

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 19, 1969.

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

PETITIONS: ABORTION LEGISLATION

Mr. JENNINGS presented a petition signed by 38 persons stating that the signatories, being 16 years of age or older, were deeply convinced that the human baby began its life no later than the time of implantation of the fertilized ovum in its mother's womb (that is, six to eight days after conception), that any direct intervention to take away its life was a violation of its right to live, and that honourable members, having the responsibility to govern this State, should protect the rights of innocent individuals, particularly the helpless. The petition also stated that the unborn child was the most innocent and most in need of the protection of our laws whenever its life was in danger. The signatories realized that abortions were performed in public hospitals in this State, in circumstances claimed to necessitate it on account of the life of the pregnant woman. The petitioners prayed that the House of Assembly would not amend the law to extend the grounds on which a woman might seek an abortion but that, if honourable members considered that the law should be amended, such amendment should not extend beyond a codification that might permit the current practice.

Mr. RYAN presented a petition signed by 11 persons stating that the signatories, being 20 years of age or older, were deeply convinced that from the time of its implantation into the woman's womb (that is, six to eight days after conception) the fertilized ovum was a potential human being, and, therefore, worthy of the greatest respect; and that the termination of pregnancy for reasons other than the preservation of the life or physical and/or mental welfare of the pregnant woman was morally unjustifiable; that, where social reasons appeared to exist for termination of pregnancy, then the social condition rather than the practice of abortion should be treated; and that experience in countries where abortions were permitted on social or economic grounds indicated that such practice created many new problems. The signatories also realized that abortions were performed in public hospitals in this State, in circumstances which necessitated it on account of the life or physical and/or mental health of the pregnant woman. The

petitioners prayed that, if the House of Assembly amended the law, such amendment should definitely not extend beyond a codification that might permit the current practice.

Petitions received.

QUESTIONS

UNEMPLOYMENT

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry elaborate on the report regarding unemployment figures given by the Commonwealth Minister for Labour and National Service yesterday?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Yes, I am able and pleased to do so, because the significant features of this report are a drop of about 25 per cent in the number registered for employment in South Australia compared with the position about a year ago, and an increase of about 50 per cent in the number of job vacancies compared with the position last year. Further, the number receiving unemployment benefits has decreased remarkably and we are now rapidly reaching the position I forecast in a statement in the House about a month ago, namely, that not only were there shortages of skilled tradesmen such as carpenters and bricklayers in the building industry but that in other fields there were shortages, particularly in the metal industry where there were shortages of such tradesmen as boilermakers. The reply to the question is that there is a marked upward swing that I know every member welcomes strongly.

WATER QUALITY

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: While watching a television programme this morning I heard that tonight, I think, on *Newsbeat* two prominent doctors were to claim that the water supply in South Australia was not fit for human consumption. I do not know who the doctors may be, but I would not be surprised if they came from a place where the drinking water came from sewers. I think that their statement may cause some panic and that it is undesirable for medical men to say such a thing, but I am confident that officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department can give a complete answer to such a foolish statement. Will the Minister of Works arrange for his officers to appear on the programme in order to reply to these claims?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I am pleased that the honourable member has asked this question, because I understand that he, when a Minister, had some personal dealings with

one of the doctors concerned. I had prepared a reply on this matter to a question asked by the member for West Torrens, and out of courtesy to him I prefer to give the reply direct to him when he asks for it. However, I assure the honourable member and the House that, as the charges that have been made by the doctors are ill-founded, arrangements are being made for a statement by me to be given on the television programme. Because the House is sitting, I cannot appear. When the reply containing the assurances that I can give is given to the question of the member for West Torrens, the honourable member will find that the charges are ill-founded and based on wrong premises. If the claims of these doctors were true, half the people of Adelaide would not be walking around now.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Minister a reply to the questions I asked last week following charges being made about the quality of the Adelaide water supply?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The honourable member asked two questions and, for the sake of convenience and for his assistance, I will combine the replies. Tests were conducted at several points independently by officers of both the Public Health Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Both results indicated a complete absence of faecal or E. coli and no salmonella was detected, whilst only low counts of coliforms were present. These results show that all water sampled and tested would be perfectly safe for human consumption and assurances to this effect have been given by both the Director-General of Public Health and the Engineer-in-Chief, Engineering and Water Supply Department. Organisms found in the water at Henley and Grange Community Hospital and at Glenelg are not related to disease or to dangerous forms of contamination.

All drinking water supplies of any size in South Australia are examined regularly for bacteriological quality and for turbidity, colour, taste and odour. Microscopical examinations are also made regularly on all surface supplies. For the metropolitan area the metropolitan reservoirs and the Murray River are sampled weekly for bacteriological examination. All trunk water mains feeding into the metropolitan area (after chlorination) are sampled for bacteriological examination twice or three times weekly. Finally, samples for bacteriological examination are collected weekly from 35 taps located on the reticulation system throughout the city and suburbs. The purpose of the bacteriological examination is to estimate the

likelihood of contamination by pathogens (organisms causing waterborne diseases such as typhoid, para-typhoid, cholera, dysentery, gastroenteritis, infectious hepatitis, etc.) and thereby check the efficiency of chlorination of the supplied water. I repeat the assurances given me that the quality of water is checked regularly and that the tests indicate that these samples are perfectly fit for human consumption.

RACING CAR ACCIDENT

Mr. McANANEY: On Saturday a serious accident occurred at a motor car racing circuit in Western Australia, and I understand that the arena was not covered by a public risk policy. To allay the fears of the public, will the Attorney-General ascertain whether people attending similar race meetings in South Australia are covered by a public risk policy?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: This was a most tragic happening that no-one would like to see repeated in South Australia or, indeed, anywhere. I frankly do not know what the present position is concerning similar gatherings in South Australia, but I will inquire and inform the honourable member.

CHALLA GARDENS SCHOOL

Mr. RYAN: Members of the committee of the Challa Gardens school approached me during the weekend concerning change-rooms at the school oval, which is some distance from the school. This matter was first raised with the Education Department in May, 1966, and the lowest quote received then was \$2,567. In December, 1967, the department informed the school committee that a subsidy would be made available. As nothing was done, the committee recently approached the department and received further quotes, and the sum involved has now increased to \$3,273. The committee having forwarded a cheque for one-half of that sum to the department, a member of the committee telephoned the department on July 14 and was told that plans had been approved and that it was only a matter of a few days before the work would start. He telephoned again on August 15 and was told once again that it would be only a matter of days before final approval was given and that the project would then go ahead. As members of the committee are concerned about this matter, will the Minister of Education obtain a report on the present position concerning change-rooms at this school?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Yes.

WHARF FACILITIES

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to the question I asked on July 31 whether any precautions were being taken to make sure that Sirex wasp, etc., was not contained within the pallets of containerized cargo arriving at our ports?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The contents of all containers are subject to documentation that necessitates reference to the wood content in the form of dunnage, pallets, cases, etc. Such timber may be certified as having been treated in accordance with plant quarantine requirements, in which case it is not subject to inspection, apart from a check inspection that is carried out on a percentage of containers to check that the documentation is in order. If the timber in any container is not covered by the appropriate certificate of treatment, the container must be opened for inspection at the container terminal or at an approved quarantine station. Procedures for inspections of containers and their contents are set out in the publication *Cargo Containers and Unit Loads—Quarantine Aspects and Procedures*, issued by the Commonwealth Health Department, October, 1968, and are followed by inspectors of the Agriculture Department acting as quarantine officers on behalf of the Commonwealth Health Department.

WATER ACCOUNTS

Mr. VIRGO: My question relates to the current practice of the Engineering and Water Supply Department in rendering quarterly accounts. Enclosed in the envelope with each of these accounts is a printed note from the department informing people that, if they desire to pay the annual rate, thereby making only the one payment, they merely need to multiply by four the sum appearing on the enclosed account and then make the payment, and people may, if they wish, make their payments through any branch (not agency) of the Savings Bank of South Australia. Is the Minister of Works aware that the Savings Bank will not accept payment of more than the ordinary quarterly account (it will not accept an annual payment)? Further, will he take immediate steps to have this position rectified, so that those people using the services of the Savings Bank to pay their water rates may, if they wish, pay the annual account there?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Although I am not aware of the point to which the honourable member alludes, I know there is some restriction regarding overdue accounts:

this applies also to the payment of Electricity Trust accounts. Annual payments were introduced some time ago because people had requested that they be able to pay their water accounts annually. I shall be pleased to look at this matter and to find out the details for the honourable member.

WILD FOWL

Mr. GILES: I noticed in the paper last weekend a report about the scarcity of wild fowl in certain areas throughout Australia, stating that hunters would have a lean season. Is the Minister of Lands aware of this situation and, if he is, will he take steps to ensure a plentiful supply of wild fowl throughout South Australia in particular so that certain species do not become extinct?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: From time to time people make these statements or statements appear in the press, and probably there is a good deal in them, for I believe the number of wild fowl (and I take it that the honourable member is referring to water fowl) fluctuates greatly according to the season, particularly the season in inland Australia. As there is not much I can do about this directly, all I can say is that everything possible is being done to establish areas where the wild fowl will be secure. The Minister of Agriculture, as well as being in charge of the Fauna Conservation Act, considerably supervises its administration.

The matter to which the honourable member refers is not simple. I believe that hunters seek mainly the common variety of water fowl which, as it is in plentiful supply, is in no danger of becoming extinct. However, certain lesser known varieties of water fowl are probably shot at at times by people who do not know what they are shooting at, and the protection of those varieties should be supervised fairly strictly. My colleague is most assiduous in trying to work out the best methods of preserving these varieties.

Mr. Hudson: You say he is.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member likes to interrupt, but I think he is just plain rude. My colleague is assiduous. I will refer the question to him for a considered report which he will be happy to give. As soon as I have that report I will bring it down for the honourable member.

SEACOMBE ROAD

Mr. HUDSON: On August 7, I asked the Minister of Works questions about the state of Seacombe Road and the need for its reconstruction. In his first reply the Minister said that

the Engineering and Water Supply Department water main to go on Seacombe Road might not be installed until 1970-71 and that, of course, the roadwork would have to wait until after that date. The reconstruction of Seacombe Road being a matter of great urgency, I then asked the Minister to consider bringing forward the date of the installation of that main. Has he a reply to that question?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: Problems associated with the planning of the trunk main and the provision of Loan funds make it impracticable to bring the work of laying the new main in Seacombe Road forward into the present financial year. The original planning of the main provided for it to be located for practically the full distance of 150 chains between Main South Road and Brighton Road. The Marion and Brighton councils were informed to this effect by monthly notices forwarded by the Engineering and Water Supply Department commencing in 1968. In April, 1969, the route of the main was tentatively moved to roads south of Seacombe Road, except for the section 32 chains in length between Mostyn Road and Calum Grove in the Marion council area. Monthly advices to the two councils since that date have been altered accordingly.

The survey branch of the Engineering and Water Supply Department is scheduled to commence work at an early date on an investigation into what underground obstacles exist along the proposed modified route. Provided that these obstacles, such as storm water drains, large sewer mains, large gas mains, and Postmaster-General's Department and Electricity Trust installations, can be avoided the new route will be adopted. Following a meeting of the Public Utilities Advisory Co-ordinating Committee at the Town Hall last week, the City Engineer, Marion Council, and the District Engineer, Metropolitan District, Highways Department, stated that the work of reconstructing Seacombe Road had not been and would not be delayed by the proposals of the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

ELIZABETH TRANSPORT

Mr. CLARK: On August 6, I sought information from the Attorney-General concerning the proposed establishment of a bus service from Adelaide to Elizabeth. I wanted to know, if possible, when the service would operate and any other details the Minister of Roads and Transport could give. I understand the Attorney now has a reply to my question.

It will probably be the information that was published in the press yesterday, but I would still like the Minister to give it to me officially.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The reply does seem to cover much the same ground as that which appeared yesterday, but I will give it to the honourable member in full. The Government has decided to institute a direct bus service between Elizabeth and Adelaide. The Municipal Tramways Trust proposes to offer this service to Transway Services Proprietary Limited, the present operators of the Elizabeth buses. It is expected that this direct bus service will be introduced by the end of October or early November, 1969. The bus service will travel up the Main North Road, serving areas north of Frost Road, and will leave the Main North Road at the corner of Midway Road and travel through the eastern areas of Elizabeth, namely, Elizabeth East, Elizabeth Park and Elizabeth Downs. The estimated time of the full journey to Elizabeth will be about 50 minutes. The fares are expected to be about 25c to 35c to the Salisbury area and 35c to 45c to the Elizabeth area.

ENFIELD INDUSTRIES

Mr. JENNINGS: On June 17, I asked several Ministers a question regarding nuisances emanating from factories at Kilburn, and I have received a series of interim reports on this matter. As I believe that the Minister of Labour and Industry now has a final report, I should be pleased if he would give it to the House.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: The reply deals with the compressor noises about which the honourable member complained. The complaint regarding excessive noise at the factory of Bradford Kendall Limited has been investigated by an officer of the Department of Public Health. The source of the noise was found to be an air compressor, and the management of the company has had an air-intake snubber fitted to it. The action taken by the management has resulted in a reduction of noise, and this should prevent further justifiable complaints being made.

PORT AUGUSTA RAILWAY BRIDGE

Mr. McKEE: As the Premier has indicated to me that he has a reply to my question of August 13 regarding the Commonwealth railway works at Port Augusta, I should be pleased if he would give it to the House.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The matter of the rail link between Port Augusta and Whyalla is

one for the Commonwealth Government. South Australia has no knowledge of the priorities allocated to any of the works by the Commonwealth.

WARNING DEVICES

Mr. BURDON: My question is directed to the honourable Attorney-General.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Attorney-General!

Mr. BURDON: I understand that the Attorney-General has a reply to my question of July 29 regarding the provision of warning devices at level crossings. Will he give it to the House?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Thank you for your help, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Ryan: You need it!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, of course I do. I am grateful to the Speaker for his drawing my attention to the question. The inter-departmental committee on warning devices has reviewed the priorities of level crossings for provision of warning devices during the current financial year, and has prepared a programme. The programme does not, at present, include the crossings at Pick Avenue, Crouch Street and Commercial Street West, Mount Gambier, but consideration is being given to the possibility of enlarging the scope of this work. If this is proved practicable, the committee will again review priorities and determine which additional crossings are to be included.

MILENDELLA SCHOOL

Mr. WARDLE: I understand that a small school in the Milendella district, north-west of Mannum and north-east of Palmer, has been closed for about three years or four years and that some months ago the school and school-house were advertised for sale by tender but, apparently, no tenderer offered a sufficient amount for the property. However, as interest is being shown in the property at present, will the Minister of Education obtain a report on whether the department intends to again invite tenders for the purchase of this property?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I will get that information for the honourable member.

OUTER HARBOUR

Mr. HURST: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to my question about work on the Outer Harbour terminal?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The construction of a modern passenger terminal was recommended by the Public Works Committee

on August 11, 1964. The work was approved by Cabinet on August 24, 1964. The steelwork for the building was delivered between September and December, 1965. Because of reductions in the Loan Fund allocations to the department during the years that followed, it was not possible to commence the construction of the terminal building proper, although most of the ancillary works such as strengthening the wharf, alterations to roads and railways, and the provision of improved water, electricity and sewerage services, etc., have been completed. Expenditure to date on the project is \$433,000 (including the purchase of the steelwork) out of a total authorized amount of \$1,638,800. The steelwork is not lying on the site, nor has it ever been on the site. It is stored at the dockyard, and has been treated to stop deterioration. Loan allocations over the past six years have been:

	\$
1963-64	3,480,000
1964-65	3,200,000
1965-66	2,560,000
1966-67	2,050,000
1967-68	2,055,000
1968-69	3,000,000
1969-70	4,725,000

Whilst it is agreed that the construction of a passenger terminal at Outer Harbour is highly desirable, the increased allocations of the last two years are due to the construction of Port Giles, the roll-on-roll-off berth at Port Adelaide, and deepening the entrance, etc., to Thevenard, all of which works are considered to be more pressing and of more importance at the present time.

FARM MACHINERY

Mr. EDWARDS: My question is further to one I asked earlier this year about the problem of loose nuts and bolts on farm machinery. Since asking my question, I have received several telephone calls and letters, including a letter from another State, and these show that the problem is serious. Some cars require a rebore and new pistons after travelling only 4,000 or 5,000 miles. I do not consider that this indicates a good standard of assembly of new machinery. Several new tractors, each costing about \$12,000 have had to be returned to factories for almost complete major overhaul after being used for about four months. I will not mention the names of any firms, but several firms, not just one, are involved. I have been told that the assembly of several big tractors and self-propelled headers is faulty. One man, after taking delivery of a 19ft. header, had to have it pulled to pieces and

rebuilt before he could use it for harvesting. Persons who pay between \$12,000 and \$14,000 for machinery do not expect to have such difficulties with it.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is starting to debate the question.

Mr. EDWARDS: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what Parliament can do about this problem, which seems to be getting out of hand?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I am not sure about what Parliament can do but, because of the way in which the honourable member has asked his question, I appreciate the seriousness of the position and I will certainly examine the matter immediately.

PETERBOROUGH RAMPS

Mr. CASEY: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to my recent question about the provision of handrails at the Peterborough subway?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am afraid that the reply does not carry the matter any further than the information I gave the honourable member when he first asked the question. The reply states that the Railways Commissioner is proceeding to have a handrail installed in the subway ramps at Peterborough.

TELEVISION COVERAGE

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I understand that you, Mr. Speaker, have a reply to the question I asked recently concerning the televising of proceedings in the House.

The SPEAKER: In replying to the Leader's question I said I would discuss this matter with the Solicitor-General. We had a discussion and he sent a memorandum to me, as follows:

You have asked my advice on the following question:

If permission was given to television stations to record and broadcast sound, what would be the legal consequences for:

- (a) The ordinary member who says something defamatory in the House?
- (b) The television station that broadcasts the defamatory statement made by the member in the House?

(a) In my opinion, the ordinary member is not deprived of his absolute privilege by the television station's recording and broadcasting what he says in the House. The only possible exception to this rule might arise if the member caused or procured, or joined in causing or procuring, the recording, knowing and intending that what he said would be published outside. I know of no precise authority supporting that exception, but on principle it could be so.

(b) In my opinion, the television station's broadcast would not, generally speaking, be

privileged, and would be subject to all the ordinary laws about defamation. It has never been a defence to an action in defamation that what was published had been previously published on a privileged occasion. In special circumstances, such a broadcast could be privileged, but those circumstances would arise so rarely that they can for all practical circumstances be disregarded. I feel that, as a matter of practical policy, it would be wise to refuse leave to have Parliamentary proceedings recorded in sound.

Because of that opinion, if any television station applies to me for permission to take film in the House such permission may be granted, but permission will not be granted for sound. If further action is required, the matter is now one for Parliament itself to decide.

PORT PIRIE LAND

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question concerning the use of land owned by the Education Department at Port Pirie?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: An order has been placed with the Housing Trust for the erection of a house for a senior master on the staff of the Port Pirie Technical High School. The trust expects that tenders will be called in late September or early October for this house, which will be erected on land on the corner of Balmoral Road and The Terrace. The balance of the land will be used in future housing programmes.

WALLAROO HARBOUR

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Minister of Marine further information in reply to my recent question about the seismic survey of the Wallaroo harbour?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The honourable member asked about progress of the seismic survey, and this reply amplifies what I said previously. It does, to some extent, repeat what I said, but it states what is the latest position. I am informed that the Marine and Harbors Department does not expect to receive the report before September 1, 1969, after which it will take several weeks to evaluate the results.

SEVENHILL WATER SUPPLY

Mr. ALLEN: People in the district of Sevenhill and Penwortham have desired a water supply for some time. Although one or two projects have been rejected, now that the move has been made to consider a scheme for Watervale they desire to once again revive the possibility of providing a scheme for their district. Will the Minister of Works have a

spot survey conducted in these two areas in order to ascertain the possibility of providing a reticulated water supply for Sevenhill and Penwortham?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I will have the matter investigated for the honourable member.

SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY

Mr. HURST: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question concerning the shipbuilding industry in this State and can he say whether evidence will be tendered at the Tariff Board inquiry on this matter?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Director of Industrial Promotion has discussed the matter with the company, and the Director will give evidence in this case before the Tariff Board on behalf of the Government.

OSMOND TERRACE

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question seeking assistance for children crossing Osmond Terrace at Glenelg North?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The danger experienced by children who cross Osmond Terrace in order to attend schools, as well as the anxiety of parents, is readily appreciated. Where crossings are immediately adjacent to schools, the Education Department has, on several occasions, supported an application made by the Headmaster and the school committee to have a crossing installed. The matter of providing some form of crossing rests with the Corporation of the City of Glenelg. Any move to have such a crossing installed would have to be made by the Glenelg council to the Road Traffic Board. The Headmaster is well aware of the situation as also is the school committee. Their attention will now be directed towards securing some other kind of crossing, such as a zebra crossing, on Osmond Terrace.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

Mr. FREEBAIRN: My question arises from a reference in the *Advertiser* of Saturday, August 16, in relation to daylight saving. The Gallup poll organization conducted a survey of people's reaction to daylight saving in four States—New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania. The press report states that those interviewed were asked:

Next summer, would you favour, or oppose, having daylight saving, that is, putting the clock ahead an hour?

The report goes on to state:

Those in favour were asked whether it should be for six months from October to March, or for four months from November to February. I am happy to be able to say that in South Australia only 30 per cent of those interviewed opposed daylight saving in any form and, of the balance, 35 per cent favoured daylight saving of one hour for six months, and 23 per cent favoured daylight saving for four months. As it is evident from the survey that more than two South Australians in three favour daylight saving, will the Premier bring this matter before Cabinet for urgent consideration?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member knows that I recently proposed that South Australia should move to Eastern Standard Time. It is impossible to know what the general community (or a part of it) thinks about this matter. However, as much opposition to this change arose previously, I said that the Government would not act in the matter and that no change would be made. I assure the honourable member that no change will be made during the coming summer along the lines he suggests. I think the matter needs much more thought at this time. The recent reaction was not favourable (it was certainly not favourable regarding the numbers that contacted me); but any subject such as this is open for the Government to consider at any time in the future. I give the honourable member an undertaking that no change will be made during this coming summer.

Mr. EDWARDS: It has come to my notice that farmers and other people in Victoria will ask that half an hour of daylight saving be introduced in Victoria. In view of this, will the Premier ask the Victorian Government whether it will introduce this daylight saving and, if it intends to do so, whether it will consider altering the time in that State to Central Standard Time to save South Australia the trouble of altering its time to Eastern Standard Time?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Although I know this matter has been raised many times over the years, in activating it again recently I simply set in train the interest that has resulted in many questions in the House and discussions in the community. I must say that I have now made a definite statement that no action will be taken in the immediate future regarding South Australia's time. It is simply not feasible for Victoria, New South Wales or any other community on the eastern coast of this country to come back to C.S.T. I remind the honourable member that, as most movements in time

throughout the world are directed towards saving time, it is most unlikely that any of the Eastern States would move back to C.S.T., thereby losing half an hour of daylight each day. I am sure this is simply not on. The idea that 10,000,000 people on the eastern seaboard would change their time to accommodate 1,200,000 people in South Australia is simply not on, either. Therefore, after having been involved in this matter for some time and knowing something of what people in other States think about it, I assure the honourable member that people in the Eastern States will not reverse the general movement around the world, which is toward daylight saving.

AGED COTTAGE HOMES

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: For some years now, homes for pensioners have been provided by Aged Cottage Homes, Incorporated, an organization that started in my district. At the time that the Commonwealth Government first started granting a subsidy toward building these homes, some people were induced to enter into agreements with Aged Cottage Homes and provided substantial sums in return for what was, in effect, a life tenancy of units in the homes. I have several agreements concerning which \$1,800 was provided by a prospective occupant of one of the units, and it is clear from the agreement that the people concerned were to have a life tenancy without further payment, other than that they were to contribute \$1 a week as security for the payment of insurance, rates and taxes, and the cost of repairs.

Subsequently, Aged Cottage Homes, Incorporated, had a number of people who had entered into such agreements enter into new agreements, which did not in themselves cancel the previous agreements specifically but which purported to be tenancy agreements in which the donor of the original money would have a tenancy agreement and no longer a right to a property. Some donors refused to sign such agreements, but many did sign them. Since then, there has been a consistent increase in the sums to be paid by these original donors to Aged Cottage Homes, Incorporated, and a disagreement has arisen between this organization and some of the residents which has culminated now in notice being given by the Secretary to certain residents in the following terms:

Attached is an account showing the arrears of rent—

they dispute that rent is owing, but this is what the board says—

up to June 30, 1969, payable by you. I have been instructed by the Board of Management to inform you that unless all arrears of rent are paid before the date of the next board meeting, viz., August 25, 1969, the board will give consideration to the termination of your agreement for breach.

These people are elderly pensioners of no great means who cannot undertake an expensive action in the courts to determine what are their rights under the original agreement and whether it was proper for some of them to have been induced to sign some other apparently substitute agreement. Aged Cottage Homes, Incorporated, I am instructed, is registered under the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act, and it would seem that the Government is in some position to account for the fact that, under licence given by the Government for collections for charitable purposes, moneys are subscribed for the purpose of providing homes for old people, and that a considerable area of dispute has now arisen which will cause considerable hardship and distress.

Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary urgently to undertake with Aged Cottage Homes, Incorporated, an investigation of this matter, first, to try to see that the original rights signed for by these residents are maintained to them and, secondly, that in future neither this nor any other organization collecting money in this way and undertaking to provide homes in return for a donation of this kind uses its position to change the whole basis of the arrangement to the detriment of the person who has donated the money in consideration for a life tenancy?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be pleased to get a report on this matter from the Chief Secretary and to let the Leader know what course will be followed.

MODBURY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: The Minister of Works will be aware that from time to time I have asked in the House questions about sewerage in Modbury, specifically the area of Victoria Drive, Clyde Street, Reservoir Road and adjacent streets. I last asked such a question on February 19, and the Minister replied by correspondence on March 10. I draw the Minister's attention to the last paragraph of his letter, which states:

It is now expected that work on the scheme referred to will commence in June, 1969, and Victoria Drive and Clyde Street will be included in the first stages of the work.

This work has commenced but, on August 15, I received a telephone call from a resident in the area who told me that Victoria Drive had not been sewered and that, although work had commenced in Clyde Street, apparently rock had been struck, with the result that all the houses had not been connected to sewerage. This applies also to Reservoir Road. As the equipment has now been taken elsewhere, and as perhaps only the trunk sewer has been installed, will the Minister ascertain why this work has not been completed and when this area is expected to be sewered?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I know that, when rock is encountered, the work currently being undertaken is sometimes by-passed temporarily and other work proceeded with, and that the men later come back to work on the rock. However, I shall be happy to get for the honourable member a report on the progress of the whole project.

JERVOIS ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the Jervois electricity supply?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The reference in the Loan Estimates to Mobilong concerns the establishment of a 132,000-volt substation in this locality about four miles north of Murray Bridge. At the substation a 132,000-volt transmission line under construction from Cherry Gardens via Mount Barker will connect to the existing transmission system. The new transmission line and substation are required to meet increasing power demands in the Lower Murray and South-East areas generally. In the Jervois area the Electricity Trust has had a complaint of low voltage from one consumer. It is planned to install an additional transformer and re-arrange low-voltage mains to correct the situation. The work is expected to be completed in October.

HEART TRANSPLANTS

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Today's *Advertiser* reports that Dr. Philip Blaiberg has died 19 months or so after receiving a heart transplant. The report seems to suggest that, even though we are only in the early stages of this experiment, a heart transplant at least extends the possibility of life. Will the Premier ask the Minister of Health whether South Australia has the necessary facilities to enable such an operation to be carried out or whether there are any legal barriers to its being carried out?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As I understand it, the standard of surgery in South Australia is such that heart transplants could be carried out, but no decision has been made as yet that they will be carried out. However, what I have said is off the cuff and comes only from general conversation. I will obtain a report for the honourable member, especially relating to the legal aspects he has raised. I assure the honourable member that the heart team (or whatever it is called) in South Australia, which is recognized as one of the leading teams on heart surgery in Australia, would be competent to carry out these operations but, to my knowledge, no decision has yet been made to go ahead with them. I will supply the report as soon as possible.

SOIL SURVEY

Mr. ARNOLD: In recent years the Agriculture Department has pointed out how important it is that plantings, especially plantings under flood irrigation, be on the correct grade and angle in regard to the soil type and so on, so that water can penetrate the soil. In past years certain work in the nature of survey services to growers to help them to get the right angles and grades on their properties has been carried out by officers of the Lands Department. The importance of this work is being highlighted, as are the increased yields to be derived from it, and it is getting beyond the capability of the Lands Department to handle the demand. Therefore, will the Minister of Lands take up this matter with the Minister of Agriculture with a view to having survey facilities provided within the Agriculture Department to assist in this most important work?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will examine the question and provide a considered reply as soon as possible.

STUDENT TEACHERS' BOOKS

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Before the alteration in the student teachers' allowances last year, it appears that books were available on loan to students of the Adelaide Teachers College from the bookroom. That policy was altered last year when the Minister of Education directed that student teachers should buy the books so as to enable them to build up their own libraries. During the considerable debate in the House about this, the Minister reiterated her view that it was advisable for student teachers to take the course of building up their personal libraries. However, at the end of June this year student teachers were

informed that books were no longer available for sale, as the remaining stock of books had been distributed to the high schools. It also appears that the reading material available from the bookroom is designed principally for tertiary education and not for secondary education. An article in a student publication brings this out, stating:

Remaining texts will be distributed, on application, to high school libraries. I assume this means that schools will purchase the books and not receive them *gratis* but, regardless of any money exchange, how do the schools rate a higher priority than the intended recipients—Adelaide Teachers College students? And when, if at all, was any official announcement issued to the effect that sales to students would cease at mid-day on Friday, June 27? Not 12 months ago the Minister of Education defended the allowance deductions by affirming the desirability of building private libraries. Now the college is dispatching the potential libraries to secondary school students.

Can the Minister say whether that account of the situation is correct and that a change has been made? If a change has been made, why has it been made, in view of the statement the Minister made to the House at the time of the debate last year?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I can only say that, for some months before the day was announced after which the opportunity for students to purchase surplus books would not be available, this fact was advertised in the *Education Gazette*, and student teachers and teachers were invited to make use of this offer to obtain books for their private libraries. Because of the great deal of detail in the Leader's explanation to his question, I will have to call for a report on the matter. Perhaps he would be so kind as to let me look at the journal from which he has quoted so that I will be able to take up the matters he has raised and give a considered reply. However, I want to make the point clear that the *Education Gazette* advertised the opportunity for students to purchase these books for their own libraries.

SCHOOLS EXPENDITURE

Mr. HUDSON: In presenting the Loan Estimates last year, the Treasurer was good enough to supply me with information as to the sums the Commonwealth Government had contributed towards the cost of school buildings, and an estimate was provided at that time as to the likely Commonwealth contribution towards the cost of school buildings of one type or another for the 1968-69 programme. However, in the current Loan Estimates the only information provided on this matter is the

following cryptic statement at the top of page 15 of the Treasurer's explanation:

Included in the proposed expenditures are technical colleges, science laboratories, teachers' colleges and libraries projects towards which the Commonwealth will continue to contribute unmatched grants in accordance with its legislation.

Can the Treasurer now say how much of the money spent on school buildings referred to in the Loan Estimates last year was provided by the Commonwealth Government and what is the estimate of such expenditure for this year?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I cannot give the figures out of my head. If I can obtain them for the honourable member within 24 hours, I will do that and bring down a reply.

CHURCH HALL

Mr. CLARK: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to my question of July 29 regarding emergency accommodation for a church at Elizabeth?

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

The Apostolic Church of Australia, Elizabeth Downs Branch, has previously been in touch with the trust concerning the availability of a Nissen hut for Sunday school and church purposes. When the Gepps Cross Hostel closed down, the trust purchased several Nissen huts for the express purpose of assisting community and sporting bodies with halls of a temporary nature, and at present it has two of these huts not in use. However, consideration has been given to using these two huts, which are both at present in a compound at Parafield. It is proposed to provide one at Ingle Farm to serve a community of several hundred families, this community having no hall whatsoever. At present, there are no church facilities in this area. Consideration has also been given to use of the other hut for community purposes in the south-western suburbs of the metropolitan area. While the trust sympathizes with the church in being deprived of the accommodation previously available to others, it would appear that the Nissen huts will be used for the above purposes.

The two which the trust has at present are already committed. The report continues:

Some years ago the trust, acting on behalf of the South Australian Government, made its former emergency dwellings available to organizations, and several hundred churches and other bodies used these units for halls and Sunday schools. In many instances, the local councils stipulated a given time for these units, as it was accepted that they would be replaced with buildings of a more permanent nature. It could be that some churches or other organizations may be wishing to dispose of these former emergency dwellings, and it is suggested that the church should explore this possibility.

STRATHMONT HOSPITAL

Mrs. BYRNE: On July 13, 1965, the Public Works Committee recommended the construction at Strathmont of a hospital and training centre for the intellectually retarded at an estimated cost of \$5,702,000, and work on this project has commenced. Can the Minister of Works say when the training centre is expected to be completed and opened?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

Mr. McANANEY: The Auditor-General's Report for 1966-67 contains a table setting out the cost to the taxpayer of the functions of Government, whereas this information was omitted from the report last year. As such a statement enables back-benchers to ascertain quickly what the various departments cost (for instance, it shows that the cost of education to the taxpayer is about 45 per cent of the money supplied by the taxpayer), it is of considerable importance at the moment. If it is not possible to include this information in this year's report, would it be possible for the Treasurer to have such a statement prepared for the information of members?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I thank the honourable member for drawing my attention to the fact that a statement that had previously appeared in the Auditor-General's Report did not appear in last year's report, for I was not aware of that fact. If the report has now been compiled and is being printed (as I think it may be, although I am not sure) and if it is not possible to have such a statement prepared and incorporated in the bound copy of the report, I will ask the Auditor-General whether he can prepare a statement for members.

LAND ACQUISITION

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: During the Address in Reply debate I said that a lady had sunk her life savings into the leasing of a shop and equipment, that the Highways Department had since advised her that it was acquiring the area, and that she was somewhat distressed about the compensation she was to be paid. I am delighted to know that the Treasurer noted this matter, and I believe he now has a report.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I directed the honourable member's comments to the Minister of Roads and Transport, and I now have a report that deals with a certain property which, I believe, is the property the honourable

member had in mind when he raised the matter. I am omitting the person's name from my answer. The property is affected by the proposed widening of Grange Road. Negotiations with the registered proprietor for the purchase of the property have been finalized and the docket is at present with the Solicitor-General for settlement, which is expected within one month. Remodelling of the shops on the new alignment was not considered practicable. The delicatessen is subject to a lease until December 5, 1970, with right of renewal for a further three years. As it is expected that right of entry will be required by December, 1969, the lessee will be entitled to compensation in respect of the unexpired term of the lease, negotiations for which will commence when settlement has been effected.

CAPE WILLOUGHBY LIGHTHOUSE

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have been told that the Commonwealth Department of Shipping and Transport is to have the Cape Willoughby lighthouse, on Kangaroo Island, demolished. It is one of the oldest lighthouses in Australia and is a considerable tourist attraction for all South Australians, not only for the people in the district. Several representations have been made to me to approach the Minister of Marine to ascertain whether, if it is necessary to install a modern automatically controlled light, this could be done separately from the old lighthouse, or whether the old lighthouse could be repaired. In either case, the old lighthouse should be retained as a tourist attraction, whatever new facilities are to be installed.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I agree that this is certainly an attractive pillar for local tourists, but I point out that, under the Commonwealth Navigation Act, lighthouses are mainly the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government. However, the point that the Leader raises will be investigated to find out whether what he would like done could be done.

CADELL TRAINING CENTRE

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about housing at the Cadell Training Centre?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The matter of building some four-bedroom houses at the Cadell Training Centre was discussed when the additional houses were being designed, but it was decided that it would be better to build standard houses and consider the addition of portable units where the size of the family

warranted this. The housing committee of the Public Buildings Department is currently investigating the use of portable rooms as additional units, and the Prisons Department will be eligible to apply for these when a decision has been reached.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked last week about water reticulation to houses at the Cadell Training Centre?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: By arrangement with the Public Buildings Department the Superintendent of the centre has had trenches dug by trainees, exposing the old system of piping leading to the houses. Following discussions with representatives of the Public Buildings Department on August 7, 1969, the Superintendent is providing messing facilities for Public Buildings Department employees at the centre, to save travelling time when work commences. The Public Buildings Department states that work on the general service to provide an increased pressure of water to the houses will commence on Monday, August 18. The instantaneous heaters are being replaced by storage heaters, delivery of these heaters is expected by August 27, and installation work will commence on September 1, 1969.

RENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST

Mr. HUDSON: The Loan Estimates presented by the Treasurer for this financial year include reference to the Renmark Irrigation Trust, the substantial reduction in the provision for the trust being said to be consequent on a revision of the plans for the pumping station and ancillary works being undertaken in relation to the scheme. Some months ago, when I was shown over the scheme, work was proceeding apace. Will the Minister of Irrigation give a detailed report on the matter, indicating particularly what difficulties being experienced by the trust have caused these modifications to the scheme and the delay in the completion of the work?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will get a full report.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. VIRGO: On August 5 the Attorney-General, when replying to a question asked by the member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne) about the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study, said, as reported at page 639 of *Hansard*:

The committee referred to—
in fairness, I must point out that the term Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study

joint steering committee had been used, and that committee was not then in existence—

by the honourable member is an advisory committee only. It has considered many submissions and has made recommendations to the Government on many aspects of the M.A.T.S. proposals. No provision exists for persons to appear before the committee, and full consideration is given by the committee and the Government to all submissions put to it.

On the reverse side of this, on August 7, the Premier, in his speech in the House, said that the Metropolitan Transportation Committee would make its recommendations to the Government in about six months' time. He also said that every opportunity would be given to interested people to make submissions on this matter: I am referring to the re-routeing of the Noarlunga Freeway. Will the Premier clear up the suggested conflict between the two statements and, assuming that he has used the correct term, will he say what assistance will be provided to people making submissions to this committee?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am extremely sorry that the honourable member has been confused by his reading, and I will get a report for him, spelling out the position in terms as simple as possible.

GRANGE RAILWAY LINE

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my questions about the Grange railway line and the strip of land, owned by the Railways Department, between the Grange terminus and Henley Beach?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: From the honourable member's question, it certainly appears that the situation needs to be explained clearly. On March 28, 1957, an Order in Council by His Excellency the Governor directed that the then existing railway between Grange and Henley Beach along Military Road be removed and the land already acquired for a right of way for a future railway between Grange and Henley Beach be retained. Since that time a survey has been made of the possible patronage of any new extension from Grange to Henley. In 1966 it was decided that before any action was proposed this should wait for the submission of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report. The honourable member is well aware of the proposals in that report and, as was stated recently, an investigation is proceeding to determine the full implications, including cost, of retaining the line. Quite clearly, this matter is not resolved, as no final decision has been made on the retention or otherwise of the line. Also, in view of

the Order in Council, the Railways Commissioner is obliged to retain the land already acquired for a right of way for a future railway between Grange and Henley Beach which is vested in the South Australian Railways Commissioner. While the land to which I understand the corporation is referring is not so vested, it is recorded as a public road and the Railways Commissioner is empowered by the South Australian Railways Commissioner's Act to construct railways on public roads, so that, in effect, the retention of this land, either as a road or as land vested in the Railways Commissioner, is necessary in order to comply with the Order in Council.

DUST NUISANCE

Mr. McKEE: A letter written to me by the Port Pirie Trades and Labour Council states:

Council delegates are concerned about the dust blowing from the ore heaps on the Port Pirie waterfront. A resolution was moved at our last meeting to seek your assistance in this matter, by asking for support in the House, to have either a retainer wall built or covered storage bins as exist at other ports. This dust must be a personal nuisance to shoppers and a never-ending problem to cleaners of business premises in Ellen Street. The wharf area always appears to be a bit of a shambles and if it could be hidden or covered a source of dust nuisance, as well as an eyesore, would be eliminated.

I think the Minister of Marine will agree that dust from the ore heaps at Port Pirie creates a serious problem, particularly in summer. As the Minister expects to visit Port Pirie soon, will he investigate the problem then?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I shall be pleased to oblige the honourable member.

LIFTS COURSE

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to my question of August 7 in which I sought financial reimbursement for employees of the South Australian Railways who undertake the lifts course at the Kilkenny Trade School?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It is not the practice of the Railways Commissioner to reimburse financially departmental employees who undertake *ad hoc* courses such as the one referred to by the honourable member. The fact that employees undertake courses and training of this nature is taken into account in assessing suitability when such employees seek positions involving promotions.

SMALL BOATS

Mr. ARNOLD: We are all aware of the recent expansion in the boating industry in South Australia, and of the value of this industry to the State. I am actively interested in yachting and power boating in the Upper Murray and at Lake Bonney. Recently, I was told in Adelaide that, as the Royal South Australian Yacht Squadron has premises at Outer Harbour and the boat haven is at Glenelg, the southern beach zone is the only area that is not served adequately with shelter facilities for small boats. I ask this question in the interests of all people interested in boating in South Australia, especially country people visiting the metropolitan area. I believe that some time ago consideration was given to topping what is known as Jetty Rocks, about a quarter of a mile south of the Brighton-Seacliff Yacht Club. As topping Jetty Rocks with a stone wall would provide an excellent natural shelter for small craft, can the Minister of Marine say whether this project has been considered in recent years?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I am not aware that this proposal has been considered.

Mr. Hudson: A survey was made.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: It could have been undertaken, although I do not recall it. However, now that the honourable member has raised the matter, I will investigate it, because it sounds an interesting proposition.

PUBLIC PARKS

Mr. HUDSON: In the Loan Estimates a provision this year, namely, \$300,000 for public parks, repeats the provision for last year. In his statement the Treasurer said:

Any amount remaining unspent at the end of the year from this provision is to be transferred to a deposit account so that it may be available for such purposes as required in the future.

I point out to the Treasurer that this procedure and the cryptic statements he has made in introducing the Loan Estimates mean that members are not informed of the amount of the provision used in any one year to purchase public parks or to assist councils to purchase park areas. For that reason, will the Treasurer ascertain the sum spent under this heading for the 1968-69 financial year, and what amount is currently held or was held at the end of June in the deposit account? Also, can he arrange for the Loan Estimates to provide that information in future?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I respectfully point out to the honourable member that this

is the second question he has asked today in which he has used the term "cryptic statement in the Loan Estimates explanation". I admit that much information concerning finances associated with Loan funds is not spelled out in detail in the statement, because this would be impossible, as the honourable member would appreciate. However, the statement is extensive, and it took some time to read to members. Although it is not possible to cover every detail in the Loan Estimates, we have a debate in which we invite members to seek specific information. That information is obtainable and will be provided. Unspent moneys are held in the trust account because the Government believes that it is prudent to maintain an availability of about \$300,000 for the purchase of public parks in each Loan year. This enables councils to take advantage of offers from time to time that qualify for Government assistance. Had it been otherwise and had we recouped the balance of unspent moneys in this line to general Loan Account, there might come a time when the \$300,000 in any one year was insufficient, and opportunities would be missed. This situation is not desirable and, therefore, the trust account was created. I will obtain details for the honourable member of what was spent last year and what remains in the trust account.

HORMONE SPRAYS

Mr. WARDLE: Members may recall that in my district last year about \$50,000 or \$60,000 damage was caused to cucumber and glass-house tomato crops by hormone sprays. We have been assured that the Government is preparing legislation to assist farmers and horticulturists alike, but it seems that in the last few days further extensive damage that may be attributable to hormone sprays has been caused. The department is working on this problem now. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture how advanced the proposed legislation is?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Beyond understanding that the Bill is being drafted, I do not know, but I will obtain that information.

LIQUOR PRICES

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about liquor prices in dining-rooms and whether the recommendation of the Liquor Industry Council on new prices is being observed?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have received a letter from Mr. Aitken, Chairman of the Liquor Industry Council, as follows:

I apologize for not having answered sooner your inquiry concerning Mr. Broomhill's question in the House. The matter was referred immediately to the Australian Hotels' Association, but could not be dealt with until their council meeting this week. The Secretary of the A.H.A. is of the opinion that a very large percentage of its members is observing the recommended schedule, but, in an endeavour to obtain accurate information on the position, the Liquor Industry Council is again circularizing all hotels, motels and restaurants, reminding them of the percentages and asking that those who feel they cannot conform register their prices with the council, specifying the reasons for any higher mark-up.

In this connection, Sir, I would like to draw your attention to the "press release" forwarded to you on May 6 last, which set out the recommended maximum scale of charges. The statement included the following paragraph, which is an important aspect of the scale:

On the other hand, it is realized that some establishments with exceptionally high standards of service and presentation might find it difficult to conform entirely with the pattern of the recommended scale. The Liquor Industry Council anticipates that the level of prices of wines with meals in such cases can be justified if so required. My council, and that of the A.H.A., hope that the present request for licensed dining-rooms to register any over-scale prices will prove that the spirit of the recommendations is being observed. This is a difficult problem and I believe we must all remind ourselves that, even under price control, dining-room prices were not controlled. Obviously, the Commissioner believed that *caveat emptor* applied. The Liquor Industry Council is, nevertheless, doing everything in its power to ensure that fair margins are being and will be observed.

BAKERIES

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to my recent question about prosecutions in respect of weekend baking of bread?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: The information sought by the Leader regarding penalties for breaches of section 194 of the Industrial Code for weekend baking of bread is as follows: 21 prosecutions have been recorded, as set out in the table below. In each case the fines accord with the penalties provided in the Industrial Code Amendment Act, 1968, although many of them are the minimum fines. It is pointed out that the fine for a second offence applies only in respect of breaches that were committed after the conviction for a first offence. Similarly, the fine for a third offence (the minimum being \$100) applies only in respect of breaches that were

committed after the conviction for a second offence.

The fines have been paid in eight cases: in the one case in respect of which the fine has not been paid before the due date, I understand that the court is issuing a distress warrant. The time given by the courts for payment of the fines in the other 12 cases has not yet expired: payment has not yet been received in any of those cases. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to have the schedule setting out the details required by the honourable member incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

CONVICTIONS FOR WEEKEND BAKING OF BREAD

Bakery	Fine
West Torrens Bakery—	\$
L. & D. Forza	50 each
" "	75 each
L. Forza	100
" "	125
" "	100
Continental Bakery Pty. Ltd.—	
Company	30
"	50
"	50
"	50
"	50
Europa Bread and Cake Pty. Ltd.—	
Company	40
"	60
"	120
H. Lahska	20
Perry's Bakery Pty. Ltd.—	
D. & V. Perre	25 each
Company	25
Company and D. Perre	50 each
Company	75
"	50
Keswick Bakery—	
A. Donnini	30
"	50
Gold Star Bakery Pty. Ltd.—	
Company	20

HACKNEY REDEVELOPMENT

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Local Government a reply to my recent question about Hackney redevelopment?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The report concerning the Hackney redevelopment project has been made to the Government. It has taken a considerable time to consider, mainly because of the financial implications and the need to have consultations with both the Treasury and Housing Trust officers. These discussions are still continuing, and the Government hopes to make a further statement regarding the Hackney area in a few weeks.

FESTIVAL HALL

Mr. HUDSON: My question deals with the provision of \$700,000 in the Loan Estimates for the construction of a festival hall. This provision repeats a provision made in last year's Loan Estimates. The Treasurer pointed out that this procedure was being followed to avoid a heavy impact on Loan Account in one or two years. This procedure leads to the problem that it is not immediately clear to members how much has been spent on this project, and it is therefore not possible to assess accurately the contribution that the Loan Estimates are making towards capital works being undertaken throughout the State. Can the Treasurer ascertain what sums, if any, have been spent in respect of the festival hall, and can he institute arrangements to ensure that members are provided at least once a year with a general statement of the financial position that applies in relation to the festival hall?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As the honourable member is aware, the festival hall is a joint project; its total funds are expected to be provided by the Government, by the Adelaide City Council and by public subscription. The Government, for its part, has made a limited commitment, and the amount set aside in the Loan Estimates this year is to provide for that part of the Government's total commitment which, on an annual basis, would extinguish the commitment over a period. I am not quite sure of the length of this period. However, the comment I made in presenting the Loan Estimates is correct: the Government wishes to set aside Loan funds each year, because it could otherwise be faced with a commitment in a later year that it would be difficult to meet without unduly curtailing other works. So, here again we propose to include a steady amount in each year's Loan Estimates that will meet the Government's commitment by the time it is required to be paid. I do not know how the honourable member's request concerning progress payments could be met, but I will discuss it with the Under Treasurer and see what joint arrangements are being made between the Treasury and the Adelaide City Council in regard to progress payments for the scheme from period to period.

KANGAROO ISLAND ROADS

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In 1968, at the request of local residents, I visited Kangaroo Island in company with the member for the district (Hon. D. N. Brookman). We

inspected the area where it was proposed that a causeway should be constructed across American River to shorten the distance between Kingscote and Penneshaw; this causeway was to be a substitute for sealing and straightening the road that runs right around the American River inlet. I understand that the present Minister of Roads and Transport visited the island recently and said that he, too, would examine the possibility of proceeding with this causeway. When I was Premier I referred this matter to the department, but there was insufficient time to finalize it before the last general elections. Since that time there has apparently been no final decision on this matter. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport what is to be done and whether, in fact, the causeway can be erected, as it would mean a facility and a considerable saving to the people at the Penneshaw end of the island?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

GARDEN SUBURB

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Local Government a reply to the question I asked about the progress being made by the Garden Suburb inquiry committee?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: This must be regarded as an interim report only. The honourable member will appreciate that I am just as anxious as he is (perhaps more so) about this matter.

Mr. Virgo: Why?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Because I have more of it in my district. The reply is that a report of the Colonel Light Gardens Inquiry Committee has been completed and will now be considered by Cabinet.

FISHING HAVENS

Mr. HUDSON: In last year's Loan Estimates (at page 540 of *Hansard*) the Treasurer, referring to the sum of \$93,000 that had been made available for fishing havens, said:

As I have explained, this provision is to be recovered from the special amount available within Commonwealth Aid Roads Act grants. This year, a sum of \$225,000 is provided for fishing havens and foreshore improvements. Can the Treasurer say whether any portion of this sum is to be obtained from Commonwealth Aid Roads Act grants?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Although I must check that matter, I believe that the whole of the sum will be so recovered. There

is a limit to the amount that can be recovered from this fund, and I think that the sum proposed exhausts that limit. However, I will verify that matter for the honourable member.

REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its main purpose is to improve, streamline, simplify and render less costly the procedures governing the legislation dealing with strata titles. The opportunity has also been taken to correct the anomalies known to be in the principal Act and to bring some of its provisions up to date with a view to its consolidation. Clause 2 provides for the Bill to become law on a day to be fixed by proclamation. This will give the general public and the Administration time to become familiar with the new streamlined procedures provided for in the Bill before they are brought into force. Clause 3 corrects erroneous references to the titles of the Acting Registrar-General, the Registrar-General and the senior Deputy Registrar-General.

Clause 4 corrects an obsolete reference to the "said province" by substituting for that reference a reference to the State; clause 5 brings the provisions of section 23 into line with modern administrative practice; and clause 6 deletes from section 28 of the principal Act the requirement that the husband of a married woman must consent to an application by her under that section to bring land under the Act. Clause 7 amends section 39 by removing the necessity for a caveat to contain an address "within the city of Adelaide" to which notices may be sent and provides that the address must be within South Australia. Clause 8 amends section 64 so as to empower the court to direct the Registrar-General to cancel, correct or issue a certificate of title or any memorial or entry in the register book notwithstanding that the relevant duplicate certificate has not been produced to him. Clause 9 inserts in the principal Act a new section 115a which empowers the Registrar-General, in cases where the Crown or some other statutory authority acquires land compulsorily or in whom land vests by operation of law, to issue a certificate of title to the land without the production of the relevant duplicate certificate or the usual formalities.

This power was sought by the Commonwealth Crown Solicitor in relation to land compulsorily acquired by the Commonwealth, but the Government is of the view that the same principle should apply to any land compulsorily acquired by a statutory authority or vested in a statutory authority by operation of law.

Clause 10 removes from section 184 a redundant reference to the old Trustee Act of 1893. Clause 11 amends section 191 in two respects. First, it removes the necessity for a caveat to contain an address "within the city of Adelaide" to which notices may be sent, and provides that the address must be within South Australia. Secondly, it removes the necessity for a caveatee to give in his application to remove a caveat an address in Adelaide for service of notices, etc., and provides that the address must be in South Australia. With modern means of communication and transport, this amendment would be of great advantage to the legal and business community and could cause no hardship or inconvenience. Clause 12 amends section 223m of the principal Act so as to widen the definition of "unit subsidiary" by making it possible to include within its scope an area set apart for an amenity like a swimming pool. The clause also strikes out from subsection (4) of that section the redundant words "unless the contrary intention appears", the intention being that, where a unit subsidiary is shown on a deposited plan as appurtenant to a unit, that unit subsidiary is always to be regarded as part of that unit.

Clause 13 amends section 223mb of the principal Act. Paragraph (a) of the clause makes it necessary to distinguish the units shown on a strata plan by numbers instead of by numbers or symbols as at present. It is considered that it is much simpler to identify units that are distinguished by numbers than by symbols. Paragraph (b) of the clause is really consequential on the elimination of the functions of the Commissioner of Land Tax in relation to the schedule of unit entitlements. Clause 14 amends section 223mc. Subsections (3) and (4) of that section deal with the conversion of titles to existing building-unit schemes to strata titles. As at present enacted, subsection (3) of that section does not permit of the conversion of title where any of the units in the scheme have not been sold by the registered proprietor of the parcel at the time of the lodgement of the strata plan. Paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of the clause will enable an existing scheme to be converted, notwithstanding that any of the units are still in the name of the proprietor of the parcel.

Paragraph (d) of the clause adds a new subsection (6) to section 223mc. As the Act now stands, under section 223na (11) the deposit of a strata plan and the entering on a certificate of title of a memorial of an application accompanying a deposited strata plan are deemed to be dealings in land. It is considered by the Registrar-General that an application accompanying the lodgement of a strata plan should be deemed to be a dealing in land in order that the application might be given the status of an instrument with priority over dealings with the parcel lodged subsequently to the application, thus obviating difficulties which could arise in the event of a dealing being lodged in the interval between the lodgement of the strata plan with the Registrar-General and its deposit under the Act.

Clause 15 amends section 223md of the principal Act. As the Act and the regulations stand, neither the council of the area nor the licensed surveyor who certifies the strata plan can be held responsible for the accuracy of the plan. Visual inspections have disclosed discrepancies between the details shown on the strata plan and the actual structures on the parcel. The object of the proposed new paragraph (b) of subsection (1) is to place an onus on the council to ensure that the strata plan represents an accurate delineation of the units and unit subsidiaries as constructed and laid out on the parcel. A similar onus will be placed on the surveyor by amending the form of the surveyor's certificate to be endorsed on the strata plan. The new paragraph (ba) (i) is designed to ensure that all the buildings and structures on the parcel have been actually completed in accordance with the approved plans and specifications at the time when the council gives its certificate of approval. The new paragraph (ba) (ii) gives some latitude in cases where, in the process of building, there have been inconsequential departures from the approved plans and specifications.

The object of the new subsections (3a) and (4a) is to safeguard a promoter who proposes to embark on a building scheme for which strata titles will be required. At the moment, a promoter may obtain the approval of the council to the plans and specifications and may also be notified that the Director of Planning has advised the council that the proposed scheme does not contravene, and is not inconsistent with, any provision of the Planning and Development Act, 1966-67, or with any authorized development plan (regulation 54).

The promoter may then proceed to outlay a large sum in the construction of the building scheme only to find that, when the scheme has been completed, and he applies to the council and the Director for their respective certificates of approval, his application is refused owing to a change in the law or the regulations.

The new subsections (3a) and (4a) are designed to protect a promoter from such a predicament. However, the proposed amendments carry a rider to the effect that the construction of the buildings must be commenced within 12 months after the council approved the plans and specifications or the Director gave the prescribed advice to the council (under regulation 54). The proposed new subsection (7) offers a workable compromise in any case where it is discovered that part of a structure erected on the parcel encroaches on a public street. Its object is to avoid the difficulty and delay which would attend the acquisition of a title, by the registered proprietors of the parcel, to the land encroached on.

Clause 16 amends section 223mf by eliminating the procedures requiring the schedule of unit entitlements or any amendment thereto to be submitted to and approved by the Commissioner of Land Tax or other appointed person. This provision was originally inserted because it was feared that a promoter might set up a fictitious schedule, particularly where he intended to retain one of the units for himself. From experience, it has been found that schedules set up by promoters are sensible and equitable, and official policing of schedules achieves inconsequential results. The proposed amendments to section 223mf remove the necessity for the approval of the Commissioner (or other person appointed) to be obtained to any schedule of unit entitlement or to any subsequent alterations thereto.

Clause 17 amends section 223mg of the Act by eliminating the functions of the Registrar of Companies as a repository for documents under the Act and in relation to the approval of names and the registration of statutory corporations. Clause 18 repeals section 223mh and enacts a new section in its place in consequence of the elimination of the functions of the Registrar of Companies. Clause 19 repeals section 223n and enacts a new section in its place requiring the Registrar of Companies to transfer to the Registrar-General all registers and records kept by him, before the Bill becomes law, for the purposes of these provisions. This provision is also consequential on the elimination of the functions of the Registrar of Companies.

Clause 20 strikes out subsection (11) of section 223na, as it has become redundant in view of new subsection (6) inserted in section 223mc by clause 13 (d). Clause 21 amends section 223nc of the principal Act in consequence of the elimination of the functions of the Registrar of Companies. As approval of the names of the statutory corporations has been also eliminated, provision has been made in future for a standard name for each corporation distinguished by the number of the relevant deposited strata plan. Clause 22 amends section 223ne by making provision for a larger committee and consequentially larger quorums at committee meetings. Paragraphs (c) and (d) of the clause are consequential on the elimination of the functions of the Registrar of Companies, and paragraph (e) replaces subsection (11) with a new subsection that exempts a corporation from the payment of any fee in connection with the furnishing of any return or information to the Registrar-General under subsection (10) (f) of the section.

Clause 23 clarifies the provisions of section 223nh. Clauses 24 to 28 are consequential on the elimination of the functions of the Registrar of Companies. Clause 29 amends section 231 of the principal Act by striking out an obsolete passage relating to hard labour and solitary confinement. Clause 30 makes a conversion to decimal currency of a reference to the old currency. Clause 31 amends section 241 by excluding from its application any strata plan as defined in section 223m, as the section is not applicable to strata plans.

Clause 32 amends section 242 by excluding from its application certificates for units represented on a strata plan as the section is not applicable to strata plans. Clause 33 brings two references to the principal Act up to date. Clause 34 removes from section 245 the necessity for the court to appoint a person to act as next friend of a married woman, as married women are now under no disabilities as such.

Clause 35 brings the reference to the principal Act up to date. Clause 36 amends the Third Schedule to the principal Act by making an amendment to the form of caveat in the Third Schedule in consequence of the amendment to section 39 by clause 7. Clause 37 makes an amendment to the form of caveat in the Twelfth Schedule in consequence of the amendment of section 191 by clause 10. Clause 38 repeals the Fifteenth Schedule to the principal Act, which is now obsolete.

Clause 39 repeals and re-enacts the Twenty-Fourth Schedule to the principal Act. This schedule sets out the form of a Certificate of Title for a unit and of a Certificate of Title for common property. The only difference between the existing and the new forms is that the date of deposit of the strata plan is omitted in the new forms. The inclusion of this date serves no useful purpose. Clause 40 repeals and re-enacts the Twenty-Fifth Schedule to the principal Act, which is the form of the schedule of unit entitlement. In its new form, the endorsement of the Commissioner of Land Tax has been omitted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill makes two amendments to the Barley Marketing Act to enable that Act to be reprinted under the Acts Republication Act, 1967. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 repeals section 5 of the principal Act which deals with transitional provisions relating to a State Barley Board. These provisions have been rendered ineffectual by reason of administrative action taken to constitute a board under section 4 of the Act. Clause 3 corrects a grammatical error in section 14 (1) of the principal Act.

Mr. CLARK secured the adjournment of the debate.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Anzac Highway Agreement Act, 1937-1940, ratified an agreement between the municipalities of Glenelg and Unley and the then District Council of West Torrens and the Commissioner of Highways for the construction and maintenance of part of what is now known as the Anzac Highway. The amounts payable in respect of the construction of the highway by the councils have now been repaid and hence it is agreed between the parties that there is no real need for the continuation of the agreement.

Accordingly, by agreement between the councils concerned and the Commissioner of Highways, the Commissioner has taken over the further reconstruction of the roadway, on terms rather more favourable to the councils, by exercising his powers under section 26 of the Highways Act. The formal notices regarding the exercise of these powers were issued to the councils concerned on December 1, 1967.

However, at the time it was not noticed that action under these formal notices may have been nullified by the operation of section 6 of the Anzac Highway Agreement Act. Briefly, this section provided that any agreement to vary the agreement as set out in that Act which had the effect of increasing the amount payable by the Commissioner of Highways would have no effect until it was ratified by Parliament. It is not entirely clear whether the action under the formal notice constitutes action as a result of agreement between the parties but, *ex abundantia cautela*, this Bill is presented ratifying the actions of the Commissioner of Highways and the councils. Accordingly, at clause 2, the Bill repeals the Anzac Highway Agreement Act and rescinds the agreement and, at clause 3, all actions by the councils involved or the Commissioner are rendered valid and effectual in so far as this is necessary.

Mr. BROOMHILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOAN ESTIMATES

In Committee.

(Continued from August 14. Page 994.)

Grand total, \$101,716,000.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): In speaking to the Loan Estimates, I believe members need to keep firmly in mind the general position that existed at the beginning of this financial year regarding the Loan Account. The Treasurer makes this perfectly clear when he states that, during the 1968-69 financial year, there was an actual surplus of \$6,819,000, so that the balance of funds held on Loan Account had increased to \$12,477,000 by June 30, 1969. The Treasurer continues:

The Government concluded that it should plan a 1969-70 programme at a level sufficient to absorb fully the funds currently becoming available, but that it would be prudent at this stage to reserve most of the existing Loan balances of \$12,477,000 held at June 30 last. The programme set out in the Loan Estimates now before members totals \$101,716,000. This will require all funds becoming available during 1969-70 and make a small call, of about

\$550,000, on the funds held from previous years.

Therefore, if the Treasurer's Estimates are anywhere near accurate, the result will be that, at the end of this current financial year, the Loan Account will be in surplus by a little less than \$12,000,000. However, because of certain financial practices adopted, the effective sum will be greater than that. Members will note that last financial year a sum of \$500,000 was provided for the festival hall and that, during the year, a further \$200,000 was allocated for that purpose. Therefore, in 1968-69, \$700,000 was set aside for the festival hall, and a further \$700,000 is set aside this financial year, making a total of \$1,400,000.

Any honourable member will no doubt be surprised if any substantial part of that \$1,400,000 is spent by the end of this financial year. The likelihood is that only design costs will have been incurred by the end of this financial year so, in effect, what the Treasurer has done is to reserve another sum of more than \$1,000,000 by placing that sum with the Adelaide City Council. Furthermore, in the Loan Estimates we have the repeat provision for public parks of \$300,000. It is stated that any sum remaining unspent at the end of the year from this provision is to be transferred to a deposit account so that it may be available for such purposes as are required in the future. This afternoon, in reply to a question, the Treasurer did not deny that there were sums available in this deposit account at present and that the likelihood was that, at the end of this financial year, there would still be substantial sums available in that account—again, money made available through the Loan Estimates but not spent during the current financial year.

It would seem to me that, if these moneys were not put into these special deposit accounts or under the control of the Adelaide City Council, the effective surplus on Loan Account at the end of this financial year, if the Treasurer's estimates turned out to be correct, would be more likely to be \$13,500,000 to \$14,000,000. However, one way or another this matter needs to be carefully examined if we are to make a proper assessment of the contribution these Loan Estimates will make to the capital development of the State and, also, if we are to make any assessment of the propriety, in the current circumstances, of the Treasurer's reserving such a huge sum and not spending it during the current financial year. I point out also that provision is made in the Loan Estimates for \$1,061,000 for the West Lakes Development Scheme, and this is not a

provision that will lead to any spending during the current financial year. This provision is purely a rearrangement of accounts. On this matter, the Treasurer has said:

The appropriation of \$1,061,000 from a new Loan Account to recoup the accounts of three authorities will in itself have no net impact on Government finances.

This, of course, has no net impact on Government finances and the economy of the State. All it means is that the Loan Account is reduced by \$1,061,000 while other accounts held at Government level and in the names of the Housing Trust, the Marine and Harbors Department and the Lands Department will be increased by an equivalent sum. All these things have to be taken into account if one is to make any effective assessment of the impact of these Loan Estimates on the State's economy and, indeed, if one is to make any effective judgment of whether or not the Treasurer has adopted the right course. In his statement the Treasurer said:

Another important consideration is the future effect of our carrying out this year a capital programme about 16 per cent above last year.

The plain fact of the matter is that the effective capital programme to be carried out this year is simply not 16 per cent above last year. We cannot conclude from the overall payments proposed from Loan Account this year as against last year what the effective percentage increase in the capital programme is. As I have pointed out, some of the proposed payments from Loan Account involve transfers to other accounts or to other authorities of sums that will not be spent during the year. There is no doubt that the total transfers involved amount to nearly \$2,000,000. That would have to be taken into account if one were to attempt to work out the percentage increase in the capital programme and the capital works programme to be carried out by the South Australian Government this financial year. Obviously, from a mere superficial inspection, the programme is significantly less than 16 per cent above last year.

I want to refer now to one matter of detail—the provisions in respect of school buildings in the Loan Estimates for this financial year—because I believe that these provisions reveal a serious situation. We are told that in this financial year the payments proposed from the Loan Account total \$13,800,000, as against proposed payments last financial year of \$13,700,000 and actual payments of \$13,270,000. The net contribution of the State to that programme we do not know.

We are informed that certain sums are provided by the Commonwealth Government, in particular sums relating to expenditure on technical colleges, science laboratories, teachers colleges and libraries projects, and these projects all involve unmatched Commonwealth grants: in other words, the State can attract these grants without having to spend an equivalent sum of money on a \$1 for \$1 or some other basis on the same projects.

It is clear that this financial year will see an increase in the amount of Commonwealth aid provided for technical colleges, science laboratories, teachers colleges and libraries projects, first because it is the first year in which money available for libraries will be spent and, secondly, because there is a significant increase in the money proposed to be spent on teachers colleges. In fact, last year the money proposed to be spent on teachers colleges amounted to only \$1,145,000, whereas this year \$2,300,000 is proposed to be spent on them. So an increase of almost \$1,250,000 is proposed for expenditure on teachers colleges, and the greater part of that will be provided by the Commonwealth Government. Therefore, when we take these two points into account—the fact that for the first year the Commonwealth will be providing assistance for school libraries and the fact that the expenditure on teachers colleges is proposed to be increased by about \$1,250,000—it is clear that this State's own contribution to school buildings and teachers college buildings has been reduced.

Mr. Broomhill: And at a time when the need is greatest.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. At a time when there is more concern about the position of education both at the capital level and at the level of current expenditure, the State Government has introduced Loan Estimates which, on the surface, make it clear that it is reducing substantially its own expenditure from its own sources on school buildings, in circumstances in which the Treasurer plans to have a surplus on Loan Account at the end of June, 1970, of some \$12,000,000—

Mr. Broomhill: It is a thorough disgrace.

Mr. HUDSON: —and in which other transfers from Loan Account will be made during the financial year of sums varying between \$1,500,000 and \$2,000,000 that will not be spent on actual capital works.

Mr. Broomhill: For accounting reasons.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, for the West Lakes Development Scheme, because the Government wants to make an even allocation each year for

the festival hall, and because there is again a regular allocation for public works.

Mr. Broomhill: To me, it seems misleading.

Mr. HUDSON: But can any honourable member opposite say that the present circumstances are such that this State, because it is getting increased sums of money from the Commonwealth Government for teachers colleges in this financial year and because it is getting sums of money from the Commonwealth for the first time this financial year for libraries, can afford to reduce the amount that South Australia itself provides towards school buildings?

Mr. Broomhill: There is no excuse for it.

Mr. HUDSON: I say that there is no possible excuse for this procedure being adopted in circumstances where the needs of education are more clearly stated and are more clearly recognized by the people in general than ever before. Nothing could be more designed to weaken further the confidence of teachers than this action, because it is clear that there is no need for the Treasurer to reduce the amount of money that South Australia from its Loan funds is providing towards school buildings.

Let me deal with this matter in further detail. When we compare the school building provisions in the detailed Loan Estimates statement last year with those for this year, we find that the total provision for primary and infants schools (new schools and major additions), for area schools (new schools and major additions) and for technical high schools and high schools (new schools and major additions) in 1968-69 was \$6,454,000, whereas this financial year it is only \$5,040,000. So, for new school buildings and major additions in the overall field of primary, infants, area, technical high and high schools this Government has reduced the provision in the Loan Estimates by \$1,414,000. Can anyone justify this reduction?

Again, if one compares the provision this year for craft work, domestic art centres, change rooms, and typing rooms (and includes Raywood Training Centre), one finds that the provision last year was \$771,000, whereas this financial year it is \$1,270,000, so in that area there has been an increase. For technical colleges and adult education centres, the provision last year was \$210,000, whereas this year it is down to \$90,000. As I have already indicated, the provision for teachers colleges has been increased but, as most members including the Treasurer well know, most of

that increase of over \$1,000,000 is financed by the Commonwealth Government, not by the State. Finally, the category "General" in the detailed statement provided with the Loan Estimates shows \$5,100,000 this year, as against \$5,130,000 last year, which is much the same.

Summarizing, the main change is the reduction in the amount that the Government is proposing to spend on new buildings and on major additions to school buildings (whether they be infants, primary, area, technical high or high schools) of \$1,400,000, coupled with an increase in expenditure on teachers colleges of \$1,250,000, the latter financed in the main by the Commonwealth Government and the former reduction going mainly to increase the sum that the Treasurer will have as a surplus on Loan Account at the end of June, 1970. In other words, the Commonwealth Government is being used, via a reduction in the amount the State is to spend on school buildings, to provide a bigger surplus on Loan Account at the end of June, 1970.

On no account can this sort of change be justified. One would think, to see a reduction of almost \$1,500,000 in the provision for new buildings and major additions to schools, that our schools and the standard of our buildings were absolutely first rate and that there was no area left for any significant improvement; but every member knows that that is simply not the case. In my own district, I can point to the rebuilding of the Paringa Park Primary School which has been on the books of the Education Department for at least four years now and which is still waiting to be done. However, the Minister told me the other day, in answer to a question, that no date had been fixed for the commencement of the rebuilding of this school. Anyone who knows anything about schools in my district would be aware that the Brighton High School has for years been awaiting the construction of a third wing. About half of the children at that school are taught in classrooms that have been temporary accommodation for as long as most people care to remember. Everyone in my district knows, too, that a new wing is urgently needed at the Seacombe High School and that that school has virtually run out of ground on which more temporary classrooms could be erected.

Mr. Broomhill: It is not an isolated case, either!

Mr. HUDSON: No, and much the same position applies at the Brighton High School, which is running out of room for temporary accommodation unless it encroaches on the

playing fields. Everyone associated with the Seacombe High School realizes the urgent necessity for the completion of this third wing. The Brighton Boys Technical High School, a fine new school which is only in its third year of operation, now needs temporary classrooms because the Education Department has not the money to erect a further solid construction building which would provide the extra classrooms needed and which would cater for the boom in adult education activities at the school. Clearly, there is a real need at this school for a project that will adequately provide for local needs. At school after school throughout my district (and the District of Glenelg is not atypical of other districts in this respect) there are temporary classrooms galore that badly need replacing.

Can any member, even the member for Light, justify the reduction in expenditure on new schools and on major additions that the Treasurer is proposing for this financial year, in circumstances where he will have a \$12,000,000 surplus in the Loan Account at the end of the year and where the current Budget deficit is below \$8,000,000? The Treasurer seems to suggest that it would be immoral for him to run a deficit overall on both the Budget and the Loan Account and, in view of his previous statements, for him to have to use deposits held at the Treasury to finance an overall Government deficit. It seems to me that the Treasurer, in order to prove himself consistent with the statements that he made when in Opposition, has now determined on a policy whereby, as the State experiences a deficit on Revenue Account that shows little sign of being reduced, it will be necessary for the Government to have an expanding surplus on Loan Account. This is done in order to keep the Treasurer honest and to make it clear to everyone in this State that the Treasurer meant it when he said in Opposition that it was wrong for the South Australian Government to meet a deficit from deposits held at the Treasury.

Although his statements at that time had nothing at all to do with sound Government financing or were not consistent in any way with the normal economic doctrine that has been propounded for many years, the Treasurer above all had to be consistent so far as the South Australian public was concerned, even if it meant reducing our expenditure on schools. That is what these Loan Estimates do, and I cannot understand the Government's adopting this kind of

position. The Minister of Education, the Minister responsible for schools in South Australia, is getting an extremely poor deal from her Cabinet colleagues, including the Treasurer.

It is about time members on both sides spoke up and said that, regardless of statements made before the last general election, it is wrong for the Government to continue as it is proceeding now. The Treasurer takes great pride in the fact that the allocation for housing is the highest amount ever allocated to that item in this State. However, one would have thought that, in a State in which expansion occurred regularly year after year, we would set new records each year in most fields: the present record is a measly one.

Mr. McAnaney: You went back. How did you achieve that?

Mr. HUDSON: The honourable member knows well that a complete reply was given on those matters by me and by the former Minister of Education in the Loan Estimates debate last year. I refer the honourable member to the record of that debate, in which he was set right about what he had stated as facts. Rather than repeat incorrect statements, he would be advised to bring pressure to bear on the Treasurer to make proper provision for school buildings. The people of South Australia are not interested in the kind of stale Party political debate in which the honourable member wishes to indulge. They are interested in something constructive being done in the best interests of the schools that serve 80 per cent of the population.

It is about time Government members recognized that the Government schools in South Australia are experiencing a crisis. Those schools teach the vast majority of our students. I have said before that I consider that the State has a responsibility regarding the standards of education in all schools and I have said that, in present circumstances, State aid is necessary for an independent school that is having difficulty in getting its standards of education as high as a modern economy justifies.

The same point applies to Government schools but, unfortunately, Government members, including the Cabinet collectively, are showing the most appalling apathy about standards in those schools. Those members show the same kind of attitude as is demonstrated by their Commonwealth colleagues. They say, "So long as we look after the independent schools, the Government schools can go to hell." That view comes out in these Loan Estimates, but such a policy is

wrong. Every child, regardless of the school he attends or his parents' position, has a right in a modern community to the best standard of education the community can afford.

In many independent schools and in Government schools the standard of education is nowhere near the kind of standard that our so-called affluent society can afford. Members opposite are mostly farmers, practical men, who say, "What do we know about education? What do we care? We can depend on the practical experience we gain on the farm, and what is the point of educating children so that they can attend a university and become a lot of revolting students?" I am trying to stimulate those members to take an interest in this matter and put pressure on their Government to do something about the present position and to prevent the Premier, the Treasurer, and other Cabinet Ministers from putting their heads in the sand, refusing to do anything about the issue, and at the same time applauding the Commonwealth Government's decision to grant massive State aid to independent schools. Government members do not criticize the Commonwealth Government for its refusal to grant per capita aid to Government schools and they compound the felony by reducing the State Government's provision for Government schools and buildings. This is a scandalous situation.

I know that most members opposite, being farmers, are not interested in this matter, but surely they can see beyond their own experiences and problems. The need for expenditure on education is much greater now than it was when members opposite were children: what was good for them is no longer good today. There is a shortage of skilled and professional persons of every type. Surely members opposite know that we are contributing to that shortage by promoting the migration of Australian professional people to other countries. In particular, this Government has been doing as much as it can to promote the export of Australian teachers to Canada. The policies being adopted by the Government regarding the teaching profession lead us to conclude that.

Mr. Rodda: This speech will look nice in the *Stock and Station Journal*!

Mr. HUDSON: I hope the *Stock and Station Journal* publishes it, particularly my statement that educational standards in country areas should be the same as those in the city. The educational standards in many country areas have been a disgrace for years. For many years after the Second World War,

country schools were neglected by the Playford Government. For years and years, under the Playford Government—

Mr. Rodda: And the Walsh Government, too.

Mr. HUDSON: But not under the Walsh Government—

Mr. McAnaney: Oh, oh!

Mr. HUDSON: The honourable member should let me finish the sentence. Many country schools did not have Leaving Honours classes, because most of those classes that had existed in the 1930's were eliminated during the Second World War, presumably as an economy measure. Where were the members for Victoria and Stirling during all those years when high school after high school in country areas had no Matriculation or Leaving Honours classes, and the children in those areas had to go to a metropolitan school in order to obtain Leaving Honours schooling? What were they doing?

Mr. Rodda: Sitting in the nose of a Lancaster.

Mr. HUDSON: Good on you, and when the honourable member came back what did he do about that particular issue? Has the honourable member promoted the interests of country education?

Mr. McAnaney: What did you do about it?

Mr. HUDSON: I have been talking about the needs of country schools for as long as I have been a member here, and both inside and outside the House, whenever I have had the opportunity of speaking publicly on this matter, I have said that the Playford Government's record of having country high schools without Leaving Honours classes was an absolute and utter disgrace. Members opposite know that it was a disgrace: all I suggest is that, if the member for Victoria wants to tell me that something I have said about the multitude of farmers we see confronting us on the other side is going to look well in the *Stock and Station Journal*, I hope that the record of members opposite and the record of the L.C.L. Governments in relation to country education will also look well in that journal. No other State, except probably Queensland, has such a poor standard of overall facilities in country schools compared with those of metropolitan schools.

Mr. McAnaney: Why don't you quote figures?

Mr. HUDSON: If the member for Stirling would consider the situation that applies in New South Wales he would realize that, in the years since the Second World War, in all major country high schools a full school

curriculum has been provided to the Matriculation level.

Mr. McAnaney: That's in the bigger towns with a large population. Do they spend as much per capita as we do on education?

Mr. HUDSON: So what: this is the sort of justification which the honourable member tries to give and which is used by other Government members, who do not give a hoot about education, as an excuse for not spending the money that should be spent on education. I was asked by the member for Stirling to give figures. Well, in New South Wales students from areas such as Cessnock and Newcastle—

Mr. McAnaney: They are large cities.

Mr. HUDSON:—from the river towns such as Grafton, and in towns on the northern coastal area regularly gain some of the top places in the Matriculation examination. Year after year has that been the case. The New South Wales policy in respect of country high schools is to ensure that, because of the difficulties that apply in relation to remoteness, more money is spent in country areas—so that the standards are more or less the same in country areas as those in the metropolitan area. That should be the attitude existing in South Australia, but it has not been the attitude. If the member for Stirling wants to justify the action of the Playford Government in cutting out Leaving Honours classes in country schools, then he can do so if he wishes. But let us be clear: the record on this matter is absolutely clear cut, and members opposite know in their heart of hearts that the record sticks, and that the provision made in these financial Estimates—

Mr. McAnaney: You didn't do much in your three years.

Mr. HUDSON: The provision we were prepared to make for school buildings from this State's resources in our three years was better than the provision that had been made in the past and better than that being made by the present Government.

Mr. McAnaney: It didn't tie up with the Auditor-General's Report.

Mr. HUDSON: It seems that nothing can be said to the member for Stirling: he is like a little boy who, despite the explanation given to him, keeps asking why and giving a further statement. Sooner or later one has to say, "Please keep quiet."

Mr. McAnaney: Should this be printed you had better give up.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nankivell): Order! The member for Glenelg should not take notice of interjections.

Mr. HUDSON: It is difficult. Being an experienced interjector yourself, Mr. Acting Chairman, if you wish me not to take notice of interjections you had better do some naming on my behalf. The Treasurer has made certain comments about the present Revenue Budget deficit which, when taken into account with what he has done with the Loan Estimates, indicates clearly, I believe, that the current Budget will run at a still larger deficit this year. The current Revenue Budget, when it is presented next week—

Mr. McAnaney: You said it would be a bigger deficit, but we had a surplus, so how can we have a bigger deficit?

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Stirling said it would be a bigger deficit.

Mr. McAnaney: I did not; I said it would be a bigger surplus.

Mr. HUDSON: The deficit to the end of June amounted to \$7,500,000, and any member who has closely studied this matter will appreciate that the run-down in the State's finances, from a position of surplus of Revenue Account to the deficit position, occurred over the two-year period from July, 1964, to June, 1966.

Mr. McAnaney: What about the \$8,000,000? How many schools could you have built if you had not squandered it?

Mr. HUDSON: That is a stupid interjection. I am speaking about the Revenue deficit, and that has nothing to do with the position of schools. The main run-down occurred in the two-year period: one year under the Playford Government, when he was making a last desperate throw to hold office and when the State's finances were run-down—

Mr. McAnaney: Be fair.

Mr. HUDSON: —by almost \$8,000,000 by Sir Thomas Playford. That was during 1964-65, as the member for Stirling well knows.

Mr. McAnaney: You can't get up and say that.

Mr. HUDSON: I have, and I have just said it. The member for Stirling just does not know.

Mr. McAnaney: I know as well as you know.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The member for Stirling will have his chance to make a speech when he follows the member for Glenelg.

Mr. HUDSON: The honourable member wants to make two speeches: one by interjecting on mine and one of his own. He knows full well that Sir Thomas Playford spent money recklessly in excess of what this State earned

in 1964-65 and that this pattern was repeated in 1965-66. However, the member for Stirling does not want to say anything about 1964-65 under the Playford Government.

Mr. McAnaney: Read *Hansard* and you will learn something.

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Stirling should concentrate on the year 1965-66. He is interested only in playing Party politics in respect of this matter—he does not really care about the facts at all. Since June 30, 1966, this State's Revenue Account has been more or less stable: we have had either a small surplus or a small deficit.

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

Mr. HUDSON: I do not want to ask for your protection, Mr. Acting Chairman, but it seems that the member for Stirling is going to keep up these insistent but incomprehensible interjections.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has been deliberately provocative on occasions, but I ask the member for Stirling to cease interjecting.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I think the member for Glenelg is only getting what he gives to other people.

Mr. HUDSON: I have never continued interjecting for as long as the member for Stirling has. I cannot hear half his interjections, so it is very difficult indeed.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member to ignore them.

Mr. HUDSON: And I ask you, Mr. Acting Chairman, to see that the member for Stirling does not persist in being out of order. Since the 1967-68 financial year we have had a surplus on Loan Account that, in the initial period, was less than the Budget deficit but which is now substantially greater than it. The Treasurer apparently plans to continue this policy more or less permanently.

As far as one can judge, one would not expect the Treasurer to plan a surplus on Loan Account of \$12,000,000 at the end of June, 1970, unless the Budget deficit was going to increase from \$8,000,000 to \$12,000,000 by that time. It is apparent, therefore, that we are seeing a further extension of the practice of running a larger and larger surplus on Loan Account in order to match the Budget deficit that the Treasurer is planning. I do not know for how long this situation can continue.

The Treasurer and other Government members know full well that, if the surplus on Loan Account is used to fund the Budget deficit.

South Australia will experience the penalties of the Financial Agreement. One can only assume that the Treasurer is planning to run a deficit on Revenue Account of \$4,000,000 in the Budget he will present in a few weeks' time; otherwise, there would be no possible argument for having a surplus of \$12,000,000 on Loan Account at the end of June, 1970.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I wish the \$12,000,000 was real.

Mr. HUDSON: In other words, the Treasurer is admitting that there will be a deficit of \$12,000,000 on Revenue Account at the end of June, 1970.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I did not say that: I said I wished the \$12,000,000 was real.

Mr. HUDSON: How much will be real?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: All the figures are in the statement.

Mr. HUDSON: No, they are not.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Yes, they are.

Mr. HUDSON: Unless the Treasurer is planning to increase the Revenue deficit, why is it necessary to increase the surplus on Loan Account? If the Treasurer claims that he can hold the Budget position, why can he not provide an additional \$4,000,000 on Loan Account for urgent projects?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I may be able to do so later in the year.

Mr. HUDSON: Why does the Treasurer not do it now? Why does he not provide for additional expenditure on school buildings now? Unless the Treasurer plans such expenditure now, how can such projects be implemented later?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I can accelerate the expenditure, as the honourable member well knows, if it is possible to do it.

Mr. HUDSON: The Treasurer cannot accelerate expenditure on public buildings without prior planning, as he well knows. The Treasurer has put the brakes on Government building projects, particularly school buildings.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I have not.

Mr. HUDSON: Then, why is it that the Treasurer's provision in regard to new school buildings and major additions is almost \$1,500,000 less than that of last year?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It is incorrect to say that I put the brakes on.

Mr. HUDSON: The Treasurer's own figures demonstrate that, of the total money provided for school buildings, the Commonwealth Government is providing significantly more this year than it did last year, and this State is

providing less from its own resources. If this does not mean that the Treasurer has put the brakes on, I do not know what it means.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It does not mean that, as the honourable member well knows.

Mr. HUDSON: The Treasurer put the brakes on the financial provision he is making.

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

Mr. HUDSON: I accuse this Government of putting the brakes on school building projects and of providing less from its own resources, and I have provided the detailed figures to justify this accusation. These circumstances require an immediate revision of the Loan Estimates. Every member knows of school projects within his own district that urgently need to be undertaken. Any member suggesting that such projects have not been a permanent problem is dishonest. Now, when the Treasurer has at least \$4,000,000 up his sleeve—now is the time that he could use it for school buildings. If he says that he does not have it up his sleeve, it shows he must be planning a Revenue deficit of \$4,000,000 for this current financial year. He does not expect to be taken off the hook twice by the Commonwealth Government through its making additional grants to this State, since next year will not be a Commonwealth election year.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You are fishing in barren waters.

Mr. HUDSON: I hope we shall hear more on this point, because the Treasurer certainly has some explaining to do. Certainly, his reply to the Leader of the Opposition on this point was unsatisfactory. It may well be that he has not got \$12,000,000 salted away in a cupboard in the Treasury but, as he well knows, he has the ability to go into overall deficit on both Loan and Revenue Accounts, taken together. If the Budget deficit is to stay unchanged at \$7,900,000 at the end of this coming financial year, the Treasurer must be planning to have a surplus on Budget and Loan (taken together) of \$4,000,000. He well knows that the extent of deposits held with the Treasury would permit him at any one point of time to be in deficit overall on both Budget and Loan (taken together) to the extent of a very substantial sum indeed and without ever having to touch trust funds.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Such as what funds?

Mr. HUDSON: The Flinders University and the Adelaide University are two institutions that hold deposits with the Treasury that

regularly reach a certain sum. The Treasury demands that these deposits be held with it as a convenience to it.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Those funds are not my money.

Mr. HUDSON: They are deposited with the Government. They are held with the Government, and the Treasurer well knows that Government after Government has run overall deficits (not only the previous Labor Government but also the Playford Government before that). He also well knows that every State Government in Australia is involved in this respect and that it has not applied just to an emergency. In Victoria it has been a relatively permanent feature over the last few years.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: But you have to keep the balance intact.

Mr. HUDSON: If the Treasurer is trying to tell us that we must have a balanced Budget at all costs, then I find this attitude completely beyond my ken—

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I do not say that at all.

Mr. HUDSON: —because that really did go out—

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It didn't go out. The realities of finance are still as true today as they were 20 years ago.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is too much dialogue. I ask the honourable member to address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. HUDSON: In answer to the Treasurer through you, Sir, let me say that the State can go into overall deficit; it can legitimately do so and has legitimately done so in the past under Governments of either political Party. The Treasurer may well be a little convention-bound in this matter and may not like doing it; but it certainly can be done, and there is nothing illegitimate about it, despite what the Treasurer and other members of his Party said regarding this matter during 1965-68. I believe that deals with the Treasurer's statement in reply to the Leader. How long can we continue a situation where we have bigger and bigger deficits on Revenue Account and bigger and bigger surpluses on Loan Account, because that looks to be the way in which the Treasurer is moving? How long can that situation be justified? Does the Treasurer expect to be taken off the hook when the formula for Commonwealth reimbursement grants is revised? We may get taken off the hook if we have a Commonwealth Labor Government, but it will not occur with the crowd at present in

Canberra, because their record of mistakes has been abysmal, and the Treasurer knows it.

He and other members opposite know full well that the whole background of Commonwealth-State financial relations in the last 20 years or so has been plagued by the fact that the Commonwealth Government has only limited means of controlling the economy. One thing it can control, however, happens to be the expenditure of State Governments regarding both Revenue Account and Loan Account, and control these it has done most effectively. Our own public works expenditure has been held back in circumstances where the Commonwealth Government permits a much higher rate of expansion in its own expenditure. Honourable members, both in this Parliament and elsewhere in Australia, are aware of the double standard that applies as between Canberra and the rest of Australia (the double standard that applies, for example, in relation to schools, bearing in mind the standard of schools and school buildings in Canberra in comparison with that applying to the rest of Australia). It is this kind of double standard that provides the basic background to our financial problems, and this has persisted for 20 years or more.

How members opposite expect to get out of this situation when their Commonwealth Liberal colleagues occupy the Treasury benches in Canberra, I cannot understand. As long as we continue with a situation whereby the Commonwealth Government has no adequate means of controlling the indirect forms of credit, particularly through the hire-purchase companies, Treasury advisers will say to a succession of Commonwealth Treasurers and Commonwealth Governments, in effect, "You cannot control hire-purchase expenditure unless you put on a severe credit squeeze through the banking system (and you have to make credit very tight indeed through the banking system before you will touch credit available through hire-purchase), and therefore in these circumstances you must control your own expenditure. You must control the expenditure of State Governments." The natural politics of the situation in the Commonwealth Government means that the end result of this process is that State Governments' expenditure is strictly controlled, while that of the Commonwealth Government is controlled much less strictly.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I don't think the honourable member will accuse me of not being critical of the Commonwealth-State relations regarding finance.

Mr. HUDSON: No, but I am afraid it is necessary to do a little more than this Government is doing in this matter. This Government has been most pusillanimous concerning the Commonwealth Government. Sir Henry Bolte would leave this Government for dead.

Mr. McAnaney: And not get much money!

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Stirling would not know how successful Sir Henry Bolte had been. I do not believe that one is justified in using kid-glove tactics with the Commonwealth Government in the hope that it will give better treatment. I think that is the kind of suggestion the member for Stirling is making, but I do not think it is an appropriate procedure to adopt because, until the Commonwealth Government is prepared to sit down with the State Governments and provide a proper solution regarding Commonwealth-State financial relations, we shall have the kind of situation, which we are in at present, repeated year in and year out, and we shall be faced with a continual situation in which our priorities regarding expenditure are determined for us. We never have sufficient available for the vital needs of the State, and basic areas of public investment continue to be neglected. I am saying that concerning hospitals in particular, and also schools, this is an area of public investment which, for one reason or another, has been neglected over the years and is still being neglected. Further, I am saying that the Treasurer, in his Loan Estimates (and I do not blame him peculiarly for it; I blame the whole Government—it is not a personal matter), has neglected school buildings to an extent that need not have been the case, and that the Government has made the incorrect judgment in regard to maintaining a Loan Account surplus of \$12,000,000 by the end of June, 1970. I am saying that that is improper in the current circumstances.

I hope the Treasurer will take account of these remarks and will take immediate action to ensure that the rate of this State's own contribution to school buildings is stepped up during the financial year, so that at the end of the financial year, even if the Revenue deficit rises to \$12,000,000, the surplus on Loan Account will be substantially less than \$12,000,000. Certain of the other matters I wish to raise arise through inadequate information being given by the Treasurer. I do not suggest that the Treasurer should lengthen the speech he makes, but I believe there is room for further information being given to honourable members by way of appendices. Certainly, it is difficult to work out what has

happened precisely concerning the Woods and Forests Department where, for example, for 1968-69 the estimated recovery was \$1,200,000. Of course, that acts as an offset to the further Loan repayments that have to be made. For the current financial year, the estimated repayments for the Woods and Forests Department are down to \$450,000; two years ago the estimated recovery for the department was over \$2,000,000. This recovery is, I believe, some sort of measure of the profitability of that operation.

I hope the Treasurer will remember with some pain the discussion which occurred last year during the Loan Estimates debate in relation to the Woods and Forests Department, during which I argued most strongly that the Government's decision in withdrawing the instruction that had been issued by the previous Government to the Housing Trust to specify only Woods and Forests Department radiata pine would result in a further decline in the profitability of the department and a smaller recovery to the Loan Account as a consequence. Now, as the Treasurer is aware of this rather startling change in the fortunes of the department, we should have had some explanation of it. Indeed, in his statement as to what falls and rises in recoveries are likely to occur this year there is no reference to this department. I believe the Treasurer has tried to avoid criticism on this count. It is necessary to come out into the open, and I hope that, during the course of the debate, we shall hear a full and frank explanation of what is the position in relation to recoveries in the Woods and Forests Department and about why there has been such a substantial reduction in these recoveries over the last two financial years.

I want to deal with further matters that I have already raised by way of question. I refer to them again in this debate because they affect the extent to which individual members are able to assess the Loan Estimates properly. First, I refer to the matter of school buildings and the amount of Commonwealth money provided. Last year that information was worked out and included as a little footnote in the detailed Loan Estimates statement put out in association with the Treasurer's speech, but that information is not available this year. Secondly, if one is to make a proper assessment of the Loan Estimates, one needs detailed information as to the state of spending on the festival hall and public parks and in relation to any other matter where a direct transfer is made. Thirdly, I criticize the Treasurer for not stating that the Highways

Fund has been raided (to use the words of Sir Thomas Playford) in order to pay for fishing havens.

I put it that way advisedly, not because I think that what the Treasurer has done is wrong but because I want to remind members opposite of things said when they were in Opposition about so-called raids on the Highways Fund. I think that the fact that a source other than Loan moneys is being used for fishing havens should be stated and made clear in the Loan Account. It is wrong that \$225,000 should be allocated for fishing havens and a further \$225,000 put in on the receipts side as a repayment from the Highways Fund without any mention being made of that fact anywhere in the Loan Estimates. I hope that sort of thing will not happen again and that, where another fund or Commonwealth aid road grant can be used for a perfectly legitimate purpose, that is stated.

I know there will be members opposite, who do not have any fishermen in their districts, who will be appalled at the thought that some money repaid to us on account of petrol tax payments should be used for fishing havens. I hope those members will not bring pressure to bear on the Government because of this, for I believe this source of finance for fishing havens is perfectly legitimate, particularly when it is remembered that for years and years fishermen, one way or the other, have contributed in fuel taxes to the Commonwealth Government and, apart from last financial year, have not had any money, which is returned to the States by the Commonwealth, spent on facilities for them. After all, if it is good enough for the road user to have moneys, which are returned from the Commonwealth Government as rebates arising from petrol tax, spent on roads, the facility that the motor car owner uses, it is also right that moneys contributed by fishermen to the Commonwealth Government in the form of petrol and fuel tax, which, in part, is returned to the States by way of the Commonwealth aid road grants, should be used in providing facilities that the fishermen use.

Mr. McAnaney: What are you growling about?

Mr. HUDSON: I am growling about the fact that a certain source of finance that I believe has been used in relation to these Loan Estimates has not been publicly stated as being used. I think it is of significant magnitude, particularly in view of all the arguments that have gone on about the Highways Fund and other money, that it should be stated clearly when it occurs. I favour the use of the High-

ways Fund up to the limit available in making provision for tourist facilities. This can be done here, as it is now being done in one or two other States. I believe we should do this here, for no matter how parochial we may be and how much we may be impressed by the attractiveness of our own State we must recognize that the facilities provided for tourists in many parts of the State are poor indeed, and that a significant expenditure is necessary to bring these facilities up to standard. A similar argument applies in relation to fishing havens. After all, one contributor to the Commonwealth aid road grants, which we get on account of the payment of petrol tax by the people in South Australia, is the tourist traffic. Therefore, money used from this source to provide facilities for tourists is justified.

In his speech, the Treasurer commented adversely on the consequence of the rise in interest rates forced on the States by the Commonwealth Government. I wish to take his comments a little further. He points out that the rise in interest rates will have an adverse effect on his Revenue Budget, and I suppose that is one thing that makes him rather pessimistic about the Revenue Budget prospects. However, it seems to me that we should all be making a song and dance about this matter. It is appalling that every year the debt service component in our Revenue Budget rises as a percentage of the total Budget, while the tendency for some years now has been for the Commonwealth income tax reimbursement grants to fall as a percentage of our total Budget.

Therefore, the consequence of the Commonwealth Government's action in its direct impact on our revenue side of the Budget is to lower the percentage of its revenue source (Commonwealth income tax reimbursement grants as a percentage of the total) while, on the expenditure side, because of actions taken on Loan Account and the monetary policy followed by the Commonwealth Government, we are faced in our Budget with an expenditure item which contributes nothing to South Australia, rising as a percentage of the total Budget. There is no doubt that South Australia, along with every other State in Australia, is the victim this year of the Commonwealth Government's election window-dressing. That Government has not been able to put through the kind of Budget it knows should probably have been put through; it has proposed a Budget which, in its overall effect, will have an inflationary consequence, and certainly will do nothing to moderate—

Mr. McAnaney: Explain that!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are not debating the Commonwealth Budget; we are debating the Loan Estimates.

Mr. HUDSON: I am debating the Commonwealth Budget so far as it relates—

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member can make only a passing reference to it.

Mr. HUDSON: It is an essential part of my argument.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member will have to tie it in with the Loan Estimates.

Mr. HUDSON: I will.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope the honourable member does; the Chair is waiting for him to do that.

Mr. HUDSON: I am pointing out that the Commonwealth Government, because it refused to adopt proper budgetary measures as it was faced with an election this year and did not want to do anything to displease the customers, had to adopt a more stringent monetary policy. It did not want to announce a credit squeeze, a direct rationing of credit by the banks, because the administration of such a credit squeeze, as honourable members know, causes the Government of the day to be unpopular. So what did it do? It relied on the old out-of-date weapon of increasing the interest rate. Whom does that affect? It affects this State and our Revenue Budget to the extent that we borrow more new Loan money, and the amount of borrowings provided this year at the higher rates will have an adverse effect on our Revenue Budget from this year onwards. The adverse effect accumulates over a period of years as the higher interest rate persists. Then, if the interest rate is pushed up from 5½ per cent to 6 per cent, there is an adverse effect not only in the first year but also in each subsequent year, as borrowings previously made at 4 per cent, 4½ per cent, 5 per cent or 5½ per cent have to be reborrowed at 6 per cent, and the effect becomes cumulative. This is a most serious matter.

Here, we are faced with the Commonwealth Government, because it is an election year and because it is scared about its election prospects, taking an action to try to institute some control over the economy, which has an adverse effect on the financial position of every State—and this done in circumstances where, as everyone knows, if it wins the election (and heaven help us if it does!) a little "horror" Budget will be introduced immediately afterwards.

Mr. McAnaney: That is only slander.

Mr. HUDSON: It is not slander. If the member for Stirling was not in the Chamber, I would ask him to put his money where his mouth is; but that would be contrary to Standing Orders, so I will not ask him to do that. However, if he considers the position carefully, he will appreciate that the Commonwealth Government has adopted a completely dishonest approach in its financial dealings.

Mr. McAnaney: Stick to facts!

Mr. HUDSON: I am sticking to facts. No instruction has been issued by the Reserve Bank to any trading bank to ration credit. There has been no attempt by the Commonwealth Government in its Budget to provide an antidote to the inflationary tendencies that are developing in the economy and are well-known to every economist. The only thing of any consequence that has been done is to increase interest rates, which has a direct adverse effect on this State's position, on these Loan Estimates, and on our future budgetary position.

Mr. Nankivell: What about the 1 per cent increase in statutory reserve deposits?

Mr. HUDSON: That is a minor matter. All this does at this level is merely to soak up a little of the surplus liquidity that exists in the banking system. Perhaps members opposite do not know that, in order to get any substantial contractional effect by bank credit, the Reserve Bank has to get the message across directly rather than deal indirectly via interest rates and S.R.D., which is in fact the position. Unless a rise in S.R.D. carries with it an expectation amongst the trading banks that there will be a further tightening up in the credit position, it will have little impact at all and, until the Commonwealth Government comes out with a policy that directly affects people's expectations in these matters, the monetary decisions already taken are virtually useless, except adversely to affect our position. I hope that members opposite instead of playing Party politics will come out and protest vigorously about what the Commonwealth Government has done about this. We all know that the previous member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) is not with us, but surely his spirit is. We do not have to be advocates of social credit in order to object to the kind of action that the Commonwealth Government has taken on this occasion, simply because it is frightened it may lose an election; so the future prospects of development in this State and every other State must suffer as a consequence.

I want to raise the matter of expenditure on hospitals. It is not possible to make a complete

judgment on this, because not enough detail is provided in the Treasurer's statement; but, so far as one can judge, at the end of this financial year the money remaining to be spent on various hospital projects (I have included only the major ones) is as follows: on the Royal Adelaide Hospital project, \$2,287,000; on the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, \$5,302,000; on the Strathmont Hospital, \$2,835,000; and on the Modbury Hospital, \$9,200,000 (to complete stage 1); on the Port Augusta Hospital, \$3,200,000; and on the Port Pirie Hospital, \$2,265,000. This makes a total of \$25,489,000 remaining to be spent on various hospital projects, and that is certainly an underestimate. At the current rate of spending on hospital projects, it seems to me that the hospitals vote would have to be fully concerned with current and existing projects for the next three financial years after this one before any further money would be available for any major project.

I raise this matter because it is now of vital importance to the south-western districts hospital. We hope that the Commonwealth Government and the Universities Commission will be approving this particular hospital as a teaching hospital to be associated with the establishment of a second medical school at Flinders University. Undoubtedly, however, that approval will carry with it a heavy expenditure commitment from this Government in order to provide the facilities for a full teaching hospital associated with that university. It will be a much more expensive project than the Modbury Hospital project will be because, to have a teaching hospital, we must establish it, probably, at the 500-bed level from the time students start being taught there. I have heard it said that it is hoped that the first graduates will come from this second medical school in nine years' or 10 years' time. I raise this matter now because I cannot see how a fully-fledged teaching hospital at Flinders University could be completed within the next six years to enable new medical students to graduate from a second medical school in nine years' to 10 years' time, unless we have a complete change in the financial provision for hospital building.

This again, I consider, will require a complete change in the Commonwealth Government's attitude to State works projects. After all, the Royal Adelaide Hospital rebuilding programme has been on the Loan Estimates for about seven years or eight years, and the total cost of that is \$26,200,000. The total cost of a teaching hospital of the size necessary to justify a medical school at Flinders

University will also be about that sum but, if the building of such a hospital is spread over eight years or nine years, we will not have new medical graduates from the second medical school at Flinders University for another 12 years, 13 years or 14 years, and our present projected time table will not be valid: we will not be able to adhere to it.

Mr. McAnaney: The work at the Royal Adelaide Hospital was slowed down because old buildings had to be knocked down.

Mr. HUDSON: To a large extent, the time taken with the Royal Adelaide Hospital rebuilding project has been long not only because of the physical difficulties of rebuilding at an established hospital but partly because of the financial limitations imposed by the Loan Estimates on the availability of money for rebuilding. If the same kind of limitation exists regarding Flinders University and a new teaching hospital, we will not get new medical graduates from Flinders University before 1981 or 1982, instead of in 1978, as we had hoped.

Mr. McAnaney: We have a Government that has reserves.

Mr. HUDSON: The honourable member will have to have another talk with the Treasurer, because the Treasurer thinks that the reserves are necessary to cover revenue deficits. Unless he can persuade the Treasurer to run an overall deficit, the Treasurer will not have any reserves, because he will say that every cent in reserve is necessary to have.

Mr. McAnaney: You ought to be consistent in your argument.

Mr. HUDSON: I am not using my argument. I do not agree with the Treasurer.

Mr. McAnaney: Do you agree with the Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. I have referred to what the Treasurer says, and the Treasurer, not me, is the person the member for Stirling has to convince, because the Treasurer controls the purse strings.

Mr. Rodda: You are doing some electioneering.

Mr. HUDSON: I am not electioneering. If the member for Victoria is not interested in the financial problems associated with building the south-western districts hospital as a teaching hospital so that a second medical school can be established at Flinders University, that is all right. He need not be interested. However, I assure him that the matter is vital to the future of this State and to the future availability of graduates.

Mr. Rodda: We told you that three years ago.

Mr. HUDSON: I said this eight years ago: the member for Victoria is, as usual, about three years or four years late in hearing the good news. This has been the position since quotas were first established in the medical school at Adelaide University. I make the point that, if there is not some overall change in the Commonwealth Government's attitude so that the State can find itself able substantially to increase its provision for hospitals, the building programme for the south-western districts hospital will be delayed seriously, because existing projects in the Loan Estimates will fully use up, after this financial year, the normal hospital allocation for another three financial years.

If in the next financial year we hope to start work on the hospital, we will be able to do that only by delaying some existing projects and spreading their completion over a period longer than three years. That would enable us to get some initial expenditure on the south-western districts hospital in 1970-71, but the fact that other projects would have to be delayed would react on the financial provision made at the critical stage of the south-western districts hospital. That point is completely valid and, unless the Commonwealth Government changes its attitude, we will be faced with considerable delay in building the hospital.

We need more medical graduates now. We have had a quota on medical students at Adelaide University for six years. That quota is restricting and will continue to restrict the type of graduate from our medical school until the first graduates come from Flinders, and that will be, on present indications, in another nine years or 10 years. We do not want that time postponed further to 13 years, 14 years, or 15 years by a financial limitation imposed by the present Commonwealth-State financial relations. I hope members opposite know that, although their Government built fewer houses last year than had been built in the previous year, there has not been a substantial increase in the provision for the Housing Trust or in the capital development programme of the trust. The Treasurer, dealing with the Housing Trust, said:

During 1968-69 the trust completed 1,898 housing units, compared with 2,375 in 1967-68. So, in the first year of the Hall Government, there has been a reduction of 500 in the number of housing units completed by the trust. Members on this side complained

bitterly last year about the reduced amount of Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement money, namely, \$19,500,000 compared with \$21,000,000. We are extremely disappointed that the total capital programme for the trust for this financial year amounts to \$24,320,000 compared with a programme for last year of \$24,250,000. Even though the consequence of that programme in the last financial year was a \$5,000,000 reduction in the trust's building rate, the Government has not seen fit to make the necessary finance available so that the trust can expand its building programme this year. In circumstances where there is a substantial delay in obtaining rental accommodation in my district, I take a dim view of the Government's action. The opportunity is clearly there for a substantial improvement to be made in the rate at which the trust provides rental accommodation, but it has not been allowed to do that by the Government, a fact that I deplore.

I also deplore the substantial reduction in the capital programme of the Electricity Trust. This year the trust's total programme is \$23,720,000: last year it was \$28,620,000, and in the last year of the Labor Government it was higher still. To some extent it may be claimed that this reduction of about \$5,000,000 is due to the fact that the Torrens Island power station is no longer making the same heavy demands on finance, but that is not the complete reason. The total Torrens Island power station programme covers a reduction of \$2,400,000, but there are further reductions in the trust's programme, the main one being \$2,800,000 to provide distribution lines.

Mr. Corcoran: It is important to the people in the country.

Mr. HUDSON: Quite. The Government boasts of what it is doing to promote development, but it has reduced by \$5,000,000 the overall programme of the Electricity Trust. Admittedly, the Government has made the same provision of Loan money (\$6,000,000) as was provided last year, and it is allowing the trust \$10,000,000 of semi-government borrowings, the same sum as was borrowed last year. The reduction in the trust's programme is caused, in the main, by the \$5,000,000 reduction in the funds available from the internal sources of the trust. Does that situation reflect a decreased profitability of the trust likely in the current 12 months, or what is the reason for it?

Has the trust applied, or is it applying, to the Minister of Works to increase its tariff to try to offset this situation? Will the Minister of Works say whether the trust has made such

an application and whether it is being considered or whether it has been refused by the Government? The superficial appearance from the Government accounts is that a \$5,000,000 reduction in the sum available from the internal sources of the trust suggests that there has been a substantial change during the last 12 months in the profitability of the trust's operations. Will the Minister deny that we will not be faced with an increase in tariffs? Apparently not.

Mr. Corcoran: I think what you have said is correct.

Mr. HUDSON: I think there is some substance to it. I believe the Estimates are subject to the most serious weaknesses in relation to housing, Electricity Trust developments, and the provision of school buildings. I think the stand taken by the Treasurer is scandalous; to allow the Commonwealth to provide more money for teachers colleges so that he can reduce the allocation for school buildings is most unsatisfactory and subject to the most serious condemnation, and the provision for hospitals causes serious doubts about the future of the south-western districts hospital.

On all counts I say that the Treasurer has adopted the wrong attitude in his overall approach. It is improper for him to reserve a further \$4,000,000 to create a still larger surplus on Loan Account at the end of June, 1970, and, for those reasons, I believe that the Treasurer and the Government deserve the strongest possible condemnation.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): In speaking about the Electricity Trust the member for Glenelg, who has just resumed his seat, said something about funds from internal sources being available to meet extensions this year, and suggested that the reserves were not available because of the condition of the trust's profitability. In 1967-68 the trust's profit was about \$500,000, and about the same annual profit has been made in the past. At the end of 1968 the trust had \$9,620,000 in cash, and these are the internal resources that can be used: they cannot be used repeatedly. Funds are available from depreciation that the trust writes off each year in order to have cash available. Because of this build-up of cash resources the trust was able to use its internal resources, but this situation cannot continue indefinitely.

The stage has almost been reached where country extensions will be limited. Almost every area has electricity available to it, and new extensions do not require so much money being diverted to them. Some areas have had a drop in voltage because of the increased use

of electricity. In the southern districts electricity will be cut off on about six Sundays during the next six months, because the voltage is to be doubled in the line. This type of work will have to be done, but calls on the trust for work to be done will not be so great in the future as they have been in the past.

The member for Glenelg said that the Commonwealth Budget was inflationary, but when the figures are examined this statement can be seen to be incorrect. Last year the Commonwealth budgeted for a deficit of nearly \$600,000,000 but the actual deficit was \$300,000,000. The Commonwealth Government raised Loan moneys, and net proceeds from oversea borrowing and funds raised in South Australia enabled it to reduce the amount of Treasury notes on issue by \$68,000,000, and its borrowings from the Reserve Bank were reduced by \$127,000,000. When this is done it withdraws financial resources out of the banking system. This year it is budgeting for a deficit of \$30,000,000 and it will borrow Loan money, too. The issue of Treasury bonds will be considerably reduced and possibly eradicated. Borrowings from the Reserve Bank will be considerably reduced, so less credit will be available for the community as a whole. This will mean a general tightening-up by the banks.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Why didn't they say this sort of thing in the Loan Council?

Mr. McANANEY: I am simply correcting what the member for Glenelg said: he blamed the Commonwealth Government on these lines. Much has been said about the supposedly reduced amount we are spending on school buildings. In 1963-64 the then Liberal Government spent \$9,800,000 of Loan money on education and in 1964-65 it spent \$11,200,000. In 1965-66 the then Labor Government increased the amount to \$11,700,000; in 1966-67 it decreased the amount to \$10,700,000; and in 1967-68 it decreased it to \$8,700,000. The member for Glenelg claimed today that, somehow or other, he and the previous Minister of Education (Hon. R. R. Loveday) had proved that this was not so. The honourable member is always very good at making statements, but it seems that he never refers to the Auditor-General's Report and gets down to the facts. There was a very big increase in spending on education after the present Government took office. Last year \$13,300,000 was spent on school buildings—an all-time record.

Mr. Clark: Who planned most of that?

Mr. McANANEY: This year \$13,800,000 will be spent, but possibly \$2,700,000 will be

received from the Commonwealth Government. Nevertheless, we will be spending \$11,100,000 out of our own resources. The honourable member who has interjected has been a member of the Public Works Committee for some time, but I point out that new buildings will be erected to replace the Grange Primary School and the Murray Bridge High School. We are now replacing existing schools rather than building schools in new areas. In the prosperous period to 1965 we could hardly keep up with the demand for new schools imposed by the rapid population growth of nearly 3 per cent per annum.

Mr. Clark: Normally, before the Loan Estimates are considered the Public Works Committee has about a dozen school building projects referred to it.

Mr. McANANEY: It will be very busy in the future, then.

Mr. Clark: No, it will not.

Mr. McANANEY: During the three years of the Labor Government, when the rate of population increase fell, the pressure for new schools was not so great, so new schools were planned to replace old ones. It has been suggested that a new primary school will be built at Victor Harbour. There is now confidence that South Australia will return to a rate of population growth of about 3 per cent per annum. Even the birth rate has increased, but the Government cannot claim any credit for that. This Government, being honest, does not take credit for this natural happening. More migrants are arriving and fewer people are leaving the State. The member for Glenelg said that the Playford Government, in its last year of office, spent its money extravagantly, but other Government members and I have successfully proved that his statement is incorrect.

In its last year of office the Playford Government imposed taxes some of which did not take effect until the month when the Labor Government took office. That Government had the benefit of the revenue from these taxes for a full year, yet that year was the year in which it got into great trouble. The Keynesian theory is that in a time of full employment a Government should restrict expenditure and build up reserves for the future; it should not undertake too many public works projects, because they increase the demand for goods and thereby push up prices. It is in these circumstances that we have inflation. This is the guiding principle for controlling the State's economy. Unlike

the Commonwealth Government, the State Government cannot use the Reserve Bank. Consequently, it is only by this method that we can keep South Australia on an even keel, and no-one did it more successfully than Sir Thomas Playford. I believe that the present Treasurer has carried out the same sound financial policies that Sir Thomas Playford carried out. At the beginning of the last financial year I was critical of him, because I thought he was doing the wrong thing by perhaps not making more use of Loan funds to cure the unemployment situation more quickly. Now, however, after 12 months this State is gradually returning to full employment. The present unemployment figure is 1.19 per cent; so there has been an improvement of .7 per cent in the last 12 months. If the unemployment figure is reduced by only another .2 per cent we will have a situation of full employment. In these circumstances we must be careful not to create a demand for goods that will get us into trouble. Therefore, it can be seen that the Treasurer has carried out a very wise policy.

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

Mr. McANANEY: The member for Glenelg said that our expenditure on various items this year was lagging, but history has shown us that, despite the Opposition's willingness to do many things, it always breaks down and never achieves as much as a Liberal Government achieves. The Australian Labor Party tries to make handouts in order to improve the conditions under which most citizens live but always, when it is in Government, it runs out of money, because it does not concentrate on development.

Mr. McKee: What about you? How did you get into Government? Answer that!

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. McANANEY: Last night, I was reading the speech that I made to this debate last year (I saw that the member for Port Pirie interjected then, too) and I said then that we would cure unemployment. The honourable member said, "How do you cure unemployment?", but now we know. It is cured with a Liberal Government. We concentrate on development and increased production, and this enables more goods to be sold and the sharing of increased returns. The position was never more apparent than when the Labor Government took office in 1965. About 40,000 people had gone into employment in the previous three years, industry had been booming, more money

had been coming in, and there had been higher duties on increased turnover, etc., and everything was good, indeed.

Mr. Burdon: Tell us what you did.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Mount Gambier is out of order.

Mr. McANANEY: I am not listening to the rabble. Despite the booming conditions to which I have referred, industry stagnated during the ensuing three years, and the returns from stamp duties and various other revenue-producing activities did not increase at the normal rate. Little money was being circulated in that period, and the Labor Government spent more money than it received from various sources, including the Commonwealth Government. Labor members always shy away from the Auditor-General's Report and produce figures they have obtained elsewhere; but if they went to this report, which is an accurate one, they would become aware of their comparatively low rate of expenditure, particularly on school buildings.

They are claiming now that we have no interest in this aspect, but we are doing our best to see that more money goes into school buildings, and we will build more schools than would have been built under a Labor Government, when the economy was not going as well as it should have been (when industry was lagging, unemployment mounting and money disappearing, with the result that fewer hospitals and schools could be established). The Treasurer has now restored confidence in this State, and there will be further development and increased revenue.

The Opposition claims that we are salting money away, that it will be wasted, and that fewer schools and hospitals will be built, but that money is there and earning interest at the moment. I have much admiration for the Treasurer's ability. Although a farmer, he is a hard-headed business man, and he will see that this money is earning interest. We have been told the money is there in case we run into a deficit. Although it is suggested that no money was provided on the Estimates for a teaching hospital, the money will be there and, if we are ready to go ahead with this or any other project, that money may be spent. There has been a miraculous recovery in our finances during the 15 months in question.

As I said earlier, 12 months ago I was most critical of what the Treasurer was doing, but now he has proved himself. He has the facts and figures to show the progress made. The member for Glenelg said the Commonwealth

Government had introduced an electioneering Budget, but what is the true score? The Commonwealth Opposition has claimed that it is wrong to bring foreign capital into Australia to develop mining and industry. However, revenue is being produced in both respects. The Commonwealth Budget shows that 47½ per cent of the profits of various companies benefit this country, and this is swelling the Commonwealth coffers at present and enabling that Government to hand out more money for social services and education.

Members opposite have said that the Commonwealth Government has provided only for independent schools but it can be seen that big increases are being made in education grants generally. Although the Commonwealth Government has not been involved in education for long, it has provided a 38 per cent increase in this respect, and this is made possible by the increased revenue available to the Commonwealth Government. The Commonwealth Government has increased its earnings from \$6,174,000,000 to \$6,954,000,000 without increasing taxation. This has been possible because the Commonwealth Government has encouraged development, which means that more money is rolling into its coffers. The economy is booming with the result that more grants are available for education and more money is able to be channelled to all sections of the community. To suggest the Commonwealth Government is stinting on education is ridiculous. Over \$265,000,000 will be appropriated in the Budget for education this year or 38 per cent more than last year's expenditure. Of course, there can never be enough money for education, but we are making progress.

By his fighting speech and his general approach at the last Premiers' Conference the Premier has shown how he will put this State's case for a share in the great wealth coming to Australia at present. Naturally, we all want our children to have the best possible education. I have six children all of whom received a better education than I received. The Opposition accuses us of being farmers, but there are more examples of a good education and of greater experience in administration on this side than there are on the other side. The Opposition demonstrated in its three years in Government that it was completely lacking in that respect. I believe that the Commonwealth Government is giving to the States a reasonable share of tax reimbursements in relation to the gross national product. I do not think the States will get anywhere in their

argument about tax reimbursements unless the Premiers agree. Despite what the member for Glenelg said about other States receiving more than we received, South Australia received a much larger share per capita than two of the larger States.

The member for Glenelg referred to the wonderful standard of education in New South Wales. However, when the Commonwealth Government was recently considering assisting that State with education, it was found that \$10,000,000 was needed to be spent to bring education in that State up to the standard of education in the other States. It is not right to compare a big city like Grafton with a small place like Strathalbyn, where there are barely enough students to qualify for a Matriculation class. There should be more Matriculation classes and more progress in that direction. The pupil-teacher ratio is dropping, and that is progress. It is certainly not good, but it is better than it was previously.

The Commonwealth Government is putting it over the States. These figures that I am about to quote come from the *Australian*, and they are slightly different from similar figures given elsewhere. Of a total income of \$6,954,000,000, \$6,237,000,000 comes from taxation, and other receipts amount to \$717,000,000; \$280,000,000 comes from interest, rents and dividends, which are collected mainly from the States. That is how the revenue comes about this year. Expenditure is \$6,983,000,000, but this is not all spent on normal budgeting. There is a surplus of about \$1,325,000,000 of which the Commonwealth lends \$758,000,000 to the States, on which it charges them interest. It also spends \$567,000,000 on Commonwealth public works or on loans to instrumentalities, such as the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Authority upon which it receives interest. This \$1,325,000,000 surplus is really a capital saving of the Commonwealth above its normal day-to-day expenditure, and most of it has been lent at interest to the States or statutory bodies.

Where the Commonwealth Government collects money in taxation, it should make interest-free and non-repayable grants for building schools and hospitals, because it is the taxpayers who have provided this money; that is some way in which the present difficult position can be overcome. If the Commonwealth Government hands out money indiscriminately as taxation reimbursements and there are irresponsible State Governments (as there have been) which "blow" the money, we do not get the school buildings and other essential capital

works. That is the approach that should be made to the Commonwealth Government: that it should not charge us interest on the money it gets from the Reserve Bank or obtains from the taxpayers. I am critical of the Commonwealth Government, and suggest that that is the approach that should be made: that this money should be returned in grants for building schools and hospitals. Nobody more than the members on this side of the Chamber believes that we do need schools.

This State has a bright future. Industry is buoyant, confidence is being restored, employment is high, and skilled tradesmen in most categories are in short supply. We have only to look at the *Advertiser* on a Saturday to see pages and pages of vacancies for skilled tradesmen, which we so desperately need to be filled. The Labor Party, when things got a little slack in the State, tried to reduce the number of migrants coming to South Australia. Our policy, with our dynamic young leader (although we have some unemployment, which we have inherited), is to get more migrants. We need them, and they will need houses, so the building industry will get going again. Our population growth, which dropped to 1 per cent, is nearly back to 2 per cent. In March, 1969, there was an increase of 4,500, whereas the increase for March, 1968, was only 3,200. The population has increased rapidly in every quarter of the last year. More houses will be built as people need them. The Leader of the Opposition and the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) have concentrated on houses built by the Housing Trust, but have overlooked that activities of private builders are increasing. More houses are being built and the more we can encourage building societies, which are booming in other States, and the State Bank to lend money, the more houses we will build.

The trust's building rate dropped because in the three years of Labor Government 700 houses were empty. Why should the trust have built additional houses when houses already built were empty? However, the building industry will progress now and things will be good again. The Loan Estimates provide for an expenditure of \$10,000,000 (about 16 per cent of the total) on housing and there will be an amount in reserve to meet any emergency. There will be growth in every aspect of development and encouragement by the State during the coming year. Once again, I commend the Treasurer for the sound way he has dealt with the finances over the past 12 months. We certainly have a good future for the next 12 months.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): Traditionally, it is customary for members who speak in this debate to deal with the Loan Estimates in general and then to refer to matters that concern their districts. I listened carefully to the Treasurer as he explained these Estimates. I agree entirely with the statement by the Leader of the Opposition that the \$12,000,000 of Loan money salted away could have been used for public works. It is all very well to ask Dorothy Dix questions about the employment position: the overall benefits to the State of the expenditure of that money are important, apart from the employment that it would have provided.

Mr. McKee: How can we ask the Commonwealth Government for money when we have money in hand?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. How can the Government continue to make those representations if it will not spend almost all the money available on public works? The Government's policy merely gives the Prime Minister a let-out regarding future representations. I agree entirely with the Leader that the Government has deliberately refrained from carrying out urgent and important public works. This has been done to enable the Government to save much money. It has been said that this money is to be used to a large extent to offset the Revenue Account. When in Opposition, the Treasurer criticized the former Treasurer for raiding trust funds, and the general public was led to believe, at that time, that this was not an acceptable way for Loan moneys to be used. Yet we find the present Government, for two successive years, copying the book-keeping methods of the former Treasurer. It seems that the Treasurer, whilst in Opposition, must have been talking tongue in cheek, otherwise he could never justify introducing Loan Estimates in the way they have been presented during the last two years. I refer now to the Treasurer's opening remarks in his statement.

The CHAIRMAN: There is too much audible conversation, and the Chair is unable to hear the honourable member for Wallaroo.

Mr. HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Treasurer, when explaining the Loan Estimates, said:

Twelve months ago I gave members a brief review of the state of both Loan and Revenue Accounts and pointed out that the Government's first consideration had been to see that the balance of Loan funds unspent at June 30, 1968, should be reserved to the greatest practicable extent towards covering Revenue deficits outstanding at that time—

that was the first time that the Treasurer had said he was satisfied with the former Treasurer's method of handling the State's finances— and to contain to the lowest practicable limit any further net loss of cash during 1968-69 on the two accounts taken together. The proposal then was to reserve in full the Loan balance of \$5,658,000—

that was the sum in the initial stages when the present Treasurer was prepared to copy the bookkeeping of the former Treasurer, even though he not only criticized the former Treasurer and his way of bookkeeping but also travelled to the districts of many members and made similar comments—

towards offsetting cumulative Revenue deficits of \$8,365,000, and, after allocating \$19,500,000 of new funds for housing, to carry out a general Loan programme aggregating \$91,640,000. The financing of the latter programme was expected to use all but \$400,000 of funds becoming available during the course of the year. The addition of the \$400,000 reserved to the known balance of \$5,658,000 available at June 30, 1968, would have given a balance on Loan Account at June 30, 1969, of a little over \$6,000,000.

At this time last year he indicated what he intended would be the presentation of the second Loan Estimates: he was so satisfied with the former Treasurer's method of handling the State's finances that he was prepared to go further in copying those methods. The Treasurer's explanation continues:

The allocation for housing was made as planned and the overall transactions financed from these special housing funds were close to estimate. However, there were some variations from estimate both in the extent of recoveries and in the general works programme and, instead of a small build-up of \$400,000 in balances as proposed, there was an actual surplus of \$6,819,000 during the year, so that the balance of funds held on Loan Account had increased to \$12,477,000 by June 30, 1969.

So, the Leader of the Opposition had every justification for taking the stand that he took last Thursday, and it received publicity in the local press on the following day. The Treasurer has confessed that there is nothing wrong with this method of bookkeeping and he has told members that he believes in the former Treasurer's method of bookkeeping to such an extent that he will ensure that, if there is any revenue deficit in the current year, he will have a substantial amount whereby he can balance his Budget. This method may be all right to a certain extent but, when I think of the schools, hospitals, and other public works that should have been completed, I maintain that it is wrong for the Government to salt away as

much as \$12,000,000 simply to ensure that it will have ample money to cover the deficiencies that arise from its bad administration.

This is my answer to the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney), who made a very poor attempt to justify what the Treasurer has done. During his speech he was egged along by his own colleagues and no doubt his purpose was to attempt to justify what the Treasurer had placed before members, but it was a poor attempt. It only added to what I have already said about the Treasurer: it only heaped coals of fire on his head. The member for Stirling amply illustrated that the Treasurer was salting away this money because of the inefficient way the present Government is handling the State's finances. It is wrong for someone to shout from the housetops that a method of bookkeeping is wrong and then to follow it for two consecutive years.

Mr. McKee: Why was he saving \$12,000,000? For a rainy day?

Mr. HUGHES: He gave the impression that he had to cover up the inefficient handling of this State's finances. The Treasurer (at page 772 of *Hansard*) said:

As I have indicated, the Government considers it prudent at this stage to hold in reserve practically the whole of the Loan funds accumulated to the end of June, 1969. It is quite clear that of the balance of \$12,477,000 so held we must continue to hold \$7,905,000 as an offset to the revenue deficits, which had been actually incurred and were outstanding at June 30, 1969.

That was a clear admission that the Government was not able under its own methods of bookkeeping to balance the Budget and that it was necessary for the Treasurer to salt away a considerable sum to try to protect the revenue deficits he was expecting. The Treasurer tried somewhat to cover up the charges that were made.

Mr. McKee: Don't tell me they have something to hide!

Mr. HUGHES: The Government certainly has something to hide; otherwise I do not think we would have seen a press statement from the Treasurer so soon after the statement made in the Chamber by the Leader on Thursday last. The statement could have been made only in an endeavour to cover up what had been said by the Leader in the debate. If it were not, the Treasurer could have waited until today and made a Ministerial statement.

Mr. McKee: Do you think the member for Stirling has been advising him?

Mr. HUGHES: Maybe he has, but, if the Treasurer is going to be advised by the member for Stirling, he is certainly headed for much trouble. However, knowing the Treasurer as I do, I do not think he would need to rely on any help from the member for Stirling. The following report appeared in the *News* on August 15, which was the day after the Leader made his claims in this Chamber:

Claim on Loan Fund "Untrue": The Treasurer, Mr. Pearson, said today the claim by the Opposition Leader, Mr. Dunstan, that \$12,000,000 in Loan money was salted away in the Treasury was not true. Mr. Dunstan made the charge in Parliament yesterday and repeated it today. Mr. Dunstan said \$12,400,000 was salted away in the Treasury as "a little nest-egg against future deficits on Revenue Account".

The money could be spent on urgently needed school, tertiary education and hospital buildings. Mr. Dunstan said the Loan Estimates presented by Mr. Pearson made nonsense of the principles on which he claimed to criticize the Labor Government. "For the Treasury to refuse to use money available to the limit and to underspend to the extent of \$12,000,000 is disgraceful," he said. Mr. Pearson said in a special statement that \$7,900,000 of the \$12,000,000 was already spent to cover revenue deficits built up by the Labor Government and bequeathed to him.

The Treasurer knows that that is not true. He should have been able to administer the finances of the State in such a way that, if there was a deficit, it was not necessary for Loan moneys to be used for this purpose. He should have been able to work out his Estimates whereby, when the Budget was presented, he could have provided a certain sum in order to meet a deficit. I am not saying that the Treasurer is wrong in doing what he has done. It is quite in order. However, it is wrong for such a large sum to be salted away. It may be all right to salt a certain sum away but it is not all right to extend the sum to \$12,000,000.

Mr. Rodda: It isn't salted away.

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member should have another look at the Treasurer's explanation of the Loan Estimates, and then he would certainly find that the money had been salted away. The Treasurer is making sure it is salted away so that he will be able to cover the deficits with which he knows he will be faced later. It is not good business to salt away this money when urgent public works need attention.

Mr. Broomhill: Particularly schools.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, the Government has greatly neglected its responsibility to the children of the State.

Mr. Lawn: Do you think the Treasurer is getting any interest on this money?

Mr. HUGHES: No, especially when one considers the interest he is paying out.

Mr. Lawn: He's paying the Commonwealth interest on the money he has salted away.

Mr. HUGHES: He is, and, had it been used for what it was intended to be used, it could be returning a handsome profit. The report continues:

This was actually a reduction from the accumulated deficit of \$8,300,000 and resulted from careful control of spending and unpopular taxes—

we agree with that, but we do not agree with this—

which Mr. Dunstan had exploited for political purposes. In addition, \$550,000 of "the so-called salted funds" would be used for this year's programme. The \$4,000,000 balance must be held against likely Budget shortages arising from rapid expansion costs, to meet increased wage awards and special emergencies.

Therefore, the Treasurer admits in this press statement that he is salting away moneys which, because of the inefficient handling of finances by the Government, he knows he will have to call upon to meet deficits. Rather than have the people of the State see that his Government cannot balance the Budget, he is prepared to deprive the State of urgent public works, particularly in regard to schools.

Mr. McKee: It is the capitalist policy to keep children ignorant.

Mr. HUGHES: I think it was a sorry day for this Government when the member for Light was asked to ask a Dorothy Dixier.

Mr. Freebairn: I haven't spoken yet.

Mr. HUGHES: I know; I am waiting to hear the honourable member's speech. I am referring to a question asked by the honourable member of the Minister of Education on June 17. The Government must have regretted this ever since it asked the honourable member to ask the question, because it has rebounded upon the Government. I know very well the Minister wishes she had not looked over her shoulder and asked the member for Light to ask this question, because the reply set in action school teachers throughout the State in respect of deficiencies in education. For a long time teachers have been concerned about the position of education in the State. When the Minister claimed that there was no crisis in education, the people in the best position to know about this let the Government know that there was a crisis.

Mr. Broomhill: The Government knows it now.

Mr. HUGHES: It certainly does. It is a question the Minister of Education wished she had not asked the member for Light to ask because, had she not made this statement in this Chamber, it would not have received the full publicity it did. If the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) likes to read one of the leaders in the *News*, he will find that it disagreed entirely with the Minister. The reports appearing in various newspapers disagreed entirely with the Minister that there was no crisis.

Mr. Clark: Didn't the Minister say something about calling for a report,

Mr. HUGHES: The Minister mentioned that, too, but I am not going fully into the real reason for the question being asked. It was meant to take a rise out of the Opposition but it backfired, with the result that I can safely say that 90 per cent to 95 per cent of the members of the teaching profession agree there is a crisis in education—and they would know that much better than any honourable member of this Chamber would. The Minister of Education was in a position to know, but she denied that a crisis existed. Her statement went out to the press and almost immediately letters were written to the newspapers contradicting it. Many school organizations and teachers are taking a definite stand on this matter.

I mentioned earlier that, if some of this money had been used in the direction in which it should have been used, there would have been no need for the letter I will now read to appear in the official journal of the South Australian Institute of Teachers. It is headed "Children sit on floor for lunch", and reads:

After reading the letter in the March 26 Journal expressing concern at the design of schools I am prompted to add further comment.

My particular facet for discussion is the lack of proper eating facilities at schools, in particular mine. This building is two years of age and has as a "lunch shed" a three-walled building with a cement floor. The dimensions of the shed are 70ft. x 30ft.

There are 416 children having their lunch at school at present, and the lunch shed has seating for about 100 of them—the rest sit on the floor. Those children who sit on the floor are constantly touching the places where other students walk and then they are handling food, and eating it. Quite an unhealthy state of affairs.

On contacting the local health inspector I was told that nothing could be done, and so an inspection was not to be undertaken. Dissatisfied, I contacted the School Health Services and I was given a sympathetic hearing, and promised an inspection as soon as possible.

I was informed by the chief medical officer that there are no standards set down for school eating areas, excepting that there must be adequate seating. I was fairly shocked to hear this statement.

Factory workers have canteens which must be of a certain standard, but the school children of this State could eat their lunch on a dirt floor, provided they had adequate seating.

I have had letters from parents complaining of the eating conditions, and I don't blame them one bit for protesting.

I would like the Minister of Education to come out and have her lunch with the children at this school, sitting on the floor of the lunch shed. Let us face facts. If we teachers had to eat under these conditions, then we would be up in arms immediately. Why should the children be subjected to these conditions? I submit that, in this phase of school building, the Government should immediately spend some of its 1968 surplus money which was not spent on education. If new schools are being built, then let them have proper eating facilities. I would be interested to hear of other cases.

The letter is signed by a teacher at the Smithfield Plains Primary School, and I entirely agree with him in his complaint. If some of the surplus money available last year had been spent, as it should have been, on matters similar to those mentioned, teachers would have no cause to complain. They are complaining not on their own account but because of their interest in the welfare of the children whom they oversee during school hours. I commend this teacher for having the courage to write this letter, which he knew would become public, because it shows me that he is certainly concerned about the welfare of the future leaders of the State.

That is only one complaint about one phase in which the Government could have spent some of its surplus money last year. I and, doubtless, other members, have received complaints from various schools where resolutions have been adopted because of the teachers' concern about the welfare of children. I have a letter signed by 23 teachers in my district. They did not send a photostat copy to every member: they wrote to me, as their representative.

Mr. McKee: They probably got tired of writing to the Minister.

Mr. HUGHES: No doubt the Minister has received many letters, but I doubt that she has this letter.

Mr. Ferguson: I have a letter, too.

Mr. HUGHES: Then I hope that the honourable member will have the courage of his convictions and read the letter to the Committee, if it comes from his district, and that he

will give earnest consideration to the request made, because he knows as well as I do that the Government did not spend, on education, the money that was available to it. The full amount of money available to this Government in the past has not been spent and it does not seem that the Government intends to spend it in future. This is of grave concern to the teachers who have the oversight of our future generation. The letter, addressed to me, dated yesterday, and from 14 Cameron Terrace, Kadina, states:

We, the undersigned, have written to the Premier and the Minister of Education stating that we consider that there is a crisis in education in South Australia and urging the Government to take immediate action to overcome this crisis. We, as members of your constituency, urge you to support our stand in every way possible.

I assure the 23 responsible people who had the courage to sign the letter that I will give my support to their stand.

Mr. Jennings: What about reading out the names?

Mr. HUGHES: I do not intend to do that. I am sure the teachers would not mind; otherwise, they would not have signed the letter. They must be admired for doing that because they understand the situation although the Government does not. When I am asked to do so by 23 responsible people from a school, surely the member for Victoria, who is trying to interject, does not object to my bringing this matter before this Chamber.

Mr. Rodda: Not at all.

Mr. HUGHES: Then why is the honourable member croaking. He is objecting, and if the Treasurer had not told him to be quiet he would still be croaking.

Mr. Rodda: They are quoting your slogan about a crisis in education.

Mr. HUGHES: They are not quoting my slogan, because I have not raised this matter previously. I am doing it this evening because I have been asked by my people to do it. A letter dated August 16 sent to me from the Moonta District High School and the Moonta Primary School states:

I would like to inform you that a meeting of members of the S.A. Institute of Teachers of the above schools, held on Monday, August 11, 1969, passed the following resolutions:

1. That this meeting find the reply of the Minister of Education of June 27, 1969, unacceptable and that we call on the Government to take the following steps as a matter of urgency:

(1) Allot a greater share of its Budget to education,

- (2) Give serious consideration to the appointment of ancillary staff to relieve teachers of non-professional duties, which we consider to be one of the main reasons for dissatisfaction among teachers,
 - (3) Consult more closely with the elected representatives of practising teachers, before making decisions affecting teachers, pupils and schools,
 - (4) Work for a greater allocation for educational needs from Commonwealth aid by not attempting to gloss over serious inadequacies.
2. That the Premier consider the appointment of a Minister of Education more aware of and sympathetic towards the needs of education in South Australia.

That is signed by the S.A. Institute of Teachers representative at the Moonta High School.

Mr. Rodda: Don't they have a slogan?

Mr. HUGHES: It is all very well for the member for Victoria to keep harping like a parrot about a slogan. It is not a slogan of mine.

Mr. Rodda: It is your Party's.

Mr. HUGHES: That is where the honourable member is wrong. By his interjections he is reflecting on the teaching profession of this State.

Mr. Rodda: You are playing politics now.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not. I would never have had any cause to make that statement tonight if the honourable member had not referred to slogans. He is making accusations against the teaching profession, which is a responsible body. The teachers have signed letters, yet the honourable member casts a reflection upon them. I take exception to the honourable member's accusations, and I will certainly make them known to these teachers. These people approached me in a democratic manner, and I assure the honourable member that they will not take kindly to his interjections.

I have received letters from people outside my district and I have replied to them courteously, but I will not read them here. I could quote other letters, but I will not do so: Government members are capable of doing it—if they have the courage. Although I have said that I will not quote from letters received from people outside my own district, I will not refrain from quoting from some public statements that have been made. The member for Victoria tried to ridicule teachers in my area: let him continue with his ridicule of teachers at the 80 schools who made the

following public statement headed "80 Schools Protest on Education" in the *News* of August 14:

Teachers in about 80 South Australian schools had now circulated motions critical of the State education system, a spokesman for the S.A. Institute of Teachers said today. The motions, passed by school staffs at meetings last week, are being forwarded to the Premier (Mr. Hall), the Education Minister (Mrs. Steele) and State and Federal Parliamentarians.

The meetings followed a reply by Mrs. Steele to teachers' demands for immediate improvements in 12 areas of S.A. education. The teachers passed motions on a variety of educational subjects.

The meeting at Henley High School passed a vote of no confidence in Mrs. Steele and her advisers, and in particular recorded dissatisfaction with her reply to the institute's requests. The meeting declared its belief that the amount of money allocated to State education in South Australian public schools and teacher education by the Government was insufficient and steps should be taken to obtain an immediate and substantial increase.

A third motion passed by Henley High School staff considered the shortening of the seven-week holiday in the 1969-70 Christmas vacation completely unacceptable and said South Australian schools should return on February 10, 1970, as usual. Elizabeth Vale Primary School staff voted to express dissatisfaction with the "terse dismissal" by Mrs. Steele of the institute's request for immediate improvement in 12 areas of education.

Teachers at Linden Park Demonstration School criticized the "irresponsible" attitude of the State Government with regard to education and called on the Federal Government to show its integrity by allocating funds to cover the critical situation.

The meeting requested Mr. Hall to establish realistic and responsible priorities and the Opposition Leader, Mr. Dunstan, to emphasize the Government's lack of responsibility and to consider the pressing needs of education in his Party's policy. The staff at Daws Road High School called on Mrs. Steele to accept the fact that there was a crisis in education.

Mrs. Steele later said she was not prepared to comment at this stage. She said she preferred to wait until she had been able to study the text of the various motions. After that she would comment.

I have taken the liberty to read the whole of the report concerning the protests of the 80 schools, and members will notice that I referred to the request made to the Leader of the Opposition as well. Not wishing to be accused of taking something out of context, I have been especially careful to read the whole of the report. This goes to show that it is not members of the Opposition who are playing politics in this matter.

Mr. Rodda: Not much!

Mr. HUGHES: I would not have expected that remark from the member for Victoria.

It seems now that he is reflecting on the teaching profession as a whole. The honourable member previously tried to ridicule the teachers whose names appeared on the two letters to which I referred. Surely, 80 schools constitute a sufficient number of schools in this State to indicate the attitude of schoolteachers to the Government.

Mr. Rodda: You couldn't even wash the windows when you were in Government.

Mr. HUGHES: No, but this Government has not rectified the position. If there was any mistake on our part, it should have been the Government's responsibility to rectify it.

Mr. Rodda: Isn't this playing politics?

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member is playing politics. I am not here to play politics tonight. I have placed before members the facts as the teaching profession sees them, and I am justified in doing this without being accused of—

Mr. Rodda: I think you should have acted responsibly.

Mr. HUGHES: Why does not the honourable member's Government act responsibly? The honourable member is admitting that it is not a responsible Government and, if that is so, the Government should resign. It should accept the wishes of the people and resign, and let the Labor Government return to make a valiant attempt to rectify any mistakes, for I am not saying the Labor Government made no mistakes. However, if the member for Victoria knew that a mistake had been made he should have used every ounce of his ability and power within his Party to see that that mistake was corrected.

Mr. Rodda: You are merely hoodwinking these teachers.

Mr. HUGHES: No, I am not. Up to date, I have had nothing to say about this matter. What has taken place has concerned entirely their own thinking. By his interjections, the honourable member is implying that I have influenced the teachers to whom I have referred, but I have not spoken to one of them about the matter, and I am not in the habit of telling lies. I assure the honourable member that the teachers did not need me to stir them up: the Minister of Education stirred them up and received support from the likes of the members for Victoria and Onkaparinga.

Mr. Rodda: What about your Mr. Harris?

Mr. HUGHES: Now that the teachers have made a start on this they will not let up

until they achieve what they consider to be reasonable education standards for the people of South Australia.

Mr. Rodda: What about the Labor member for Christies Beach?

Mr. HUGHES: I don't know anything about that. I did not intend to speak at length when referring to the Loan Estimates generally and would not have done so had it not been for the interjections of members opposite that reflected on the teaching profession.

Mr. McKee: They made you hostile.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, because these teachers are responsible people and, as they cannot defend themselves in this place, I have taken their part. I assure the member for Victoria that his remarks will not go unheeded, for undoubtedly teachers will be watching closely what is said in this Chamber about education. The sum of \$225,000 is made available for fishing havens and foreshore improvements. The Treasurer's explanation states:

The sum of \$225,000 is proposed this year for work on a number of projects to provide improved facilities, the more important being \$39,000 to complete extensions to the jetty at Cape Jaffa, \$54,000 for the construction of a landing structure at Coffin Bay, and \$20,000 to commence the reconstruction of the slipway at Robe.

As the Minister of Marine would know, representations have been made by the fishermen in my district to have some sort of fishing haven established at Wallaroo to protect their boats. Therefore, I am disappointed that no provision has been made for Wallaroo. Having made representations to the Minister and following his visit to Wallaroo, the Wallaroo fishermen really thought some provision would be made in the Loan Estimates for something to protect their boats. Representations were made to the Minister on July 10 last year pointing out the number of trawlers that visited the gulf, and statistics were given of the total fish weights for the year 1967-68. Representations were made to the Minister in July last year, but I refer now to a press report of January 29 this year:

Marine Minister inspects harbour facilities. Wallaroo shipping and swimming facilities were inspected by the Minister of Marine, Mr. John Coumbe.

Then reference was made to the work that had been done at Wallaroo, including the pile renewal of the jetties. The report continues:

Mr. Coumbe expressed concern at the condition of the old jetty and undertook to examine the possibility of the providing of a new jetty for fishermen east of the harbormaster's office.

There had been a tremendous increase in fishing at Wallaroo, mostly because of prawn and abalone catches.

Will the Minister of Marine take up with his colleague the Minister of Agriculture the urgent need for a fishing haven? I am not an expert on this. I made a suggestion, which was not acceptable to the department because it was unworkable in view of the condition of the piles at Wallaroo, but will the Minister consider this matter to see whether something cannot be done about a fishing haven at Wallaroo?

In his explanation, the Treasurer refers to police and courthouse buildings at a cost of \$800,000, and he mentions various places where this money will be allocated. More than once I have been asked to make representations to the Minister at the appropriate time about the acoustics in the Moonta courthouse which, I understand, are very bad. When I have sat in the courtroom, I myself have had no difficulty in hearing but I understand that the justices find it difficult, because of the height of the ceiling, to hear all the evidence that is presented on the sitting days.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Could you be heard?

Mr. HUGHES: I should say they could hear me adequately. If I was brought up before the justices, I would be a little nervous and perhaps my voice would be lowered a little, so they might find difficulty in hearing me.

Mr. Lawn: The courtroom would not be used on many days in the year in Moonta?

Mr. HUGHES: It is used, and because of that I have been asked to bring this matter before the Government.

Mr. Lawn: I thought they were all law-abiding citizens in Moonta?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, they are, but we have many visitors, which makes the work hard for the justices. They do a wonderful job in assisting any Government of the day but, because of the high ceiling, they have asked that something be done to improve the acoustics in the courthouse. In his explanation, the Treasurer referred to the Housing Trust and stated:

The trust has continued to be particularly active in the provision of housing of reasonable standard in the country and of the total of 1,898 completions last year almost half were in country areas. Of the houses under construction at June 30, 1969, over 55 per cent were in the country. The major part of the trust's activity in the country has again been at Whyalla to meet the needs of industrial growth.

I think we all know the part that the trust is playing at Whyalla. When I asked a question of the Minister of Housing earlier this session, apparently I was misunderstood. I was making representations about the building of more rental houses at Kadina because of the difficulty experienced by married teachers in finding accommodation at the beginning of the school year. The report came back through the Minister of Education, who told me that she thought I should have asked the question of her. However, I intended not that the houses should be departmental houses but that they be rental houses, built by the trust, and it was hoped that some priority could be given to the teaching profession, because many of the teachers appointed to that area were married and had a housing problem at the beginning of the school year.

I now ask that the trust find out the requirements at Kadina to assist persons who desire to live in trust houses there, preference being given to schoolteachers. I am not complaining about the number of departmental houses built at Kadina compared with the number built at other places. However, if suitable houses were available for schoolteachers there, perhaps we could keep the married men for one or two years longer. It is preferable to keep teachers at schools such as the Kadina Memorial High School for a longer period rather than have many new teachers each year. Teachers who have experienced a housing shortage have expressed a desire to leave the area. Therefore, I ask the Minister to have the trust carry out the survey I have mentioned and build additional houses at Kadina. I wish to deal with other matters, but will do so on the lines.

Mr. GILES (Gumeracha): Having listened with interest to what Opposition members have said in this debate, I am absolutely appalled and disgusted at the criticism of the Treasurer, who has presented some sound business policies in the Loan Estimates. Recently, I heard of a case where two men claimed money from the same land transaction. Obviously, the land broker could pay only one of the men, because he could not find two sums. It seems that Opposition members think that two sums are available in this case. The \$4,572,000 that the Treasurer has kept as a reserve may have to be used for purposes he referred to in his statement: a possible increase in wages, assistance for a section of primary producers, or increased pumping of water.

Although the reservoirs are at present filled to three quarters of their capacity we do not know what will happen in the future and we must be prepared.

The Treasurer knows what he is doing, and I compliment him on presenting the Loan Estimates in the way he has. In the Gumeracha District, primary producers have had many problems during the last 12 months. The vegetable-growing industry, centred on the Piccadilly Valley at Uraidla, has had a bad time. The rains that fell last February caused much rot in various types of vegetable (cabbages, cauliflowers, lettuce), thus placing growers in a precarious financial position. The apple industry was also adversely affected by the February rains.

Mr. Langley: You can buy cabbages for 6c: there must be a glut.

Mr. GILES: Obviously, the member for Unley understands the situation perfectly!

Mr. Langley: That's right.

Mr. GILES: As housewives cannot buy a cabbage without knowing whether they will be able to use all of it, this makes them reluctant to buy cabbages. When they buy one it may go rotten, and their reluctance to buy cabbages automatically reduces the purchases of this and other commodities. Consequently, growers cannot get a reasonable price for their produce.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member speaking on the Loan Estimates?

Mr. GILES: I was speaking of the problems in the apple industry and I will connect my remarks with loans to producers. One of the factories in my district received assistance under the loans to producers legislation, and this enabled the apple industry to recover. We appreciate the wise way the Treasurer acted in order to stabilize several industries in the Adelaide Hills.

The CHAIRMAN: There is too much audible conversation.

Mr. GILES: One of the main problems in the Adelaide Hills is that of noxious weeds. Recently the Adelaide Hills Noxious Weeds Eradication Committee was formed.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member linking up this matter with roads?

Mr. GILES: No; it comes under the Agriculture Department.

Mr. HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I ask whether noxious weeds are classed as vermin.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! That is not a point of order. The honourable member for Gumeracha.

Mr. GILES: Primary producers in the Adelaide Hills are asking that the Woods and Forests Department ensure that it completely fence its properties so that it can have controlled grazing inside them. The member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) has severely criticized what this Government has done in the field of education and he has said that it is deplorable that a previous Government removed Leaving Honours classes from various country schools. This step, however, was inevitable because it was impracticable to have teachers in those schools with classes of only two or three students.

It is distressing that, because agriculture is not a Matriculation subject, its status is not as high as it should be. The number of drop-outs in the field of agricultural education is very great. Figures I have show that there were 1,332 first-year students studying agriculture, 996 second-year students, 768 third-year students, 354 fourth-year students, and only 46 fifth-year students. One reason why students do not continue with their studies in agriculture is that it does not have the status of a Matriculation subject. That we must have qualified persons to teach agriculture as a subject is in itself a problem. At present in South Australia there are only 51 teachers of this kind, of whom 19 have a Diploma of Agriculture, eight have a Bachelor of Agricultural Science degree or some special degree and the rest are interested in teaching agriculture but have no qualifications concerning this subject.

Indeed, the committee that has been formed to deal with the problem is extremely concerned about the lack of agricultural education in South Australia. Urrbrae Agricultural High School last year initiated an extension course for the fourth and fifth years, involving eight students last year and 23 students this year. I believe this will fill a gap in agricultural education for young lads who may wish to return to the land.

Although the course commenced in February, 1968, with only a limited number of students, it was intended at the outset that, on successfully completing the course, the student concerned would be awarded the Urrbrae certificate in agriculture, and it is hoped, in the interests of the student who matriculates in agriculture at Urrbrae, that that certificate will soon hold

some status. It is hoped, too, that students will be willing to continue in this agricultural course provided at the school.

The course is a complete breakaway from the present system operating at the school of offering the single subject of agricultural science or agriculture with other general and craft subjects. It consists of a full programme of studies in the fourth and fifth year, orientated towards agriculture. The three-core subjects, which occupy about two-thirds of the student's time, are agriculture and animal husbandry, farm management and rural economics, and farm engineering. The general subjects are English, social studies and statistics, while science is taught not as a separate subject but as scientific principles desirable for better understanding of agriculture and animal husbandry and of farm engineering. Enrolment at fourth-year level will be restricted to two classes, each of about 25 students, so that boys in smaller groups can gain a better insight into the principles and practice of the core subjects, in particular, through participation in field and laboratory work.

The course is terminal, in that it is not meant to be a preparation for higher studies at Roseworthy Agricultural College. It is designed to prepare a boy to take his place as a responsible citizen in an agricultural community. There are two main requirements for enrolment: one is the production of satisfactory evidence of an opening for work on the land or for a position with a stock or similar firm, after a further two years at secondary school; the other is evidence of three years of satisfactory secondary schooling which need not include a study of agriculture. On the basis of this evidence, and after an interview with the headmaster, a decision will be made on students' readiness to cope academically with the course and on their general suitability for enrolment.

I believe this course has a great future in South Australia in regard to the agricultural teaching of our younger boys. I believe it can fill what may be called a gap in agricultural education, and I trust that in future consideration will be given to establishing courses of this nature at schools in various centres throughout this State. I believe that students attending such a course should be able to carry out this practical work in an environment similar to the one to which they intend to return. For instance, if a person came from a block on the Murray River it would be desirable for him to go to a school in that area (say, at

Glossop) to take this extension course, learning viticulture and studying orange and deciduous trees. If a person wanted to do farming, obviously the West Coast would be a place where he could attend school to study farming methods in that environment. Perhaps the South-East could be another area where these courses could be established.

One of the greatest problems involved in establishing courses of this type throughout South Australia is the training of suitable teachers to handle them. At present, few teachers are available, as is illustrated by the figures to which I have already referred. From talking to headmasters from various schools at which agricultural subjects are taught, I understand that it will be necessary for teachers to have at least the Diploma of Agriculture of the Roseworthy Agricultural College or a Bachelor of Agricultural Science degree. One teacher said that, to teach the course, either of these qualifications was necessary as well as a few years' experience on a farm or property so that the teacher would be able to teach the practical approach to the subject satisfactorily.

It is most interesting to know that a great sum will be spent soon on teachers colleges. I believe that adequate facilities for the training of teachers have been lacking. However, \$600,000 is provided for Bedford Park and \$1,700,000 for Salisbury. Although a great need exists for teachers and various school buildings, I do not believe there is a crisis in education. I interpret "crisis" to mean a time when, if something drastic is not done, a whole system will collapse. However, the word "crisis" has been bandied around in the modern sense to try to force the issue; it has been used to illustrate that a need exists, but I believe the word has been wrongly used. Although I accept that there is a need in education, I do not believe there is a crisis.

Agriculture is taught in some adult education classes, and it is interesting to note that considerable sums will be spent on adult education facilities in South Australia. The sum of \$55,000 is provided for the Adelaide, Murray Bridge and Upper Murray centres. Adult education is being used to great advantage more and more by older people throughout South Australia. All that is necessary to form a class is the participation of 10 pupils. Provided those pupils can be obtained, a class can be held on practically any subject. At Mount Barker a management class has operated for just over 12 months, proving most successful.

This is advantageous for the person running an agricultural or horticultural property. I support what the Treasurer has placed before us. He has given us sound estimates. I support the first line.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): I support the first line. The honourable member who has just resumed his seat began his speech by saying that he was shocked and appalled at some of the speeches made by members of the Opposition. I believe he spoke correctly because he, like the rest of the members opposite, has not sought to answer the arguments put forward from this side, because of the shock and strength of those arguments.

The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Evans) spoke on the M.A.T.S. plan, but he could well have joined in the previous debate on that. I listened with great interest to the economist of the Liberal Party, the member for Stirling, and noticed that he seldom referred to the Loan Estimates but dealt with the Commonwealth Budget and tried to explain it away. That was a little unfortunate. However, he did refer to one important thing, the need for more education. There is much evidence to suggest that his statement is correct.

The amazing thing he said was that the Commonwealth Government was, in effect, giving the States a reasonable amount of money. I do not know whether the Premier is wrong, the Premiers of other States are wrong or the honourable member is wrong but, when a statesman says that the State is getting all it wants when it has so many needs, he ceases for all times to be a statesman.

Mr. McAnaney: You are taking half of what I said.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: That is enough for me: in fact, it is far too much. The member for Gumeracha (Mr. Giles) made a spirited attack, and I thought he was going to give someone a cauliflower ear when he started talking about cabbages. When he mentioned the apple industry he gave us all the pip. Then he dealt with noxious weeds.

These Loan Estimates and the accompanying statement by the Treasurer are colourless, unimaginative, and very disappointing documents. I propose to deal with the Loan Estimates and not other matters. In view of the criticism that was made by those now in Government of the Opposition when it was in

Government, these documents become remarkable. How many times do we find this Government doing the things that we did when we were in office? I do not suggest that it is wrong in that. It is following a good lead, but members opposite were free in their condemnation of the previous Government. In his explanation of these Loan Estimates, the Treasurer states:

I would make clear that the under-expenditures last year have not been caused by the omission or planned deferment of any proposed works. All projects have proceeded as quickly as practicable having regard to the capacity of departments to plan and supervise efficiently and to the capacity of industry to construct or supply. Any delays in timing and the consequent carry over of commitments into 1969-70 have been taken into account in adding to this year's allocations, which I shall comment on in detail a little later. I make clear the Government's firm view that it would be financially irresponsible to attempt at short notice to implement a crash programme of new works simply designed to mop up temporary savings that may occur in a particular year.

This sounds well, but I refer to a remark made by the present Treasurer when we were in Government. Because we had amounts of unspent money, we were criticized for not spending the amounts allocated for particular departments. The present Treasurer, when speaking on behalf of his Party in 1966, stated, as reported at page 1087 of *Hansard*:

Apart from that, I have found in my time as Minister (as, I am sure, the present Minister of Works has found) that a scheme, commenced and proceeded with as rapidly as manpower and material resources permit, is usually finished at a minimum of cost.

There is nothing wrong with that statement until it is linked with his statement on this year's Loan Estimates. Sometimes it is necessary for a small sum not to be spent, but in the Engineering and Water Supply Department \$1,041,266 is underspent, and that is not a small sum. Surely this State, the driest in the driest continent, should have the objective of supplying water as quickly as possible, and surely the Government should spend all the money at its disposal in so doing.

The Public Buildings Department, of which I have knowledge (I was Minister of Works for three years), could never get enough money, yet that department spent wisely and well what money was made available to it. My Party had a five-year programme. During our term of office there was a hump in expenditure and we were afraid that, because of the shortage of money, we would not be able to carry out works that we had planned.

Now, we learn that \$3,974,082 was not spent, in spite of what the present Treasurer said when we were in the position when the only wise way to spend money was to spend it as rapidly as we could.

Mr. McAnaney: That is when there was much unemployment: you had to spend it to save that.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I think the member for Stirling would do well to be unemployed for a few minutes, because his interjection is contrary to fact. Although he has a peculiar manner, he is also a most agile person, as I know of no-one who is as capable of putting his foot in his mouth as he is. When we were in Government we were told that we had done something terrible, that we were shockingly neglectful, because we had not pushed on with work on the Chowilla dam. One member who has now left Parliament said several times that if Chowilla was not completed and supplying water by 1973 this State would find itself in great distress, and he had some justification for his argument. When we were in office the present Treasurer had much to say on this project, and the *Hansard* report of the debate on August 8, 1967, records the following:

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Everyone earnestly hopes that the Chowilla dam scheme can proceed. Three years ago the then Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Frank Walsh) was good enough to say in one of the river towns that it was time the Playford Government stopped talking about Chowilla and got on with the work. Unfortunately, we are still talking about Chowilla, although some progress has been made. I sincerely hope that we shall get this project moving soon, because there is an increasing problem connected with the quality of Murray River water. Possibly quality is as important as quantity. The Minister of Works is now concerned about what he calls a slug of salt coming down the river. If the Chowilla dam scheme were in operation, its reserves could dissipate this slug so that it would no longer be a problem. However we look at it, although there are misgivings about the effect of the Chowilla scheme, I cannot in my researches come to any other conclusion than that it will be of inestimable and vital benefit to South Australia. We must have it.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: I could not agree with you more.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I hope that the project will be completed as soon as possible. We may have been talking about it; we were talking about it, but today not one cent is allocated on the Loan Estimates for Chowilla or a similar project. We are not talking about it now; when one talks about it he is looked at in a way that suggests he is not doing so. I am not arguing the pros and cons of the Chowilla and Dartmouth dams, but I am saying that a Party that was critical two years

ago but is now doing nothing at all condemns itself to the greatest degree. Sir Thomas Playford was a keen student of South Australia's needs, and he must be somewhat disappointed today. I am sure everyone is earnestly hoping for progress on this matter.

The Marine and Harbors Department is facing a difficult period. When I was sitting in what everyone tried to make a hot seat, the present Treasurer, then in Opposition, on August 8, 1967, said (at page 1098 of *Hansard*):

There is no provision made for Port Pirie, or for a terminal at either Ardrossan or Wallaroo. We were going to have three "super" ports. The honourable member knows that we deepened the swinging basin and channel at Wallaroo and made it possible, as he has proudly boasted, for big ships to get in there. A "super" port was to be established at Ardrossan; the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) may have preferred to see it established at Wallaroo but, whether he may have or not, we are not having one at either place. I gather from his statement that the present Treasurer, when in Opposition, was conscious of the need for a major port in South Australia, and I could not agree more. I am conscious, too, of the great problem of determining where this port shall be. One could advance arguments for a number of places, and the present Minister is having a real think about this matter. Once we start to spend money on a "super" port, we must ensure that it is spent wisely. Consequently, I do not blame the Minister for demanding a full investigation. If the Labor Government was condemned two years ago for not taking steps in connection with this matter, it is very poor that members of the present Government, who were then so critical, have not clearly indicated that some progress is being made, even if it is only to refer the matter to the Public Works Committee.

Mr. Venning: Why didn't you table the report when you were in Government?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Because it was not for tabling: it was a report made to advise the Government, which I believe was the best Government South Australia has had for many years, and which was never voted out.

Mr. Venning: It should have been a public document.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: That is an interjection from a member who has not had the experience of holding a Ministerial portfolio and who is therefore unqualified to speak. The honourable member knows full well that, although it was not a public document, members of the Opposition were not

denied an opportunity to peruse it. Some members may not have known that it was available, but any member who came to me and asked to see it could do so. I did not say, "Keep it to yourself." I told the Treasurer at the time that he could take it and use it. When he asked, "Can I quote from it?" I said that he could; and when he asked, "Can I tell the people?" my reply was "Yes".

Mr. Venning: Why didn't you give it to the member for Wallaroo?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: He was not aware that it was available.

Mr. Venning: He couldn't have been very interested in the situation.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I do not mind interjections, even though I know they are out of order, but the one that was made so callously and so unjustly a moment ago should be accompanied by an apology. If the member concerned has the stomach to apologize, he will do so. No member represents his district more ably than does the member for Wallaroo. When in Government, we were not continually giving back-benchers documents and telling them to ask questions about them, although perhaps we would have been better off if we had done that. I followed the member for Flinders (now the Treasurer) in his office as Minister of Works. Having a pretty good knowledge of what was going on, he was most helpful to me, I frankly admit, when I went into office. He often came to me and talked about problems, and that is probably why he received the document.

I speak with all the gratitude I can muster for the Treasurer's attitude towards me when I was Minister, so let there be no mistake about that matter. However, there is not one word in these Estimates or in the Treasurer's statement regarding a "super" port, but I am not surprised about that, because I am aware of the great difficulty that exists here. I think it was unfair and unjust that we should be attacked, because we were merely unable to do what the present Government is unable to do. Much has been said about the \$12,000,000, but I have no objection to this manner of budgeting. However, although I do not wish to condemn the Treasurer's action, I point out that we again find the Government doing something similar to what the Labor Government did. Yet this is something for which the Government of that day was criticized. We were supposed to be stealing.

Mr. McAnaney: We never used that word.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Perhaps members opposite said we were filching. At any rate, we were supposed to be doing something really terrible.

Mr. McAnaney: It was, too.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The old foot is going into the mouth again. I think that one of the most moderate men in the Government today is the Treasurer. It is hard for him to say something that is not reasonable and fair, and he will only say something that is not fair when he is forced to do so by the Party he serves and by its members. On August 8, 1967, he said in this place:

We must remember that during the last two years his own Treasurer has taken money from the Loan funds and applied it to the Budget. That is the truth of the matter, and it can be seen from the Treasurer's own figures. It is very regrettable and it illustrates the inexperience and ineptitude of the Treasurer in handling this State's finances.

Mr. McAnaney: A sum of \$7,000,000 in one year wasn't bad.

Mr. Hudson: That was Playford in 1964-65.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I say now that the present Government stands condemned out of its own mouth. Because of my physical condition, I will not talk for long, but I wish now to turn to a matter on which the Labor Party has no policy and to which the Treasurer did not refer in his explanation—the fluoridation of our water supply. Just 12 months ago, when I asked what it would cost to install the plant to fluoridate the South Australian water supply (and I put the question on notice so that an estimate could be made and the facts given), I was told \$160,000. However, the Loan Estimates provide for \$185,000, and I assume this is for the metropolitan area; I doubt whether \$185,000 will be the final figure. Are we to assume that the sum of \$185,000 has been arrived at so that the project will not have to be submitted to the Public Works Committee for inquiry? Is it a fact that the Government does not want an inquiry? In reply to the question by the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon) in July, the Minister of Works indicated that, in his view, there were no corrosive elements in fluoride. I had the pleasure a few days ago of presenting a petition containing 5,000 signatures of people opposing fluoridation. That 5,000 will be 50,000 in 12 months after fluoride is added to our water supply. To say that fluoridated

water has no corrosive quality indicates a lack of knowledge. Shortly after fluoride has been added to the water supply, people will find that they will have to renew their water services at a cost of about \$240, and they will soon learn whether or not fluoride contains any corrosive substance.

The member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon) when speaking in the debate on the Address in Reply showed conclusively from evidence of responsible citizens that the use of fluoride in water had, by corrosion, injured hot water services, laundry fittings, washing machines, pumps and car radiators. This evidence came largely from Australians. I am the happy possessor of a book containing evidence and photographs of various parts of pumps, machines, laundries, pipes and bottles that have contained fluoridated water, showing the effects of that water compared with non-fluoridated water. I am prepared to make this book available to anybody to look at in my presence. If people do not want to know, they do not look and do not study. Many articles have been written about corrosion resulting from fluoridated water. The following is a statement on the corrosion case against fluoridation by Willard R. Edwards, Regius Professor of Engineering and corrosion consultant, dated December 13, 1966:

More than 150 cities in the nation have tried fluoridation and later discarded it. Many of these cities have given it up because of the corrosion damage to their water equipment, and this is where my interests lie. As a member of the National Association of Corrosion Engineers and as a certified corrosion engineer with 14 years of professional experience in all branches of corrosion prevention, I have spent half of this time in areas in which the water supply was fluoridated. Corrosion engineers are usually graduates in metallurgy, chemical or electrical engineering. My formal training was four years at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and one year at the University of Oklahoma, with a B.S. degree in electrical engineering. In the average steel and cast iron pipe, corrosion is accelerated in fluoridated water because of the water becoming a more conductive electrolyte. The corrosion products combine with the fluorides (or fluoride ions) in the water and are precipitated as rust and sludge. Laboratory analyses on such rust or sludge samples have consistently shown high fluoride contents of from 500 to 8,000 parts a million, and higher. Following are typical examples of areas in which reports of increased corrosion damage occurred soon after fluoridation was introduced:

- (1) City water mains burst, due to internal pipe corrosion.
- (2) Hot water heaters were eaten out and burst, the cost of replacement being \$100 or more.

- (3) Lawn-sprinkling piping systems corroded and leaked.
- (4) Dishwasher and other water pumps corroded and had to be replaced at considerable expense to home owners.
- (5) Domestic and industrial plumbing rapidly corroded internally and the frequency of leaks and repair costs increased as much as 500 per cent.
- (6) Fluoridation supply equipment was eaten up by the fluoride. Replacement is very costly. The reliability of such equipment is impaired and may result in dangerously high fluctuations of the fluoride content in the water.
- (7) Pipes, meters and water-using equipment became clogged by internal rust and sludge high in fluoride content.
- (8) City water meter gears became corroded and inoperative and maintenance doubled.

Mr. Hurst: It looks like we'll be up for a nice cost!

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: That is right. The statement continues:

- (9) Automobile radiators were eaten out by fluoride corrosion.
- (10) Laundry equipment and piping corroded, resulting in rusty water, spoiled laundry and customer dissatisfaction.

Fluorine itself is a pale, greenish-yellow gas, slightly heavier than air, poisonous, corrosive and of a penetrating and disagreeable odour. It is an exceedingly active non-metallic element. Fluorine enters readily into reactions with most of the other elements to form compounds. It is found in nature as fluorite and cryolite. The latter is a fluoride of aluminium from which the by-product, sodium fluoride, is obtained. Fluorine readily attacks metals and reacts with them to form metallic fluorides. The element, fluorine, is commonly found in calcium fluoride in ground water, but in this state it is more stable and far less toxic than sodium fluoride. It thus becomes more corrosive to metal pipes, tanks, and other metal surfaces in contact with it. Some specific instances of corrosion failure in cities with fluoridated water follows:

(a) San Francisco has had frequent instances of burst water mains following fluoridation. One 16in. main burst with a resulting repair damage and clean-up cost of \$30,000. Pipe sludge and residue at the break showed a content in sludge at the breaks of from 1,100 to as high as 22,000 p.p.m.

(b) Hot water heaters in San Francisco, formerly lasting (or warranted for) 15 years, now last from nine to 10 years, a reduction of one-third or more in life. This means the annual cost of hot water heaters using fluoridated water increased 50 per cent.

(c) In Miami, Florida, a tremendous increase in water heater replacements was required after fluoridation. Seven local manufacturers of electric water heaters went out of business because their tanks corroded before the warranty period expired. Other out-of-town water heater manufacturers stopped shipping heaters into the fluoridated Miami area because so many of the heaters rapidly developed leaks short of the warranty period.

Mr. Burdon: This is to be a cost on the people.

The Hon C. D. HUTCHENS: Of course, and no consideration is being given to the inconvenience caused by the damage. The statement continues:

(d) In Pinellas County, Florida, the Allied Plumbing and Heating Contractors Association published a statement saying: Because of laboratory reports, personal experiences, and other information studied, the Association believes, beyond a shadow of doubt, that fluorides have an adverse effect on pipes, valves, water systems both public and private, and especially on hot water heaters and hot water storage tanks. Included in the studies of damage to 6in. and 10in. water mains after fluoridation Since the repairs to the new sewer will doubtless cost the taxpayers millions of dollars and since the probable damage to the public and private water systems due to fluoridation was not considered by council when the ordinance was passed, it is therefore felt that since the public will have to defray all costs of any damage done due to fluoridation, the above should be given careful consideration.

(e) Fluoridation has caused great expense annually to residential, commercial and industrial water users in the repair and replacement of clogged and corroded equipment, expense that could have been avoided if the water had not been fluoridated.

The member for Mount Gambier said a few minutes ago that this would be a cost on the people. Of course it will be, simply because the Government of the day was too lazy and too inclined to please a few people who could not tender evidence to establish that fluoride would be fully effective in combating dental decay. In these circumstances, to put the people to such great expense without doing anything to remove the cause of dental decay is a criminal offence. Consequently, I urge the Government to consider carefully these points before it goes on with this project. I will now quote a letter written by Mr. Edmund Sargent (of Wilmington, Massachusetts) who has undoubtedly been a student of the use of fluoride; he writes:

To my fellow townsmen:

As superintendent of Wilmington's water system, it has been my responsibility to add sodium fluoride to our water since 1955. Having had close contact with this toxic material and feeling a deep concern for the people of Wilmington, I am compelled to report to you on this situation before you vote next Saturday on whether or not to continue fluoridating our water supply.

Since the installation of the fluoridator at the pumping station, there has been a series of breakdowns of that equipment due to corrosion of the metal parts. I have been asked how much longer it will be before the same thing happens to pipes, meters, hot-water tanks and

household plumbing, even though the concentration in the fluoridator is much stronger than in the system. It is my duty to report that I have already observed an increase in corrosion throughout the town since we started adding fluoride to our water.

I must also notify the townspeople that it has been impossible to maintain the recommended 1 part per million. This is the concentration which we add to the water at the pumping station; but tests of fluoride in the lines have fluctuated from .4 to 1.4 parts per million, dangerously close to 1.5 parts per million which according to the U.S. Public Health Service makes the water unsafe for drinking purposes.

Mr. Hurst: And it is contrary to the recommendation of the World Health Organization, which recommended a maximum of 1 p.p.m.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes. The letter continues:

In view of these facts, I would urge the voters of Wilmington to consider carefully whether or not they wish to continue adding sodium fluoride to the public water supply. Personally, it is my conviction that the water system should be used for the sole purpose of supplying pure, potable water, and the furnishing of sodium fluoride and other drugs which have been suggested for mass medication through the water mains should be left to other more appropriate agencies.

The writer of this letter was making his living out of putting fluoride into the water supply of a certain district. I make this plea to the Government before it is too late: it should carefully consider this matter before it finds that it not only has to increase the cost of water to pay for the damage done by fluoride but also has to consider the private individual who, through the addition of fluoride to our water supply, will be put to greater expense. I am sure that if this matter were the subject of an inquiry or referendum it would be rejected out of hand.

Mr. Langley: It was dealt with at one of the biggest meetings that has ever taken place on the subject.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: My colleague the member for Unley had the opportunity to chair the biggest meeting held at that time in order to protest against adding fluoride to the water supply, particularly as it concerned the citizens of the city of Unley. That meeting was held with some enthusiasm and since that day there has been no trouble in getting signatures of people opposed to this measure which, if implemented, I am sure will be regretted. I support the first line.

Mr. FREEBAIN (Light): Although I always enjoy hearing my friend the member for Hindmarsh, I do not know whether I go

along with him entirely in what he has said about the policy of the present Government.

Mr. Venning: You can at least hear him.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, the honourable member speaks in a good loud tone which is gratifying to members opposite who wish to hang on every word he utters. However, I do not entirely agree with the remarks he has made about the Government's intention to fluoridate Adelaide's water supply. I remember reading a story about an American city in which it was intended to introduce fluoride. Although I do not know for certain whether it was the fair city of Wilmington, I will say that that was the city involved. The Wilmington authorities announced that fluoride would be added to the city's drinking water on a certain day. For two or three weeks following that day, numerous complaints were received from citizens to the effect that fluoride was creating all sorts of dire conditions. However, officers of the city's administration then announced that fluoride had not, in fact, been introduced but that a date had merely been named so that the citizens would realize that fluoride really had no serious effect.

I was interested to hear my friend the member for Glenelg address the Committee at some length, but he made a slight mistake when he invited me to pay attention to his remarks on education. I was paying close and rapt attention to those remarks, and I was surprised that he should go through the list of deficiencies in schools in his district, because I recall that, in 1965 when the member offered himself to the electors of Glenelg, the supporters of his Party in Glenelg claimed that the then Minister (Sir Baden Pattinson) had been lavish in his expenditure on schools in the Glenelg District because he had feared for the safety of his Parliamentary seat. Labor supporters at that time admitted that the condition of the schools in the Glenelg District was considerably above average—

Mr. Hudson: Who said that?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: —and yet in the intervening four and a half years we find that the standard of schools in that district has declined dramatically (or so the member says). However, in three of those four and a half years a Labor Administration was in power in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

Mr. FREEBAIRN: If the member for Glenelg starts picking a fight he has to be prepared to get a gentle punch on the nose.

When we come to debate the lines he can have something more to say about the schools in his district that have declined so dramatically over the past four and a half years.

Mr. Hudson: You're just making this up.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The honourable member went through a list of all the schools in his district, complaining that each one of them was not up to standard. He gave many details.

Mr. Hudson: Talk about the schools in Light.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The schools in the Light District are in excellent condition. I am proud of them and their staffs; no-one can say there is a major deficiency in the educational opportunities being offered to the children in my district.

Mr. Broomhill: What do the teachers say about them?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The teachers are very happy about them. I enjoy the active interest taken by members opposite in my contributions to debates, but all they do is prolong my golden words. I did not want to be sidetracked on this education matter: I was merely making a passing comment to destroy some of the arguments put by my friend, the member for Glenelg.

Mr. Hudson: I'm not a friend of yours, and I'll ask you to withdraw the next time you say that.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: When I discuss the Loan Estimates I do so in the context of the federal system of government. When we realize that members opposite do not believe in the federal system which they are out to destroy, we see how hollow their criticisms are. I understand that they want to destroy the federal system, substituting in its place some system of regional councils, each council to be superintended, managed or chaired by some sort of commissar (I think that is the title). My point is that, as members opposite do not believe in the federal system basically, how can we consider their criticisms valid? I wish to refer the Committee to 1927.

Mr. Langley: You weren't born.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I admit that; in 1927 I was several years unborn. I want to refer the Committee to a most excellent publication called *Commonwealth Payments to or for the States 1969-70*.

Mr. Broomhill: You're living in the past.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am living in a world of reality, because the Commonwealth-State Financial Agreement, hammered out in that

year, still serves our Federation very well. At page 58 of chapter 4, which is entitled "Loan Council Borrowing Programmes", this Commonwealth publication states (and this bit of history is good for members opposite):

The Australian Loan Council is constituted under the 1927 Financial Agreement between the Commonwealth and the States. It is composed of representatives of the Commonwealth and each State Government and co-ordinates the public borrowings of the Commonwealth and the States. The Prime Minister or his nominee is the representative of the Commonwealth and Chairman of the council and the six Premiers or their nominees represent the States. The Loan Council determines the annual borrowing programmes of the Commonwealth and the States together with the terms and conditions on which loans to finance these programmes are to be raised.

That is a part of our federal history (the 1927 Financial Agreement) which ripped the Australian Labor Party up and down and from left to right. It broke into four fragments, and those fragments were represented here in the State Parliament: the Australian Labor Party; the Parliamentary Labor Party (I think it called itself); the Independent Labor Party; and I think there was also a lunatic fringe called the Lang Labor Party. I see that the member for Glenelg is dying to tell the Committee something more about the big split. Anyway, we have gone a little way from there: instead of having a Party fragmented four ways, we now have a Labor Party fragmented only two ways. We all know, however, that we have at least three factions in the group representing the Labor Party here. When I drew attention last week to the fact that a member of one of the factions had said that three other faction members were expendable, the fat was in the fire.

Let me get back to the Loan Estimates. Where do these Loan funds come from? They are a return from the Commonwealth Government of moneys that provident Australians invest in Commonwealth bonds. This represents the money returned from the Commonwealth Governments, having been lent by provident Australians. If members of this Committee can speak in this debate with a clear conscience, they will examine their own financial affairs and ask themselves what contribution they have made to Commonwealth Loan funds. I look at members opposite and see them hanging their heads in shame.

Mr. Virgo: We are laughing more than ever before.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Do I assume that members of the Committee are all doing their

share in contributing to Loan funds? Have they taken out their share of Commonwealth bonds? If not, they have not done the right thing by our State. Perhaps they all have good life assurance policies. I would not like to think that any member opposite was so improvident as not to have a life assurance policy. I know the member for Glenelg has an enormous life assurance policy. If members opposite had such policies, they would have the satisfaction of knowing that part of the premiums they pay is invested in Commonwealth loans. I thought I should bring the debate back into touch with the Loan Estimates and let members examine their own consciences. It is only fair to remind members where the Loan funds come from; then they can speak in this debate in the knowledge—

Mr. Hudson: It doesn't all come from Loan funds. What about the amount from taxation?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am glad the honourable member said that, because I am going to ask those members opposite who are sufficiently interested in Commonwealth-State finances and who believe in the federal system to turn to page 60 of the publication to which I have referred. Having said that Loan funds are the redistribution of funds that provident Australians invest in Commonwealth bonds, I point out, as stated on page 60 of this book, that the Commonwealth Government underwrites the Loan funds. This has been done by the Liberal Party and Country Party Administration in Canberra. Those who can think back to the dim, dark days when an Australian Labor Party Government was in office in Canberra will recall that that Commonwealth Government did not underwrite the Loan programmes. It was the Menzies Government that did that, and in the last 10 years the Commonwealth Government has found an average of 16 per cent from general revenue to reinforce the Loan programme.

I will read the interesting figures of Commonwealth support from the Loan programme over the last 10 years. All Liberal and Country League Administrations believe in a programme of full employment. They do not believe in having unemployed to create some sort of revolutionary situation such as I suggest members opposite want. Our Commonwealth Government reinforces the Loan programme to ensure that the States maintain continuity in the public works programme.

The contributions have been as follows:

Year	Contribution per cent
1958-59	2
1959-60	14
1960-61	38
1961-62	3
1962-63	nil
1963-64	nil
1964-65	23
1965-66	28
1966-67	14
1967-68	28
1968-69	16

I understand that this year the Commonwealth Government's support is also about 16 per cent, although I have not calculated the precise figure. In the last 10 years the Commonwealth Government has supported the Loan programme at an average rate of about 16 per cent. This indicates the L.C.L. policy of supporting our federal financial structure.

Mr. Hudson: Are you sure that—

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I listened politely for three hours to the member for Glenelg.

Mr. Hudson: No, you didn't. You chattered away like fury.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: No. I had a couple of asides with my colleague, but every golden word spoken by the member for Glenelg was noted. I was going to make another complimentary remark about the Commonwealth L.C.L. Administration but perhaps I should move on to my other points rather than make my speech a eulogy of that Government. There is also an interesting statement on page 72 of this most excellent book that all members opposite should have. I think the Socialist Government was swept from Canberra in 1948. In 1948-49, South Australia's share of Loan funds was only \$13,040,000, out of a total Loan programme of about \$133,000,000. This was about 10 per cent. Since the days of Sir Thomas Playford, South Australia has received more than its per capita share of Loan moneys because the former Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, adopted a deliberate developmental programme, a policy that is being followed by the present Premier.

For 1969-70, the State's share is \$103,920,000 out of a total allocation of \$758,000,000. Our share is about 13.7 per cent, yet we have only 9.4 per cent of the Commonwealth population. We are reaping the benefit of a generous Loan allocation, which is a legacy of Sir Thomas Playford's determination to make South Australia a developing industrial State. Realizing that some of these large figures may be too difficult for Opposition members to

absorb, I will break them down to a per capita basis. In 1948-49, when the Labor administration was swept from office—

Mr. Virgo: It wasn't swept out in 1948.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It was swept out at about that time. I do not suppose a year or two makes much difference. In 1948-49, South Australia's per capita share was \$19.47 and the Australian per capita average was \$17.18. For 1969-70, South Australia's per capita share is \$90.01 while the Australian average is \$61.96. South Australia is doing well under the federal structure with Liberal and Country League support. I realize that Opposition members do not believe in the federal system; they do not believe in investing money in Commonwealth bonds so that, in turn, the State can develop; and they do not believe in life insurance, which eventually helps the State's development. Sometimes I wonder what members opposite do believe in.

Mr. Lawn: They believe in commonsense and truth.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I believe that members opposite should back the Loan Estimates. As an illustration I cite the case of a person who may have worked in industry, say, at General Motors-Holden's. He builds his way and climbs the trade union ladder in such a company, earning an honest living and doing a honest job for Australia and his fellow men. He then enters Parliament at a greatly increased salary but still observes the frugal habits that he followed during his industrial life. Consequently, he is able to invest in Commonwealth bonds and life assurance, which money then comes back to the State and helps its economic development. I do not wish to develop this theme, but I remind members opposite that the Playford Administration always aimed to get the maximum share of Loan funds because, by doing so, it helped South Australia.

Mr. LAWN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Acting Chairman. The honourable member is talking about a man who kept his job at Holdens only because he spoke the truth. In view of the pearls that the honourable member is casting round, I draw attention to the fact that there are no swine in the Chamber, other than himself.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nankivell): That is not a point of order. The honourable member for Light.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I can never understand the honourable member: at the tiniest word of criticism he folds up. He is now running

out of the Chamber because he is terrified that I will launch an attack against him. I wish that members opposite would not run outside when I make a speech; I can only assume that they cannot take it. Sir Thomas Playford used to tell the story of Mr. Forgan Smith, who was at one time the Labor Premier of Queensland. Mr. Forgan Smith adopted the deliberate policy of holding back Queensland's industrial development because he wanted to see Queensland as a simple primary-producing State; he did not want any industry in his beloved State. We are now reaping the benefits of this Labor Premier's ultra-conservatism; he thought he was doing the right thing, but he did not have the foresight (which Labor Premiers never have) to realize that investing money in his State makes for industrial development.

Mr. Rodda: What do you think will happen if the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) becomes Premier?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: If the political fortunes of the Australian Labor Party are to rise, it will be essential for the member for Edwardstown to occupy the seat now occupied by the Leader of the Opposition; I have said this several times inside and outside the Chamber. That Party will never be successful unless a man of his calibre occupies the front bench. The Leader of the Opposition stopped his habit of challenging the Premier to television debates after the thrashing he received on the Chowilla controversy.

Mr. McKee: Tell us about the letters you have received from the teachers institute.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I have been invited to speak on education. I have received several letters from much respected and valued constituents who are involved in the teaching profession. Having told them I was happy to address meetings, I was asked to attend one of their gatherings. I addressed those present on the matter of State financing, and we had a pleasant round-the-table discussion about their problems. I believe this discussion was greatly to the benefit of the teachers as well as to my own benefit.

Indeed, I think that if Labor members had sufficient courtesy to address, in an honest fashion, meetings of teachers in their own districts, it would be in their own interests as well as those of the teachers concerned. The member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) came into my district to address this group a few weeks ago and did a first-class job. He was honest and straightforward, as he always is, and did not engage in politics.

Mr. Broomhill: Were you there?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: No. The address was reported in the teachers' journal and also in the local press, and I received verbal reports about it from teachers who attended.

Mr. Broomhill: Why weren't you there?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Because I was not invited. I thought the member for West Torrens would know better than to ask such a silly question.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nankivell): Order!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I think the reason for so many letters being received from teachers has been the political activity in which members opposite have indulged. I am sorry to say that I find that some teachers in my district with whom I have discussed education matters have been completely misled by Labor propaganda. If members opposite lived up to the high standards set by the member for Whyalla, our whole politico-educational problem would be much less.

Several times since I have been a member of this place I have told members opposite something about the history of the Murray River settlements at Cadell and Waikerie, which were begun in the late 1870's and early 1880's as communistic types of settlement where no-one owned anything and where everyone was intended to contribute his work for the common good. However, because no-one owned anything and because these communistic types of people thought they could work for the common pool, the venture failed, as socialistic ventures are bound to fail.

Modern successful settlement at Cadell and Waikerie has come only since the First World War, and it came then only as a result of soldier settlement in those areas. I am pleased to see on these Estimates that the pumping plant and continuation of drainage works at Cadell will be financed on a continuing basis by the granting of another \$40,000.

Mr. McKee: Where were these Communist-type settlements?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: One was established at New Era, which is now called Cadell, and the other at Waikerie, and I am sorry to say that the Government of the day gave these two Communist-type settlements a measure of finance.

Mr. McKee: What do you mean by calling them Communist-type settlements?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: They were settlements where no-one owned anything and where all the work and efforts came from and earnings went into a common pool. That to me is a Communist-type enterprise, and these two enterprises failed, as Socialistic enterprises have to fail. I am pleased to see that the Treasurer has seen fit to continue the work he has been doing at Cadell. Although this is not in any way a personal reflection, I regret that the former Minister of Works ran out of money for the Cadell settlement and for the Watervale water reticulation scheme.

Mr. McKee: The Commonwealth ran out of money.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I have gone through the Loan Estimates and tried to point out to members opposite (and I hope the member for Port Pirie notices this) that the Loan funds provided by the Commonwealth to the Australian States have been progressing at about 6 per cent a year.

Mr. McKee: You are a Fascist.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Therefore, there was no excuse for the former Minister of Works to interrupt the water reticulation scheme for Watervale. Similarly, there was no excuse for him not to continue with the rehabilitation work at Cadell. Expenditure on these two items was cut because the Labor Administration thought it was no good spending money in a safe Liberal and Country League district. Therefore, some people in my district had to wait until an L.C.L. Administration came into office for this important work to be continued. At this stage I will not go into details of the work to be done at Cadell, reserving my comments on that for the debate on the lines. I am worried about the expenditure we make on railways.

Mr. McKee: Why don't you spend money on education? You salted \$12,000,000 away.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The member for Stirling tells me that the figure involved is \$8,500,000. Where are we heading with the South Australian Railways? Members opposite are not very worried whether public utilities pay their way; in fact, they are not very worried about anything paying its way, as far as I can see. Regarding the railways, in the financial year 1963-64, debt services amounted to \$4,960,000; working expenses were \$31,060,000; earnings were \$29,670,000; the working loss was \$1,390,000; and the total loss for the railways was \$6,350,000. I hope members opposite will think about this,

because it is worth thinking about. The remedy that members opposite tried to effect was to introduce road transport control, and we all remember how disastrous to the A.L.P. that was. I am now addressing the Committee on the amount of Loan funds we are investing in the South Australian Railways and am trying to make the point amid some interruption.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nankivell): If the honourable member will address the Chair, there will be less interruption.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Thank you, Mr. Acting Chairman. In the financial year 1964-65, \$5,190,000 was to be set aside to service the Loan debt, earnings were \$29,960,000, and the working loss was \$1,940,000, the total loss being \$7,130,000. In 1965-66, the debt service was \$5,570,000, working expenses were \$32,580,000, earnings were \$29,140,000, and the working loss was \$3,440,000, making a total loss of \$9,010,000. I wish the member for Edwardstown to note this, because I blame the railwaymen's union for most of this loss. In 1966-67 the debt service was \$5,840,000, working expenses were \$34,160,000, earnings were \$30,420,000, and working loss was \$3,740,000, the total loss being \$9,580,000. That is a total loss almost as large as all the money we invest in school buildings in South Australia. If one has a real interest in education, he will deplore the fact that the railway losses were so great as to almost equal the money we are able to invest in schools. In 1968-69, the debt service was \$6,450,000, working expenses were \$36,390,000, earnings were \$30,400,000, and the working loss was \$5,990,000, the total loss being \$12,440,000. The last amount is as great as the amount we spend on school buildings. We must take a close look at the way the railways are run.

Mr. Broomhill: What do you mean by "a close look"?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am trying to emphasize my remarks because it is important that I get them properly stated. The Auditor-General's Report would suggest that the inefficient railway services in particular are the passenger services that run after 6 p.m. in metropolitan Adelaide. If it will effect a reasonable saving to do away with metropolitan rail services after 6 p.m.—

Mr. Broomhill: This is a brilliant idea!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: —and if the people get properly served by bus services, we shall be doing the taxpayer a good turn if we cancel metropolitan passenger train services operating

after 6 p.m. I hope members opposite will think about this. I wish the railwaymen's union would be more practical and realistic in its attitude.

Mr. Broomhill: What do you mean by that?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I hope my remarks will be published in the railwaymen's magazine, because some remarks I made about a year ago were published. I think we must look carefully at the inefficient railway services in this State, because I do not consider that our State balance can continue if we are investing as much money in making up railway losses as we are investing in school buildings. I have spoken of many items and have tried to educate members opposite in the basics of the Commonwealth-State financial pattern in which they do not believe and which they criticize. They do not believe in the federal structure at all, although South Australia does very well out of our State financial arrangement.

I have spoken of one or two items affecting my district and I have thanked the Treasurer for getting on with public works in my district that the former Minister of Works (Hon. C. D. Hutchens) was not able to proceed with, either because he ran out of money or because

some of his colleagues overspent their budgets, as a result of which the district of Light was chopped out. I hope members opposite will think about what I have said regarding the railways and perhaps they will offer constructive ideas on how to increase the Railways Department earnings or reduce the losses. When they were in Government they came up with road transport controls, and we all know how disastrous those controls were to the Labor Party electorally.

I hope that we will get more co-operation from members opposite regarding our finances because I consider that Opposition members have a part to play in helping the Railways Department to correct its economic trend. I commend the Treasurer for his masterly presentation of Loan Estimates and I express pleasure at having a good, practical Treasurer, a man who has succeeded in private business life and has brought his business skills into Parliament to serve the State.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.49 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 20, at 2 p.m.