

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 20, 1968

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: CITY OF WHYALLA

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I have received through the honourable member for Whyalla a petition from the ratepayers of the city of Whyalla, addressed to me as Speaker, and couched in terms of section 32 of the City of Whyalla Commission Act, 1944-1964, praying for an alteration in the system of local government in Whyalla. I caused the petition to be checked through the good offices of the Chairman of the commission (Mr. C. L. Ryan) who has advised me that the petition contains 3,382 signatures (53.5 per cent of the ratepayers of the city of Whyalla as at July, 1967).

The petition stated that it was desirable to establish in Whyalla a local government body in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act, because of (1) the greatly increased population and the prospect of a further considerable increase; (2) the elevation of Whyalla to city status; and (3) preference of the majority of ratepayers for a fully elected representative body. It asked (1) that legislation be passed to dissolve the City of Whyalla Commission and to establish in Whyalla a local government body in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act; and (2) that the House would cause to be appointed a committee of inquiry to make recommendations to ensure satisfactory transitional provisions.

Received and read.

QUESTIONS

DISCRIMINATION

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Has the Premier a reply to the questions I have asked previously about reports made locally and in other States of a breach by certain hotels in South Australia of the Prohibition of Discrimination Act?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am pleased to be able to inform the honourable member that the Attorney-General has investigated this matter to ascertain whether a breach of section 3 of the Prohibition of Discrimination Act, 1966, has occurred. Section 3 provides:

A person shall not refuse admission to any licensed premises, place of public entertainment, shop, or any public place, or any part

of any licensed premises, place of public entertainment or shop open to the public, to any person by reason only of that person's race or country of origin, or the colour of his skin. Penalty: Not exceeding \$200.

Miss Frese was contacted and the matter discussed with her. She has now written to the Attorney-General the following letter:

On August 5, I was interviewed by a representative of ABS channel 2 for its "Today Tonight" programme featuring arrangements made for the Ninth International Congress of Soil Science. Among various questions asked, I was invited to comment on the problems or difficulties faced in arranging hotel accommodation for 1,000 delegates. On discussing some of the difficulties which arose in accommodating these people, I mentioned that two or three hotels indicated that they would prefer not to have non-English speaking people, coloured people, and cook Kosher food. At no time did any hotels refuse to render any special services, or to accept delegates of non-European origin. I understand this interview was screened on August 6 on channel 2 and, on the following day, I was appalled to read in Adelaide newspapers a distorted version of the abovementioned interview quoting me as having said that hotels refused to accept the delegates in question. I hereby wish to repeat and stress that no hotels in Adelaide at any time refused to accept coloured delegates.

It appears abundantly clear that there has been no breach of the Act, and indeed no suggestion of discrimination. As South Australians are justifiably proud of their reputation for hospitality, I am glad that there can be no suggestion of any reflection upon that reputation. The Government regards the matter as closed.

MOCULTA WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Several years ago I made representations on behalf of constituents living in the township and district of Moculta requesting that Moculta be provided with a reticulated water supply either from Angaston, which is about four or five miles away, or from Truro, which is about three miles away, and I was informed that the request could not be granted as the proposition would be uneconomical. However, as I have noticed in recent months that the new Swan Reach to Stockwell main passes close to the township of Moculta, can the Minister of Works say whether the Moculta district and township will receive a reticulated water supply from the Swan Reach to Stockwell main in due course?

The Hon. J. W. H. COURCE: As I realize the importance of a water supply for this part of the honourable member's district, I will examine the suggestion and bring down a report as soon as possible.

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS

Mr. CLARK: I have received from a constituent a letter, one paragraph of which states:

In common with many people of my acquaintance, I am very concerned at the cases of apparent cruelty to animals in this State that are constantly reported in the press and on television. It amazes me to learn that the South Australian Government gives no financial support to the societies at present concerned with animals, viz., the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and the Animal Welfare League.

Can the Premier say whether this statement is correct and, if it is, will he consider providing in this year's Budget for some assistance to the two organizations mentioned in this letter?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Following the honourable member's representations, I shall be happy to consider the matter and to let him have a reply as soon as possible.

COOBER PEDY POLICE STATION

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Premier a reply from his colleague to my recent question regarding the Coober Pedy police station?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have a reply to questions asked by the honourable member and the member for Whyalla (Hon. R. R. Loveday). The answer, which is of mutual interest, is that a police station has been requested for Coober Pedy and that the matter of providing extra police assistance will receive consideration when the premises are available.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. VIRGO: At the beginning of last week the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report was released by the Premier and since then many people have had the opportunity to study it. The reaction to that study, particularly from those personally involved, has been anything but favourable. I draw the Premier's attention to the study objectives on page 4 of the report, as follows:

The broad objective of the study is to devise a workable, acceptable and adaptable plan to guide traffic and transport development in metropolitan Adelaide up to the year 1986.

People in the Edwardstown District have already expressed to me grave concern about the proposed alignment of the Noarlunga Freeway and of the rapid rail transit. The question of necessity that arises is whether there has been a full and thorough investigation. We know that the consultants employed were competent in their field, but the question continuously being asked is whether every possible alternative, including that of building the Noarlunga Freeway as an elevated freeway

over the land at present owned by the Railways Department and thereby probably not involving any land acquisition and not interfering in any way with any houses on the land involved, has been considered. Can the Premier say whether the Government, if the scheme proceeds (and I sincerely hope that it does not proceed in its present form), will accept the responsibility of finding for those people who will be affected by the implementation of the scheme other houses of comparable standard in all ways, including value and distance from employment, shops, schools, beaches, and other facilities, and whether the Government will also accept responsibility for compensating those property owners whose properties are in close proximity to works involved in the scheme and, although not required, will be considerably devalued as the result of the implementation of the scheme?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am sure the honourable member realizes that this scheme is put forward for the benefit of the community, not of the Government. Of course, the community as a whole will bear the costs of acquisition, and the Minister of Roads and I have said that, where acquisition is necessary, proper prices will be paid. It is not our policy that individuals should be harmed financially when their properties are required for the good of the community. I am sure the honourable member also realizes that those making the report have included among the investigating authorities much local representation. An attempt is not being made to foist on the public a scheme from outside Adelaide: as a study it contained much local opinion. However, I will obtain a reply for the honourable member as soon as possible.

Mrs. BYRNE: Some of the people whose houses will be demolished if this report is adopted have bank loans that will not have been paid off by the date of demolition, even if the freeways are not constructed for 15 years. They are concerned that, because they have already had one loan or because of their age in, say, 15 years' time, they will be disqualified from obtaining another bank loan which it will be essential for them to have to purchase another house. Will the Premier consider this aspect when preparing his reply to the member for Edwardstown?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be happy to consider this matter.

Mr. VIRGO: I do not in any way consider that this is a political matter, and I hope that it will be treated on its merits and not become

a political football. I understood the Premier to say that the Government intended to implement the M.A.T.S. recommendations. Would he amplify his statement about compensation? He referred to "proper prices". Can he say whether those proper prices will be only the market value of the houses affected or whether they will take into account the personal value that has been built into those houses by the many thousands of hours of work and devotion of the various owners? Also, does the Premier consider that, if the plan proceeds in accordance with the existing recommendation of the M.A.T.S. report, the peaceful living and contentment of many thousands of citizens will be sacrificed merely for the purpose of providing faster travel for motor cars?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I accept the honourable member's contention that this should not become a political matter. Because the questions cover a wide range and have many facets and because of the honourable member's interest in detail, I will obtain a detailed reply. I remind the honourable member that this plan is to be considered for six months, and the Government will listen to every matter about which representations are made. No-one has said that the plan will be implemented in its entirety. It is put forward so that it can be discussed and representations made, and it has very properly been made available through councils so that those interested can study it. However, I will obtain replies to the questions asked by the honourable member.

MEAT

Mr. McANANEY: In the past week or so the matter of a charge of 1c a pound inspection fee on meat coming in from Port Lincoln has been raised. Last week the Minister of Agriculture announced that he would issue licences to Port Lincoln so that the charge would be ½c a pound. On Friday the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board refused to inspect meat from Port Lincoln unless it was assured that it would receive the 1c a pound levy. As this action is directly opposite to what the Minister of Agriculture said would be the case, will the Minister of Lands discuss this matter with his colleague to ensure that the ½c charge is implemented?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will ask my colleague what is the present position, and inform the honourable member when I have that information.

RADIATA PINE

Mr. HUDSON: In explaining the Loan Estimates the Treasurer stated:

The sum of these increases was offset to the extent of \$1,000,000 because the proposed repayment from the forestry undertaking had to be deferred pending a review to determine what the undertaking could afford consequent upon the latterly reduced sales and forest exploitation.

Normally, the Woods and Forests Department is expected to repay to the Loan Account about \$2,000,000, but this year there has been a \$1,000,000 reduction in that repayment. During the short time I was Minister of Housing, the question of the Housing Trust's use of radiata pine was discussed and, as a result of my recommendation, a Cabinet decision was made requiring the trust to specify Woods and Forests Department radiata pine in all its contracts. In view of the position of the Woods and Forests Department can the Minister of Housing say whether the Government intends to maintain that policy in order to maximize the trust's use of radiata pine from the Woods and Forests Department and thereby to protect as much as possible the position of the Loan Account?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As the honourable member is aware, many industries in this State supply building materials of all kinds, and the Government's view is that all of these people should have a reasonable opportunity to maintain their output and their industry. The Woods and Forests Department as a supplier of building materials is one of many suppliers. Real objections were raised to the proposal outlined by the honourable member and, after these objections had been considered, the Government did not insist that the trust should specify entirely the use of radiata pine by all its subcontractors. The honourable member has linked this matter to the matter raised by me on the Loan Estimates regarding the deferment of a repayment by the Forestry Board, and he suggests that he believes that action taken by the Government has been responsible for making that necessary. That is my interpretation of the question. As the member for Glenelg knows, in the Woods and Forests Department's mills there has been an accumulation of timber stocks which has been built up for some time, although I do not know over what period. This is not unheard of in the department's history. In my own time as Minister of Forests, about 12 years ago, there was a similar circumstance in which the board became somewhat embarrassed by an

accumulation of stocks. I suggested to the board (although it was partly the board's idea) that it should embark on a sales drive in Victoria. The board did this, and it was successful: in a short time it resulted in a clearance of surplus stocks. The contribution to surplus which may or may not have been made by the present Government's policy decision is not material to this problem. I for one am not prepared to say that the Government should refuse to use the products of other suppliers in this field merely to protect the Woods and Forests Department, as this would be an untoward preference to a Government industry.

Mr. Hudson: The previous policy has been reversed?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The policy suggested by the honourable member has been modified, so that the Housing Trust is not required to specify exclusively the use of radiata pine in its contracts, for the reasons I have already given.

Mr. BURDON: Is the Minister aware (and I think I am correct in saying this) that, with one or two exceptions during 1967, the Housing Trust has always specified in its subcontracts that it would use radiata pine from the Woods and Forests Department, a policy initiated by Sir Thomas Playford and continued by the previous Government? Can the Minister say what sales loss the Woods and Forests Department can expect as a result of the present Government's decision? Why was this decision made while a serious overstocking problem existed? Finally, what effect does the Minister expect this decision to have on the future ability of the Woods and Forests Department to make substantial repayments to Loan Account?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

CHANDLER HILL ROAD

Mr. EVANS: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question of August 7 regarding a dangerous corner on Chandler Hill Road, Happy Valley?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Roads reports that the construction of the curve on Chandler Hill Road opposite the property of Mr. D. Nicolle is not planned within the next few years. Arrangements are already in hand for advisory speed signing.

COMPREHENSIVE INSURANCE

Mr. RYAN: Has the Attorney-General replies to my questions of August 13 about an illegal practice which had been developed by

an insurance broker and which concerned motor vehicle comprehensive insurance?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The questions asked by the honourable member raised issues that concern a particular broker, whose activities have recently been investigated by the police. Those investigations resulted in an arrest and charge and, accordingly, it would be undesirable at this stage to say anything while the matter is *sub judice*. In so far as the honourable member's questions refer to circumstances outside the ambit of the police proceedings, they relate to possible civil proceedings. Civil proceedings are taken on the initiative of the individual citizen, who is guided by his own legal advisers, and it would be inappropriate for me to make any general pronouncements on law relating to this matter. I have no reason for supposing that the civil remedies ordinarily available in the circumstances likely to be disclosed by the evidence will be defective.

HILLS QUARRY

Mr. GILES: A quarry in Horsnell Gully which is at present extending its operations is using a ridge that overlooks the old Norton Summit Road. There is a drop of 600ft. from the quarry ridge to the Norton Summit Road, involving a steep gradient of one in two. As there is a possibility of rocks falling from the quarry ridge to the Norton Summit Road, will the Premier ask the Minister of Mines whether action cannot be taken to protect motorists in the area from falling rocks?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be happy to obtain a report for the honourable member.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. CASEY: Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked some time ago about an expected increase in manpower when the railway line between Broken Hill and Port Pirie is completely standardized?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The effect of gauge standardization on the railway establishment at Peterborough has been carefully considered by officers of the Railways Department. While on the one hand an increase in interstate traffic is envisaged, on the other the number of trains carrying Broken Hill concentrates must necessarily decrease on account of the greater haulage capacity on the standard gauge track. However, a substantial transfer depot will be established at Peterborough and,

in addition, it is intended to retain the servicing and maintenance facilities at that station. Overall, therefore, it is not expected that, in the long term, there will be any substantial variation in the railway establishment at Peterborough.

MAITLAND WEIGHBRIDGE

Mr. FERGUSON: About 12 months ago the Highways and Local Government Department installed a weighbridge within the township area of Maitland on the Yorketown road. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads how much it cost to install that weighbridge? Will he also ascertain the purpose of installing it; when it is intended to operate; and who will man it?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will try to obtain that information.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about local government regulations?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Minister of Local Government states that, early in 1964, the Auditor-General considered it desirable that accounting practices in local government be reviewed, and recommended that a committee be set up for this purpose. Cabinet approved the setting up of a committee of inquiry with the following terms of reference:

That the committee of inquiry examine accounting procedures, systems of book-keeping, annual returns and records kept by local governing bodies, with a view to simplification and uniformity and with particular application to country areas.

The committee invited all councils to submit any views or comments, and after intensive investigations submitted its report and recommendations on September 15, 1967. The introduction of the new regulations is far from a panic measure and, in fact, they will do much to assist councils and up-grade the standard of local government accounting procedures throughout South Australia. The Government has no intention of taking a backward step by revoking the regulations.

RENMARK HOUSING

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to the question I previously asked about the delay in providing rental houses at Renmark?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The General Manager of the Housing Trust reports that the trust is aware of the housing situation at Renmark and is at present preparing a site for

further rental houses in the town. It is expected that tenders will be called for the erection of rental houses shortly. Some of the houses currently being built at Renmark have been reserved for tenants who have intimated that they would like to purchase a house, and these tenants, on vacating their present accommodation, will make available houses for rental applicants.

FLUORIDATION

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I recently asked about fluoridation?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Details of the fluoridation of water in the United States are as follows:

The population of the United States in 1966 was 199,500,000. Of this total 36.3 per cent received fluoridated water. Of the total population only 153,500,000 were then supplied with reticulated public water supplies. Of this figure, 47 per cent were receiving fluoridated water. Latest figures released by the American Dental Association put the estimated number of Americans drinking fluoridated water at 78,000,000.

LAURA POLICE

Mr. VENNING: Has the Premier a reply to the questions asked last week by the member for Frome (Mr. Casey) and by me about the closing of the Laura police station?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Laura police station was closed on July 31, 1968, when the officer in charge was transferred to Port Pirie. The residence is in a bad state of repair and has reached the stage where further patching would be uneconomical. It is not fit for habitation in its present state. As Laura is only seven miles from Gladstone on the main road (and the two officers at Gladstone can adequately cope with the additional commitment of policing Laura), the district will not suffer from the closing of the station.

Mr. VENNING: It was reported in the press that on the night of August 3 only one police officer was on duty between Clare and Wilmington. As the member for Frome (Mr. Casey) told the House last week, the fortnightly dance at Laura is notorious not only because of the activities at this function but also because of its popularity amongst the people in the North. Then on the alternative Saturday night a similar—

The SPEAKER: Order! There has been a tendency amongst members this session to give a terrific amount of information before they ask questions, and to conclude by asking, "Is

this so?" This procedure is strictly out of order. The honourable member is debating this matter, and he must now ask his question.

Mr. VENNING: Yes, Sir. A recent press report stated that on the night of August 3 there was only one police officer on duty between Clare and Wilmington, the police station at Laura having closed on the last day of July. Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary whether that was so?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will find out for the honourable member.

GAS

Mr. HURST: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to the question I recently asked about employment on the natural gas pipeline?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: There are at present five persons employed in South Australia by the contractor for the construction of the pipeline (in the office and store), and all of them were recruited in this State. I understand from the Manager of the Natural Gas Pipelines Authority, which will operate the pipeline, that when the construction of the pipeline is completed between 40 and 50 persons are expected to be employed on its operation, all of whom will be recruited locally. I have been informed by the South Australian manager of the contractor that preference in employment will be given to trained and competent South Australian employees but in the initial stages, and until local staff are trained, some technical and specialist staff from overseas and other States will be employed in positions in which no persons in South Australia with the necessary experience are available.

Mr. HUDSON: Last Thursday I asked the Treasurer a question concerning the Natural Gas Pipelines Authority and the sale of a 10 per cent interest in the South Australian oil and gas fields at Gidgealpa and Moomba to an Australian company, Vam Limited of Melbourne. I asked the Treasurer whether the Government had approved the sale and what possible change in representation on the pipelines authority could be expected as a result of this or other similar sales that might arise. Has the Treasurer a reply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member's question boiled down to the matter of representation on the pipelines authority by producer interests. Under the Act the producer companies nominate two members of the authority, and a producer company is defined to include Delhi Australian

Petroleum Limited and Santos Limited until either has been proclaimed, after recommendation by the Minister of Mines, to have ceased to be a producer company. It is defined also to include any other company proclaimed after recommendation by the Minister of Mines. The proposed new arrangement between Delhi Australian Petroleum Limited and Vam Limited will, it is understood, give the latter only equitable rights, without full ownership, for some significant period until certain financial transactions are completely carried out. It is accordingly unlikely that the Minister of Mines could, in the interim, regard Vam Limited or its appropriate subsidiary as a producer company. If the present arrangements are consummated and the Minister of Mines subsequently recommends a proclamation of the new participant as a producer company, then that company would be authorized to act jointly with the other producer companies in nominating members as required to replace those already nominated and appointed.

Mr. HUDSON: On August 15, I asked the Treasurer a question regarding the provision in the Loan Estimates of \$1,000,000 this year and last year for the Natural Gas Pipeline Authority and I asked him to indicate whether this borrowing would be of a permanent nature or whether the money would be repaid to the Loan Fund as it was gradually replaced by semi-governmental borrowing. Has the Treasurer a reply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Whereas the estimate made early in 1968 was that the capital expenditures on the natural gas pipeline for the initial construction would be about \$39,600,000, and present indications are that the authority will be able to live within that figure, the Treasury planning has been that the loan requirements may be about \$40,000,000 by June 30, 1970. It is already arranged that \$20,000,000 will be borrowed for terms of 15 years or more by the authority as a semi-governmental body in accordance with a special approval given by Loan Council, and that the Commonwealth Government will advance as required a further \$15,000,000 repayable over the eight years 1972-73 to 1979-80. These arrangements leave a further \$5,000,000 or thereabouts to be secured for the authority, and this is the figure referred to in the Loan speech to be secured from other sources. Arrangements were made in 1967-68 for the authority to secure long-term borrowing on the ordinary annual semi-government borrowing programme of \$969,000 and a

further borrowing of \$780,000 in similar manner is proposed for 1968-69. If it is practicable to allot from the ordinary annual semi-government programme in 1969-70 a further \$750,000, there would remain another \$2,500,000 (approximately) to be found by June 30, 1970. Already \$1,000,000 has been provided during 1967-68 out of State Loan Account and a further \$1,000,000 is anticipated this financial year, with possibly another \$500,000 or so in 1969-70. This assumes a total initial requirement of \$40,000,000 for the pipeline. It is expected that the advances to the authority out of State Loan Account will be short term only and will be repaid either out of the authority's own operating recoveries or by further semi-governmental borrowing after June, 1970.

Mr. HUDSON: I address my question to the Treasurer, and it relates to the question I asked last week concerning—

The Hon. R. S. Hall: Why need you explain a previous question?

Mr. HUDSON: This is a brief explanation and, if anyone is interested enough to read *Hansard* or if anyone is concerned to listen to what is going on at present, there is—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot debate the matter. He must ask his question.

Mr. HUDSON: My question relates to the increase in the cost of the natural gas pipeline as a result of the increase in diameter from 18in. to 22in. Has the Treasurer a reply to my previous question?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Under Treasurer reports that the earlier estimates for an 18in. pipeline suggested a total capital requirement of \$37,400,000 of which \$31,000,000 was likely to be required in the first instance and the remainder later during the first five supply years for additional compressor equipment. For a 22in. pipeline the estimates made early in 1968 suggested a cost of \$39,600,000 in the first instance with a further \$1,800,000 for compressor equipment, probably during the third and fourth supply years. Accordingly, the decision to change from an 18in. to a 22in. line involved an increase in estimated costs in the first instance of about \$8,600,000, but the net increase for the programme to the end of the fifth year was estimated at only \$4,000,000 (that is \$41,400,000 as compared with \$37,400,000). The main benefit of the 22in.

proposal is, of course, that for comparatively minor subsequent expenditure beyond the early \$41,400,000 upon further compressor equipment, it could carry considerably increased volumes of gas, whereas the \$37,400,000 spent upon an 18in. pipeline would have brought the pipeline to its maximum capacity and any further capacity could only be secured by duplication at comparatively high cost. With the proving by early 1968 of greatly increased reserves of gas the 22in. proposal became a clearly economic one, whereas the earlier estimates of reserves could not justify it. The figure of \$35,000,000 often quoted in respect of the 18in. pipeline was the expected necessary borrowing to finance it, as it was expected that about \$2,400,000 of its total cost could be financed out of recoveries during the first few years of operation.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister of Lands report on the present position of drought assistance for South Australian farmers?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Commonwealth Government has decided to end drought relief in general form on September 30. In reply to a letter received from, I think, the Prime Minister on this matter, the Premier sought an extension of this assistance for South Australia, because it was not clear at the time whether the drought had actually ended in all parts of the State. The Commonwealth has now stated that it cannot carry on most forms of drought relief beyond September 30 next, and the following measures will apply:

(1) Freight rebates on the movement of fodder from another State and within the State will cease at the end of September, 1968.

(2) Freight rebates on the movement of stock back from agistment and on movement of stock purchased for replacement will apply up to December 31, 1968.

(3) Advances to primary producers to enable them to carry on where finance is not available through normal channels will continue but will apply only to applications received and approved up to September 30, 1968.

(4) Grants to district councils and other bodies for the provision of employment will cease on September 30, 1968.

I point out that farmers who have not needed assistance hitherto but who think they will probably need it should apply immediately to the department. If they do that and subsequently do not require the assistance, no harm will have been done, but they should apply only if finance is not available from any other source. I also point out that grants for employment end on September 30. These

grants have been a great help up to the present, because farmers have been able to have some gainful employment; in fact, some of them will need it until harvest time.

Mr. NANKIVELL: In his rep'y the Minister indicated that it was intended to continue assistance to farmers by way of loans for carrying on after the completion of the present Commonwealth arrangements. Can the Minister say whence that money will be provided?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I did not say that. I said that the Commonwealth had announced that the cut-off date for freight rebates on the movement on fodder would be September 30, and for the movement of stock on agistment it would be December 31; for advances to primary producers it would be September 30, and not beyond, and for grants to district councils it would be September 30. Some primary producers may need carry-on finance between September 30 and the harvest, when they will be employed on their own properties and will no longer find that this money is available through employment by the district councils, so I strongly suggest that, if farmers cannot find finance from other sources, they go to the Lands Department before September 30 seeking drought relief assistance, not employment. This will be considered as long as they apply before September 30 and money is not available from any other source.

Mr. CORCORAN: The Minister of Lands said that no further advances would be made after September 30 but applications could be made by any person who considered he might require financial assistance. If he thinks he may need it, he should apply and, if he does need it, he can use the money but, if eventually he does not need it, he need not use it. I am concerned about the scheme of repayment of the loans already made as carry-on finance to primary producers. Will the Minister obtain for me a report on how many applications have been made and the amount of money involved so far? During the time I administered this scheme, whereas other States had set a time limit for repayment to be made I decided that this was not a wise step because a primary producer could have a very good season and would be able to repay a substantial part of the advance; on the other hand, a primary producer might experience a bad season. I thought that, if a set time limit was imposed, he might not bother to repay the money until the time was up. Because the State was required to repay this money to the

Commonwealth, I thought it better to leave the matter flexible. Has the Minister considered whether any change could be made or whether a policy might be formulated in regard to repayments?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have considered it and have made no change. I endorse the system that was in operation when I took office. As members know, a competent committee is continually considering applications for drought assistance and making recommendations on them. It prescribes varying rates of repayment, irrespective of the fact that the State Government has to repay the money on a set basis. I think this is the best system and it will not be affected but I will obtain the information requested by the honourable member.

Mr. Corcoran: Will you ascertain the number of farmers who applied for carry-on finance and the amount made available?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will obtain that information in detail and make it available as soon as possible.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I thank the Minister of Lands for the replies he gave me regarding drought relief. As much of the work that was being done by councils under grant has been held up because of weather, and as farmers would prefer to work rather than to borrow money in order to carry on, will the Premier use his good offices with the Commonwealth Treasurer to see whether it would not be possible to get an extension until the end of November of the period through which the Commonwealth Government will assist with drought relief, so that those farmers who depend on this money for income will not have to wait too long between completing work and receiving their first payment from their cereal harvest?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will do what I can to get a report and see what is possible for the honourable member.

SUBCONTRACTORS

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to my recent question on contracts between the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited at Whyalla and subcontractors, and on the conditions applying thereto?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: The statement made by the member for Whyalla in asking his question, regarding a condition contained in some contracts made by the B.H.P. Company, was not entirely correct. I understand that the contracts between that company

and firms contracting for construction work require that during the currency of the contract such firms shall not, without the consent of the company, take employees of the company into their employment. There is no such requirement as to ex-employees of the company, as the honourable member suggested. A significant number of ex-employees of the B.H.P. Company are employed by engineering firms in Whyalla, including many who have been trained by that company, both as apprentices and otherwise. This does not appear to be an unreasonable condition, having regard to the labour situation at Whyalla. It encourages other employers to take workmen to Whyalla. It also ensures that, in order to meet his contract obligations, the contractor does not deplete the resources of the company, with which he has contracted to do certain work, by engaging employees of that company without its consent. Such action would defeat the purpose of letting a contract. It seems clear that the policy which the B.H.P. Company has adopted has been a significant factor in the industrial growth and population increase at Whyalla.

CRIMINAL LAW

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Earlier this session, in reply to some things I had to say in the Address in Reply debate, the Attorney-General delivered himself of some remarks concerning the committee of inquiry into substantive and procedural matters of criminal law in South Australia, which committee had been set up by my Government, and the research project for the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General, which had been set up jointly by the Attorney-General's Department in South Australia and the Adelaide University.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: On consumer credit?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. On the first of these matters, it would appear that, when the Attorney-General replied in the House, he could not have had a discussion with the Chairman of the criminal law revision committee (Mr. Justice Hogarth) with whom I had had discussions in detail on the matters to be dealt with by this committee. At that time, Mr. Justice Hogarth seemed satisfied about the work to be done by the committee, and the committee proceeded to work. Can the Attorney-General say what work has been done by that committee and what meetings have been held since the Government took office? Secondly, regarding consumer credit, it would also appear, from the reading of the file by

the Attorney-General, that he had not bothered to bring himself up to date with discussions I had had with Professor Rogerson and other members of the university staff concerning the facilities that had been provided for them and the arrangements that could be made by the Attorney-General's Department for research work to be done on that project. Can the Attorney-General say what work has now been carried out by the Attorney-General's Department in furtherance of the arrangement that I personally made with Professor Rogerson at that time to carry out this project?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Leader has asked me about two matters. The first concerns the revision of the criminal law which, during his term of office, he announced would be undertaken. Either before or after (I think before) I spoke in this House, I had seen Mr. Justice Hogarth (I called on him in his chambers and discussed this matter with him) and, to my recollection, what I said in the House was the substance of what he told me on that occasion. I asked His Honour not to continue for the time being with the inquiry and the work on this matter, because (and the Leader will probably remember this) the then Leader of the Opposition (the present Premier) announced in our policy speech that we would set up a committee to advise the Government on law reform. Although I cannot yet make an announcement on that matter, I hope to be able to do so in the next couple of weeks. The question of revision of the criminal law will be swallowed up in the broader reform that we plan. However, as I think I said in the Address in Reply debate, the committee that the former Attorney-General, my predecessor, had set up had done some work but, so far as I could ascertain, had been given no precise terms of reference and was working rather in the dark. As I say, that work has been suspended for the moment.

The inquiry regarding consumer credit was undertaken by South Australia at the request, I understand, of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General, and carried out in this State by the law school at the University of Adelaide. Professor Rogerson called on me recently (I think it was about the time I spoke in the Address in Reply debate) and the only help he requested, which I gathered from him and from the file had been promised by my predecessor, was secretarial help. I understand that the report is almost complete and should be ready in the next few months. The only thing that was delaying the report was

lack of typing assistance, and I have asked the Public Service Board to arrange to give that, in accordance with the undertaking that had been given by the present Leader of the Opposition. Further, my understanding of the position is that no significant research assistance was given by the previous Government toward this project. The work had been done entirely by those at the university, and by the time we came into office it was too late to give any assistance that would have been of help.

BURRA ROADS

Mr. ALLEN: Recently the Minister of Roads told me that work would commence next year on the Burra-Booborowie-Spalding roads, Nos. 140 and 375. Will the Attorney-General ask his colleague whether pre-constructional activities on survey, design, acquisition and material investigation will be carried out this year to enable construction and sealing to commence next year?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will ask my colleague about the matter.

HOUSE FOUNDATIONS

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to my recent question about house foundations used by the Housing Trust?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The reply is rather lengthy but, as the matter is of interest, I will read it in full. I have further discussed this matter with the General Manager of the Housing Trust and he has now supplied a comprehensive report. The trust's soil laboratory tests carried out in the Holden Hill area, in which it is building 63 single-unit sale houses, showed that, while the whole of the area was comprised of expansive clay soil, the depth of the clay and the degree of potential movement varied. From soil samples taken from a pattern of test holes located strategically over the site, the profiles vary from surface silty clay loam overlying silty lime fines, clayey silt and sandy clay, with lime being evident throughout, to bands of silty clay of high to very high potential movement from 19in. to 36in. below the surface. From these profiles and the tests made upon the samples it was determined that wall construction be in brick veneer and masonry veneer and that the three following footing types appropriate to the depth and behaviour characteristics of the expansive soil be used:

(1) On specifically numbered sites having very high expansive soil, deep beam external footings 14in. wide by 36in. deep reinforced with three half inch diameter rods top and

bottom with the bottom of the footings founded not less than 27in. below natural surface: internal footings to solid walls of bathrooms, toilets and laundries to be 11in. wide by 36in. deep reinforced with two half inch diameter rods top and bottom. Stumps to sub-floor bearers supporting framed walls taken down 30in. and set on concrete pads. Corner stumps fully concreted in and braced at right angles to the slope where they exceed 30in. above natural ground level.

(2) On specifically numbered sites where the expansive clay was in thinner bands and closer to the natural surface, external deep beam footings 14in. wide by 21in. deep and internal footings 11in. wide by 21in. deep founded not less than 12in. below the surface and reinforced as for 36in. deep footings. Sub-floor stumps founded 30in. deep as before.

(3) On a specific group of eight houses where there was a band of silty clay loam at the surface, this band to be removed, replaced with suitable material, benched and compacted: on these sites external footings to be 18in. wide by 12in. deep reinforced with three half inch diameter rods top and bottom and internal footings 11in. wide by 12in. deep reinforced with two half inch diameter rods top and bottom: these footings to be founded directly on top of the benched and compacted surface without excavation.

In addition to employing these three footing types, to restrict "wetting-up" through garden development, all houses are being provided with 4ft. concrete paving around the full perimeter and bitumen impregnated caneite is inserted between the paths and all gullies and gully sinks and the junctions sealed with a pliable sealing material. It is worth noting that the trust, for several years now, has been providing flexible jointed sewer pipes on all its houses built on expansive soils, to reduce the likelihood of cracking sewer lines due to soil movement.

From the foregoing it can be seen that the trust has endeavoured to provide suitable footings to the 63 houses being built at Holden Hill. The trust takes considerable measures to avoid cracking of its houses but points out that until an economical system capable of withstanding all the vagaries of expansive soils is devised it is impossible to guarantee against any cracking occurring. The problem remains with the soil scientists, the engineers and the building industry as a whole. I have read the report at length, because I think it shows that the trust has not been inactive in this matter but, indeed, has pursued every possible avenue of investigation and has been in the forefront of experimentation with various types of foundation in order to meet differing soil circumstances. This is somewhat contrary to the view I often hear expressed that the trust is wedded to the standard and

conventional types of house foundation and does not have proper regard for the soil conditions in which it builds. The report indicates completely to the contrary, and I think members will commend the trust for the work it is doing in order to solve this difficult problem.

DENTAL HEALTH

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the establishment of Government dental clinics and the extension of treatment for pensioners?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The dental clinics referred to in His Excellency's Opening Speech are school dental clinics. They will be staffed by school dental therapists working under the supervision of a dental officer. School dental therapists are trained to treat dental caries in schoolchildren, and in dental hygiene and health education. Their whole period of training is directed towards restoring and preserving dental health in children, so that they may maintain the best possible dental health throughout life. There is no training in the types of dental care appropriate to elderly people; for example, in denture work. In addition, the Dentists Act permits these young women to operate only in the school dental service. It is expected that the first clinics will be in operation by the middle of 1969.

GOOLWA BARRAGES

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question about the operation of the Goolwa barrages?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The operation of the five barrages to maintain lakes at the designed pool level involves the adjustment of gate openings at Tauwitchere and Ewe Island, and the removal of stop logs at Goolwa, Mundoo and Boundary Creek. Adjustments are made as and when necessary, with due regard for the flow in the Murray River, wind influence on levels, and tide heights, and are carried out with a minimum of delay. It is the practice to close barrages when the level is 2in. to 3in. higher than normal pool level.

SCHOOL CHARGES

Mr. BROOMHILL: Last week I asked the Minister of Education a question concerning public examination fees and the Minister undertook to obtain a report on whether information could be provided to parents early in

the Intermediate year and whether consideration could be given to parents who would find it difficult to meet the fees. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The Public Examinations Board has no power to waive fees for the examinations it conducts. If they are not paid, the candidate cannot sit. However, schools sometimes assist by paying the fees in deserving cases and allowing the parents or parent to repay the money over a period. When the fees are not paid to the school, the parent must remit them direct to the board. If it is stated on the application that the student attends a particular school, the money will be included on that school list where the student will be examined. If the school name is not stated on the application in these circumstances, the student is treated as a private student and advised to sit at a central place (for example, Centennial Hall). Consideration will certainly be given to the honourable member's suggestion that parents of students be reminded early in the year that they will be required to pay examination fees later in the year.

ORANGES

Mr. WARDLE: About three weeks ago two extremely severe frosts caused tremendous damage to the navel citrus crop at Mypolonga and, no doubt, in many other river areas, and between 50 per cent and 70 per cent of the total navel orange crop was ruined. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture to have one of his officers investigate this situation to ascertain whether any assistance can be given to citrus growers similar to that given to producers affected by drought, fire, etc.?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes.

METEOROLOGY

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question about installing meteorological recording equipment on Troubridge Island?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Regional Director of the Commonwealth Bureau of Meteorology has advised that standard meteorological equipment, including an accurate wind recorder, will shortly be installed on Troubridge Island. Similar equipment has been installed at Neptune Island and Althorpe Island, and the installation on Troubridge Island will complete the network of reporting stations designed to improve the

forecasting and warning services, not only to fishermen but also to any small craft operating in Investigator Strait and the gulf waters. Forecasts and warnings are available to the operators through the fishermen's limited coastal radio stations and through the national and commercial radio and television stations.

MINERALS

Mr. McKEE: Recently, I noticed a press statement that the Minister of Mines had said that the Government intended to speed up the search for minerals within the State. I understand that several discoveries of copper deposits in the northern part of the State have been reported recently, that some of the deposits are worth while and that some of the ore has been sent to Port Kembla for treatment. In view of the high freight charges and smelting costs, which have made these ventures uneconomic and caused many operations to cease in some areas, could the Premier obtain from the Minister of Mines a report in respect of the potential of these deposits with a view to establishing a copper smelting works within the State, as no doubt these deposits would be known to the Mines Department?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I appreciate the honourable member's question, because the Government is most interested in regenerating mineral search in South Australia. I will take up this matter with my colleague and get a report for the honourable member.

CEDUNA POLICE

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked on August 7 about the Ceduna police station?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: A programme of work has been determined for the erection of a new combined police station, courthouse and Government office building at Ceduna. Planning is proceeding on the basis that the department will be able to call tenders towards the end of this financial year for the project. It is expected that it will take about 12 months from the date a contract is let to complete the buildings. Provision has been made in the 1968-69 Loan Estimates to enable this programme to proceed.

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked recently regarding the possible appointment of an extra police officer for the Ceduna area?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Ceduna is at present policed by a sergeant, a first class constable and two constables. Additional accom-

modation has been sought, and I understand that funds have been included for the purpose in the Loan Estimates for 1968-69. The question of having an extra police officer on the staff will be considered when the accommodation is available.

INSTITUTE COMMITTEES

Mr. HURST: Has the Minister of Education a reply to a question I asked on August 1 about additional financial assistance for institute committees?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The Council of the Institutes Association has applied for a sum to be included in the 1968-69 Estimates for maintenance of and repairs to institute buildings and for an increase in subsidy to cover increased book costs. These requests are receiving consideration in connection with the preparation of the Budget.

EAST END MARKET

Mr. GILES: Has the Minister of Lands obtained a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my recent question about the changing of marketing hours at the East End Market?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture reports:

I have had representations from greengrocers regarding marketing hours at the East End Market. All aspects of this problem are being carefully examined, and any supplementary information furnished by the honourable member will be fully considered in conjunction with present investigations.

PENSIONERS' SPECTACLES

Mr. BURDON: During the term of office of the previous Government I took up with the then Minister of Health the matter of providing a spectacles service for pensioners in country areas, and particularly in Mount Gambier. The then Premier (now the Leader of the Opposition) announced on February 19 that a pilot scheme would be introduced and that Mount Gambier would be the starting point. I understand this service was ordered by the Director-General of Medical Services. Can the Premier, representing the Minister of Health, say what the present position is?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will get a report for the honourable member.

CANBERRA TELEVISION SERVICES

Mr. JENNINGS: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to a series of questions I have asked him about Canberra Television Services Proprietary Limited?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: As I indicated last Tuesday in my earlier reply to the honourable member, an application was made to the President of the Industrial Commission by the three dismissed employees of Canberra Television Services pursuant to the provisions of section 26 (2) of the Industrial Code, 1967. The application was heard by the President on August 14 and August 15. After hearing evidence as to what had occurred, the President requested the parties to confer. At the conclusion of their conference the parties indicated that they had made a private arrangement concerning the matter and applied to withdraw the application. The terms of the arrangement were not disclosed by the parties. As the parties have resolved their differences, the matter is therefore concluded.

WOOMERA LIBRARY

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: In the report of the Woomera Public Library for the period from January, 1967, to June 1968, the Librarian makes the following complaint:

In the 18 months covered by this report 544 requests were sent to the State Library and the reply for 177 of these was "Not available".

Will the Minister of Education ascertain whether this situation was due entirely to the State Library's lack of funds, resulting in the Woomera library, and possibly other libraries in the State, being unable to obtain sufficient books, and will she consider whether special consideration should be given to the Woomera library?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I shall be pleased to obtain this information for the honourable member.

FOOTWEAR PRICES

Mr. RYAN: As there appears to be an upward trend in retail footwear prices, will the Treasurer, as Minister in charge of the Prices Department, ascertain whether these prices have been decontrolled and, if they have, whether this has been done as a result of an alteration in Government policy or on a recommendation by the Prices Commissioner?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not agree that there has been an upward trend in footwear prices, but I say this as a result of my personal observations and not as a result of any information sent to me by the Prices Commissioner or anyone else. Having compared prices of brands and types of footwear in Adelaide with those in other capital cities I have recently visited, I believe that Adelaide prices are on a par with those in other State capitals.

Representations have been made to me by the industry that these prices should be decontrolled, but no action has been taken to decontrol them.

STATE'S FINANCES

Mr. CASEY: In view of the Prime Minister's recent statement in South Australia that a Commonwealth Liberal Government could expect to have better working relations with State Governments of the same political colour as that of the Commonwealth Government, can the Premier explain why South Australia's claim for extra assistance made at the recent Premiers' Conference has been consistently ignored? Will he say whether the Government is aware that the Queensland Government received so much financial assistance for drought relief from the Commonwealth Government that it was able to release funds for other State purposes, including \$20,000 for the Queensland State Library? Is the Premier now able to announce a break-through in his relations with the Commonwealth Government as a result of his so-called mystery mission to Canberra last Friday to plead with the all-powerful?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: If I did not know the honourable member better I would think he was being political. My mission to Canberra last Friday had nothing to do with this State's finances. The report that I travelled with the Under Treasurer was wrong. He was in Canberra, but I did not know this until I was returning to Adelaide, so there was no connection between his visit and my visit. The honourable member is wrong in assuming that any request of the South Australian Government has been rejected. The matters are still proceeding.

MOONTA RAIL SERVICE

Mr. HUGHES: On June 27 the Minister of Transport was reported in the *Advertiser* as saying that \$100,000 would be saved if the two passenger rail services to Yorke Peninsula were discontinued. Following this report, I was prompted by some of my constituents to ask the Minister to consider having one rail-car service provided between Moonta and Adelaide, instead of cancelling both services. In my constituents' opinion this would save about \$50,000. The Attorney-General, however, last Thursday replied to my question as follows:

The Minister of Transport reports that the retention of one passenger rail service operating between Moonta and Adelaide would

result in only a marginal saving to the Railways Department and that, accordingly, if the request were agreed to, the aim in improving railway finances would be defeated.

Apparently, several railway employees heard this reply announced during radio and television news services, or perhaps they read it in a newspaper. Consequently, they have become most concerned about the matter. To enable railway employees in the Wallaroo District to plan their future, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Transport to announce an approximate date when passenger rail services between Moonta and Adelaide will be cancelled?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will ask my colleague whether he is prepared to do that.

WILD LIFE RESERVE

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question about the final details of the dedication of a fauna and flora reserve on southern Yorke Peninsula?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It is not yet possible to advise the honourable member when details will be completed and the national park on southern Yorke Peninsula will be dedicated. Progress has been made with regard to surrender of certain leases and termination of annual licences involved. Further action is required under the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act, and this action is not expected to be completed within the near future. This matter is being attended to as best it can be in the circumstances.

ANZAC HIGHWAY

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads a reply to my recent question about the bicycle track alongside the Anzac Highway?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague reports:

The demand for the bicycle tracks on the Anzac Highway has decreased substantially during recent years. The tracks had been in service for 30 years and had reached the stage where total reconstruction was necessary, and it was considered that this expenditure was not justifiable.

When I passed along this route on Sunday morning I took special note of the accuracy of this remark. The track is not in good condition, even for running. It has already been taken up in some places and householders have planted lawns in its place. The report continues:

The safety of cyclists using the Anzac Highway carriageways will be kept under close scrutiny but no undue difficulties are foreseen as this is a normal situation encountered throughout metropolitan Adelaide.

LANGHORNE CREEK MINING

Mr. McANANEY: Test drills have been put down in the artesian basin in the Langhorne Creek and Milang area. Will the Premier ask the Minister of Mines whether a preliminary report has been made regarding any discoveries and whether any conclusions have been arrived at?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As I should like to oblige the honourable member, I will do what he asks.

PORT PIRIE EDUCATION

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question regarding the Port Pirie branch of the Institute of Technology?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I regret that I have not yet obtained a reply for the honourable member.

SOUTH-EAST RAIL SERVICE

Mr. BURDON: Has the Attorney-General received information from the Minister of Transport regarding the South-East rail service?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Layout plans for air-conditioned sleeping-car and sitting-up accommodation on the Mount Gambier night train service have been prepared. The priority of Loan funds for other works is such that this work will not be undertaken during the present financial year.

OUTER HARBOUR

Mr. HURST: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to my recent question regarding the sum spent last year on road work, fencing and ancillary office accommodation at Outer Harbour?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The sum spent on works at Outer Harbour during the financial year 1967-68 was \$84,995.

WALK AGAINST WANT

Mr. CASEY: Can the Premier say, first, whether the Chief Secretary (Hon. R. C. DeGaris), after bringing honour and glory to the Legislative Council by completing the Walk Against Want course at the weekend, is now as lame as Government excuses for wanting to keep the Legislative Council in

existence; secondly, whether the performance of the younger Attorney-General in running the course was intended as a symbolic gesture of virility to back his case for universal voting rights for the Legislative Council; thirdly, why the Hon. C. M. Hill, as Minister of Transport, did not bring up the rear in a truck to help his suffering colleagues?

The SPEAKER: The question is rather facetious. Does the Premier desire to reply?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: There is nothing symbolic about the Attorney-General: everything about him is real. I am pleased to hear a member of the Opposition again state that Party's policy, which is for the abolition of the Legislative Council. At least we know where the honourable member stands on that issue.

PARILLA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Premier a reply from the Minister of Mines regarding the drilling of a bore for a township water supply at Parilla?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: All of the department's present boring plants and crews are committed on urgent projects. Priorities are examined at regular intervals, and it is proposed to construct the Parilla bore on completion of the current work in the Milang area. It appears at present the earliest this bore can be constructed is in about one month. Should the situation change, it may be possible to commission another plant for the Parilla project.

UNSOLD HOUSES

Mr. BROOMHILL: Recently when I asked the Minister of Housing for information regarding unsold Housing Trust houses he said there were 214 unsold houses at that time compared with 500 for the corresponding period in the previous year. I then asked him how many houses had been provided in the Elizabeth area during the last four months for Commonwealth Army and Air Force personnel. Can he now give me this information?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: With great respect, the honourable member need not repeat his whole question, for I could have identified it on a brief reference. The General Manager of the Housing Trust states that in the period from April 13 to August 10 this year the trust let 128 houses at Elizabeth and Smithfield Plains to Commonwealth Army and Air Force personnel.

FREELING SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of July 31 concerning new toilets at the Freeling Primary School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: A contract has now been let to Messrs. Celmins and Sariks for the erection of the toilet block at the Freeling Primary School. The contractors have quoted a period of 18 weeks to complete the work.

UNLEY POLICE STATION

Mr. LANGLEY: Last year, it was decided that the yard at the Unley police station should be levelled and resurfaced, and recently I discovered that the levelling had been done but that the surface had been cut away as a result of the wet weather. Will the Minister of Works ascertain when the bituminizing of this area will be completed?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I shall be happy to do that. The wet weather to which the honourable member has referred is probably the very reason why the work has not been completed. As he is probably aware, some bitumen work cannot be done in wet weather.

ARTIFICIAL INSEMINATION

Mr. McANANEY: In my area some dairy farmers who keep high-productive herds wish to obtain the semen of their own proven bulls and the only facilities available are at Tongala, Victoria. The farmers are permitted to bring the semen into South Australia, but the Artificial Insemination Board's inseminators are not allowed to use it even though they go past these places. I cannot see why this embargo should apply. Will the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, ascertain why these inseminators cannot provide this semen?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes.

COONAWARRA TOURISM

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Immigration and Tourism a reply to my question of August 13 concerning certain aspects of tourism at Coonawarra?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Coonawarra is shown in some maps used by travellers but not in all of them. Coonawarra is included in the Royal Automobile Association strip maps but not in the R.A.A. surface maps. The R.A.A. has been asked to include Coonawarra in its surface maps in future.

THEVENARD FOOTBALL MATCH

Mr. HURST: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the behaviour at a football match at Thevenard?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Thevenard is policed from Ceduna, which has a complement of four police officers, including a sergeant, who at present are able to control the apparent unruly behaviour in the district.

WATER RESOURCES

Mr. CORCORAN: On August 8, I asked the Minister of Works a question about the policy outlined by the previous Government on the employment of consultants to investigate and report on the water resources in part of the State in conjunction with an investigation to be carried out by the Engineering and Water Supply Department in other parts of the State. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I regret that I do not have a reply. I should have indicated to the honourable member when he asked his earlier question that it might take several weeks to get the information he requested. It may still be a couple of weeks before the information is available, but I will obtain a reply without further delay.

MILE POSTS

Mr. EDWARDS: Can the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads, say what is the cost of erecting concrete mile posts; whether they are necessary; whether it would not be better to put the extra money into roadworks; and whether it would not be better if such posts could be placed at five-mile or 10-mile intervals?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will obtain my colleague's opinion on the matter.

HOUSING TRUST PROGRAMME

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Minister of Housing a reply regarding the present waiting period for Housing Trust houses and flats?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The General Manager of the Housing Trust reports:

The trust cannot give a definite waiting time for its rental houses, because the time depends on many factors, including the urgency of the case and the availability of houses which, in the metropolitan area, at present is governed by the number of vacancies occurring in the existing rental houses. The trust does make allowances for deserted wives and widows with families and reduces the waiting time considerably in these cases,

according to their urgency. The delay in the northern suburbs is about 18 months, while in the southern areas the waiting time is about three years. Naturally if the conception of the metropolitan area is widened to include Elizabeth the waiting time for a rental house is considerably reduced. There is wide variation in the waiting time for the two and three-storey flats. For example, at Stow Court, Fullarton, the waiting time is up to 2½ years, while at Henley Beach or Brooklyn Park it could be three months. There is a much greater delay for ground floor flats than for flats on the upper level, and this, too, varies from group to group. The answer to the honourable member's question in this case is that the time ranges from three months to 2½ years, according to the applicant's requirements. Since the cottage flat scheme was first introduced in 1955, the trust has had a difficult task in satisfying the many urgent applications received. At present, the waiting time for a single-person flat is up to seven years, while for a two-person flat (time again depending on vacancies) it is between 12 and 18 months.

EGGS

Mr. FREEBAIRN: My question follows the reply given me last week by the Minister of Lands regarding the charges levied by the various State Egg Boards for grading eggs. In his reply the Minister said the grading charges for eggs were as follows: Central Queensland and South Queensland, 4c; New South Wales, 6.3c; Victoria, 5c; Western Australia, 4.25c; and Tasmania, 3.7c. In South Australia the agents charge 6c a dozen for their services to growers. Will the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, ask his colleague what services the agents of the South Australian Egg Board provide to growers to justify the higher charge for egg grading in this State compared with the levy in all the other States, with one exception?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: As I pointed out last week, the board is aware of changing conditions within the industry, and at present it is investigating the whole basis of payments to grading agents. However, I will obtain a further report for the honourable member.

PRAWNING INDUSTRY

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a reply to my recent question regarding the prawn fishing industry?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Director of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation reports:

A total of 40 vessels has been licensed to trawl for prawns, some fishermen having been issued with permits to trawl in more than one zone. The numbers of prawn trawling permits issued for the respective zones are as follows:

Zone A	13
Zone B	2
Zone C	13
Zone D	11
Zone E	15
Sub-Zone C	7

Monthly production figures compiled from fishermen's returns since permits were first issued on April 14, 1968, are as follows:

	lb.
April	20,913
May	77,248
June	97,592
July (incomplete)	146,617
Total	<u>342,370</u>

BEACHPORT WATER SUPPLY

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week concerning the future Beachport town water supply?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The present depth of the bore at Beachport is 1,180ft. There has been some trouble with the plant but drilling is scheduled to resume this week with a target depth of approximately 1,200-1,250ft. Results to date have been disappointing. A large volume of water has been located of a very high saline content. It is hoped that better quality water may be available in the Knight Sands at the approximate target depth, in which case the salt water will be cased off. The prospects at this stage do not look promising. Work is resuming this week.

UPPER HERMITAGE WATER SUPPLY

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on August 15 concerning the Upper Hermitage water supply?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The Engineering and Water Supply Department has no immediate plans for an extension of water main to serve houses situated at Range Road North, Upper Hermitage.

SCHOOL BUILDINGS

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last Thursday concerning the arrival of a consultant from England to advise the Public Buildings Department on the construction of school buildings?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The firm of Peter Falconer and Partners will consult with the Education Department and the Public Buildings Department on designs of new buildings.

The consultant will be working in close liaison with officers of both the Education Department and the Public Buildings Department as to the future requirements for schools in this State. The consultant plans to arrive in Adelaide on Thursday, September 12, 1968, and is expected to remain here for eight weeks.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Before relinquishing office as Minister of Education, I approved the policy and programme of having a representative of Peter Falconer and Partners, specialist architects in school buildings, come to South Australia to confer with officers of the Public Buildings Department. Will the Minister of Works say whether that programme has in any way been altered or whether it remains the same as when I approved it?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Although I am not sure whether the programme has been altered, I replied last week to a similar question that had been asked by the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell). In the supplementary reply given today, I pointed out that arrangements were in hand for the Falconer organization to send a consultant to South Australia, following the visit to the United Kingdom by the Director-General who returned, as I reported last week, with progressive ideas concerning South Australia's future educational requirements. In conjunction with this scheme, it was arranged for the consultant in school buildings to come to South Australia to inform both the Education and the Public Buildings Departments on future requirements, so that the programmes of those two departments would coincide. The reply I have just given the member for Albert referred to the date on which the consultant would arrive in Adelaide, and he will work in Adelaide for about eight weeks. Following his return to England, an officer of the Public Buildings Department, who would have worked in close liaison with the consultant visiting Adelaide, would subsequently visit England in order to examine the work being done there. Travelling back to South Australia, that officer would visit other countries, particularly the United States, so that improvements in educational and public buildings work in this regard would be closely in line with the State's future requirements.

WINE GRAPES

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It was reported in the press a few days ago that the Commonwealth Bureau of Agricultural Economics would shortly conduct an investigation into the cost structure of the wine grape industry. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of

Agriculture when the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry will commence its field survey and whether each of the three wine grape-growing areas in the Light District will be visited for the purpose of taking evidence?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes.

LOAN EXPENDITURE

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Treasurer a reply to the question I asked last Thursday about a comparison with last year's provision of the provision under this year's Loan Estimates for the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The new building for the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science is really a part of the major redevelopment of the Royal Adelaide Hospital site, although it was reported on separately by the Public Works Committee. With the letting of a single contract for the new wing and the new nurses' home, it was decided to treat the institute project as part of the major redevelopment, and hence the presentation in this way in the Loan Estimates for 1968-69. The actual expenditure last year in respect of the institute wing was \$79,000, and the estimated expenditure in 1968-69 is \$1,050,000.

KEITH DEPOT

Mr. NANKIVELL: As I have received a letter from the Minister of Works referring to the Engineering and Water Supply Department's intention to spend, I think, \$32,000 in constructing a depot at Keith, will the Minister ascertain where that depot will be situated?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The need for this depot has arisen with the advancing programme of the Taillem Bend to Keith main. The depot is planned to be erected and operating by the time the water supply arrives at Keith. However, I will obtain as soon as possible a report on the specific point raised by the honourable member.

DERNANCOURT ROADS

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Housing ascertain whether the kerbing and sealing of the road was included in the purchase price of houses built by the Housing Trust in Meylan Crescent and Willowbrook Avenue, Dernancourt?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am sorry, but as I did not catch the question, I ask the honourable member to repeat it tomorrow.

WHEAT SILOS

Mr. CASEY (on notice):

1. What is the number and location of permanent wheat silos in this State?

2. What is the number, expected date of completion, and location of permanent wheat silos under construction in this State?

3. What is the total holding capacity of those wheat silos that are already constructed or under construction?

4. What is the number and location of temporary storages for wheat in the State?

5. What is the number, location and expected date of completion of additional temporary storages for wheat under construction?

6. How much wheat is still held in permanent wheat silos in this State?

7. What is the estimated wheat harvest for the 1968-69 season in South Australia?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. There are 154 permanent wheat silos in South Australia. Details of locations are included in the attached schedule which, because of its length, I will not read but which the honourable member may peruse.

2. Six, as follows:

Port Lincoln, civil contract to be completed early November, 1968; Thevenard, civil contract to be completed in September, 1968; extensions at Lock, civil contract to be completed in October, 1968; Kapinnie, civil contract to be completed in September, 1968; Keith, civil contract is scheduled for completion in October, 1968; and Wirrega, civil contract to be completed in November, 1968. In addition a 1,000,000-bushel extension at Wallaroo is expected to be commenced in November, 1968, for completion by July, 1969, and a further 1,500,000-bushel storage block at Giles Point, to be commenced in the first quarter of 1969, is planned for completion about September, 1969.

3. 48,557,000 bushels.

4. Thirteen, located as follows (*vide* schedule):

ADELAIDE DIVISION

Port Adelaide (Australian Wheat Board Depot).

Bordertown.

Farrell Flat.

Löxton.

PORT PIRIE DIVISION

Port Pirie (Australian Wheat Board depot).				
Gulnare.				
Jamestown.				
Wirrabara.				
Booleeroo Centre.				
Yongala.				

PORT LINCOLN DIVISION

Port Lincoln (Australian Wheat Board depot).				
Port Lincoln (Australian Barley Board depot).				
Kimba.				
Lock, Warrambo.				

THEVENARD DIVISION

Thevenard (Australian Wheat Board depot).				
---	--	--	--	--

5. Additional temporary storages for wheat under construction are at Port Lincoln, Wudinna, Edillilie, Tumby Bay, Kimba, Thevenard, Lock, Port Pirie, and Jamestown. These are all scheduled for completion by the commencement of the 1968-69 harvest intake.

6. 12,623,000 bushels.

7. The current tentative estimate is 65,000,000 bushels.

STUDENT TEACHERS

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (on notice):

1. How many graduates, male and female respectively, attend South Australian teachers colleges?

2. Are the numbers of these graduate students increasing or decreasing?

3. How many students, male and female respectively, in each yearly course attending South Australian teachers colleges, are married?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The replies are as follows:

1. 54 men and 26 women.

2. The numbers of graduate students are increasing.

In reply to the third part of the question, I ask leave to have the following table incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

MARRIED STUDENTS

Course	Year	Men	Women	Total
Primary	1st	5	1	6
	2nd	6	5	11
	3rd	6	2	8
Infants	2nd	—	1	1
	Secondary	1st	5	—
2nd		5	—	5
3rd		10	3	13
4th		11	5	16

MARRIED STUDENTS—continued

Course	Year	Men	Women	Total
Commercial Physical Education	3rd	—	1	1
	1st	1	—	1
Craft	3rd	1	—	1
	4th	2	—	2
	1st	1	—	1
	2nd	5	—	5
Art	3rd	1	—	1
	4th	1	—	1
	1st	1	—	1
	2nd	1	2	3
	3rd	1	—	1
	4th	1	—	1
		64	20	84

VETERINARY SCIENCE

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (on notice):

1. How many South Australian students have gone to another State to study veterinary science in each of the years from 1959 to 1968, inclusive?

2. How many South Australian students have been unable to go to another State to study veterinary science during the period from 1959 to 1968, inclusive, because places were not available?

3. What scholarships are now available for South Australian students obliged to go to another State to study veterinary science?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The replies are as follows:

1. Figures are not available to show the total number of South Australian students who have gone to another State to study veterinary science since 1959. It is known, however, that in addition to students who have been awarded veterinary science scholarships a number of other South Australians have studied under Commonwealth scholarships, Commonwealth Government cadetships and as private students. The following table shows the numbers of applications received and scholarships awarded for veterinary science made available by the State Government:

Year	Number of applications received	Number of scholarships awarded
1959	3	1
1960	12	2
1961	5	1
1962	Applications not invited	1 transferred from Ag. Sc. cadetship
1963	15	3
1964	17	2
1965	17	2
1966	20	6
1967	17	9
1968	20	6
<hr/>		
	126	33

2. No figures are available to show the number of students unable to study veterinary science because places were not available.

However, the following figures, relating to the current academic year, are submitted as a guide:

	Melbourne University	Sydney University	Queensland University
Number of South Australian students who applied for admission in 1968:			
First year	19	11	*Nil
Second year	6	*Nil	4
Number of South Australian students admitted in 1968:			
First year	1	11	*Nil
Second year	Nil	*Nil	3

*Sydney University now insists on enrolment in first year only, and Queensland will not accept interstate enrolments into first year. In both cases inquiries were received but not considered.

It will be seen that quite a few qualified applicants from South Australia were unable to gain entry to veterinary science this year.

3. The following scholarships for the study of veterinary science are available in South Australia:

- (a) Veterinary science scholarships issued by the Agriculture Department. Depending on the availability of places at interstate universities and the quality of the applicants, up to six of these scholarships are awarded annually. Successful applicants are entitled to the payment of tuition, fees, and an annual allowance ranging from \$525 in the first year of the course to \$640 in the final year of the course. There are 20 students at interstate universities holding these scholarships.
- (b) The Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry issues cadetships in veterinary science and these are available on a competitive basis to South Australians. The number of cadetships currently held by South Australians is not known.
- (c) Commonwealth scholarships.
- (d) Australian Agricultural Council scholarships.

FRUIT FLY (COMPENSATION) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS (REDIVISION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 15. Page 680.)

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): It does not give me any pleasure at all to speak on this Bill.

Mr. Rodda: Are you kidding?

Mr. CLARK: No, I do not like the thing at all. I remind honourable members, too, of just how the Bill is described: "A Bill for an Act to provide for the appointment of a commission to make, and report upon, a division of the State into proposed electoral districts, and for purposes consequent thereon or incidental thereto." Some members have referred to it as an electoral reform Bill, but I do not think it can be described in that way.

Mr. Lawn: It provides for redistribution.

Mr. CLARK: Yes. It is, I suppose, electoral reform in the sense that it at least makes a little better the shocking condition of our districts as they are now. I have been a member of this place since 1952. Of course, that is a long time.

Mr. Hudson: Some members opposite might regard it as a bit too long.

Mr. CLARK: There are times these days when I would often agree with that sentiment. However, as I managed to obtain a majority of 11,000 or 12,000 at the last State election, who am I to argue with my masters over a thing like that?

Mr. Hudson: Your majority would be sufficient to elect four or five members opposite.

Mr. CLARK: I would not say that, but the majority of electors in my district (and it was given to my Party—I do not claim the credit for myself) would be larger than the total number of electors in some of the present districts. I have been a member since 1952 and, as I look around the Chamber, I see only seven members who were members when I first came here. I refer to the Speaker (Hon. T. C. Stott), the Treasurer (Hon. G. G. Pearson), the Minister of Lands (Hon. D. N. Brookman), to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches), the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn), and the member for Hindmarsh (Hon. C. D. Hutchens).

Mr. Rodda: You are a hardy old veteran.

Mr. CLARK: At times I am inclined to think I have become a veteran. When I have the pleasure, or displeasure, of hearing the utterances of some members who have entered the Chamber since I have been a member, at times I think it is well to be a veteran.

Mr. Rodda: That is a sign of getting old.

Mr. CLARK: No, it is a sign of experience. Of course, this Bill will mean that more changes will take place: it could mean that old faces will go.

Mr. Hudson: New faces could go, too.

Mr. CLARK: Yes, some very new faces may go; that will be in the hands of the commissioners to be appointed under the Bill. Before speaking, I took the opportunity to glance through previous volumes of *Hansard* for the years since I have been a member in which I found that many hundreds of pages had been devoted to debates on electoral reform. I have added more than my fair share of pages on this matter. In years to come, these passages of *Hansard* may well be an interesting study for political historians, who may find difficulty in believing that a system such as that debated in those pages could possibly have existed in a State such as South Australia. I do not intend today to add a great many more pages to the hundreds already devoted to this subject.

When I rose, I felt sorely tempted to commence my remarks by apologizing to the Premier. I have never been in the habit of apologizing; in fact, I have never had to apologize in this place (I have never done it of my own volition, either). The reason is possibly that, mainly, I am (as honourable members well know) polite, soft-tongued and moderate unless I am severely provoked. However, I thought of apologizing to the Premier because, during the long, extended debate which lasted through most of an afternoon and night early in the session, I doubted the Premier's word and expressed myself fairly strongly in doing so. I doubted what he had said before the Millicent by-election which, as quoted in the press (and newspapers are normally correct), was as follows:

If we win Millicent, I will consider it an endorsement of our plan. If we lose Millicent, I shall consider it an endorsement of the A.L.P. plan. Of course, we will then have to compromise.

As I say, earlier I doubted the Premier's word because I felt that, although Millicent had been lost in a fairly obvious way, the

Premier was not prepared to keep his promise, and I accused him of that bluntly. I now withdraw that accusation. I am not apologizing, but I know now that the Premier is keeping his promise. I understand that this Bill is the compromise that the Premier is prepared to make, following the Millicent by-election. However, I ask honourable members to think of the sort of legislation that would have been introduced if the Premier's Party, by some amazing stroke of fortune or if sufficient people in the Millicent district were misguided enough, won that by-election. Just imagine what the legislation might have been!

I think it may be well to consider some of the things that have been attempted in recent years. I have a strong feeling that, if Millicent had been won by the Government, legislation would have been introduced that would be best described as being similar to the now famous poisonous legislation introduced on February 20, 1964, by the former Liberal Premier. At this stage, I offer a warning to new honourable members. I note a regrettable tendency on the part of some of them to follow in the footsteps of the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) and I warn them that there are better examples on their side of the House than that gentleman. I say that not unkindly but to try to help. We have all been new members at some time, and the position of a new member is not easy. Let me remind the House of what was introduced in 1964 by Sir Thomas Playford and let me remind the House also that this was a complete reversal of his earlier form. We had never heard of such a thing before and one or two honourable members, when they first heard of it and until they had the opportunity to examine it, started to think that there might be some advantage in that legislation.

Sir Thomas abandoned his previous definition and in the Bill to which I have referred he provided for 20 members from so-called primary producing districts, 20 from non-primary producing districts and, best of all, two from country industrial districts. That seems to me to be what could well have been provided for by the present Government if it had won Millicent. It seemed to some of us that at last Sir Thomas Playford was relaxing the iron hand in the very rough and worn velvet glove.

Mr. Jennings: Some people thought that he was infected by democracy.

Mr. CLARK: I understand that one or two people in South Australia thought that. It did not take long for them to change their minds, particularly when they heard this statement by the then Leader of the Opposition, the late Hon. Frank Walsh, on February 25, 1964:

Two factors are forcing the Government to make a change. Under the present distribution, it faces defeat at the next election.

In fact, that Government was defeated at the 1965 election. The Leader of the Opposition continued:

An even stronger force is at work—the mounting criticism against the autocratic Government which has remained in office contrary to the votes recorded by the electors.

Events also proved him right on that matter. As honourable members know, Parliament rejected the Bill, because there was not a constitutional majority in favour of it. However, it is interesting to note who voted for that Bill but did not speak in support of it. I am not accusing them about that. The Opposition members who spoke were the late Hon. Frank Walsh, Hon. G. A. Bywaters, Hon. R. R. Loveday, Hon. D. A. Dunstan, Mr. Lawn, Mr. Riches, Mr. Casey, Mr. Jennings, and me. The only speaker from the Government side was the one who introduced the Bill, and apparently that was considered quite enough. One may ask whether Government members were ashamed of that particular legislation. I think many of them could well have been ashamed, but that did not affect the voting on the issue. The honourable members who voted for the Bill (and some of them are still here) were Mr. Bockelberg, Hon. D. N. Brookman, Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe, Mr. Ferguson, Mr. Freebairn, Hon. R. S. Hall, Mr. Harding, Mr. Heaslip, Mr. Laucke, Mr. McAnaney, Hon. Robin Millhouse, Mr. Nankivell, Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson, Hon. G. G. Pearson, Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, Mr. Quirke, Mr. Shannon, Hon. Joyce Steele, and Hon. B. H. Teusner.

I believe sincerely that many of those honourable members would have liked not to vote for the Bill. As I have said, there was not a constitutional majority in favour of it, and the Bill was defeated, yet strangely enough those who supported it must have known that it was a confidence trick of the most unsavoury kind, because I am certain that not all the honourable members who were then on the Government side of the House were stupid. Those of us who have been here for some time know that in those days, even until 1964, most people

on the Government side (and this may be hard for new members to understand) blindly followed the Playford doctrine like sheep.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Just what are you trying to say by that implication?

Mr. CLARK: I am trying to give the Minister information and, heaven knows, he needs information!

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: What about giving us information about the Bill?

Mr. CLARK: All my remarks are leading up to that, as the Minister will find if he is patient enough to listen. I think he will do that, because I usually find him a particularly good listener. In the Bill to which I have referred we were confronted with a change just as great as the change that seems to be provided for in the Bill before us. We know what had been the Playford theory for years. I am pointing this out to show the enormous difference between the policy and ideas on legislation introduced for many years up to 1964 and that being considered now.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You wouldn't suggest that your side was consistent, I hope?

Mr. CLARK: I make no suggestions whatever about that. I have not mentioned consistency. I could do so, but I do not want to go into that particular issue at this stage.

Mr. Rodda: You're implying it, I think.

Mr. CLARK: I am not implying: I am saying. I do not imply. If I have something to say, I say it straight out. Let me return to the Playford theory and system that was as firm as the rock of Gibraltar and just as immovable. In 1953, Sir Thomas Playford said:

Generally speaking, the country is under-privileged . . . I believe the present electoral system has been of great benefit to them. Let me make it quite clear that I do not budge one inch from my belief that the present metropolitan area is adequate as compared with the representation for country areas.

In 1954 he said:

If we are going to develop the State and provide for decentralization that is no warranty for taking away representation by country members.

Again, in 1958 he said:

. . . any alteration in the two for one system would have a bad effect on the community and not improve the State's development.

All other Liberal members trotted meekly along behind him in agreement. The debate on the Bill now before us shows that many Government members believe that this system

was correct, although they have not said so, and they are no more happy about this legislation than I am. Perhaps I like it better than they do, but I do not like it much. But what changed members' ideas about this important issue? Along came the 1965 election and every L.C.L. member realized that his Party had been devoured—bones, hide, and every other part—by that ravenous man-eating gerrymander which they had bred on the State by artificial insemination and which for so long the Liberal Party had fed, fondled and nurtured. It was a tiger that gobbled up its creators.

After more than 30 years we come now to a change. Yet the Party that introduced the change is still prepared to stick to the pernicious nonsense about the Legislative Council that it has stuck to for years. We have heard rumblings recently of the Premier and the Attorney-General both being anxious to have adult franchise for the Council. However, I take that idea with a grain of salt: perhaps it is a smoke screen of propaganda. I say this with no reflection on you, Mr. Deputy Speaker: I believe that you are one of the most sincere members, and you opened your speech on this Bill by saying, "I believe that no member in this Chamber would try to defend retaining the present electoral boundaries in this State." I am not questioning your sincerity, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I know that you believe this, but I wish that I could. I cannot believe that members, who have for years supported one system to their obvious advantage, can violently change and support something that, on the face of it, does not look any better for them than it does for us. I am sure that Government members support this Bill because they think they must, and not because they like it. We on this side are suspicious of this legislation, but can we be blamed? For many years we have had so many Bills dished up as a brand of electoral reform that, perhaps, we have become suspicious by nature.

Mr. Ryan: By experience, too.

Mr. CLARK: The member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) checked carefully the figures that he quoted in this debate, figures showing what would have happened in 1968 if we had fallen for the 1963-64 electoral confidence trick. In 1968 we won the election but did not win the Government, and no-one would disagree with that contention. Under the system that was sought to be foisted on us in 1964, in the rural primary-producing seats

(and these would have taken some defining) the Australian Labor Party would have won two and the Liberal Country League would have won 18; in the non-primary producing seats (and these would not have been easy to define, either) the A.L.P. would have won 14 and the L.C.L. six; and in the country industrial seats the A.L.P. would have won two and the L.C.L. nil. Instead of the figures that we did have, compared with the present system (and heaven knows I am not advocating that that is good), there would have been 18 A.L.P. members and 24 L.C.L. members, but we have 19 each with one Independent. The L.C.L. would have won Government under that system by six seats, after receiving 43 per cent of the votes.

Mr. McAnaney: How do you work out the 43 per cent?

Mr. CLARK: I wish the honourable member would do two things for me when he interjects, because he worries me.

Mr. McAnaney: You don't know the answer and you can't give one, that is why you are worried.

Mr. CLARK: I know that I do not have to answer interjections, but when I do, in my most kindly manner, through you, Sir, the honourable member does not want me to do it. I give the honourable member two pieces of advice. When making an interjection he has the habit of scowling across the Chamber with a ferocious appearance on his face. This attitude is completely out of character because, normally, he is a pleasant-faced mild-mannered rather attractive type of member. He has another bad habit, too. I do not think I am deaf, but I have trouble hearing his interjections, so I suggest that he do two things and starts doing them tonight.

Mr. Jennings: He learned from his Fascist friend alongside him.

Mr. CLARK: I doubt that, but I suggest that the member for Stirling, by practising in front of a mirror, seek to remove that fear-some look on his face, because it is not natural and, secondly, that he try to raise his voice another 10 or 12 decibels so that I can hear him. I like to hear him, and within the limits of his ability he tries to ask thoughtful questions and make thoughtful interjections.

Mr. Edwards: Would you like a hearing aid?

Mr. CLARK: If I needed one I would be glad to have it, but I think that some honourable members could do with speech aids, too.

I emphasize that we are suspicious of this latest redistribution legislation, and are looking for the nigger in the woodpile. I do not like the legislation much, but I shall support the second reading hoping that we can get it into shape in Committee. I sincerely believe that our amendments will improve the Bill: when coming from this side they usually do, and I am not boasting. I seek the earnest consideration of the amendments, but will not discuss them in detail.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member would be out of order if he did.

Mr. CLARK: I realize that, Sir, because they have not been moved yet. I shall suggest a few things about which we hope to do something in Committee. It seems to me, and probably to most members, that the deputy commissioners to replace ill or deceased commissioners should be specified in the Bill, and we will seek to do this. If something happened to one of the commissioners almost anybody could be appointed to take his place. I think that was never the intention of the Bill, but that is how it reads.

I do not think the Chairman should be given the right of veto. If he is given that right, there is not much point in having the other commissioners there at all. I will say a word or two about clause 7 because it is expected of me, and I would not like to disappoint my friends and others. My Party and I want to know just what is the idea of excluding the municipality of Gawler from the metropolitan area. I went to some trouble to work this out and am interested in it. If the few thousand people in the municipality of Gawler are included, they will not be enough to make an additional metropolitan seat. I am reminded, on checking past history, that the 1962 electoral commission included Gawler in the metropolitan area. Since then there has been much development in the area, so why now exclude it?

Since the introduction of this Bill, people have had the chance to know what it is all about. I have been hammered by people asking whether it is right that Gawler will be tacked on to a big country area running to the north or north-east or goodness knows where. Most people in Gawler, irrespective of their political opinions, do not want this to happen. Over the last few years Gawler has developed considerably. At long last it is getting sewerage, which could make a great difference to the prosperity of the town, because I could cite many examples of industry being

prepared to come to Gawler until it found there was no sewerage there and no way of getting rid of waste material. However, I need not deal with that now—I have spoken about it often enough over the years. I sincerely believe that Gawler should be the top end of the metropolitan area, not the bottom end of a country area stretching a long way up into the north.

I was interested—in fact, amused—last Thursday when the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn), during the speech by the member for Frome (Mr. Casey), interjected seriously and said, speaking of Gawler, as the member for Frome was at the time:

They want to be attached to the District of Light and be represented by me.

Fortunately, there were in the gallery that afternoon two people from Gawler. Afterwards they asked me, "Is it possible that that chap from Light could represent the District of Gawler?" I replied, "Apparently, he thinks he could. Frankly, I do not think it is possible myself." One of the two then said, "I was here a few weeks ago when he spoke on this same matter, and all he did was to quote from the South Australian Labor Party's platform and a whole lot of reviews and other publications without saying anything except calling the people on the other side of the House Socialists. Surely we shall not get a chap like that to represent us? As far as I can see, the member for Light"—and he did not put it as politely as I shall put it—"is still in his political diapers." I said, "We have to have some sympathy for new members. He has been here only seven years." The other then said, "We have no objection to a man learning slowly or being in political diapers but we do like him to keep them clean and, as far as we are concerned, the honourable member has not been doing that." As he was speaking, the thought occurred to me that members on this side could greatly assist the member for Light, because they could provide him with a copy of something he has not thought of—the Commonwealth A.L.P. platform. That could keep him going with speeches for the rest of the session. While he is talking stuff like that in this House, people are realizing how much interest he has in his own district. When people in Gawler heard that the member for Light was thinking of running for Gawler, they were appalled.

Mr. Jennings: They shuddered.

Mr. CLARK: I do not know how to describe it: it was a sorry and sad feeling. However, I do not think they need worry about it

because, if Gawler was included as a part of the District of Light, a part of the District of Barossa, which is represented so ably by my colleague the member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne), and a piece of my district would have to be included, too. People living in that part of Barossa now have enjoyed good representation over the years. I myself represented Wasleys, Lyndoch and Rowland Flat, which are now part of the Barossa District, when I entered Parliament. I got a majority in those towns. When I was elected in 1952, with the country districts included, I doubled the majority of the man whose place I took, and in the following year I doubled that majority again.

Mr. Nankivell: I can well understand that.

Mr. CLARK: I appreciate the complimentary interjection by the member for Albert. I know he realizes that the type of representation people get makes a difference. I represented those places for two or three years. I was followed by Mr. Condor Laucke (now Senator Laucke), who represented the district very well. He was followed by the present member for Barossa, who is giving the district fine representation. I will not say anything about the existing District of Gawler, but most people there think the representation is all right. If the member for Light seriously thought about running for preselection in this area, he would have to go around and canvass more people and convince more members of the Liberal and Country League than he did before he was preselected for Light in the first place, and that would be a gargantuan job.

Let me now quote from a leading article in last week's *Gawler Bunyip*, which is one of the oldest and most astute papers in the State. It does not take political sides. It would as willingly publish a leading article in opposition to me if it thought I were wrong as it would in opposition to members on the other side if it thought they were wrong. As regards future plans for Gawler, the article began by dealing with a project at present being discussed in that area—the possible enlargement of the Gawler council area. I understand, though I am not sure of this, that discussions have been held with the neighbouring council to the south, and there is a strong possibility that some of the area of that district will be ceded to Gawler. Under that proposal, it would mean that an area of one electoral district was being ceded to another one in the District of Gawler which, for some peculiar reason,

is being proclaimed non-metropolitan. I will read two extracts from this leading article. The first is as follows:

However, the planners of this area today must look to the future. How will Gawler and district look when the development predicted by the Town Planning Authority takes place? Will Gawler one day be a little island of parochial anachronism in a sea of modern development?

I hope not: everyone in the area hopes not.

Mr. Rodda: It is too well represented.

Mr. CLARK: At the moment it is, and I hope such representation continues. Later the editorial makes a point that I particularly commend to honourable members' attention. Frankly, I am not talking about this matter with a view to my retaining a seat in Parliament. It does not mean very much to me any more whether I represent a district in Parliament, but I think it does mean a great deal to the people of the district. The editorial continues:

At present Gawler is considered, planning-wise, as the bottom end of the country—not the top end of the city. It really should be considered as the top end of the city, with all the assistance and industrialization this means. The planning authority should be told that Gawler wants an active part in the rapid development of this State.

Mr. Nankivell: Would that make you the head of the State?

Mr. CLARK: I am afraid not. It would be no more likely to make me the head of the State than the honourable member is likely to achieve this objective. There appears to be very much more community of interest between Gawler and the towns farther south than there is between Gawler and the towns farther north, such as Hamley Bridge. This was not so when I first became a member of Parliament in 1952. I do not mean to imply that Gawler is not very thankful to the people from the surrounding areas who visit it to shop and for the industry and money that is thereby brought into the town, but this also applies to the shopping centres at Salisbury and Elizabeth. I hope that Gawler will retain most of this shopping trade. As members who know me realize, I have great affection for the town of Gawler, where I have lived for most of my life. It is a great town that has for too long been denied its rightful place. There was a time when Gawler was one of the most important industrial towns in South Australia but, unfortunately, it appeared to many at the time that it lost this position as a result of deliberate Government neglect

and loss of contracts. I see no reason why this glory should not return and why we should not go out of our way to aid its return. If, however, this Bill is passed in its present form Gawler's return to its previous importance will be prevented.

I do not like some other aspects of this Bill, but I will not deal with them now. Other members on this side have expressed their opinions on them, with which opinions I agree. I have wondered, and I have tried hard to see, whether there is a trap in this legislation. If there is, it is not an obvious trap. If this Bill passes both Houses, we will look forward with interest to the commission's report. Perhaps the trap will then be sprung, although I hope it will not. If it is, we will know what to do. This is not a threat, but a promise.

Much has been said in this House recently by certain members, and by one member in particular, about Socialism and Communism. I am sorry to see that he has not said anything about Fascism, and I think he has been very wise not to do so. If, in so boldly and provocatively calling us Socialists, he thinks he is using a dirty word, his criticism has misfired, because I am proud to be called a Socialist: it is one of the most honourable words in the English language. When I first entered Parliament one or two members called for a bold statement from members of the Opposition about what they thought of Communism. When I made my maiden speech in 1952 everyone listened with great pleasure (at least, they listened in silence); I said:

I am firm in my opposition to the outworn political doctrines which I believe are ruining the nation. I believe in Party government; I believe it is our only bulwark against Fascism, Capitalism, and Communism. Unfortunately, we still have Communism with us. I hate and detest the godless dogmas of this faith. I believe it is a doctrine of decay and atheism.

Today, 16 years later, I assure the House that my opinion is unchanged. I am still proud to be called a Socialist, I still dislike the Communist Party intensely and I still think the Liberal Party is very little better than it. I support, with strong reservations, the second reading of this Bill and I again remind members that its passage will not necessarily bring about electoral reform. I hope, however, that by the time this Bill passes the Committee stage it will be a genuine Bill for electoral reform.

Mr. ALLEN (Burra): I would be neglecting my duty if I did not speak in support of this very important Bill. Being a man of few words—

Mr. Jennings: Yes, but you use them very often!

Mr. ALLEN: I will make my remarks brief and to the point. Like other members, I completely agree that redistribution is necessary. I represent an area of about 4,500 square miles. There are four electoral districts in South Australia larger than mine, but mine is large enough for me to realize how much extra work and travel a redistribution will mean to country members generally. Over the years the population has increased in the metropolitan area to such an extent that city electoral districts have got out of proportion to country electoral districts. Both Parties have attempted to bring about electoral reform, but have failed. I will not go into the reasons why previous attempts have failed, because they are now part of history. I wish to help legislate for the future: my predecessor capably handled the past.

The Government has put forward a proposal that should be accepted by the Opposition and the public generally. I agree with the general opinion that everyone in this country is equal to everyone else, but I emphasize that all electors are entitled to adequate representation (this is all country people ask for) and there cannot be adequate representation on a one vote one value basis. The loading proposed for country electoral districts is necessary and it is implemented by most countries and by the other States of Australia. I will not go into further detail on this matter, because it has been well covered by members on both sides.

The Leader of the Opposition compared sizes of electoral districts in the Eastern States with the expected figures for South Australian electoral districts. He conveniently refrained from mentioning the Western Australian figures. I believe he made an unfair comparison, because the country districts in the Eastern States are more densely populated than are those in this State. I was interested to hear the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) refer to the extra work involved in representing country electoral districts. When speaking on this Bill he said:

In my view, if it is true (as I think it is) that country members have greater difficulty in representing a number of people equivalent to the number represented by city members (because of the greater area that has to be covered) . . .

He said he thought that country members had greater difficulties; he was not too sure about it, and he does not know. I am sure that his experience in Millicent would help him to

understand the difficulty involved in representing a country district. I suggest that the member for Eyre (Mr. Edwards) show the member for Glenelg over the Eyre District one weekend. I further suggest that the member for Eyre would have to look after him, because if he fell down one of those wombat holes we might never see his happy, smiling face here again, and I am sure no-one would want that to happen.

The honourable member went on to say that increased amenities and privileges should be available to country members to assist them in carrying out their duties. There is much merit in what he said, and I thought he would have received headlines for that statement, because any mention of increased amenities for members of Parliament usually receives prominence. I agree with some of the honourable member's statements, but I am afraid I cannot agree with all of them.

I find it difficult, living so far from the city, to attend to my correspondence. I have a filing cabinet in this House and another at home and, as I spend three days a week in the House and four days at home, usually the correspondence I want when I am in the city is home and the correspondence I want when I am at home is in Adelaide. Consequently, I find it extremely difficult, and I think this applies to all country members.

Mr. Jennings: How would you get on with 45,000 electors to look after?

Mr. ALLEN: I believe all country members have difficulty regarding their correspondence. The member for Glenelg has pointed out that Commonwealth Parliamentarians have secretaries and that they also have their telephone accounts paid. I would not go so far as to advocate this for State Parliamentarians, but I think that one secretary to look after five members would be a step in the right direction. At present we have a pool of typistes, and they do an excellent job. Constituents often try to contact a country member at Parliament House. If there was a secretary to every five members, that person could answer the telephone and thereby save many telephone calls.

During the session a country member's mail often remains in his box at Parliament House from Thursday night until the following Tuesday, and a secretary could attend to that mail. Being a new member here, I do not know the procedure when a member goes on holidays.

Mr. Hurst: When you are representing a metropolitan district you don't get holidays!

Mr. ALLEN: I am sure that members in this House are just as much entitled to a holiday as is anyone else in the State. It would be convenient for a member, when he went on holidays, to have his correspondence attended to by the secretary and to be advised of any urgent correspondence needing attention. When this measure is adopted we will have to consider these matters closely in order to see that country members can spend more time in their districts.

The member for Frome (Mr. Casey), when speaking on this Bill last week, quoted an article from a country newspaper following a seminar held by Jaycee at Jamestown a short time ago. The honourable member said:

The Jaycee movement not only there but throughout the State was concerned about the undemocratic system operating in South Australia under the Playford regime.

When I challenged the honourable member on that statement he said, "Perhaps the member for Burra could elaborate." As I was present at that seminar, I will do so. The article referred to did not quote the findings of the seminar as a whole. Those findings are on tape, and any member opposite who wishes to refer to them can do so. The guest speaker, in opening the seminar, said that he was not in favour of Party politics and elaborated on a system under which Party politics could be abolished. The article did not quote the findings of the seminar, as the member for Frome and others would have us believe. When speaking on this measure, the member for Frome laughed heartily at some of his own remarks, but members on this side of the House will laugh when I read the following article from a country newspaper:

"A Party and its policy" was the subject of the last Jamestown Rural Youth Club meeting at which the president welcomed Mr. T. Casey, M.P. (member for Frome) and Mr. P. H. Quirke (former L.C.L. member for Burra). The two prominent political figures were asked to speak on the topic "A Party and its Policy". They eloquently stated and explained the various objects of each of the political Parties as is stated in the respective platforms, and hastened to assure members of the club that each Party is vitally interested in people who work on the land. Mr. Casey stated—

this is the part that will make honourable members laugh—

that the only basic difference as regards the policy of each Party deals with the freeholding of the land.

I imagine that all members in this House have done much homework on this Bill to see just how it will affect their own seats. I do not

think they would be human if they did not do that. After hearing the member for Frome dealing with electoral figures and giving us his assumptions of the various boundaries, I was a little reluctant to speak along these lines, as I thought perhaps it would be trying to anticipate the commission's findings. However, as the honourable member discussed these boundaries I thought I would be entitled to reply to his suggestions.

He commenced with Flinders and said that about 500 voters would be taken from Eyre and given to Flinders to give the latter district the minimum number of electors required under the 15 per cent tolerance. As that tolerance is given only when a community of interests is involved, I cannot see his point, as I cannot see that on the present boundaries there is any community of interests between Flinders and Eyre. I think that if the whole of the subdivision of Elliston was put into the Flinders District it would give Flinders 9,481 electors, which is only 2 per cent under the country quota.

If the subdivisions of Tarcoola and Woomera and the districts of Iron Baron and Iron Knob were put into the Eyre District, that would give a total of 9,299 electors, or only three per cent under the State country quota. Whyalla, after losing the subdivisions of Tarcoola and Woomera and the districts of Iron Baron and Iron Knob, would on the March election figures have a total of 10,917 electors, which is 13 per cent over the country quota. That is the only instance where the commission would have to use the 15 per cent tolerance provided in the Bill.

Port Pirie, which has about 6,000 voters, would obviously have to take in the subdivision of Port Germein, giving it a total of 9,824 electors, or two per cent over the country quota. Stuart, after losing Port Germein, would have to take in the subdivisions of Melrose, Carrieton, Hawker, Cockburn and Beltana, giving it a total of 9,228 voters, or only four per cent under the country quota. Burra (or Frome) would take in the subdivisions of Orreroo, Peterborough, Terowie and Robertstown, giving it a total of 9,200 voters, or five per cent under the country quota. One could go right through the State in this way; it would not be a hard job, and it would not be difficult to work out the small tolerance in each case. For instance, Mount Gambier would need only a five per cent tolerance. The Bill is a fair attempt to obtain

electoral reform, and the Opposition would be wise to accept it in its entirety. I support the second reading.

Mr. VIRGO (Edwardstown): At the outset I would like to clear up a few points, not the least being that in the 20 days since the Premier introduced this Bill there seems to have been a growing feeling amongst members of the Government Party that the members on this side are completely happy with the Bill. Frankly, the sooner members opposite get it into their heads that that is not so, the better. Unfortunately, this attitude was first started by the Premier when the following was reported in the *Advertiser* on August 3:

Mr. Hall said he sensed a general acceptance of the Government's reform proposal to divide the State into 47 Assembly seats. He gathered that the Australian Labor Party was impressed by the Bill providing for an Electoral Commission which he introduced in the Assembly on Thursday. Although this was not to say there would not be some serious criticism of it from the Opposition, he did not expect much trouble in getting it through Parliament.

The plain fact is that in its present form the Bill is completely unacceptable. It is a dictatorship and a continuation of the gerrymander that we now have. It certainly does not introduce electoral reform, as the previous speaker suggested when he said that both Parties had attempted to introduce electoral reform over the years. I strongly refute the claim that the L.C.L. has tried to introduce electoral reform proposals. It has only attempted to extend the existing gerrymander as happened in the 1962 attempt, which, fortunately, members opposite did not have the numbers to get through this House. Although this is a watered down version of the gerrymander, it is still an extension of the gerrymander that has kept the L.C.L. in power for years and years against the will of the people.

Mr. Venning: Who was in power before?

Mr. VIRGO: I am not concerned with that. The L.C.L. introduced this scheme in 1936 and, if the honourable member cared to do his homework and go through the records, he would find that only once from 1936 to 1965 did L.C.L. candidates gain a majority of votes, although the Party was always able to gain a majority of seats. One can understand members opposite being rather loath to forsake a system which has served them so well and which has denied the people the right to elect the Government it wants and reject the one it does not want. Members opposite should not run away with the idea that this

is electoral reform, because it is no more electoral reform than we had from the Playford Government in 1962, and it will not give effect to the express wishes of the people, who demanded that we have democracy and one vote one value in the South Australian Parliamentary system.

The Premier, presumably trying to gain some credit, has always made great play of the fact that the L.C.L. introduced this electoral reform Bill only 107 days after it took office, while three years ago it took the A.L.P. 114 days to introduce its electoral reform Bill. However, I imagine most members of the Opposition and you, too, Mr. Speaker, would have read the reply in *Hansard* in which the Leader of the Opposition adequately answered this quite unfounded charge by the Premier. We must not lose sight of the fact that, although the Labor Party gained 53 per cent of the votes, it lost two seats in country areas and consequently lost the majority to continue in office. If the Government is looking for credit for the introduction of this Bill, let us get the record straight and put the credit where it should be: it lies fairly and squarely in the lap of the general public, which demanded that the Bill be introduced. It was forced upon the Liberal Government, and it was not out of a sense of justice to the people of South Australia that it was introduced. The credit is due to the thousands and thousands of people who, a few days after the election, were prepared to gather in the Parade Ground and to expose themselves to show where they stood; to the people who marched down King William Street; and to the people who gathered in Light Square to demand that the L.C.L. minority Government introduce some form of electoral reform.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. VIRGO: I am sorry if members opposite do not like it, but the sooner they face the fact that it was public pressure that forced them to introduce this Bill, the better.

Mr. Burdon: They don't like their consciences pricking them.

Mr. VIRGO: That is true.

Mr. McAnaney: Why don't you speak up?

Mr. VIRGO: I will speak up, because, if there is anything to get hot under the collar about, it is the rotten electoral gerrymander that the Liberal Government has perpetuated for years. It was exactly the same rotten gerrymander the honourable member's Party

introduced in 1936 that operated in 1965 and in the years before that. The Labor Government attempted to rectify the position, but what happened? Unceremoniously, another place threw the Bill out of the window.

Mr. McAnaney: That would have reduced the country vote even more than this Bill will.

Mr. VIRGO: Let us be quite clear about the position. You know, as well as everybody else knows, that the public, through the demonstration in Light Square, through the 70,000-odd signatures on a petition presented to this House, through the demonstration that took place outside Parliament House, and through the packed gallery in this place afterwards, forced the Liberal Government to introduce electoral reform. You know that as well as I do.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to be seated. There are too many interjections. I ask the honourable member to address the Chair, because I think that would assist in preserving better order.

Mr. Jennings: Why don't you ask some of your own members to do that?

Mr. VIRGO: I bow to your ruling, Sir. I apologize to you, but I was addressing my remarks to members who were interjecting.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I merely say that it is inadvisable for members to address themselves to other members by saying "You" and "You are". If the honourable member addresses the Chair, I think he will find that there will be fewer interjections.

Mr. Rodda: He is doing all right for a boy.

Mr. VIRGO: Many members opposite have been doing what I have been doing. I regret very much if my remarks, which were directed to members of your Party, Sir, have apparently touched a sore spot. Another request, coupled with the request for electoral reform, was made by the public with which I hope the Government will expeditiously deal when this Bill has been concluded. I refer to the petition signed by 73,000 people requesting an immediate election as soon as there has been some form of electoral reform. I sincerely hope there will be the same reaction to this request from the Government to public pressure as there has been in relation to introducing a Bill to change the electoral position. Of course, this Bill is certainly not designed to introduce electoral reform.

It has been suggested that the Bill offers a short cut towards agreement between the Government and the Opposition. I agree that its terms are a great departure from those previously put forward by the Government, particularly those expounded at the times of the Millicent by-election and the last State election. Few people would object to having 47 members in the House of Assembly. I do not think there is any great importance in the question of how many members the House has: the important point is how many electors each member represents. Whether the Bill is a short cut to agreement will be known only when the Committee stage is reached. I was somewhat appalled to read in *Hansard* (I was not present to hear the honourable member's speech) that the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) had said that, if the Government accepted any of the Opposition amendments, he would vote against the third reading of the Bill. That is similar to what the L.C.L. candidate said on television during the Millicent by-election campaign. He said that he would cross the floor of the House on this matter. I do not think he was fooling anyone: I will wait and see whether this happens. I do not blame the member for Light for his attitude because, with the member for Burra (Mr. Allen), he has done his homework and realizes that, with many more electors added to his district, he will probably finish up losing his seat. Therefore, I do not blame him for complaining or for opposing the amendments.

Mr. Jennings: What does it matter, if he has no guts now?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order.

Mr. VIRGO: The position is that the member for Light is being pressed from all sides. I understand he was disappointed when the member representing his neighbouring district was elected Premier. I can understand his dismay when, having led the bandwagon at the L.C.L. caucus meeting for those who believed this Bill should not be introduced, he was overruled.

Mr. Rodda: Who told you that?

Mr. VIRGO: I have my avenues of information as all other members have. Do not blame me—blame your own organization.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. VIRGO: I think the best way to describe the Bill is that it is one of the greatest confidence tricks of all time. I am wondering whether, when he went to America early this year, the Premier learnt—

Mr. Hurst: About Scientology.

Mr. VIRGO: That may be so. However, this confidence trick is so old and so elementary that I am amazed that everyone has not seen through it. It is exactly the same type of confidence trick as the Government's colleagues in Canberra pulled last week in relation to old age pensioners. The trick is to let things get so bad that any improvement is good—that is the theory behind these things. The electoral system in South Australia had become so rotten that we had 40,000 electors in some districts and 5,000 in others. Therefore, anything nearer to a balance is an improvement and, it is suggested, should be accepted. That is the theory behind the Government's move in this case, and there was the same type of theory behind what the Commonwealth Government did in Canberra last week. It had let the value of pensions drop to bedrock so that it could increase them by only \$1 and tell the pensioners that they would get \$1 more than they received before.

Mr. Lawn: It is 75c in some cases.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes. I wish to refer to some of the comments made by members opposite. I am happy to see that the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) is in the Chamber, because I want to say a word or two to him.

Mr. Giles: You are supposed to be addressing the Chair.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr. VIRGO: During the debate, the member for Stirling said that he did not see much value in the one vote one value principle. It is not surprising that he should make that statement. He is not the only member who believes it: I think the member for Light said something similar.

Mr. Jennings: Sir Thomas Playford said it for years.

Mr. VIRGO: That is not surprising. However, at least I get some satisfaction from the fact that these members acknowledge that one vote one value is a principle, because it is a most important principle.

Mr. Jennings: It is fundamental.

Mr. VIRGO: It is a principle that we must always strive to uphold: it is the fundamental principle in a democracy.

Mr. McAnaney: Why did you want to bring in a Bill providing for a two-to-one loading in Frome? Is that one vote one value?

Mr. VIRGO: I am discussing the Bill before the House; I am not giving a lesson in ancient history. I wish you would refer

to this Bill, too. Do not try to be too smart, because I intend to show you where you get off.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members are out of order in interjecting. I shall have to call them to order or name them if they do not cease to interject. The honourable member for Edwardstown.

Mr. VIRGO: I should apologize to you, Sir, if I am causing an uproar in the House, but I believe it is time that some members opposite were told a few home truths.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to address the Chair.

Mr. VIRGO: I am doing that now.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, if the honourable member continues to do that, I shall have no complaint.

Mr. VIRGO: I was referring to part of the speech of the member for Stirling. The following is an extract from *Hansard*, in which he said:

The dictionary definition of "democracy" is as follows:

That form of Government in which the sovereignty of the State is vested in and exercised by the people at large.

I point out that the definition does not say "by individuals". The dictionary definition of "people" is as follows:

A body of persons who compose a community, race or nation.

Mr. Clark: He had to get a dictionary to find out the meaning.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes, and I wish the honourable member had used a decent dictionary. He should have gone to the Parliamentary Library, because the definition in *Webster's Dictionary* is certainly not what he quoted. Perhaps he has a 30c pocket dictionary. If he does not know the meaning of words he should consult a decent dictionary, which will give him the proper definitions. The definition contained in *Webster's Dictionary* (and I hope the member for Stirling takes heed) states:

Government by the people; majority rule; the acceptance and practice of a principle of equality of rights, opportunity and treatment.

That is vastly different from the definition quoted quite erroneously by the member for Stirling. The worst feature of this Bill is the restricted terms of reference that are to be imposed on the commission, and these terms of reference are a flagrant denial of the basic

principle of one vote one value. For members opposite to say that that principle cannot apply, that we have to be nice to people in country areas and give them added representation, is just so much hogwash, because if that principle applies on a State basis then it would apply on a Commonwealth basis. Members opposite must realize that there is no weighting of country areas under the Commonwealth redistribution, but it is on the basic, fundamental, democratic principle of one vote one value.

Mr. Lawn: The L.C.L. has protested against the redistribution.

Mr. VIRGO: That Party has not protested against the principle of one vote one value: it has protested about the fact that in Grey some of the traditional Liberal support is taken from them, and that in Sturt one of the most revered members will be defeated at the next Commonwealth election. That is what they complain about, not the principle.

Mr. Hudson: They will be pretty upset about Adelaide!

Mr. VIRGO: I am not sure about that. I think members of the L.C.L. will be pleased to be relieved of the millstone around their necks. Under the Commonwealth redistribution plan Sturt and Bonython have fewer votes than the country districts of Angas and Barker.

Mr. Corcoran: They have taken into account one of the terms of reference that does not appear in this Bill.

Mr. VIRGO: Exactly, and it is one of the most important, too, but, unfortunately, it is conspicuous by its absence in this Bill, that is, the trend of population. That must be considered, otherwise a proper redistribution cannot take place. This is more important when we realize that the one time factor associated with this Bill is in the clause directing the commission to determine what use certain sections of metropolitan Adelaide will be put to in seven years' time. The natural assumption is that there will be no further redistribution within seven years.

Mr. Hudson: They should take into account the trend of population.

Mr. VIRGO: They must. This emphasizes the necessity to do that, and I believe that they should consider it under the terms of this Bill on a seven-year period.

Mr. Casey: That would affect Whyalla.

Mr. VIRGO: I am not concerned about individual districts. We have to rid our minds of political advantage when discussing a Bill

like this. The uppermost thought in our minds should be what system will produce the Government that is the choice of the people. This is what we have to accept, not whether it is advantageous to the Liberal Party or to the Labor Party, or to any other Party. Our main thought should be what will give effect to the will of the people. If an election is held, and 50.001 per cent of the people vote Labor, there must be a Labor Government. On the other hand, if 50.001 per cent vote Liberal the people should be made to suffer under a Liberal Government, but not with a vote of 43 per cent. I comment now on remarks made by the member for Light. When he spoke about the principle of one vote one value he said:

This arithmetical nonsense of one vote one value is unreasonable and cannot apply in real life.

Mr. Freebairn: On what page of *Hansard*?

Mr. VIRGO: I do not know the page: I am reading from the galley proof.

Mr. Freebairn: You will find the latest copy of *Hansard* on your file.

Mr. VIRGO: I am not concerned about the latest copy. I am reading from what is recorded in the galley proof of the speech by the member for Light, and he made that statement. He continued, and I do not know whether he wanted it reported this way or not (that is up to him), and said:

We have heard much from members opposite about one vote one value and why the Party that gets 51 per cent, 52 per cent or 53 per cent of the votes should be in power. However, every member knows that Parties are not mentioned in the Electoral Act or the Constitution Act and that a person casts his vote for a candidate. If he follows a card when he is inside the polling booth, that is his own private business entirely. The claim that a Party that obtains the percentage of the votes that I have mentioned has a mandate to be the majority Party in the House of Assembly is sheer nonsense.

I hope that we will never hear the Government Party saying that it has a mandate to do anything, because I will remind the member for Light that such a claim is sheer nonsense.

Mr. Hudson: The only mandate that this crowd has is to resign.

Mr. VIRGO: That is correct. If the member for Light believes honestly and sincerely in his statement let him go to the next election without the Liberal Party ticket and see whether the people of Light will elect him because his name happens to be Freebairn. I challenge

the honourable member to do exactly what he said—go without the Party support and see how far he gets. He knows, as does every member, that none of us would be here, except the Speaker, if we did not have the support of the followers of our Party. Let us hear no more of this utter rubbish from the member for Light about not needing the support of a Party to succeed.

Mr. Freebairn: What about Mr. Quirke?

Mr. VIRGO: I wish you had his ability! I am sure the member for Victoria is feeling a little bit out of it. I wish I could make a few comments about all the members opposite who have spoken but it is difficult to find any common sense in their contributions or something worth answering because few of them dealt even with the provisions of the Bill, although they dealt with the electoral reform systems in Western Australia, Queensland, Britain, France and elsewhere. The member for Victoria said that the L.C.L. had gone a long way along the road to compromise. It has still a long way to go, too, because, if it expects this side of the House to agree to some of the mandatory clauses it has written into the Bill, it is mistaken. I refer for example to the Chairman's power of veto: in other words, members opposite do not want a commission but only the Chairman. Under the terms of the Bill, he is the only one to make decisions. I remind members opposite that, while they are preening themselves about how far they have gone, they should see how far the Labor Party went. We had a 56-seat policy. Members opposite know that only too well as they have had our policy read to them in this House often enough. Every member knows and everyone who reads *Hansard* knows our policy. Later, I shall refer again to our policy because, when the member for Victoria quoted from it last week, he used our old policy. He should make a further investment and obtain our new rule book; it will cost him only 50c.

Mr. Rodda: What will be your policy tomorrow?

Mr. VIRGO: I want to refresh members' minds on why the Labor Party found it necessary to compromise. Much of this was brought about by falsehoods, misleading statements and misleading advertisements by the Liberal Party prior to the last election. It has spoken often about the need for country representation—I shall come to that in a moment. Let me make it plain that the Australian Labor Party had a policy of 56 members for one reason, and one reason only:

it believed there should be no reduction in country representation, and the only way to get that was by retaining the principle of one vote one value and having a 56-member House. If members opposite care to do some homework and are capable of doing it, they will find that statement completely accurate.

Mr. McAnaney: It is a lie.

Mr. VIRGO: It is not a lie, and the honourable member knows it. If he is prepared to do his homework or get somebody to do it for him, he will find that with 56 seats and one vote one value the representation of 26 country members will be retained. In the last week before the last election, the Liberal Party came out with full-page advertisements, in most cases, in country newspapers saying, "We cannot afford to have 17 more politicians. Vote against Labor."

Mr. Corcoran: They said that at Millicent.

Mr. VIRGO: That is right. The Labor Party then said, "If the country people do not want continued present representation, we are not anxious to retain the 56 members in our policy. We were doing it only because we thought there should be a continuation of the existing number of country representatives."

Mr. McAnaney: There would be only 19 country members under the 56 seats proposal.

Mr. VIRGO: If the member for Stirling goes on making statements as stupid as that, all he is doing is showing his lack of ability to do a little simple arithmetic.

Mr. McAnaney: Why not face up to the facts of life?

Mr. VIRGO: Under the 56 seats proposal, there would be 26 country members, with the principle of one vote one value, and all the talk of members opposite cannot alter that fact; it is indisputable. Painful as it may be to them, the plain fact is that members on the other side of the House, who prior to the last election campaigned for a reduction in the country representation in this place, are now having to swallow a pill of their own making.

Let me turn to another aspect of this tongue-in-cheek attitude of the Government to the need for adequate country representation. These are purely pious statements made in an effort to try to convince the people of the country areas that the Liberal Party will look after them. Let us see how well they have looked after them in the past. On April 17 (I think that was the date) they elected a Premier, who in turn appointed a Cabinet;

at least, they finished up with nine people who called themselves the Cabinet. Let us see who these people who are so vocal in their claim to represent country areas are. I have here the official printed lists of the members of the House of Assembly and of the Legislative Council. Let us see who the members of this Cabinet are and where they come from. They are: the Hon. David Norman Brookman, 46 Dutton Terrace, Medindie—metropolitan; the Hon. John William Hurtle Coumbe, 49 Braund Road, Prospect—metropolitan; the Hon. Raymond Steele Hall, 4 Ilford Street, Vale Park—metropolitan; the Hon. Robin Rhodes Millhouse, 40 Pekina Avenue, Eden Hills—metropolitan; the Hon. Glen Gardner Pearson—and this is the one relief—Cockaleechee; and the Hon. Joyce Steele, 14 Kennaway Street, Tusmore. So the first thing that these people, who assert that they believe in country representation and say it is so vital, did was to appoint six members of this House to a Cabinet. They said, "We are going to have five metropolitan members out of the six". Now let us see what they did in the other place.

Mr. Hudson: Are you suggesting that a metropolitan cabal has taken over?

Mr. VIRGO: In the other place they had to appoint three members to Cabinet. The first was the Hon. Renfrey Curgenvin DeGaris, 19 Wahroonga Avenue, Wattle Park. The list continues: the Hon. (Charles) Murray Hill, 20 Victoria Avenue, Unley Park. So, the Hon. Mr. Hill lives in the metropolitan area. The next Minister on the list is the Hon. C. R. Story, who has a post office box at Renmark, but we all know that he lives in the District of Edwardstown. So, eight out of the nine Ministers live in the metropolitan area. Now, I ask: how much does the Government care for the country? I am not concerned where the Speaker lives, because he claimed to be a member of the Government and then disclaimed such membership.

Let us pursue this matter further and see how good these people are who claim to represent country interests! During the Millicent by-election campaign, the Leader of the Government in another place provided the Electoral Office with a list of people, all of them country electors, whose names he believed should be removed from the electoral roll. Of course, we realize that he was being a good member of the Liberal Party. Since Labor Party policy is often quoted to us, let us consider the constitution of the Liberal Party of Australia. One of the duties of members of the

Liberal Party is to secure the enrolment of every person eligible to be an elector and the removal from the electoral roll of the names of all ineligible persons. Why did the Chief Secretary, in submitting this list, pick out only those people who he thought and was advised would vote for the Labor Party? Why did he not go right through the electoral roll and remove his own name, because he is not a *bona fide* resident of the area? Why did he not remove the name of Mr. Lewis, who the Court of Disputed Returns was told was a resident of Tasmania? No! Don't remove those names! Those people might vote Liberal! This indicates how much these people think about country representation!

Let us consider this important matter further and discover why there will be and should be reduced country representation. When a Liberal Government first introduced the current electoral system in 1936 and members of Parliament went to the people on March 19, 1938, there were 364,884 electors in South Australia, of whom 211,963 lived within the area then regarded, and still regarded, as the metropolitan area, that is, the area comprising the State Assembly districts included in the Legislative Council Districts of Central No. 1 and Central No. 2. There were then 152,921 electors in the remainder of the State. Let us consider what has happened in the 30 intervening years, during which the Liberal Party has usually controlled the Treasury benches and during which that Party has talked about the need for decentralization and promoting country interests. The number of electors has grown from 364,884 to 609,626. The total increase in the number of electors over that period is 244,742, but we find that of those electors only 93,435 are country electors. So, whilst the Liberal Party was in power for so long and whilst it was talking so much about the need for decentralization and for promoting country interests, why did it not do something along these lines? The plain fact is that there has been an increase of only 93,435 country electors in 30 years.

This small increase becomes even smaller when we deduct from it the increase in the number of electors in the Gawler subdivision, which is part of the real metropolitan area, the Morphett Vale subdivision and what was the Gumeracha subdivision but is now the Highbury subdivision. If we take into consideration the increases in the number of electors in these subdivisions, the figure of 93,435 must be reduced by 51,074. So, the actual increase over 30 years in the number of

electors in the remainder of the State is 42,361. Consequently, the blame for the reduction in country representation lies fairly and squarely with Liberal Governments, which have successively occupied the Treasury benches since 1938.

Mr. McAnaney: Do you mean "successfully".

Mr. VIRGO: No, I said "successively". I certainly quarrel with the proposal that the Liberal Governments have been successful: the only objective in which they have had success is holding office against the will of the people. We are seeking, if it is humanly possible, and the people of South Australia are demanding, that this policy be altered. One of the Bill's most disturbing features is the excessive tolerance allowed, which has been brought about because the Bill provides that the commissioners shall arrive at a figure called "the State quota". Once they have arrived at this figure they need no longer take any notice of it at all; it becomes completely insignificant.

Mr. Giles: How do you work your percentage out, if you don't use it?

Mr. VIRGO: The quota is the figure on which the number of electors for each electoral district should be based. What is the point of arriving at it? Just to hang it on a wall as a pretty picture?

Mr. Giles: Why do you want a percentage, then?

Mr. VIRGO: I do not know where the member for Gumeracha has been for the last half hour: I do not know whether he has been asleep, whether he has been reading the paper or whether he has been out of the Chamber, but I suggest that he read the Bill, which requires the commissioners to take into account the number of electors in the State, divide it by 47, and then get something called a State quota. However, they have to disregard it completely from that point on. This makes me wonder whether it is worth while arriving at this State quota. The Commonwealth electoral commissioners take into account the number of electors in the State, divide it by the number of seats required, and in that way arrive at the quota, which is the operative figure used. That is a commonsense thing to do and that is what a State quota is for. I cannot see that this is anything but a vehicle upon which there can be some further skulduggery with figures. It is just a further juggling of figures to try to continue, to the greatest extent possible, the gerrymander that this State has suffered for 30-odd years.

Mr. Casey: They are not dinkum.

Mr. VIRGO: Of course they are not dinkum. We would not have had a Bill had public pressure not demanded that the Premier introduce this Bill.

Mr. Rodda: Are you supporting it?

Mr. VIRGO: I am supporting the second reading, in the hope that some common sense will prevail amongst members opposite, and in the further hope that we can get this Bill amended so that some semblance of democracy can be achieved and so that the commissioners will not be wasting their time when they go into the exercise of redistribution. The Bill as it now stands virtually forces the commissioners to bring into this House a gerrymandered redistribution. I want electoral reform: I do not want a gerrymandered redistribution, which is the great hazard existing today. I want to get over this, somehow.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Rah, rah, rah!

Mr. VIRGO: The Minister of Works can go "Rah, rah, rah" all he likes. Perhaps he and his colleague sitting alongside him are prepared to go to their electors in Torrens and Burnside and say, "We believe you have only about three-quarters as much intelligence as people in the country." I should be glad if they were prepared to say that: I certainly am not prepared to say that to people in my district. I believe the people of Edwardstown, Torrens, Burnside and all other metropolitan districts should have as great a voice in Parliament as have the electors in all other parts of the State. That is the basis of democracy, and it is the very thing for which people have fought and given their lives. Apparently members opposite want to treat this matter as a joke. We have boys up in Vietnam today who are fighting for what is supposed to be a democracy. I do not want to go too far into whether or not it is a democracy.

Mr. Lawn: The Liberal Party doesn't want democracy here.

Mr. VIRGO: No. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

LOAN ESTIMATES

In Committee.

(Continued from August 8. Page 552.)

Grand total, \$91,640,000.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): Close examination of these Loan Estimates immediately reveals just how shabby

and base the politicking of the Liberal Party was when in Opposition, because time after time while the Labor Party was in Government we saw pamphlets, public statements and attacks in this House that the Labor Government was improperly using Loan funds. The charge of impropriety was on the basis of our using Loan funds for capital works which had not previously been charged to the Loan Account but which had been charged to the Revenue Account. We were subjected to such charges as recently as the Millicent by-election. Indeed, on May 2 this year the Treasurer saw fit to make a similar play publicly in a statement in the *Advertiser* when he claimed that \$17,000,000 in Loan funds had been withdrawn from their normal proper use in development and capital projects. He was in office at that time and complained on the ground that we had used for capital works these moneys which had previously, under the Playford Government, been charged to the Revenue Account. But what has happened here?

An examination of these Loan accounts show that the Treasurer has not merely perpetuated the charging to Loan Account of the works that we charged to that account but that he has gone further: he has charged to Loan Account new classes of works not previously so charged. Indeed, he has done more than that. He has done what this State has not done within the memory of practically any member present: he has borrowed money against a revenue deficit. One expects in the political life of this community that, when responsible leaders of a Government or a Party go before the people and make statements about their policy on revenue and Loan matters, that is what they believe and what they will carry out when in office. But here we see a complete repudiation of the things that this Party now in office said time and time again when the Labor Party was in office. Of course, they knew at that time that what they were saying was nonsense.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Baseless.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Completely baseless, because they knew we had to expand the revenue expenditure in this State to bring services up to the level of those in the other States. They knew, and they said in Canberra in June (indeed, they repeated the statement that had been made by our Government time and time again at Premiers' Conferences and at Loan Council meetings) that South Australia had to increase its expenditure on State services such as education, health, hospitals, law and order, and public relief for the poor and the

aged. Having increased that expenditure we had, as the other States did, to take that money from revenue, because it was a revenue expenditure. It was not something against which we could borrow money, and we had to charge to our Loan Account the capital works of this community. They said that was wrong. Having got into office they not only did it but went further.

Mr. Ryan: Now they say it is right to do so.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. When things are different they are not the same. Just what sort of credibility has this Government got? After all the things it has said again and again, it repeated this charge on pamphlets circulated against the Deputy Leader of the Opposition during the Millicent by-election. But what has the Government done now? More serious than that, the Treasurer's Loan Estimates statement would lead us to believe that we are now getting a considerable increase (he says it is 16 per cent) in works expenditure this year. That is not so, and he must on any analysis of the figures know it is not. He arrives at the 16 per cent increase by taking a certain number of works provided for in last year's Estimates, many of which had been started but the accounts for which had not come to be paid before June 30. Indeed, we had a much bigger under-spending in Loan Account than had been estimated when we had left office from the way the accounts were running at that time and given the undertakings that had been commenced. But it always happens at the end of the year that some accounts do not become due before June 30, even though the expenditure has been made within the community.

Let us examine the overall comparison between 1967-68 and 1968-69. If we do that, we should inflate the 1967-68 figures by \$4,208,413, which was the under-spending on school and hospital buildings, and reduce the 1968-69 figures by the same amount. In addition, the short-term loan of \$1,000,000 provided in both years for the Natural Gas Pipelines Authority should be subtracted, as this money will be repaid when alternative financial arrangements are made. The effect of the \$1,500,000 reduction in Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement money should be taken into account by reducing the 1968-69 figure by that amount. Also, the provision for 1968-69 of \$500,000 for the festival hall might as well be written off, because from the way that matter is going at the moment there is no chance that that money will be spent this

financial year. The State Government's own provision for school buildings in 1968-69 is likely to be about \$900,000 less because of the under-estimation of Commonwealth assistance. So, if these adjustments are made, the actual payment for 1967-68 would be the adjusted figure of \$80,546,570, because that will be the figure as against works commenced in that time. The adjusted figure for 1968-69 will be \$81,631,587, which is an effective increase of a little more than 1 per cent. An increase of 1 per cent in expenditure will not give any sort of reasonable fillip to the economy, and it needs a fillip.

In his decision to use Loan moneys as against accumulated deficits on Revenue Account, the Treasurer has made a decision which, I think, is quite wrong economically. It is disastrous to use Loan moneys of this kind as against an accumulated revenue deficit. I think one should avoid using Loan moneys against a deficit if one can do so, but what has the Treasurer done here? In his Loan Estimates explanation he said:

In approaching the financial programmes for 1968-69 the Government's first consideration has been to see that the balance of Loan funds available from the previous year should be reserved to the greatest practical extent towards covering outstanding Revenue deficits at June 30, 1968, and to contain to the lowest practical limit any further net loss of cash during 1968-69 on the two accounts taken together. I point out that, regardless of any transfer of revenue obligations to Loan account, or vice versa, the Treasurer's first concern must be to retain sufficient liquid funds so that he can pay his way from day to day.

One does not quarrel with that. The explanation continues:

Therefore, in framing this year's Loan proposals the balance of \$5,658,000, which had accrued to June 30 last, has of necessity been reserved in its entirety towards offsetting for the time being the cumulative revenue deficits of \$8,365,000.

What the Treasurer has done there (and reference is made to it in the next statement he has made on revenue deficits) is to decide at this stage that he will take some of the liquid funds available to him as reserves against the accumulated deficit. On this subject, he said:

The Government, after considering the detailed proposals of departments, which are very largely to cover commitments already made, has decided to reserve a further relatively small sum of \$400,000 towards covering revenue deficits and to frame a total works programme of \$89,740,000, including a further advance of \$1,000,000 to the pipelines authority. The \$400,000 so reserved, together

with the Loan balance of \$5,658,000 carried over from 1967-68 and set apart, will give a little over \$6,000,000 towards covering the revenue deficits, which have aggregated \$8,365,000 to June 30 last. Having regard to the fact that the advances of \$2,000,000 made or proposed to be made to the pipelines authority are on a short-term basis and may be considered as part of the reserve towards deficits, the proposal to be holding some \$6,000,000 in Loan Account at June 30 next against those deficits appears to be a reasonable and proper provision.

It appears from that statement that the Treasurer is not putting aside this money as against a possible deficit in the Revenue Budget this year: he is putting this money aside as a reserve to pay back into the Trust and Deposit Accounts \$6,000,000 as against an accumulated revenue deficit to date. That is a decision he has made, given the state of the economy at this stage. No examination of the working Deposit Accounts of the Treasury at the moment can lead one to the conclusion that they are other than buoyant. They are in a perfectly satisfactory situation to meet the day-to-day calls on the Treasury for all purposes. The Treasurer knows perfectly well that, without setting this money aside at all, if he were called upon for the whole of the Trust Accounts of the State he could write a cheque for them tomorrow and meet it and he would still have sufficient money there for his working accounts. He knows they are sufficiently buoyant but he has chosen to take this Loan money and, instead of spending it at this stage to see that we have added development works in South Australia to give a boost to the economy while we have a depressed economy, to pay it from Loan Account against a revenue deficit. I intend soon to talk about one or two specific items of management of the economy to show just what is happening. What we need at the moment (and this comes from any examination of orthodox economics—the member for Stirling has no doubt read Keynes's *General Theory of Employment Interest and Money*)—

Mr. McAnaney: I have probably read more of it than you have.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I give the honourable member credit for that. I am sure he would have turned his attention to what is now a fairly standard work on the basic tenets of public finance—that when one has unused manpower and resources, one has to endeavour to expand expenditure in the public sector. The Treasurer is in a position to do so provided that he is meeting his revenue obligations

in this year's Budget and that this money set aside at this stage is not something put there as against a prospective revenue deficit.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It's no use fishing at this stage because you won't catch anything.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am taking this statement at face value at this stage, because the Treasurer would have us believe that he is setting aside \$6,000,000 of Loan money (money borrowed on which we will have to pay interest) to pay back into the Deposit Accounts moneys as against accumulated revenue deficits of the past at a time when these Deposit Accounts are sufficiently buoyant not to need the immediate repayment of that money, and at a time when South Australia needs the expenditure of additional moneys for public works.

Mr. Hudson: He may intend to fund that deficit.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If he intends to fund the revenue deficit, that will make history in South Australia, too. I can imagine the scream that would have gone up had we ever done it. We do not know about that, but we do know that all the things that were said so constantly by the Liberal Party when in Opposition about the way in which we ran the finances of the State are now coming home to roost, because we never went as far as this.

Mr. McAnaney: What about the deficit that you left for us?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has obviously not been listening to what I have said. He rarely listens to anyone but himself.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: I think he said that because he did listen.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, he did not. The honourable member knows perfectly well, if he has consulted with the Treasurer at all, that at the moment the working Deposit Accounts of the State are buoyant and, in these circumstances, there is no reason at this stage immediately to provide for repayment of accumulated revenue deficits when the economy has unused resources that ought to be taken up by the expansion of expenditure in the public sector.

I turn now to something quite specific in these Estimates on the subject of expansion of expenditure in the public sector, because another of the things said by the Government before it took office was that it intended to get this State moving again by boosting the building industry. We already know that in

the three months since it has been in office a reduction in building approvals of a value of over \$40,000,000 has occurred.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Are you sure we mentioned the building industry?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am certain the Government referred to the building industry. I should be happy to produce for the Treasurer a pamphlet circulated in my district on this score.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You said that for six months and we did not see any result.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I certainly announced to the State that we had a whole series of proposals to try to do something effective for the building sector, and we did this.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Did you?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, my word we did. The Treasurer's Party announced that it had a great plan to get the building industry moving again, but we have not seen much movement in the right direction. What sort of movement do we see from these Loan Estimates? I will deal with housing. The most serious matter of substance in the Loan Estimates is the reduction of \$1,500,000 in the provision of Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement money. This proposition was put up to us in the past, and the Treasurer must have seen the note made by us when we were in office that the tentative Loan Estimates were accepted in principle but that there were certain exceptions, one of which was the proposal relating to housing money. There is a reduction of \$1,500,000 in the provision of Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement money from \$21,000,000 to \$19,500,000. This provides another \$1,500,000 for other works in the Loan Estimates but only at the expense of the building industry. The provision for the Housing Trust has been cut by \$650,000 from \$10,150,000 to \$9,500,000. The provision for the State Bank has been cut from \$9,650,000 to \$8,500,000, and the provision for the co-operative building societies has been increased from \$1,200,000 to \$1,500,000. The Government is clearly following the policy of reducing the overall provisions for housing and, at the same time, reducing more heavily the traditional roles played by the Housing Trust and the State Bank so that the co-operative building societies can be expanded. I admit that I spent some money for those societies but I thought the provisions we made were a great enough expansion compared with the

needs of the Housing Trust. For the State Bank, advances under the Advances for Homes Act have been reduced in the Estimates from \$700,000 to \$500,000, so that the \$200,000 of new money previously provided to finance the purchase of existing houses has been eliminated. The problems of the building industry can only be made more difficult by these policies, particularly in view of the increase in the maximum limit of any loan from \$7,000 to \$8,000. The increase in the limit means that even the same financial provision would build fewer houses. The reduced financial provision will therefore have a more substantial effect.

The Treasurer has announced that the Government intends to carry out the L.C.L. policy of making trustee investments of deposits with building societies. This is likely to cause some substantial switching of deposits from the Savings Bank of South Australia to the building societies, and, in circumstances where the increase in deposits with the Savings Bank has been less than usual, this will mean a substantial reduction in mortgage lending by that bank also. The overall impact of all these measures taken together will be far-reaching in its effects, and will make the recovery of the building industry far more difficult than would otherwise be the case. A most serious change has also taken place in the nature of the Housing Trust's capital programme. In the financial statement delivered by me as Treasurer last year I said the following:

The general dissection of the trust's capital programme of \$27,620,000 planned for 1967-68 is: \$7,500,000 for rental housing, \$6,640,000 for rental-purchase housing, \$10,755,000 for houses for sale, \$1,000,000 for flats, \$1,250,000 for shops and industrial premises, and \$470,000 for miscellaneous items.

Because of the slow turnover of some of the Housing Trust's sale houses, this programme was not achieved in full. The Treasurer this year said:

The general dissection of the trust's capital programme of \$24,250,000 planned for 1968-69, is: \$9,210,000 for rental housing, \$3,400,000 for rental-purchase housing, \$8,700,000 for houses for sale, \$920,000 for flats, \$1,300,000 for shops and industrial premises, and \$720,000 for miscellaneous items.

The allocation for flats shows a slight reduction, but the rental-purchase programme has been cut almost in half. Under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement money is used, in the main, for rental and rental-purchase housing, and a reduced allocation to the trust is reflected in the fact that the combined rental and rental-purchase programme for 1967-68 was

\$14,140,000, whilst for this financial year it has been reduced to \$12,610,000. Indeed, it should be noted that in all these cases this is not work by day labour Government employees but is work by private builders and their employees. Because of the requirements of the Auditor-General, the Housing Trust lets its contracts at tender, and the people who build for the trust are private builders. Here is a substantial reduction in moneys available to let contracts to those builders. Is this the way to get the building industry moving when it is already on the downgrade? We know from building industry unions in this State of the flight of building workers from South Australia in the past three months.

Mr. McAnaney: Were there any left here to go away after you had been in Government for three years?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course there were. At the beginning of this year the Carpenters and Joiners Union could not find enough men. It has lost 100 carpenters to other States and has 60 on its books as unemployed. The Treasurer knows that, because he has had a letter from Mr. Martin of that union expressing dismay at the present position. The Treasurer knows that a different attitude was being taken by Mr. Martin only a few months ago. These Loan Estimates do not indicate an adequate expansion of expenditure in the public sector to give a necessary fillip to our economy. I am not suggesting, as was suggested by the present Government when it was in Opposition, that the economic ills of South Australia are entirely the fault of the State Government. What can be done in priming the pump in South Australia is limited in its effect on the South Australian economy, because only about 15 per cent of our market is in South Australia.

Mr. Corcoran: The editorials in the *Advertiser* are changing to that line of thinking, too.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: When we were in office the *Advertiser* blamed us for all that happened, but now it says that the Commonwealth Government is responsible. We will need assistance from the Commonwealth Government to stimulate markets for our products, and to get the sales of South Australia's produce sufficiently buoyant to take up the slack in our economy. What the State Government can do is work to the limited extent available to it in priming the pump within this State. That is what one should expect from these Loan Estimates and from

the Budget to be introduced soon but, at this stage, we get no indication of that and, from what is stated in these Loan Estimates, it is not entirely clear how the Treasurer intends to use the \$6,000,000 that he is putting aside. He stated that he was holding it against the accumulated revenue deficit to date. Perhaps he will use it against the revenue deficit on the Budget this year, but we do not know. He is holding it in reserve at this stage without committing it specifically.

In either event, I believe that the policy is wrong and that there is room to manage the State services with some additional progressive taxation, which this State can well stand, without increasing the costs of industry and without altering the cost differential, which we have established and which is a bi-partisan policy in this State. We could spend this money to expand public works adequately, and we could manage to balance the Budget on our revenue. But, if the Treasurer is simply using this to balance his Revenue Budget or if he is, as he has said, putting it aside and intends to pay it back into Trust Deposit Accounts as against accumulated revenue deficit at a time when these accounts are sufficiently buoyant for him to carry on without difficulty, then, in either event, I believe that this is a disastrous policy for the State. The extraordinary thing is that either of those policies runs completely counter to all that was said about financial responsibility by the Party opposite when it was in Opposition and we were under attack.

In these circumstances, no-one here can be satisfied with the Loan Estimates as they stand. By introducing them in these terms the Treasurer has done a complete *volte-face* from what his Party said previously and from what he said previously about the proper way to use Loan moneys. The people of the State are entitled at election time to know how their moneys are to be used so that they can express their opinion through the ballot box. What is being done now is completely contrary to what was said by the present Government as recently as the Millicent by-election.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I congratulate the Treasurer on introducing such a magnificent document. As a matter of fact, just as the Leader was sitting down, my friend the member for Enfield was remarking what fine Loan Estimates these were—and, for one of the few times in my life, I heartily agreed with him. One thing about these Loan Estimates

that fills me with pleasure is that they are the very opposite of a Socialist presentation. They aim at developing the natural resources of South Australia so that all South Australians can benefit. While the Leader was speaking, I thought of a little verse about Socialists which is not without relevance:

A Socialist is one who has yearnings for equal division of unequal earnings.

I shall confine my remarks to certain lines that relate to my own district. It is with great satisfaction that I find that the Cadell settlement will receive substantial capital injections to maintain the irrigation work already going on there. Before I discuss the situation at Cadell, I should like to thank the former Minister of Lands for the close interest he displayed and maintained in the Cadell enterprise and for what he did for Cadell while he was the Minister. I look back on the contribution I made to this debate last year and am surprised to find that some of the things mentioned in this year's Loan Estimates also appeared in last year's but, because the Australian Labor Party ran out of money, it cut down on expenditure in what it thought was a safe Liberal seat. The Labor Party thought the member for Light was in a good Liberal district and cut down expenditure in my district, so last year my people at Cadell and my people at Watervale missed out. Therefore, I am grateful that the new Treasurer has seen fit to reinstate those lines on the Loan Estimates. I know he is a much more able manager of finance than was his predecessor and I can reasonably expect that in the fullness of time my people at Watervale and Cadell will be satisfied by the expenditure of Loan funds in those two areas. It seems that last year Socialist members did not make much contribution to this debate, but I hope they will this year. As I was saying earlier, the Loan Estimates vote for Cadell will provide a worthwhile fillip to the irrigation settlement there.

Mr. Langley: Say it again!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: May I remind members opposite that I am encouraged by the member for Unley (Mr. Langley) to state that the early history of Cadell represented a failure in Socialism. In 1880 or 1890 a group of Marxists (though I do not know whether they were actually called Marxists) thought they could go to Cadell to set up a model communal village. A group of them (I am sorry to say that the State Treasurer at the time gave them some financial

encouragement to go there) went to what was called New Era and set up a Socialist village, where nobody owned anything; the whole property was common to all settlers. However, like all Socialist enterprises, it soon failed, and the settlement did not recommence at Cadell until after the First World War, when the Cadell site became the venue of the First World War soldier settler enterprise. For those soldier settlers, no doubt, the site appeared attractive. Superficially, the soils were good. The settlement was in an ox bow of the Murray River. On one side it was bounded by a low mallee island and on the other by limestone cliffs. What the settlers themselves did not appreciate was that there was a clay band 1ft. or 18in. below the surface of the sandy soil, which acted as a complete barrier to seepage drainage. It was this failure of the earlier settlers to contend with this seepage drainage that is still the trouble at the Cadell settlement.

I know the former Minister of Irrigation is well aware of the problems there, as is his successor. These things would have been attended to in the life of the last Government had it not run short of money. It spent the money in all sorts of directions and forgot about the important capital works. I am sorry to say the Cadell settlement was one of the works it forgot.

Mr. Jennings: Do you mind being called a Fascist?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I admit that I am out on the right wing of the Liberal and Country League political spectrum, and my friend the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) would perhaps be on the left wing.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable member get back to the Loan Estimates?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I want to get back to talking about the contribution that the Cadell settlement is making to the economy of South Australia. The member for Semaphore, who is interjecting now, must know that, if South Australia is to prosper and develop, the important capital works must be considered. I remind honourable members (because it will not harm them) that in 1965 the Cadell settlement produced about 63,936 bushels of citrus and, to give members opposite some idea of how this area is expanding, it is estimated that this year citrus production will be about 100,000 bushels.

Mr. McKee: After three years of Labor Government.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Not because of three years of Labor Government but in spite of the Labor Government. The value of dried fruit production in 1965 was \$45,630, and this year it is estimated the crop will return about \$71,000. This shows what private enterprise has done there.

Mr. Virgo: Under a Labor Government.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It was not the fault of the former Minister of Irrigation that more capital money was not spent at Cadell; if the Labor Party had done its job, the earnings at Cadell would be substantially more than they are. I do not want to spend time talking about all the problems in my district, because members opposite would not understand them if I did and, if they did, they would not appreciate them. Rather, I shall talk about one particular problem and elaborate on it to some extent in the hope that members opposite will understand such things at least superficially.

As I was saying earlier, the line relating to Cadell provides for the expenditure of \$65,000 on pumping plant. I am sorry to say that this line was included in the Loan Estimates last year but the Labor Government ran out of money. The important line relating to Cadell, as far as I am concerned, is the provision of \$35,000 for rehabilitation of the drainage there, which has been in poor condition for several years. Indeed, the position is now desperate; the caissons are falling in and most of the drainage lines themselves are blocked up to a considerable extent. It is only lack of funds that has prevented attention being given to this important need at Cadell. I repeat how delighted I am that at least one part of my district will be adequately catered for in this year's Loan Estimates, and I trust that, by the end of the three-year life of this Parliament, the whole of my district will receive the proper attention that it should have received over the last three years. I support the first line.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): We have listened to a very powerful speech from the member for Light, so powerful that I do not think I will even bother replying to any of it!

Mr. McKee: It was short.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, it was shorter than is usual for the honourable member, and this aspect certainly represents an improvement. For a period while the Labor Party was in Government and for a period after it was defeated, we suffered continual accusations from the current Premier, the current Treasurer

and others that the Labor Party had misappropriated funds in so far as certain items were transferred from the Revenue Account to the Loan Account. Certain capital items that had previously been financed out of revenue, such as university buildings and non-government hospital buildings, were transferred to the Loan Account. Great play was made by the current Premier of the allegation that there had been misappropriation of funds of the order of \$21,000,000. Sometimes it was \$20,000,000, and sometimes it was not misappropriation: sometimes he alleged that this money had been lost to the State. The current Treasurer continued this line of criticism soon after he came into office. Within almost two weeks of his taking office, in the *Advertiser* of May 2, the Treasurer was reported as saying:

About \$17,000,000 in Loan funds had been withdrawn from its normal and proper use in developmental and capital projects. This had been used to cover what had become during the past three years "a chronic excess of current expenditures over current revenues".

In making these remarks the Treasurer was referring to the fact that over the last two years certain commitments had been transferred from Revenue Account to Loan Account, but he completely ignored the fact that these were capital commitments and that the Labor Government was fully justified in charging them to Loan. He completely ignored the fact that in every other State in Australia such commitments were charged to Loan. Throughout the State he and his colleagues made accusations of mismanagement against the Labor Government. He alleged that the Labor Government had withdrawn money from its proper use. This was part of the political catchcry used by the then Opposition in its propaganda to try to confuse the electors of South Australia.

Mr. Broomhill: He suggested that the Labor Government was dishonest.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes; in the Loan Estimates now presented to us the Treasurer is following exactly the same policy that previously caused him and his colleagues to throw up their hands in horror. This year \$2,500,000 is being transferred from Revenue Account to Loan Account for the State Government's share of university buildings; \$2,525,000 is being so transferred for non-government hospitals, making a total on these two accounts of \$5,025,000. The Treasurer has shown that, despite what he said when he was in opposition and despite what he said on May 2, he is prepared to follow exactly the same policy as that adopted by the previous Government. In fact, he has taken it further:

the provision for a grant to the Renmark Irrigation Trust of \$100,000 was transferred to Loan Account on April 8, eight days before the Dunstan Government went out of office. The present Treasurer, however, has adhered to this transfer, which was for the year 1967-68, and he proposes to do it again in the current financial year. The provision of \$150,000 for national reserves has been transferred from Budget to Loan Account and, in addition, the provision of \$300,000 for public parks, which in previous years had been met in the Budget, has been transferred to Loan Account. The total amount of transfers from Revenue Account to Loan Account is \$5,575,000. I think this demonstrates that the Treasurer's statement of May 2 and the criticisms made by the current Premier and his colleagues over the last two years and during the election campaign were sheer humbug—nothing else than that. They were nothing else than a complete sham designed to mislead the people of South Australia. Frankly, I think all members, and in particular members on this side of the House, deserve an apology for the criticisms that the Treasurer demonstrated, through his own speech on the Loan Estimates, to be a complete fraud and a sham. I stand by this—a complete sham, nothing else but that.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You said "fraud" just now: you will be the one apologizing directly.

Mr. HUDSON: The Treasurer can make threats if he wishes to do so: they do not worry me at all. If someone criticizes Labor Government's actions, if he makes this criticism deliberately to cause the people to believe that it was mismanaging the State's funds, and if when he himself comes into power he then himself carries out the action that he made a central feature of his criticism, that is a fraud on the people of South Australia; if it is not, I do not know what is a fraud.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: They were suggesting we were crook.

Mr. HUDSON: That is right.

Mr. Casey: Do you think it is possible that they like to hand it out but that they can't take it?

Mr. HUDSON: I think it is because the Treasurer believes that when the previous Government did it it was bad and wrong and there was mismanagement but that when he had to do it (and he admits that there was no alternative) he says that he was

simply forced into it and he has all the excuses in the world. Things are not the same when they are different.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Now you have said it. Forced into it by whom?

Mr. HUDSON: The Treasurer is not prepared to face up to his revenue obligations in the Budget he is going to bring down.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Why didn't you face up to it?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HUDSON: If we had got through—

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You didn't get through.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HUDSON: Mr. Chairman, the Treasurer will be able to recall revenue items which the previous Government submitted and passed through this Chamber after they had been raised in the 1965 election campaign. I am referring particularly to succession duties and stamp duties, the provisions for which were either thrown out or completely modified in the Upper House. As a result of that, the loss to the revenue of the State over the period of the previous Government and up to the end of June this year would have been at least of the order of \$6,000,000.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: That is not correct.

Mr. HUDSON: May I remind the Treasurer that the revenue estimate submitted when the Succession Duties Bill was first introduced was that there would be an increase in revenue of \$3,000,000 a year. It was then introduced in a modified form which would have meant an increase in revenue of something less than \$3,000,000 a year, perhaps \$2,000,000 a year. If that Bill had been passed, the increase in revenue available to this State over the period of the previous Government on account of succession duties alone would have been about \$5,500,000 or \$6,000,000.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Over the three years.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, up to June 30 this year. That is what I said before. What, after all, was the revenue deficit at the end of the three years up to the end of June this year? It was \$8,365,000.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Plus transfers from Loan.

Mr. HUDSON: Do you say that is deficit?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It was in actual fact.

Mr. HUDSON: On your previous standard of accounting you condemn yourself out of your own mouth, because you have carried on the same sort of transfers and you have transferred more.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I am condemning you.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the member for Glenelg to address the Chair, and I ask the honourable Treasurer not to interject.

Mr. HUDSON: I am delighted with the Treasurer's interjections, because it is about time we nailed this phoney criticism well and truly for what it is.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member will address the Chair.

Mr. HUDSON: I will, Mr. Chairman. Let me put this on the line clearly and unambiguously. Regarding the Budget position with the previous Government, the Treasurer knows full well that if the revenue proposals of the previous Government had been accepted by the Legislative Council, the greater part of the revenue deficit that existed at the end of June this year would have disappeared.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The ostensible deficit.

Mr. HUDSON: If the Treasurer likes to put it that way. The Treasurer tells us that these transfers should not have taken place. However, he then has the gall to tell us that he has to continue these transfers because he was forced into that position by us, when in fact the revenue deficit (as I have just shown) would not have existed but for the action his colleagues took in another place. The revenue deficit of \$8,365,000, if it was the fault of anyone, was consequent on the actions of members of the Liberal and Country League in the Legislative Council. Now the Treasurer, with impeccable logic, tells us that this revenue deficit was entirely our fault and forced him into continuing the transfers. It is about time the Treasurer did some elementary logic on this sort of statement; it is about time the Treasurer cut out the kind of statement that appeared in the *Advertiser* on May 2; and it is about time the Treasurer and his colleagues stopped misleading the people of South Australia with a deliberate facade of self-righteousness—a disgusting form of self-righteousness which I hope we shall not see repeated in the future.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Thank you very much; I appreciate that.

Mr. HUDSON: I am glad the Treasurer appreciates that; I hope he takes these things to heart.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I don't need any moral lesson from you.

Mr. HUDSON: I think the Treasurer does. When he criticizes us for being immoral in some respects and does exactly the same thing himself, some moral lessons are definitely necessary, and they should be handed out in this place. In fact, I hope they are added to by other members of the Opposition.

Mr. Casey: We had to sit and take it.

Mr. HUDSON: Mr. Chairman, the position at the end of June regarding the overall deficit in South Australia has not been greatly publicized; in fact, with the deficit of \$8,365,000 on Revenue Account and a surplus of \$5,658,000 on Loan, the net position at the end of June, 1968, on both Loan and Revenue Accounts combined was a deficit of some \$2,700,000. That should be compared with a deficit that existed at the end of June, 1966, overall on both Loan and Revenue Accounts of some \$8,000,000, so between June, 1966, and June, 1968, there was an improvement in the Government's position of \$5,300,000.

Mr. McAnaney: Your Leader said it was wrong to do that when you had unemployment.

Mr. HUDSON: For the benefit of the member for Stirling, one reason why it has occurred has been that some accounts which normally could have been expected to fall due—

Mr. McAnaney: Now you are getting on to a different account.

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Stirling claims to be a great expert—

Members interjecting!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Glenelg.

Mr. HUDSON: The interjections of the member for Stirling—

Mr. McAnaney: Every time you get in a corner you get abusive.

Mr. HUDSON: —are of the usual type. They demonstrate his usual lack of knowledge on these matters, and they demonstrate—

Mr. McAnaney: That is schoolboy talk.

Mr. HUDSON: Mr. Chairman, I think the best thing to do is to ignore the member for Stirling and treat him as being in a similar category to the member for Light.

Mr. McAnaney: One can't ignore you, you talk too much.

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Stirling will get his turn to speak in this debate. I hope he will then make a better contribution than usual, and I hope he will explain the consistency between what his position will be now and the criticisms he made previously, because he was guilty of exactly the same kind of humbug for which I criticized the Treasurer. There was an overall deficit on the Revenue and Loan Accounts at June 30 of about \$2,700,000. This would have been greater but for underspending on Loan Account, particularly in relation to school and hospital buildings. We have been informed by the Treasurer, in reply to questions, that some part of this underspending was due to wet weather and some part was due to mistakes in planning made within the Public Buildings Department. We would have expected that under-spending not to have taken place. If it had not taken place, the overall deficit at the end of June this year would have been \$6,900,000. In terms of an overall expenditure on Loan and Revenue Accounts together over the whole year of \$370,000,000, or almost \$400,000,000 when one takes into account the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement money, a deficit of \$6,900,000, which would have been the case if no under-spending had taken place, is pretty paltry. It is not even a week's spending by the Government over the whole year—indeed, it is about six days' spending.

The deficit of \$2,700,000 amounts to a little more than two days' spending by the Government. When we talk about deficits and remember the outcry of members opposite when they were in Opposition and tried to raise a scare campaign among the public in general about mis-use of Trust Funds, and so on, we should remember that the deficit was very small and that, even if there had been no under-spending and the combined Revenue and Loan deficit at the end of June last had been \$7,000,000, much of that was caused by the effects of the drought and the difficult economic circumstances which were produced over the last year or so by the drought and previously by a declining demand for South Australian products in the Eastern States.

What we are pointing out (for the benefit of the honourable member for Stirling, what I am saying is completely consistent with the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition) is that the Government has a responsibility in difficult

economic circumstances to offset, to the extent that it is able, any downturn in the economy by running a deficit itself, that it is not proper for a Government in any one year to treat its own operations as if it were a business and that it must cover all spending by revenue of one sort or another. This must be true over a longer period of time, but it is completely proper and sound economic policy for a Government in times of boom to run a surplus to offset the effects of a boom and, in times of economic difficulty, to run a deficit and spend relatively more to offset the effects of such economic difficulty.

Mr. McAnaney: Why didn't you do that in January when we had record unemployment?

Mr. HUDSON: The honourable member says we had record unemployment in January, but that is a complete and utter falsehood. Unemployment in January was nowhere near the level that existed in 1960, 1961 and 1962.

Mr. McAnaney: You are preaching one thing and practising something else.

Mr. HUDSON: If the honourable member had listened and was not so filled with this feeling of hatred for everything about the previous Government, he would have heard me say that the under-spending I referred to occurred between April and June this year, and that in January such under-spending, which was mainly on the Loan Account, was not expected to have occurred. In January, the Government was spending at a record level and it was even expected that the Highways Fund would go into deficit by about \$2,000,000 or more by the end of June. That was the extent to which the position of the State had been pushed financially in January. The honourable member's statement is completely unfounded.

Mr. McAnaney: You built up the fund so that the Premier could say—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order!

Mr. HUDSON: The honourable member's interjections are absolutely unintelligible.

Mr. McAnaney: They are correct.

Mr. HUDSON: I cannot even hear what you are saying. If I hear them I cannot understand them.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

Mr. HUDSON: I find it a little hard that you, Sir, should suggest that I address the Chair when I have been subjected to an almost continual and unintelligible badgering by one of your colleagues on your right.

The CHAIRMAN: I have called the honourable member for Stirling to order, and I have asked the honourable member for Glenelg to address the Chair.

Mr. HUDSON: I have done my best to address the Chair, Sir, but have found it difficult to do so. The most serious matter of substance, so far as the Loan Estimates are concerned, has been the complete disregard by the Government of the needs of the building industry and the fact that the general effect of the Loan Estimates will mean an inevitable reduction in the amount of building carried out through the traditional sources under the control of the State Government. The State Government's contribution to the building industry in the coming financial year will be negligible. Following the increase in the maximum amount for loans from \$7,000 to \$8,000 (to which no-one could take serious objection) the Treasurer, I presume with the approval of the full Cabinet, reduced the sum provided for housing loans from \$21,000,000 to \$19,500,000. If the previous provision of \$21,000,000 had been maintained, increasing the loan limit from \$7,000 to \$8,000 would have meant a reduction in the number of houses built through this method of financing. The same allocations as last year (\$21,000,000) would have implied a reduction in the number of houses and flats constructed but when the sum available for housing loans is reduced by \$1,500,000, or by almost 7 per cent and that is taken in conjunction with the increase in the limit of loans from \$7,000 to \$8,000, the effect on the housing industry and those private builders who build for the trust or as a result of house builders getting finance from the State Bank will be a reduction in private building finance from these sources of about 15 per cent. This is a Government that says that it is concerned to get the economy moving again. The one point of great weakness in the economy, the building industry, which is the one part of the economy that most needs support from this Government has suffered a setback of considerable magnitude from the actions of this Government.

During last year's Loan Estimates debate, the present Premier criticized the then Government for not sufficiently increasing the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement money. He criticized us by saying the increase was not substantial enough. He said that only eight or nine months before the election. The previous Government was abused up hill and down dale for the so-called ills of the building industry. Since this Government has come into

power, over the last three months a further reduction in housing approvals has occurred. For the three months from January to March, 1968, compared with the equivalent three months of 1967, approvals for private houses and flats increased by 146 to 1,519. However, for the period from April to June, 1968, the latest quarterly figures available show that, compared with the same period last year, a decline in approvals for houses and flats of 119 occurred. Therefore, for the first six months of this year, there was a slight improvement in house and flat approvals but the period from April to June saw a deterioration.

The Treasurer is well aware of these figures, for he was questioned about them in this place on August 1 and asked for his detailed opinion of them. He made clear at the time that he was not satisfied with the position in the building industry. However, in the Loan Estimates he has proposed action that can only make the recovery of the building industry more difficult. Furthermore, the way in which the housing agreement money has been allocated as between the Housing Trust and the State Bank on the one hand and the co-operative building societies on the other suggests a prejudice on the part of this Government against the traditional roles of the trust and the State Bank, because the allocations to both organizations have been reduced substantially to provide an increase of 25 per cent in the allocation to the co-operative building societies. I do not see what possible justification exists for saying to people on the waiting list for a State Bank loan that they will have to wait longer because the Government wants to provide more money to the co-operative building societies and is reducing the allocation to the State Bank still further in order to do that.

The detailed figures which were given by the Leader and which are worth repeating are as follows: a reduction of \$650,000 in the allocation for the Housing Trust from \$10,150,000 to \$9,500,000 (a reduction of slightly more than 6 per cent), a reduction to the State Bank of \$1,150,000 from \$9,650,000 to \$8,500,000 (a reduction of 12 per cent), and an increase of \$300,000 to the co-operative building societies. When these changes are seen in conjunction with the proposal of this Government to make certain types of deposit with building societies trustee investments, we can see that these Loan Estimates are part of an overall design by this Government to cut the traditional roles played by the State Bank

and the Housing Trust in order to expand substantially the role played by the co-operative building societies.

I hope the Treasurer is aware of the serious adverse effects this action may have not on the State Bank but on another important institution, the Savings Bank of South Australia. It is my view (and I think this will be supported by official figures from the Savings Bank) that a significant percentage of deposits held with the Savings Bank of South Australia (of the order of, say, 75 per cent of total deposits) is controlled by 15 per cent of depositors. Many organizations interested in a form of trustee investment have large deposits with the Savings Bank of South Australia and their support of that bank has been an important factor in enabling it to make a further contribution to the building industry in South Australia, admittedly partly through financing the purchase of existing houses. If the market for houses already built is not buoyant, the market for new houses will not be buoyant, and thus the market for the building industry will not be buoyant.

The Treasurer neglects at his peril the role played by the Savings Bank. To propose legislation of the type he is proposing, in relation to making deposits with building societies trustee investments, which may produce a substantial switch of funds from the Savings Bank to those building societies in circumstances where, I understand, the increase in the total deposits held by the Savings Bank have been fairly small, is to risk a situation where the new lending of the Savings Bank will have to be cut drastically. I predict that the action of this Government will not only lead to a cut in the number of houses and flats financed through the Housing Trust with Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement money and to a cut in the number of loans through the State Bank but will also lead to a substantial reduction in the number of loans approved during the coming year by the Savings Bank. When these matters are considered together the prospects for the building industry in South Australia look grim. This is from a Government that made such a song and dance when in Opposition about the alleged responsibilities of the then Government for what was happening to the building industry. This is from a Government which, during the election campaign, created a great song and dance about the need to get South Australia moving again. This is from a Government which, when previously in power, did its best to support the

Housing Trust fully. I suggest that these actions would never have been approved in a month of Sundays by Sir Thomas Playford if he were Treasurer.

It will be no good for the Treasurer to try to answer me on this point about trustee investments or on the point of the increased allocation to co-operative building societies by saying that increased activity financed through the building societies will offset reduced activity through the trust, the State Bank and the Savings Bank. These organizations are already geared up to a certain level of activity. If they do not have money to lend they will have to run their organizations down, but there is no problem for those organizations to maintain their existing level of lending. However, a serious problem exists for the co-operative building societies to expand rapidly their lending, because they are not geared up to do it. They do not have the administration established to produce the kind of rapid increase in lending that could offset the prospective reduction in lending through the State Bank and Savings Bank.

Whatever the organization, whether private or Government or whether small or large, if it has to provide a significant change in its level of operations through expansion it meets administrative difficulties and bottlenecks. It will be completely fatuous for the Government to answer our criticisms by suggesting that the co-operative building societies can take up the slack that the Government has forced the Housing Trust, the State Bank and the Savings Bank to create. The co-operative building societies will not be able to fill the gap as rapidly as the Government would wish, because of shortages of staff, inadequate accommodation and the need to make a series of new decisions about the level of their activities.

There will not be the expansion through the building societies that the Government wants, and there will be a substantial reduction in the number of houses financed through the traditional sources of funds in this State. I regard the housing policy that is now being followed by this Government as disastrous and one that will seriously hinder the future development of this State and make it more difficult than it has been for the average citizen to obtain a house at a price he can afford.

Today, I was dismayed to hear the Treasurer say that he had reversed a direction given by the previous Government in April of this year, when I was Minister of Housing, to the Housing Trust that Woods and Forests Department

radiata pine be specified in all trust contracts let to private builders. I am amazed at this decision for two substantial reasons, both of which are admitted by the Treasurer. First, as he admits, the Woods and Forests Department is heavily overstocked, and if the trust's subcontractors can now cease using radiata pine from the department the Treasurer will have made a great contribution to solving the overstocking problem with the department! Secondly, as is demonstrated clearly in the Treasurer's statement on the Loan Estimates, any sales problem of the Woods and Forests Department reacts against the Loan Estimates and the amount the Government has available to finance public works. This is in circumstances where the Treasurer had the gall to make a completely unjustified criticism of the previous Government for not using Loan money appropriately.

The Treasurer admits that the recovery to Loan Account from the Woods and Forests Department for the last financial year was down by \$1,000,000, and that was \$1,000,000 less available in the Loan Account to finance other public works. That \$1,000,000 is probably one of the reasons why the effective school building programme this year, when allowance is made for the under-spending that took place last year, has been reduced from what it should be. Today, the Treasurer justified this action by suggesting that it was proper commercial practice to allow the trust's subcontractors to buy from whomever they elected and to neglect the radiata pine supplied by the Woods and Forests Department. In reply to my question he said:

The Woods and Forests Department as a supplier of building materials is one of many suppliers. Real objections were raised to the proposal outlined by the honourable member and, after these objections had been considered, the Government did not insist that the trust should specify entirely the use of radiata pine by all of its subcontractors.

This reverses the policy of the previous Government and the policy established by the previous Liberal and Country League Administration when Woods and Forests Department radiata pine was always specified for every contract let by the Housing Trust. Sir Thomas Playford, the previous Liberal and Country League Treasurer, adopted this policy, because he well knew that if the Woods and Forests Department suffered financially this reacted back on the money he had available to finance school and hospital buildings, water supply, sewerage development, and everything else financed from the Loan Estimates. I am absolutely appalled by this Government's decision.

The Treasurer is also Minister of Housing and should know that there are tie-ups between certain timber merchants and Softwoods Products, one of the main competitors of the Woods and Forests Department. These tie-ups mean that, when subcontractors go to timber merchants, there will be a preference in favour of Softwood Products against the Woods and Forests Department, and it is absolutely fatuous for the Minister of Housing to suggest that it is only reasonable that the department should be forced to compete with Sapfor and Softwood Products in circumstances where there are restrictive practices and monopolistic tendencies amongst those private firms. Can we imagine a timber-producing company having a building subsidiary and saying to it, "All right, boys; you do not need to get your radiata pine from us; you can get it from the Woods and Forests Department". Would that be normal commercial enterprise? Is that the normal practice of private business? Not on your life!

In those circumstances, even the merest novice knows that the timber company would say to its building subsidiary, "If you use radiata pine you will use our product." What is the Government saying to its building subsidiary, the Housing Trust?—"Oh, don't worry about any of your contracts, old boy. You can allow your subcontractors to use the products of South Australian Perpetual Forests and Softwood Products. It does not matter about the Woods and Forests Department. We know it is terribly overstocked but we shall get over that somehow or other in the years to come, even if it has a serious effect on the Loan Account. Because the Woods and Forests Department's profit is a recovery to the Loan Account, this will mean only a few less schools and less money for hospitals and water supply. It does not really matter. In a few years' time, nobody will notice the difference."

Mr. Rodda: What did you do about it?

Mr. HUDSON: As Minister of Housing, I did something about it. This was one of the matters raised with me for decision while I was Minister of Housing. I immediately took it to Cabinet and got a directive from Cabinet to the Housing Trust that it had to specify Woods and Forests Department radiata pine in all Housing Trust contracts, without exception.

Mr. Virgo: That was decentralization, too.

Mr. HUDSON: That was done in every single case except one in 1967 which, in my opinion, should never have been allowed to

occur anyway. Prior to that, throughout the history of the Playford Government the Housing Trust had been required to specify Woods and Forests Department radiata pine, and for that pine, when used by the Housing Trust in its own processes, special terms were given. Those were modified as a result of my directive.

Mr. Rodda: You came too late.

Mr. HUDSON: No, I did not come too late. This process was not followed by the current Minister of Housing. He is the one who has been taken in on this point. I cannot understand how he, as Minister of Housing, can take a decision that puts the Woods and Forests Department in greater difficulty, which will result in its returning to the same gentleman as Treasurer a smaller repayment to the Loan Account. If the Treasurer can justify this, then he is more capable of gobbledegook than I thought he was.

I should like to give the Committee more information about the tie-ups in the timber industry, because I think they are relevant to this matter, and they indicate clearly that the Woods and Forests Department starts off at a disadvantage when it markets its products, as it does, through the various timber merchants. South Australian Perpetual Forests maintains an independent position. Its policy, more or less, has been that it will sell directly to the builders if they cannot deal satisfactorily through the merchants. Consequently, Sapfor's output is more or less shared among several merchants who handle the product, without there being any direct tie-up at all.

This, however, is far from being the case when we consider Softwood Products. Here, there is a clear single tie-up with Globe Timber Mills Proprietary Limited and Walter and Morris Proprietary Limited, timber merchants. There are also other indirect but quite strong connections due to the very strong influence of Gunnensen LeMessurier Proprietary Limited in the South Australian industry. Gunnensen LeMessurier Pty. Ltd. itself is closely allied to Softwood Products. The bigger merchants concerned are Lloyds Timber Mills Limited and Wadlow Timber Industries Proprietary Limited, which have close associations and with which LeMessuriers have considerable share holdings. In fact, Mr. R. LeMessurier is Chairman of Wadlow Timber Industries Pty. Ltd. Reid Brothers Limited is another company closely related to Gunnensen LeMessurier Pty. Ltd. There are other shades of the association; these could be illustrated by the fact that Mr. Geddes, of Chas. Geddes and

Company Limited, timber merchants, happens to be a member of the Board of Directors of Wadlow Timber Industries Pty. Ltd.

There are strong tie-ups, which I have just illustrated, between the various timber merchants, who are the people who happen to handle the products of the Woods and Forests Department. One of the department's chief competitors is Softwood Products. The one advantage that the Woods and Forests Department has, namely, the association with the Housing Trust, has been cut away. In circumstances where the Treasurer needs every cent he can get for financing Loan works and in circumstances where the Woods and Forests Department is, on the Treasurer's own admission, heavily overstocked, how the Treasurer as Minister of Housing gave this recommendation to Cabinet and how Cabinet approved it, I cannot understand. I am absolutely appalled by this decision, which is completely contrary to the interests of the department, the interests of the South-East and, indeed, the interests of the State as a whole, through the additional effect that it will have on the overall Loan position. The Woods and Forests Department is capable of making repayments to the Loan Account of between \$1,000,000 and \$2,250,000 a year. If it is \$1,200,000 repayments, as is proposed this year, as against \$2,250,000, which it ought to be if the department was in a healthy financial position, then there is \$1,000,000 less available to the Treasurer to be spent on ordinary Loan works.

I now want to turn to a closer examination of the position regarding school buildings. Superficially, it appears that we have an increase in the school-building programme from last year's spending of about \$11,000,000 to \$13,700,000. Last year the actual turn-out was \$8,678,000 spent out of Loan funds, with a further \$2,400,000 provided by the Commonwealth Government, making a total of \$11,000,000. This year it is proposed to have a programme of \$13,700,000. In fact, because of the under-spending during the last financial year of \$1,971,507, which therefore becomes a carry-over to this financial year, to get a true comparison of the position one should allocate that \$1,971,507 to last year and reduce the amount of \$13,700,000 by an equivalent amount for this year.

A further factor has to be considered. In the Loan Estimates presented to this Committee in 1967 the then Treasurer (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) estimated that \$1,700,000 of Commonwealth assistance would be received for schools and teaching colleges. In fact, the

outcome was assistance that amounted to \$2,400,000. In a document that the Under Treasurer circulated in March this year it was estimated that for 1968-69 the Commonwealth assistance would be \$2,600,000, yet we find in the Loan Estimates that that figure has been reduced to \$1,700,000. In answer to a question on this matter, the Treasurer claimed that a large part of the difference was accounted for by too high a preliminary estimate for the amount of assistance that would be received for Salisbury Teachers College.

I point out, however, that last year the actual turn-out was \$700,000 greater than the estimate. The figure in the Loan Estimates this year is \$900,000 below the March figure that was given to the previous Cabinet, and I suspect that the actual turn-out of Commonwealth assistance this year will be at least \$2,000,000. It will certainly be above the \$1,700,000 that was put in as the Loan Estimates figure. This is one way in which the Treasurer can get a bit of sugar on his Loan Estimates. He can have a bit of a cushion because if, as is likely, the amount of Commonwealth assistance is significantly greater than \$2,000,000, then to the extent to which it exceeds \$1,700,000 the Treasurer has that much less to provide from straight Loan funds and more available for other purposes.

Mr. Chairman, if we adjust the school-building figures as between last year and this year by the \$1,971,507 of under-spending last year, and if we assume that the amount of Commonwealth assistance for the coming financial year will be \$2,600,000 and not \$1,700,000, we find that the effective new provision from State Loan funds for school buildings this year is only \$9,128,493. This would be the amount of State Loan funds required for new school buildings, not covered by previous financial provisions. If the figure of Commonwealth assistance turns out to be correct, the effective new provision of Loan funds from State sources will be \$10,028,493 as against a provision of State Loan funds last financial year of \$10,650,000. I have no doubt that the previous Minister of Education (the current member for Whyalla) will inform the Committee, when it is his turn to speak on these Estimates, of the objection he took to the attempt to cut the \$10,650,000 provided for school buildings last year. He took the strongest objection to this, and the previous Government agreed with him that such a reduction should not take place.

The present Government has concealed the effective reduction in the amounts provided for new school buildings by carrying over the underspending from last year. If that underspending had not taken place, and if the Commonwealth Government's assistance is estimated correctly, the effective provision of State Loan funds for school buildings this year would be only a little more than \$10,000,000, a reduction of \$630,000 on what was provided during the last financial year. If the same adjustment is made in relation to the provision for hospital buildings as a result of underspending in the last few months of the last financial year, we again find that we have an effective new provision of \$9,363,194, which is only a slight increase over the \$9,060,000 provided for last year, despite the great need for increased provision for hospitals, despite the enormous programme ahead of us and despite the commitments that the present Government made during the last election campaign.

Indeed, we heard the Premier say on television that the L.C.L. would build the Modbury Hospital and the South-Western Districts Hospital at Flinders University. However, there is no mention this year of the South-Western Districts Hospital or of what progress is taking place in relation to that programme. Yet during the election campaign we had a clear and specific commitment on it. There is a statement in the Loan Estimates to which the Leader has already referred, namely, that these Loan Estimates represented effectively an increase in spending over the last year of 16 per cent, and the Leader demonstrated quite clearly that this was not the case. He said that the Treasurer, in presenting the Loan Estimates to Parliament, had given a false picture of the position and had failed to adjust between 1967-68 and 1968-69 for the under-spending that took place on account of school and hospital buildings. The Leader spoke about adjusting those two items and, allowing for the fact that the Loan Estimates figures given for this financial year were inflated by \$1,500,000 as a result of the disastrous policy this Government is following, with Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement money, an extra \$1,500,000 will be available for these items in the Loan Estimates only because Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement money has been reduced by this sum. We say that it should not have been reduced and that, if it had not been reduced, Loan Estimates available this year would be cut in this statement by \$1,500,000.

Mr. Rodda: What about the empty houses?

Mr. HUDSON: Early in April I received a clear statement from the General Manager of the Housing Trust (Mr. Ramsay) to the effect that, at that time, there were over 400 unoccupied houses in Elizabeth and Smithfield Plains and that a good proportion of those would be taken up in the months after April as a result of the transfer of Commonwealth Air Force and Army personnel to South Australia. The member for Victoria will remember a reply to a question asked this afternoon in which the member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill) was informed by the Minister of Housing that about 128 houses had been taken over the last few months by Commonwealth Air Force and Army personnel and that the number of unoccupied houses had been reduced as a result. He would also be aware that those houses were originally built by the trust on the understanding that the Army and Air Force needed additional accommodation in that area. Many of them were unoccupied only because the Commonwealth Government failed to live up to its previous commitments. However, it is now starting to honour those commitments. The General Manager of the trust informed me on April 2, 1968, as follows:

Further to minute of March 28, 1968, I wish to advise that the Royal Australian Air Force expects its allocation of houses at Smithfield Plains will be taken up by July or August. The personnel are coming from Richmond, Victoria, and the balance are at present training and testing the aircraft in America. The latest advice from the R.A.A.F. is that it will require 13 houses between now and mid-May. The Army originally expected to have taken up its allocation at the same time as the R.A.A.F. but apparently it is experiencing recruiting problems. The Army is unable to give a firm date when it will have taken up all houses as this is dependent on the rate of recruitment.

It is clear from the statement and other information supplied by the General Manager that it was certainly the trust's understanding that a significant number of these houses was to be taken up by the Army and the Air Force.

Returning to the matter of adjusting the 1967-68 and 1968-69 figures so that we will obtain a true comparison, I say that we should eliminate from the figures \$500,000 provided for the festival hall. The Treasurer and all members on the Government front bench must know that that is a phoney allocation. No money will be spent on the hall this financial year, and the allocation of \$500,000 is a means of building up the surplus a bit more at the end of the year: that is its whole purpose.

Can any Minister explain how the Government expects to spend \$500,000 on a festival hall when it has agreed to provide money for the Carclew site, which no-one except the Ministers approve of as the site of the hall, which the Adelaide City Council has rejected and which is not in line with the DeGaetani report? How \$500,000 is to be spent on the hall between now and the end of June next is absolutely beyond my imagination.

Mr. Venning: You may be surprised.

Mr. HUDSON: If the honourable member can give me an inkling how the money will be spent, I will appreciate it. If it is not spent on the festival hall it should be used for school and hospital buildings and other purposes.

Mr. McAnaney: Why didn't you use surplus Loan funds for that?

Mr. HUDSON: If the honourable member cares to check the Treasurer's reply to a question asked by the member for Whyalla last Thursday he will realize that, in the main, the under-spending took place in the last three months of this financial year.

Mr. McAnaney: That is not borne out by the Treasurer's monthly statements, which I presume you look at.

Mr. HUDSON: I know that the honourable member gets the monthly statements.

Mr. Broomhill: Apparently, he can't read them.

Mr. HUDSON: There is more to the monthly statements than appears there.

Mr. McAnaney: Are you implying that they are cooked up?

Mr. HUDSON: I am about to quote from page 659 of *Hansard*.

Mr. McAnaney: We were talking about the Treasurer's statement, but now you shoot off on to something else.

Mr. HUDSON: This is what the Treasurer said in reply to a question asked by me and to a further question asked by the member for Whyalla following a statement made by the Treasurer.

Mr. Broomhill: Is the member for Stirling suggesting that the Treasurer's statements are crook?

Mr. McAnaney: I am referring to the Treasurer's statement.

Mr. HUDSON: The Treasurer said, no doubt on the advice of the Under Treasurer: I have the information that the honourable members sought in regard to some under-spending in the Loan Estimates programme,

which resulted in a considerably higher surplus at the end of June than was anticipated. Each honourable member referred to a statement tendered to the previous Government by the Under Treasurer in March of this year, and the information he has given me will, I think, cover the matters raised by each member.

The Treasurer then referred to the Public Buildings Department, and continued:

The estimate of probable expenditures in 1967-68 put before the previous Cabinet in March, 1968, was based on the information available to the Treasury and the Public Buildings Department at the time. There were indications then that a number of contractors were spending less than had been earlier expected but general information from contractors was that they expected to make up much of the lag in progress. In fact over the last four months of the year they not only failed to make up the leeway but fell further behind.

He then said that the Under Treasurer explained that some part of this was caused by wet weather and some was caused by delay in letting contracts. However, he made it clear that the bulk of the under-spending was not expected even as late as the end of March and that it took place over the last few months of the financial year. How the member for Stirling can accuse us of under-spending I do not know, because it has occurred mainly while his Government has been in power, since April 16.

Mr. McAnaney: A sum of \$8,000,000 was spent in the first eight months, and it decreased, if anything, in the last four months.

Mr. HUDSON: This may be because of problems within the Public Buildings Department.

Mr. McAnaney: But there are hundreds of ways of spending money.

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Stirling must surely understand that the expected rate of spending on school, university and hospital buildings is not an even rate over the year: it takes place as contractors do the jobs and present accounts for payment. The rate at which money is spent can fluctuate significantly from month to month depending on the date of letting contracts and the rate at which contractors proceed with their contracts. To expect that it should occur at an even rate assumes that all contracts are let in such a way that that will happen, which is not the case. I ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.33 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 21, at 2 p.m.