Universal Ready Mixed Concrete Ltd., World-wide Camps Pty. Ltd.

That list of industries is imposing, but it is not enough.

Mr. Millhouse: Tell me, just before you go on, do you go to Elizabeth much now?

Mr. CLARK: I am there constantly. When I am not at Elizabeth, people from there are at my place. Does that answer the honourable member?

Mr. Millhouse: That surprises me, because it's not what I have heard.

Mr. CLARK: It is well known that the honourable member hears odd things and sees strange visions. I do not know whether that is a sign of anything.

Mr. McKee: It is that dillwater that he has been drinking.

Mr. CLARK: The larger industries in Elizabeth are not diversified enough, and this situation causes difficulty in the motor-body industry following a slump. It is particularly dangerous in this area where so many people have recently arrived from overseas. Most employers have a policy of last on first off, and if these people are retrenched (particularly if they are not tradesmen) before they can become established, they find some difficulty starting in a new country. I wonder at the sudden interest of Opposition members in my district. In the Elizabeth-Salisbury *News Review* of last week, in the column headed "My Word", appears the following:

Empty houses at Elizabeth have become a political football during the past weeks and reference to the matter has been made in both the Commonwealth and State Parliaments. One Elizabethan who is very, very proud of his city called me up to say that Parliamentary references coincided with an announcement by a political Party that a candidate for the next State election had been selected.

They are not my words, but those of a journalist writing for that paper. I am proud of Elizabeth and of my association with it almost from its inception. As do the people of Elizabeth I resent this typical Liberal political type of propaganda, and I am sure that the people of South Australia see through it, as do the people of my own district. Many Opposition members complain that this State does not receive enough migrants. If these comments and articles similar to the one to which I have referred were published overseas they would not induce migrants to come here, but would keep them away. We are intensely proud of the growth at Elizabeth and of what has been done and will continue to be done in

spite of temporary recessions and temporary knockers of the place. Recently, I consulted with the Premier concerning employment in this area, and we have high hopes that before long a major announcement will be made about it. The announcement will delight the people of Elizabeth, delight me, and cause gloom to the political knockers.

Mr. Millhouse: How long will it be before you make the announcement?

Mr. CLARK: I hope that it will be soon, although I shall not make it. For the benefit of the ambassador-at-large of the Opposition, who was formerly member for Mitcham, but who now seems to be occupied in other duties, I shall inform him when it is made.

Mr. Millhouse: May I get an invitation to the opening?

Mr. CLARK: I shall not send out the invitations, but if the honourable member wants a direct answer he will not get an invitation from me. The Government has confidence in the Elizabeth-Salisbury area. An imposing list of educational projects has been placed before the Public Works Committee. It includes a new third wing for the Salisbury High School at a cost of \$220,000; a new third wing for the Salisbury East High School at a cost of \$225,000; a new Salisbury North Technical High School; a new Elizabeth Fields Technical High School; and the new Northern Teachers College to be built directly adjacent to the Salisbury East High School. Obviously, the Commonwealth Government must have faith in this area, because I understand that the teachers college is to be built entirely with Commonwealth funds.

The new wing of the Salisbury East High School will contain a new innovation. Provision is made for groups of student teachers with their lecturer to observe and hear lessons being presented in the classroom from three viewing rooms. Each of these rooms will accommodate about 20 students, and they will be able to see and hear everything going on without being seen. Two are attached to ordinary classrooms and the other is attached to a science laboratory. In addition, at the end of the wing a special room is to be fitted out to enable the student teachers and lecturers to discuss the lessons observed from the viewing rooms. These rooms will also serve as common rooms for student teachers whilst they are gaining practical experience. This is an interesting and valuable innovation.

When I was teaching it was a real ordeal to give demonstration lessons to a class whilst your friends from the college listened and saw

everything that went on. Like members of Parliament, your friends criticized and poked fun at you, and it was not always a pleasant experience.

I commend the South Australian Government, and the Minister of Education in particular, for the two latest measures designed to assist schools and, particularly, to assist many parents financially. I refer to the fact that grassed ovals, etc., will now be provided in new schools and that the nucleus of a school's library will be established in the initial stages. I am happy to see such measures implemented, particularly in my rapidly developing district where it will be a great boon to parents who do not have much cash to spare.

At this stage, I go so far as to beseech the Treasurer to have a full investigation undertaken with a view to establishing as soon as possible a bus service between Salisbury-Elizabeth and the metropolitan area. Many people in Salisbury and Elizabeth live miles away from the railway line and many, because they need a means of transport, have purchased motor cars, which they really cannot afford and which have proved to be an additional hardship on them. I ask the Treasurer to confer with his colleague the Minister of Transport in order to ascertain whether something cannot be done about this matter. It is amazing to see the numbers of people on the road, particularly in the mornings and evenings, trying to hitch rides from passing motorists. I have represented Elizabeth right from the early days, when I recall opening school fetes when the schools themselves were not quite completed and when, in the winter time, I had to walk over planks to get from one place to another because the yards were not paved and because of the presence of much water and mud in the schoolgrounds. I recall, too, the occasion of an early birthday celebrated by Elizabeth residents in the early stages on which I had to fire a special rocket at the Weapons Research Establishment, jumping quickly out of the way as I did so. I was fortunately much more active in those days than I am at present.

Representing Elizabeth right from its inception has been rewarding and interesting for me and I am sure that I have made many lifelong friends and (I like to think) not many enemies. I have learnt to understand the problems of many families who have come from overseas to settle permanently in the area and I have found that, in times of

trouble, sympathy is often a useful commodity for these people. I have tried to help families in many ways, but what they need most is assistance in adjusting themselves to life here. Life in Elizabeth (in fact, in any area) is happy only when employment is assured, but problems can be magnified in the case of people who come to live in a new land and whose ties are far away in another country. As I have previously said, in times of employment difficulties these people are last on and first off.

Some peculiar tactics have been adopted by certain members in this place concerning Elizabeth and some things have been grossly exaggerated. However, at this stage I pay a tribute to the people in the area who have helped me—to the Housing Trust, whose services I have found invaluable; when I have taken the problems of constituents to the trust I have found it always ready to help whenever possible; and if it cannot help it has given me a pretty good reason for not doing so. I pay a tribute also to the churches, the clergymen and church organizations that have helped people in difficulties, in particular (if I may say so without reflecting on other church organizations) the St. Vincent de Paul Society, the Elizabeth Counselling Service, which has performed wonderful work, and the Elizabeth Community Chest, which is doing its best to help people with problems. Although it may surprise honourable members when I say this, I thank also the hire-purchase companies, because I have found that when constituents have been out of work and in difficulty over hire-purchase payments, these companies, when contacted, have been completely co-operative.

In conclusion, I say that it is quite unfair and unrealistic for anyone to expect a Government to do in three years everything one wished it to do. I think the public realizes this fact, and I firmly believe that the people will willingly give us a second term at the next elections in March. Further, I believe that the Opposition is also of that opinion. We must remember that these are difficult times, and this has not been an easy Budget to prepare. These are difficult times for the whole of Australia and, if honourable members do not believe that, I urge them to read the details in tomorrow's press of Sir Henry Bolte's Budget. I think they will then admit that this is a pretty good Budget after all. I support the first line.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): Even in the short time that has elapsed since the Treasurer presented this, his first Budget, much evidence has emerged to show that his easy optimism is unfounded. All the blame cannot be placed on the vagaries of the weather although, unfortunately, if the present dry trend continues it will, to everyone's regret, be reflected in a poor season and a consequent continued downturn in the State's economy. Nor can the Treasurer continue to blame the Commonwealth Government or the previous Government as he is wont to do. In trying to lay the blame for the present state of affairs on everyone else's shoulders but its own, the Government is fooling no-one, least of all its own supporters. There is plenty of evidence of this, because as surely as the Treasurer makes an optimistic statement about an upturn in the economy, one of the leaders of the various trade unions, whose members are so hard hit as a result of the Treasurer's economic policy, takes him to task.

Mr. Freebairn: The previous speaker was talking about the difficult times in which we in South Australia were living.

Mrs. STEELE: That does not fool anyone. One has only to study the various trends in order to see the precarious situation in which South Australia is at present placed. The true position in the building industry is shown in the latest survey by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics which appears in last week's press, under the heading "South Australian Building at Lowest Level for Five Years", as follows:

The total of 9,693 dwellings—houses and flats combined—started in South Australia during the year ended on June 30 was the lowest since 1961-62. The figures, while showing the building activity in the June quarter was lower than in the corresponding quarter of 1966, reveal more activity than in the March quarter this year.

In the June quarter 2,014 houses were started—323 more than in the March quarter but 421 fewer than in the June quarter last year—and 2,219 houses were completed—278 more than in the previous quarter but 430 fewer than in the June quarter, 1966. At June 30, 12,467 people were employed by builders of new buildings. This was 35 more than on March 31 but 895 fewer than on December 14.

Mr. Casey: One minute you complain that not enough houses are being built and the next minute you say there are too many vacant houses now.

Mrs. STEELE: I have not said anything about that.

Mr. Casey: Other members on your side have.

Mrs. STEELE: I cannot accept responsibility for what other members say. They have probably worked out their own figures, as they are entitled to. The article continues:

Completions in the year to June 30 were fewer than in the previous year in 20 of the 32 council areas in the Adelaide division. Completions at Elizabeth were only 177, compared with 246 to June 30, 1966.

However, completions at Port Adelaide to June 30 were 291, compared with 145 last year, and at Salisbury 1,387, as against 1,213. Therefore, there is a glimmer of light in a rather cloudy sky. Figures were given last evening by the member for Torrens showing the continued drop in clay brick production and this, of course, is another pertinent indication of the state of the building industry. The Auditor-General drew attention to the number of unsold Housing Trust houses, which I think was about 700. Of course, this is an alarming situation and the General Manager of the trust, on being asked to comment about it today, said, "We are holding more unsold houses than we would wish".

Mr. Burdon: He said a little more than that.

Mrs. STEELE: I am quoting what appears under the heading "Home Sales Lag Big Worry to Trust". I believe what I have quoted is sufficient to show that the Housing Trust is alarmed at the present trend in the building industry and with the fact that it has so many unsold houses on its books.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: People cannot afford to buy.

Mrs. STEELE: Yesterday, in a question I addressed to the Minister of Education, I revealed that students were performing work in schools that rightly should be done by employees of the proper maintenance division of the Public Buildings Department. I also understand that applications by new schools for initial grants to establish school ovals have either been turned down or have been severely limited to only a fraction of the previous financial grants made by the department. I suggest that these are only small straws in the wind to indicate the stringencies which the Government has had to enforce at present, though the trend is indicated in a much more serious way by the request to the universities by the State Government that fees should be increased, a fact which, of course, deters many bright students from entering upon the courses they desire to follow at a tertiary level.

In spite of these economies (and of course there are many more in the same vein), in spite of the increases in water charges and stamp duties, and in spite of higher train and

bus fares and all the other charges for this and that that have been imposed in each year the Government has been in office (of course, with the notable exception of this year—a pre-election year), the Government still cannot pay its way without recourse to reserves and trust funds. Worse, from a Government that only today accused the Opposition of playing politics, the new Treasurer considers this State to be in a financial position to meet a bill for \$1,700,000 to give an extra week's leave to public servants and members of the Police Force. No Opposition member would deny this benefit to public servants who, at all times, have given loyal service. However, surely, as responsible people, we must question such an outlay in a year when the State's financial position is so precarious.

It is principally about hospitals that I wish to speak. The true position is hidden by a smoke screen, which was seen first in the Loan Estimates presented earlier this year when the Treasurer detailed the moneys to be spent in this financial year. More than half the funds for new works was committed to a continuation of the rebuilding of the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the dental hospital, a major development initiated years before this present Government came into office and one that has always received the wholehearted support of Opposition members. When one looks at the rest of the moneys to be expended, namely, \$2,345,000, one finds only \$990,000 provided to commence new works, a small amount when one considers the total sum allocated for projected new works as being \$18,000,000. This is interesting indeed, especially when we refer to the policy speech of the former Treasurer (which by now I believe must be regarded as a horrible liability by the Labor Party) where, as the Leader of the Opposition, he made promises to the electorate that he said would only be those that could be fulfilled. Almost a third of that policy speech was devoted to the part covering health, hospitals and child welfare, but strangely enough child welfare never seemed to get off the ground, after being referred to in the introduction. In fact, it would be easier to state the subjects that the Labor Party did not refer to rather than to list the projects it said it intended to (as the document states) proceed with immediately. I shall quote from this famous document. At the bottom of page 5, the policy speech states:

Labor will—(1) Immediately increase Government infirmary accommodation, and (2) subsidize the erection and running of small

district infirmaries in co-operation with voluntary organization which have already indicated their willingness to help such projects, and (3) immediately speed up the rehousing of mental hospital patients in modern buildings adequate for their needs.

The promises of the Government Party, before it took office, to provide a 500-bed hospital in the district undoubtedly influenced the people of the Modbury and Tea Tree Gully area to change their Parliamentary representation from L.C.L. to Labor. I feel genuinely sorry for the member for Barossa for the way she has been let down by her Party. I have noticed that she never alludes to the subject now. In fact, the last question she asked about the matter was in November last year, when she asked what progress was being made. Obviously, it was an embarrassment to the Government, because she never appeared to press for a reply, which apparently was not given, according to *Hansard*. However, she may have been heartened by a reply given recently by the Minister of Social Welfare to the member for Mitcham that indicated that the Modbury project would be given priority over the teaching hospital for Flinders University.

However, although it rated a passing reference in His Excellency's Speech there was no reference in the Treasurer's Budget speech to any start at all being contemplated at Modbury, unless it was included in the line "Preliminary investigation and design, \$100,000." The member for Barossa is, I consider, entitled to feel disappointed, especially as she will face her electors next year with the promise of her Government entirely unfulfilled, unless the election policy in 1968 follows the hollow promises of 1965. Incidentally, many people, people of experience in hospitalization and hospital care, believe that the Lyell McEwin Hospital at Elizabeth is ideally situated, adequately equipped and well able to meet the hospital requirements of this part of the metropolitan area for a long time to come and that the money that would have to be expended on the projected 500-bed hospital at Modbury could be well spent on hospital facilities elsewhere.

Mr. Freebairn: Is it true that the site for a hospital at Modbury was being levelled and graded at the time of the last election?

Mrs. STEELE: The land was purchased prior to the last election. The medical profession is alarmed, as well it may be, about teaching facilities in South Australia and only the erection of a teaching hospital adjacent to

Flinders University can allay their fears. As we know, temporary expedients were proceeded with last year, such as the amendment of the Medical Practitioners Act to try to attract migrant doctors to undertake short training courses to enable them to practise in country areas. There were also moves by means of various forms of propaganda to bring doctors from overseas. There were cadetships and similar schemes, but these have proved only partially successful. This was confirmed by the Minister of Health in an address to the South Australian Hospitals Association, the press report of which states:

Mr. Shard said the Government's subsidy plan to encourage migrant doctors to work in the country had not been as successful numerically as he had hoped. At present three doctors were doing their resident medical training and a further five or six were being considered for the subsidy plan. On completion of their training, the doctors would be sent to various centres where they were most needed to fill gaps.

I suggest (and I know I am supported in this by members on this side and by the general public) that the only real way to provide sufficient doctors for South Australia is by providing another teaching hospital, and this was, according to the Government's enunciated election policy of 1965, to be erected without delay. Yet here we are in 1967 and still there is no mention of even a start on the hospital.

I shall now deal with mental hospitals. Many of the centres now functioning as part of the Mental Health Services were initiated by the purchase of properties by the previous Government. I shall not enumerate those, but they are the various hospitals that now, two years later, are functioning as part of the medical health programme in South Australia. They were part of a long-range planned development to cater for the needs of the mentally ill and the intellectually retarded in the community. The present Government inherited this development and, to its credit, has kept up the momentum. However, its record concerning Strathmont is not impressive and, had it not been for the persistence of the Opposition in keeping the matter before the notice of Parliament, the Government would have missed qualifying for even the small funds it will attract from the Commonwealth Government in this financial year.

I have many friends in this field of mental health, people who work very hard indeed and people who, perhaps, have members of their families in these hospitals. I feel that it must be a great shock to these people to find that the Government even now

has provided only \$130,000 on the Loan Estimates for work that is estimated to cost in all \$6,400,000. With the Commonwealth contribution, only \$173,000 will be spent on this hospital, although the Labor Party, in its policy speech, said the hospital was of paramount importance. The work was examined, evidence was taken, and the project was finally recommended by the Public Works Committee in 1964, but it has taken this Government three years to commit \$130,000 of its own funds to make a start on a project in relation to which it accused the previous Government of procrastination.

The Government should be able to spend much more on hospitals than it intends to spend when one considers what it is receiving from the totalizator agency board system of betting and from the lotteries, through the Hospitals Fund. To August 31 this year it had received \$588,000. It is expecting to receive \$2,700,000 from these funds in the next 10 months, but one must subtract the \$50,000 that must be paid from the Hospitals Fund on account of the winning bets tax. However, the member for Torrens showed conclusively last evening how little of the conventional funds the Government was committing for hospitals in the Estimates this year. Therefore, despite the member for Glenelg's extravagant and impassioned defence of the Government's spending on hospitals, it is clear how niggardly is its attitude to the provision of funds for essential works.

One other matter with which I wish to deal is the dental therapy school. I was one of the first members on this side to commend the Government for setting up that school last year. That this project has been a success initially is evident: it will contribute much to the dental health of schoolchildren once it is under way and its first graduates have passed out into the school dental health service.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: It is modelled on the New Zealand scheme.

Mrs. STEELE: Yes, and the New Zealand Government was happy to send to South Australia someone to help start this venture. The introduction of this school will be of inestimable value in helping solve the problem of neglected dental health in children in South Australia. I cannot help including in this comment the statement that fluoridation, if introduced in South Australia, would give a further fillip to the dental health of the community. In this place I have often spoken of occupational therapy, which is vital to the wellbeing and health of South Australians. I

am most anxious to see something done to establish a school of occupational therapy so that we can provide facilities within the State that will help rehabilitate patients in our public and private hospitals. I support the Budget, but will have more to say later.

Mr. HURST (Semaphore): I, too, support this Budget introduced by the Treasurer. I congratulate the previous Treasurer (Hon. Frank Walsh) on the magnificent job he did in handling the finances of this State. He came into office after many years in Opposition, and gained the support of the people of this State by the way he handled the State's finances. The present Treasurer has followed in his footsteps. This is a sound Budget, in spite of the difficulties that confronted the Labor Party. When we took office we inherited many commitments of the Playford Government, and these works had to be continued. The Auditor-General's Report states that each year it had been reported that few of the capital works approved in recent years had returned sufficient revenue to meet working expenses and debt charges. That illustrates the position that faced the Labor Party when it assumed office.

In the first year the Labor Government budgeted for a deficit and this had to be maintained in the second year because of a general slump in the economy of the State. If the Government had curtailed its activities when the private sector stopped spending, unemployment would have been caused. A responsible Government should ensure that there is not a large slump, and it is obliged to take up the slack when private investment is restricted. In these circumstances the Government must budget for a deficit and use trust funds moderately. In 1966-67 the Budget totalled \$255,702,000 with a deficit of just over \$5,000,000. It would be difficult for individuals to plan their ordinary living with such fine tolerance as has to be applied to a Budget with its many ramifications.

Mr. Burdon: Most people resort to bank overdrafts.

Mr. HURST: Yes, and credit. That is not unusual, because it is a common practice for private individuals. Surely it is good enough for the Government to do that to maintain the standard of living and to create a spirit of confidence in the community.

Mr. Burdon: It is the Government's responsibility.

Mr. HURST: Of course. Since this Government assumed office the Opposition has not made one constructive suggestion. The Minister of Education is spending the maximum sum

that can be allocated to him, 25 per cent of the total Budget, but I am sure he would be able to spend more. Although his work is appreciated by the people of this State, every day the Opposition asks questions trying to discredit him. These questions are designed to damper the morale of the people. Many wild predictions were made about the deficit but, according to the Auditor-General's Report and the Treasurer's Financial Statement, the Government secured a balance in Consolidated Revenue and reported a small surplus of \$106,000 as at June 30, 1967. Opposition members did not inform the public of that situation. They have tried to discourage industry from coming to this State by saying that the State would be bankrupt.

The Labor Government is a responsible one, and next year the policy that has been pursued by this Government of managing the State's finances will be overwhelmingly endorsed by the people of South Australia at the election. Many things have been initiated by this Government the benefits of which we have not yet experienced. For instance, South Australia for many years was lagging badly in the field of hospitalization but, as a result of social measures implemented by this Government, money that was previously going into other States has been channelled into services conducted in this State.

Hospitals alone will benefit by about an additional \$3,000,000 a year. Had this money over the last 10 or 15 years been put back into this State, our hospitals would have been much better off today than they are. References made by members of the Opposition to the slump in the building industry have largely been the product of their own manufacture. Questions have been asked in the Chamber about vacant houses at Smithfield, but the Treasurer clearly outlined the position on August 29 last when, referring to a report of the General Manager of the Housing Trust, he said that the decision to build those houses and to have them available in 1967 was, in the main, made early in 1965. Surely, therefore, we cannot be held responsible for that situation. I shall give one example of the many attempts made by members of another political Party to twist matters and to blame this Government wrongly. The following quotation is an extract from the report, which was supplied to the Treasurer by the General Manager of the Housing Trust and which was given to members on August 29:

In October of last year, for example, the Minister for Health, Dr. Forbes, was reported in the *Advertiser* as saying that he would discuss urgently with the Minister for the Army the proposed ordnance depot and new training unit in the area. At the expense of repetition perhaps I might add something contained in a previous answer, namely, that it is doubtful if the Commonwealth has a piece of land so well placed, so suitable for development and on the development of which so many discussions have been held over many years. It was the continued statements by the Commonwealth over so many years that something was about to be done with the land that led the trust to believe that, when defence has become such a national priority, the site would be used.

The Treasurer's reply on that occasion to the member for Mitcham clearly demonstrates that although the houses became vacant while we were in Government, their planning and design were undertaken during the term of the Playford Government. Every day we hear in this Chamber requests made by members for improvements to be effected in their various districts. Although I personally wish to see more work undertaken in my district, I point out that the Commonwealth Government, which is the main taxation authority in Australia allocates money to the States to be spent on capital works and that the State's field of taxation is limited. Naturally, while the Commonwealth Government is spending so much money on defence measures, the States will not receive an adequate share and, as a result, the Ministers must do the best they can with the allocations received. Indeed, they are doing an excellent job.

It was pleasing to see the reference to this Budget made by the *Advertiser* recently as a stay-put measure; no great increases in taxation have been introduced, and that will benefit most of the people in this State. The Leader of the Opposition having previously referred to what is being done in Victoria, it will be interesting to read about the Budget that I understand is being introduced in that State today. One has only to examine the contents of last year's New South Wales and Victorian Budgets to see what happened in respect of tram and rail fares as well as charges for other services. I believe that the Leader is merely warning the electors that if they wish to return a Liberal Government at the next elections they can expect greatly increased taxation.

Turning to the Auditor-General's Report, I commend the Electricity Trust for the way in which it has been able to extend services throughout the State. With modern developments and technological changes, the trust

has, nevertheless, not had to increase charges. True, its surplus this year was only \$518,000, compared with about \$954,000 last year. However, the trust, like other bodies, has been confronted with increased costs. One of the greatest charges on the trust, apart from paying fuel costs, is the payment of interest on debentures issued in order to undertake capital works and, while these interest charges continue to increase, there is less possibility of a reduction in power charges. We are hopeful that, with the construction of the gas pipeline from Gidgealpa to Adelaide, and as a result of the contract entered into by the trust in order to provide natural gas for power generation, costs of production will eventually be decreased and that a benefit will accrue to those who use electricity, namely, practically all householders in the State. This will also be another factor in encouraging the establishment of more industries in South Australia. I have great pleasure in supporting the first line.

Mr. HUGHES (Walleroo): It gives me great pleasure to congratulate the Treasurer on introducing his first Budget. I am sure that we have appreciated the work done by the former Treasurer in bringing down two previous Budgets to the satisfaction of the people of South Australia. I am sure that when the people fully realize the significance of this Budget they will be happy indeed, particularly when they realize that few taxation increases are included. I have been given to understand that the Victorian Budget, which is to be introduced some time today, will include substantial taxation increases. I believe that fact has been referred to in a newspaper, but I do not have it and cannot quote from it. The people of Victoria will not be happy about the taxation increases. The people of South Australia will be pleased that they live here when they compare this State's Budget with that of Victoria.

This evening we were privileged to hear a most constructive speech delivered by the member for Gumeracha; indeed, it has been the only constructive speech to come from the Opposition. With the great wealth of experience that he has gained over the years, the honourable member is one who has really grown up with the problems of South Australia.

Mr. Jennings: That is something his successor will never do.

Mr. HUGHES: I agree. When one compares the Leader's speech with the speech of the member for Gumeracha, one finds it hard to understand the election of the Leader to his position. The member for Gumeracha said that this would be his last opportunity to speak in a Budget debate, and one could tell from the attentive audience he had this evening that everything he said was being absorbed. The Minister of Works was particularly interested to hear what the honourable member said about the Chowilla dam.

The member for Gumeracha spoke principally about the water problems that will face South Australia during coming years. However, I wish to speak, not about a water pipeline but about a gas pipeline, because the district I represent is most interested in the proposed pipeline to bring gas from Gidgealpa to Adelaide. Various Opposition members have criticized the proposed route of the gas pipeline. Some of that criticism has unfairly reflected not only on Cabinet but also on members representing Spencer Gulf ports. If a certain convention had not been held at Port Augusta in the last couple of months, perhaps this criticism would not have been forthcoming from those members. Members representing Spencer Gulf ports have been charged by the Leader with not endeavouring to have natural gas serve their districts. How far from the truth that is! It goes to show how little homework the Leader does.

Only recently I said that, if the Leader had done half as much homework as had members representing Spencer Gulf ports regarding natural gas being brought to Adelaide and regarding its provision to Spencer Gulf ports if required, he would have deserved commendation. However, he did not do that. All he has done is to criticize members representing these ports and, in so doing, he has damaged his Party greatly. His criticism was uncalled for. He did not bother to find out whether members representing these ports had made representations to various people to see whether, when gas had been piped from Gidgealpa to Adelaide, it could be piped to the ports if it was required. He said that the Government had turned its back on Spencer Gulf ports. If he was sincere, he had no case whatever for saying what he said, because members representing those ports had done a great deal to make sure that their districts were safeguarded in relation to the piping of natural gas.

Mr. Hall: Are you quoting me correctly?

Mr. HUGHES: The Leader interjected as I began to say something. If he interjected when I was pausing, I could hear what he was saying and perhaps I could answer him. Apparently, his interjection could not have had any value, otherwise he would have followed it up. I point out for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition, who has offered criticism all over the country about this Government, that members representing the Spencer Gulf ports have not only obtained an undertaking that a pipeline will be provided to those ports when supply can be taken economically, but they also have an undertaking that gas will be available at those places at a price comparable with city prices, when and where required.

Mr. Hall: Can I ask who gave the undertaking?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. What is more, it is public information.

Mr. Hall: So is the Modbury Hospital.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, and here again the Leader is running around the country offering unfair criticism. Apparently, he does not know of the amount of money spent on hospitalization in South Australia or of the increases during the short period this Government has been in office. Does he expect this Government to be able to pull millions of dollars out of the hat and build new hospitals at the flick of a finger? He is not interested when I make that point. There was no money left in the hat by the Playford Government.

Mr. Hall: That is not so. Be honest about that.

Mr. HUGHES: The Leader is the one who needs to be honest on this. He ought not think that he can get away with these tricks with me, because he cannot. When he is out in the country, he can twist figures to suit the various audiences that he has the pleasure of addressing, but he is not going to twist them with me. The Leader has again shown that he is not familiar with what is going on in the State. By way of interjection, he asked who gave the undertaking. I have the press report in my hand. Apparently, he does not keep up with the press reports. I suppose he has a fancy book in which he keeps his write-ups, but he overlooks the real facts about what is going on. As the Leader knows the *Farmer* has a wide distribution in South Australia and goes into primary-producing areas. The edition of September 6, 1967, contains this report:

The Premier answers gas pipeline criticism: The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) said Tuesday that the eastern route for the natural gas pipeline to

Adelaide would give a significantly lower transportation cost for supply of established gas reserves to major markets. Should considerably increased reserves of natural gas be established and demand develop in the Spencer Gulf towns, the overall transportation costs would still be lower than if the main line were to follow the western or any other alternative route. Mr. Dunstan was answering criticism of the Government for choosing the direct route to Adelaide for the pipeline. He said he realized that a number of organizations feared that if an adequately extensive industrial demand should develop at Port Pirie, Wallaroo, Port Augusta, or elsewhere, the industry concerned might be prejudiced by having to meet an additional transportation charge to cover the costs of any special branch line which may be necessary.

However, I have already made a public statement on behalf of the Government indicating its intention that no valuable industrial development, particularly one contributing materially to industrial decentralization in the Spencer Gulf area, will be prejudiced in the supply of natural gas by reason of the fact that it is not immediately adjacent to the main pipeline route, Mr. Dunstan said.

The fear referred to was created by statements by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. McKee: The people are completely satisfied.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. The people in my district are satisfied, as I can establish by a letter that I have. The member for Port Pirie tells me that the people in his district are satisfied and I am sure that, if I asked the Speaker, he would tell me the same thing about the people in his district. I now wish to refer to inaccurate statements that were made recently in this Chamber. The member for Torrens recently took me to task for telling what was a true story so far as he was concerned. During the debate on a certain motion, he was so upset that he devoted the whole of his speech to a criticism of what I had stated. That was unusual, because he can offer constructive criticism. I take his reference as a compliment. According to *Hansard*, he said:

The Leader's motion has succeeded, because the Premier paid the Opposition a direct compliment in the way he addressed himself to it. For the first time this House has obtained information regarding this project for which Opposition members have been pressing continuously for almost 12 months. I think all members will agree that at last information concerning proposed costs of the gas pipeline via the western route, the cost of diverting the pipeline to the gulf ports, and comparative figures involved in the laterals have been forced out of the Government. In speaking to this motion, the Premier got very touchy and accused the Opposition outright of playing politics in this matter.

The honourable member went on to say (and this is a real joke), "The Minister cannot accuse me of playing politics." He was referring to an interjection. He then continued:

What about the Government's withholding information which honourable members, as private members, are entitled to know. Members on both sides want this project to commence as quickly as possible. That was markedly shown when the Bill was debated last session. We know we have to get the project going quickly and, more important, get it going economically and at an advantageous price.

I shall have more to say about this price. My quote continues:

Mr. Hudson: Are you supporting this resolution?

Mr. COUMBE: I am speaking of the motion of the Leader, which, as I mentioned a moment ago, has succeeded. The Premier said that there was a race to get this going in Australia, but we want to get it early in South Australia, before the other States can derive any advantage from their own installations. We all know that the costs have to be kept to a minimum. The Premier said that the eastern route was the cheapest but, until he said so, the House did not know that.

How untrue that statement was. I cannot understand how the member for Torrens could make such a statement, because on October 11, 1966, the member for Gumeracha had six questions on the Notice Paper and the reply to two of them was as follows:

1. The alternative routes considered by the Bechtel Pacific Corporation are: (1) that to the east of the Flinders Ranges which passes between the ranges and Lake Frome and passes close to Peterborough; and (2) that to the west of the ranges via Port Augusta.

2. The relative cost of the pipeline by these two routes differs at different stages. The initial cost of the eastern route (480 miles) is \$31,000,000, including one compressor station. The initial cost of the western route (510 miles) is \$33,600,000, including two compressor stations, which the extra distance makes necessary. The ultimate relative cost of the two routes is subject to several offsetting considerations; for example, the lateral to Port Pirie and Whyalla is reduced in length and diameter by the western route, but, on the other hand, the cost of providing "looping" at 18in. diameter, or possibly larger diameter, is increased by the extra 30 miles of the western route.

I should have thought that the member for Torrens was called on to speak quickly, had no prior warning, or had completely forgotten the reply to the questions asked by the member Gumeracha. His statement that details of alternative costs had been forced out of the Government by the Leader was completely untrue. The member for Gumeracha was

worse, because when he was speaking to the motion moved by the Leader he did an injustice to a reputable company and dealt a backhander to any new industry contemplating setting up in the metropolitan area. The *Hansard* report of his statement is as follows:

Further, an agreement has already been reached in Adelaide concerning the supply of natural gas to industry. If a new industry established in the metropolitan area tomorrow it could not obtain natural gas from the authority.

Mr. Hudson: That's not so.

The Hon. SIR THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am saying it is. The honourable member does not know the position. The South Australian Gas Company has entered into an agreement with the Delhi-Santos group, which has signed a contract to supply the company with gas at a certain price for metropolitan consumers with, I believe, five exceptions (two brick companies, two cement companies and, I think, Imperial Chemical Industries of Australia and New Zealand Limited). If any industry in the metropolitan area desires to use natural gas, it buys it from the South Australian Gas Company.

Later, the member for Gumeracha said:

Secondly, natural gas will not be available to industry in the metropolitan area direct from the authority except in five instances. Another inescapable fact is that no way exists for any industry, except for the five companies to which I have referred, which was excluded from the general agreement in the metropolitan area to obtain gas direct from the producers. Therefore, if we want to use natural gas as a means of establishing industries, we will have to consider doing this outside the area of the agreement.

I then interjected, "There is nothing wrong with that," because I was thinking of Wallaroo, and the honourable member, agreeing with me, said:

I did not say there was. However, I point out that if the eastern route is adopted this will not be easy to do. All I am pointing out is that the eastern route is not conducive to that.

I regret that the member for Gumeracha gave false information to the Chamber in an endeavour once again to boost the arguments advanced by his Leader. What will happen next year?

Mr. Hall: I can tell you.

Mr. HUGHES: If I were the Leader, I would try to learn as much as possible before the member for Gumeracha left this place, because he will be sorry after the honourable member goes. At the time, the member for Gumeracha not only misled the Chamber—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not doubt the veracity of the honourable member but I draw his attention to Standing Order No. 146, which provides that "no member shall allude

to any debate of the same session upon a question or Bill not being then under discussion, except by the indulgence of the House for personal explanations". I thought when the honourable member commenced these remarks he might have been making a passing reference, but I am afraid that he cannot continue discussing a previous debate.

Mr. HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am linking up my remarks with the overall expenses of the State. I need only refer to the Premier's Department as one example, and I could link up my remarks in other ways also. The member for Glenelg, when speaking recently in this Chamber, indicated that he knew the true position. In fact, the General Manager of the South Australian Gas Company was so concerned about outlining the true position that the following article appeared in the press, headed "Wrong View on Gas":

Recent Parliamentary statements had given an entirely wrong view of the price situation with natural gas as it affected the South Australian Gas Company, its general manager (Mr. R. Wagstaff) said yesterday. If the company was not prepared to make natural gas available to an industry at a price which would be competitive with other fuels, the producers would have complete freedom to make direct contracts with such industries. This was provided by the terms of the contract between the gas producers and the company.

[It was said in Parliament that, with five exceptions, any industry wanting to take advantage of natural gas cheaper than the company's town gas would have to be established outside the area in which the agreement applied.]

Mr. Wagstaff said it was true that the company had agreed to direct negotiation between the natural gas producers and five of the State's major industries. It was also true that the company would have the first right to sell natural gas to industries in areas served by gas mains reticulation. The company would buy natural gas on a demand commodity basis at prices which would enable it to compete effectively in the industrial field and this had been confirmed by a survey conducted by the company of 150 industrial establishments. However, if the company for some reason was not prepared to make it available to an industry at a price which would be competitive with other fuels, the producers would be free to make direct contracts with such industries.

"The company has adopted this attitude because it is in the best interests to co-operate with the producers so as not to inhibit the sale of natural gas," he said. "There is no reason to suppose that new industries using natural gas cannot be established within service areas of the company."

That article clearly indicates that the information conveyed to honourable members by the member for Gumeracha was completely wrong: it was false, and I am surprised that

the member for Torrens who was sitting close to the honourable member did not draw his attention to the facts as the honourable member was enlarging on the matter. Many things have been said about the natural gas pipeline, some by implication and others by way of direct statements: for instance, that the route has been determined politically. How silly can one get? All the districts on the western side of the ranges are held by Labor members, so this Government would have had everything to gain politically had the pipeline been brought down on that side of the ranges.

Difficult as it may be for the Opposition to understand, politics have never entered into the consideration of this pipeline. This is to the credit of the Treasurer and the Government of this State. If the Government had wanted to play Party politics, it could have decided to curry favour with the residents of the Spencer Gulf ports. However, it did not want to do that.

Mr. Hudson: It did not want to be irresponsible.

Mr. HUGHES: That is so. The Government wished to do what was best for the State. Another factor was that it was necessary to plan the route of the pipeline in the most economical way possible so that a large contract could be signed with the Electricity Trust in Adelaide to enable the trust to use natural gas. I know that the honourable member for Flinders studied the question of natural gas during his trip overseas, and since his return he has spoken on this subject once or twice. In my view, one of the main things he has emphasized is that economics come into this matter and that it is necessary to get the natural gas to the housewife and to other users at the lowest possible rate. His remarks indicated that it was necessary to route the pipeline in the most economical way.

The honourable member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) referred to natural gas at Wallaroo. He said that there was no need to worry, because when the water mains were laid in South Australia they did not follow the townships: they were put down and lateral lines were sent out from them. He said that he was satisfied regarding his own district, and he intimated that the same thing would apply concerning natural gas. As the honourable member for Flinders made the same type of speech, it seems that these two former Cabinet Ministers appreciate the problems in this matter and that they look at the thing in a practical

way. Those honourable members were prepared to come into this Chamber and say these things. Criticism has been offered regarding the people who gave information about the alternative routes.

Mr. Hall: Which one do you favour?

Mr. HUGHES: I favour the proposed route. We have been told by several members opposite that insufficient information has been made available on this matter. I point out that this Government engaged one of the world's best authorities on this subject. Let us look at the experience that Victoria has had. The *Australian* of September 7, under the heading "Victoria's \$18,000,000 gas pipeline in a tangle", carries the following article:

Victoria's proposed \$18,000,000 natural gas pipeline is in a tangle. Manufacturing contracts have been delayed indefinitely and construction costs threaten to rise steeply.

The Leader of the Opposition and one of his colleagues went to Victoria and interviewed Sir Henry Bolte. They ran all over the State, came back, and then told us how we ought to run things over here in South Australia.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Will the Leader run over there and advise Sir Henry Bolte on his latest Budget?

Mr. HUGHES: I do not think so. Those members came back here and told us how things should be run, yet we see from the article in the *Australian* that Victoria's natural gas pipeline is in a tangle. That article continues:

The tough design specifications set for the pipeline and the inexperience of the local companies tendering are being blamed.

We had one of the best authorities in the world to advise us on this matter. Members opposite may laugh, but the people of Victoria, the State that has often been quoted as being so ideal, are not laughing. That State's pipeline is in a real tangle because the Government there did not get the right people to do the job for it. Although we engaged the finest people in the world to come here and advise us on where the pipeline should go, we have had nothing but criticism from Opposition members. Another article from a newspaper, under the heading "Colin Rowe says 'Keep costs down'", states:

The former Attorney-General (Hon. C. D. Rowe) at a meeting at Brinkworth said he thought the proposed use of natural gas was one of the forward moves with industry in this State and something that should not be unduly delayed. The only way the State could progress and the only way it had progressed in the past was by keeping its costs lower than those

of its competitors. Everything possible should be done to ensure that gas is brought to Adelaide at the cheapest possible rate.

That statement was made by another former Minister. However, the Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber wants to bring the pipeline down on the longest route, which would increase the price of the gas in Adelaide to such an extent that it would not be economical for many prospective users. This would mean that it would never get off the ground. This is the type of person we have in Opposition, yet the Party opposite is trying to set itself up as an alternative Government. I am happy with the route the Government has chosen for the pipeline, and so are the people of Wallaroo.

Mr. Hall: That is very unselfish of them.

Mr. HUGHES: It is not unselfish. I think I have said enough to show the Leader and his colleagues that they have been way off the beam regarding the pipeline route. In conclusion, I wish to refer to the following letter, which was sent to the Treasurer:

Items have appeared in the press recently indicating that—

- (1) the Mayor and Wallaroo council delegates would be present at a meeting at Port Pirie about a fortnight ago to meet the Minister of Mines and the Director of Mines to discuss the desirability of bringing the gas pipeline down the coastal route; and
- (2) Wallaroo interests will be present at a meeting to be held at Port Augusta next Friday for the same purpose.

I wish to point out that these press reports are quite misleading. While I was present at Port Pirie as an observer there was never any suggestion that delegates from Wallaroo council should be present, nor was there any suggestion that a case for a Wallaroo pipeline be brought forward. As regards the forthcoming Port Augusta meeting, this is completely inaccurate as far as Wallaroo is concerned. Wallaroo council knows nothing whatever about it. In point of fact, Wallaroo must disassociate itself completely from any endeavour made by the two northern councils to have the pipeline brought down the coast—

and this is the last thing which I want to say and to which I hope members opposite will listen—

Wallaroo is fully satisfied with the Government assurance that priority will be given for the construction of a pipeline for the proposed fertilizer works.

Opposition members have no answer to that letter.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I shall now gently, kindly, softly and briefly massage the auditory organs of honourable members. I congratulate the Treasurer on introducing his

first Budget. Perhaps I can do him the greatest possible service by speaking only briefly, because I have been told that he wants to reply to the debate on the first line this evening. In these circumstances, I should have forgone my right to speak altogether except that I have some information which might be of interest to honourable members and which so far has not been given in this debate. In the completely destructive speech he made in this debate, the Leader of the Opposition criticized the Government for blaming many of its ills on the Commonwealth Government. I am going to give the Committee the benefit of what a political colleague of the Leader of the Opposition did today in Victoria. Sir Henry Bolte—

Mr. Hudson: He is a good friend of the Leader's.

Mr. JENNINGS: He is a mentor of the Leader, and this afternoon he devoted the first six pages of his Budget speech to criticizing the Commonwealth Government. I am informed by the Leader of the Opposition in Victoria that he used some choice epithets in describing the Holt Government. Amongst the imposts that Sir Henry Bolte has now levied on the people of Victoria is a purchase tax or sales tax of 1c on each \$10 transaction.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: On everything.

Mr. JENNINGS: Members do not need me to tell them that this is a most savage impost. The Victorian Premier has also foreshadowed an increase in land tax. He described the attitude of the Commonwealth Government as "ostrich-like" and as making crushing mistakes through its dominant financial powers under the Commonwealth Constitution. He said:

I have to regretfully report that the attitude of the Commonwealth has forced the State to increase taxation.

He was referring, of course, to Victoria. That is all I have about the Victorian Budget. We shall all know much more about it tomorrow but I am glad now to be supporting a Budget wherein taxation was not increased at all and a Government that is much more humanitarian than are the counterparts of our opponents in this Chamber.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I have studied the things said by members of the Opposition in this debate and was interested to hear what the Leader of the Opposition had to say about Budget policy in this State. He advocated, by implication, measures that would be utterly disastrous for South Australia. He said we had seen fit to use Loan moneys, as had until today every

other State in the Commonwealth, in financing schools and hospital buildings, and that this was running counter to the needs of the State for development. Until today, every other State had used its Loan moneys in the way that this State saw fit to under the previous Treasurer and myself. I suggest that members opposite look carefully at what their Liberal Party colleague in Victoria has seen fit to do with his Loan funds.

We must take it that honourable members opposite propose to do as their Liberal colleagues elsewhere have done in their budgetary measures. What is their answer to finding the money for our State services? The Leader of the Opposition proposes that we do not spend Loan moneys on the things that we have spent them on but that we get additional moneys from revenue. If we are not to run a deficit beyond that which we have found, it means one of two things: either that we sack men—

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It doesn't mean that at all.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —or that we raise taxes and charges. There is no other way of coping with it: we either get additional revenue or we reduce the expenditure by the Government. Only once during his whole speech did the Leader point to any expenditure in this State that he suggested we reduce. He suggested that we should not give the additional leave to the public servants of South Australia. The public servants will be interested to hear the Leader's views on that item.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: They don't want it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Deputy Leader ought to read the journal *Public Service* to see what the public servants want, because they have said it specifically.

Mr. Hall: That's buying votes.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government gave a specific pledge before it took office that it would do this. We were elected and we have done it. The cost this year clearly is not the amount suggested by the Leader and the deficit in the Budget would not be cured by striking off the cost of the increased leave for public servants this year. If we are to do the kind of thing the Leader suggests (that is, find the extra money out of revenue beyond what we are finding from revenue now) the Leader must say whether we are to do this by reducing services or by increasing taxation.

Mr. Heaslip: By using revenue to better advantage.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Let the honourable member say on what line we are to reduce expenditure. Every member who has spoken in this Chamber in the last year has suggested that we expand our expenditure. We have been reproached for not spending more. Let me point to what members opposite have been telling the public about this, because the public ought to know the position. We have vouchsafed to us in South Australia in the past few weeks one of these little publications called the *Voice of South Australia*, stating that we are paying too much in State taxation. It is obvious that members opposite suggest that State taxes and charges in South Australia should be reduced, so we would either have a bigger deficit or have to sack people and reduce our services. What, in fact, has been the record of increasing State taxation and charges under Liberal Governments elsewhere in Australia as compared with the record of the present South Australian Government? This Government has an unexampled record of cushioning to the people of this State the effect of the depredations on State Budgets by the Commonwealth Government about which Sir Henry Bolte has been so vocal in delivering his Budget speech today.

Let me give members opposite the figures. They are not the figures quoted in the Opposition pamphlets, which are not mini-truths but maxi-lies. Members opposite, in these pamphlets put out by the Liberal and Country League, have quoted taxation figures related only to amounts paid into Consolidated Revenue, not taxation and State charges paid as a whole to all funds of the State. They have carefully made a selection in order to deceive the people. However, the following figures, released by the Bureau of Census and Statistics, show the actual tax paid per capita in the various States:

State	Tax per capita	
	1964-65	1965-66
	\$	\$
New South Wales	48.58	50.86
Victoria	48.42	52.96
Queensland	40.17	41.35
Western Australia	36.76	42.40
Tasmania	32.54	35.60
South Australia	35.53	36.68

This State has the lowest figure of all the mainland States. Our figure exceeds only that of Tasmania, the only other State with a Labor Government. I turn now to the increases in taxes and charges in all States during the period of office of this Government. The increase in per capita taxes and charges in

New South Wales is 4.7 per cent. In Victoria it was 9.4 per cent before the introduction of the present Budget, which put a savage impost of purchase tax on every single business transaction in that State. Evidently this is what is now proposed by members opposite, if one can account at all for their financial policy; it is certainly difficult to judge it from statements of the Leader and his cohorts. In Queensland the increase is 3 per cent, which is less than our increase, but not very much less. However, that State receives special assistance from the Commonwealth Government, which seems to consider Queensland as a part of Australia. On the other hand, the Commonwealth Government has not given the same kind of consideration to this State.

In Tasmania the increase is 9.4 per cent. In Western Australia, that State about which the most lyrical of speeches have been delivered recently by members opposite, that booming place, that place where people are so satisfied with the expansion there—in that State the increase in per capita taxes and charges is 15.4 per cent.

Mr. Heaslip: Isn't that State booming? Plenty of overtime there.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member should go over to Western Australia and ask the people what they think about State taxes there. The Government there has already imposed a purchase tax, which Sir Henry Bolte has now copied in Victoria. So we know what Liberal Party members propose to do in South Australia.

In South Australia the increase in State taxes and charges has been only 3.2 per cent, and members opposite know perfectly well that we have not increased them in this Budget. We have been able to keep State taxes and charges low and maintain this State's finances in a sound position because we are concerned to see that the people of South Australia experience a low-cost structure. This Government is concerned to see, not that further impositions are made upon the people of this State, but rather that the depredations of the Commonwealth Government are cushioned for the people.

No other State has been able to get by in the face of the things the Commonwealth Government has done to it as successfully as this State has done. I marvel that the Opposition is prepared to come forward during the debate on this Budget and say, "It is all wrong: you should be spending more from

Loan funds on developmental works"; the Opposition also implies that this Government should have to find so much more from revenue by some means or other and reduce charges. If this Government did what the Opposition advocates, the one result would be to reduce the services to the people of this State given by the Government. I say categorically to Opposition members, "We are not going to do that."

The CHAIRMAN: I intend to put the items *seriatim*.

First line (Legislative Council, \$41,011)—passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.22 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 14, at 2 p.m.