

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 11, 1970

The SPEAKER (Hon. R. E. Hurst) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

The SPEAKER: I notice in the gallery the Hon. Christopher Robert Ingamells, Speaker of the House of Assembly of Tasmania. I know that it is the unanimous wish of honourable members that he be accommodated with a seat on the floor of the House, and I invite the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition to introduce our distinguished visitor.

The Hon. C. R. Ingamells was escorted by the Hon. D. A. Dunstan and Mr. Hall to a seat on the floor of the House.

QUESTIONS**MURRAY STORAGES**

Mr. HALL: Like many other South Australians, I am wondering just what has transpired in Government circles and in negotiations since the Premier, as Leader of the Opposition, voted for a two-dam policy for South Australia.

Members interjecting:

Mr. HALL: A report in this morning's paper has an interesting little ending that I should like to quote. It reads:

The Government wants the agreement revised to preserve South Australia's rights to have Chowilla considered as a major storage on the river.

The House Would know that the procedure to have Chowilla considered was contained in the Bill that the Premier voted to defeat. In addition to that interesting observation, the Premier has announced that he has received a reply from the Victorian Premier (Sir Henry Bolte) to which he has yet to attend before he can release the details of it to the public.

The SPEAKER: The Leader is tending to debate the question.

Mr. HALL: I submit that I am setting out the periphery of the question, and I cannot ask it unless I am allowed to explain the basis on which I am framing it. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help thinking that it is embarrassing to the Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: Following the reply the Premier has received from the Victorian Premier, he has indicated that he is to engage

in further negotiations before he can establish some other field in which he will operate. In view of the opinion widely held in South Australia that the Premier is shifting his ground so that he can condition the public to accepting a change in Government policy on this matter, I ask the Premier whether he will explain to the House how close he is now to accepting substantially the Dartmouth agreement.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The imagination of the Leader is something that never ceases to amaze me in its fertility. At the last election, this matter was fought out quite clearly in South Australia, and the position which the Labor Party had before the public was that it was perfectly prepared to accept an agreement for the building of the Dartmouth dam but would not accept an agreement in terms that provided that South Australia would never get the Chowilla dam. This was the agreement that the Leader wanted this House and the people of South Australia to accept. The provisions in that agreement were that South Australia would never get Chowilla, and we said that we were not prepared to accept an agreement in those terms. Upon the basis of the matters that were put to this House and to the people, I wrote to the Premiers of the other States and to the Prime Minister. So far, I have had one reply, namely, from Victoria. Unfortunately, this reply is not particularly clear, and it will require considerable clarification. There are some matters about which Victoria wishes to talk to us. Precisely what that State's position is concerning this matter is certainly not clear from the letter, and I shall have to take the matter further with that State. I have discussed the matter also with Mr. Askin, who has informed me that I am due to receive a letter from him within a day or so now. He originally had expected that I would get the letter at the end of last week. I have also been informed from the Commonwealth Government that the papers regarding the recommendations of the department on the submissions we made will be in the hands of the Prime Minister this week. Therefore, on the receipt of the replies from the other two persons concerned, I expect that we will be able to proceed with further negotiations.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have been away for a fortnight.

Mr. Jennings: Not long enough.

Mr. Langley: We hadn't noticed it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I would not have expected any honourable member to notice it.

Before I went away I had expected that, by the time I returned, some more definite progress would be made on the so-called renegotiation of the agreement to build Dartmouth dam, and in that I have been disappointed.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: By your colleagues in other States.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was mystified by the Premier's suggestion in his reply to the Leader that the Bill presented to this House by the previous Government—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is tending to debate the question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am only making a point arising out of the reply given by the Premier. I was mystified by the Premier's suggestion that the Bill the Leader had introduced would not have allowed for any further consideration of the building of Chowilla dam, for my recollection is that specific provision was made in the Bill for that very purpose. However, that is by the way.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I thought it was only a debating point.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, it was a good one, most relevant to the discussion.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It isn't true.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is true.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It would be better if you addressed the Chair.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not permitted to debate the question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is difficult when all the Ministers keep interjecting.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! The honourable member must conduct himself in a proper manner.

Mr. Clark: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: I would expect better of the honourable member, with his experience. He must proceed to ask his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I accept your rebuke, Sir. I have been trying for some time now to ask the question. Will the Premier say what form he intends the renegotiation of the agreement to take? Also, has he asked the other State Governments and the Commonwealth Government to convene a meeting between himself, the Prime Minister and the other Premiers and, if he has, has he suggested a time and place for that meeting? If he has, what is the time and place? If he has not, does he intend that the renegotiation should be carried on by correspondence or some other means?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I welcome the return of the honourable and gallant member to the House.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Wouldn't you say he was learned, too?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am sorry I left that out; I will willingly add it. We are used in this House to the honourable member's proceeding to tell the House that he is only making an explanation and assuring the Chair that he is doing so, and then proceeding to make a debating speech, after which, with a bland smile, he says, "I have made a debating point and now you can't stop me." That is his normal habit.

Mr. Millhouse interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member does not like getting back some of what he hands out, he had better make it obvious to the public. In reply to the honourable member's question (and not his debating point, which was neither truthful nor forceful), I suggested to my colleagues in other States that a meeting should be convened, and I suggested certain bases upon which we wished to proceed to negotiation. I thought it proper that they should be able to examine those bases before a meeting was convened so that they would know before we got there what we were going to talk about, because, otherwise, we would attend the meeting and then leave without having decided very much, as they would want to discuss our suggestions with their officers. Consequently, I informed them in detail of the matters that concerned us in respect of the agreement, which did not pass this House and which did not *get* the endorsement of the majority of the people of this State at an election specifically fought at the request of the honourable member and his Leader on the very issue on which they were defeated. I have not received an early reply from the other States on the matters I put to them because, I have been informed, their officers have been examining in detail the matters we have submitted. Arising out of that, I expect replies from them and I hope that thereafter we shall be able to fix a date and place for a meeting.

INTAKES AND STORAGES

Mr. LANGLEY: As South Australia had wintry conditions and much rain last week, will the Minister of Works say whether there has been an appreciable intake into our reservoirs, and will he give figures of the present holdings?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I appreciate the honourable member's interest in the matter: it is a pity other members are not as interested as he is in the water situation.

Mr. Coumbe: The former member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner) was.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As he is no longer with us, we must have someone to take his place. The following is the current position at our reservoirs:

| | Capacity (million gall.) | Present holding (million gall.) |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Mount Bold . . . | 10,440 | 8,115.4 |
| Happy Valley . . | 2,804 | 1,479.6 |
| Clarendon Weir | 72 | 63.4 |
| Myponga | 5,905 | 4,658.1 |
| Millbrook | 3,647 | 1,942.1 |
| Kangaroo Creek | 5,370 | 1,061.6 |
| Hope Valley . . | 765 | 577 |
| Thorndon Park . | 142 | 112.5 |
| Barossa | 993 | 517.5 |
| South Para . . . | 11,300 | 7,056.5 |
| Total | 41,438 | 25,583.7 |

In the past 24 hours there has been an increase in storage of 44,600,000,000gall.

COMMUNITY PROJECTS

Mr. JENNINGS: Has the Minister of Social Welfare a policy in respect of funds to establish community projects such as swimming pools in what might be described as under-privileged areas? Also, what organizations would be required to administer such funds? If he cannot have a policy on this matter decided by his own department, will the Minister confer with the Minister of Local Government and bring down a reply?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will discuss the matter with my colleague and bring down a considered reply for the honourable member.

APPRENTICES ACT

Mr. COUMBE: From files that the Minister of Labour and Industry has in his office he will know that I intended this session to introduce an amendment to the Apprentices Act, and I am pleased to see that the Minister intends to do so this session. In April last year I made a public statement to the effect that, following a visit overseas by an officer of the Education Department, he was to confer with the Secretary of the Department of Labour and Industry on certain oversea achievements in the provision of apprenticeship training which are quite radical compared with the practices which have been in force in Australia for many years. Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether a conference

has been held between the Director-General of Education and the Secretary of the Department of Labour and Industry and, if it has not, whether it will take place? If a conference has been held, can the Minister indicate the results of such discussions?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Fruitful discussions have taken place. The Minister will be aware that this is something that affects the training of apprentices throughout Australia and, as a result of our discussions, we, together with other State Governments, will make submissions to the Commonwealth Government, so that we can consider the effects of the Tregillis report and any action that can be taken on an Australia-wide level. I shall be pleased to keep the honourable member informed of any further developments.

BOXING TELECASTS

Mr. McKEE: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about amateur boxing telecasts?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have made private inquiries and ascertained that no contract has been entered into between the South Australian Amateur Boxing Association and channel 9, and no fees are paid to the association. Amateur boxers appear on the programme by arrangement with the association. Their fares and accommodation costs are paid by channel 9 and they receive trophies but no payment.

DOG ATTACK

Mr. RODDA: I draw the attention of the Minister of Education to a story and photograph on the front page of today's *Advertiser* concerning attacks against children at Klemzig by what is described as a vicious Alsatian cross-bred dog. Two of these attacks occurred in the yard of the Klemzig Primary School. My further investigations into this matter have shown that one child, a six-year-old boy, was attacked by the dog at recess time and that, while the school staff were taking him inside for medical treatment, a second child, a five-year-old girl, was set upon by this brute and mauled about the head. I understand she suffered severe wounds to the face before she was rescued from the attack. I further understand that the school staff immediately contacted the local dog catcher to come and remove the animal from the schoolyard but were informed that they had to capture the animal themselves, as this was not part of the dog catcher's duty. I find this remarkable; but, be that as it may, the staff did contact the police and several officers snared the dog and

tied it up before the lunch-time break, when the dog might have made further attacks on the schoolchildren.

I am disturbed by the fact that, because of its vicious nature, the dog catcher did not take the animal away and that it was decided to leave it tied up in the schoolyard. It was not until late in the afternoon that the dog's owner came and took it back to the premises where it is kept as a fierce watchdog. Will the Minister provide safeguards to adequately protect the lives and safety of children in schoolyards from vicious attacks of this nature? Will he have prosecutions launched against the owner of this dog, and will he see whether there is not justification for this dog being destroyed? The owner was quoted in today's *Advertiser* as admitting that the police have called on him on a number of occasions concerning this dog.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: From the honourable member's account of what happened it seems that the staff of the school behaved admirably, and that any difficulties were as a consequence of the dog-catching arrangements applying in that area. I certainly will consider the general procedures that are adopted in schools concerning the presence of stray dogs. Also, I will ascertain who administers the Alsatian Dogs Act. I think it is administered by the Minister of Local Government. On this matter, and also in relation to the dog-catching arrangements that apply in the Klemzig area, I will ask my colleague to take the appropriate action.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ROLL

Mr. McRAE: In the last few days I have received numerous complaints from constituents in the Elizabeth and Salisbury areas about their right to enrol and vote in the Legislative Council by-election to be held soon. It seems that, as a result of misleading advice, hundreds of people are not on the roll. Some of this misleading advice has been given in an innocent fashion at naturalization ceremonies and other places, but some of it, on my information, has not been given so innocently although it has come from so-called authoritative sources. Consequently, the Midland by-election will not be fair, as there are literally thousands of people throughout the area who have every right to vote but who will not be able to vote. Can the Attorney-General say whether he intends to take action to ensure that this situation, which cannot be resolved before the Midland by-election, at least will not happen again?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The matter raised by the honourable member is, indeed, very

disturbing. The honourable member in his question said that, in his opinion, certain misleading advice had been given other than innocently, but I am sure that he did not intend to convey that the Electoral Department was in any way involved in this, as I know that he agrees with me that the officers of that department have done an excellent job in respect of all electoral matters. However, the Government is disturbed by the situation to which the honourable member has referred. Of course, the rolls have closed for the coming by-election and, therefore, it is impossible to take action in regard to them, but the Government is instituting a programme which will have the effect of informing all electors who may be eligible to be enrolled for the Legislative Council of their rights and which will give them every opportunity to enrol and to vote at all future elections for the Legislative Council.

Mr. HALL: The enrolling of prospective electors for the Legislative Council is a move of which I do not disapprove, and I would recommend anyone entitled to vote for the Upper House to be fully possessed of those rights. However, I ask the Attorney-General whether he will make quite certain that any communication with prospective electors contains no misleading information and no reference, directly or indirectly, to Party politics.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I assure the Leader that approaches to electors will be left entirely in the hands of electoral officers, whose reputation for impartiality and efficiency in electoral matters I believe to be beyond dispute and beyond reproach. The form of the approach to the electors will be entirely at the discretion of the officers of the Electoral Department.

Mr. HALL: I was pleased to receive the Attorney's reply in which he indicated that the matter of new enrolments would be left to the Electoral Department and conducted in that department's usual impartial manner. I should like to read from a letter that has been circulated in areas in the Midland Legislative Council District, as follows:

Dear Fellow Citizen,

It has come to my attention that you are not an enrolled voter for the Legislative Council although you are eligible to be enrolled. In view of the fact that the Legislative Council—South Australia's Upper House—is heavily weighted against the Labor Party, and therefore against the present Government, it is essential that every practicable step be taken to ensure that all those people eligible enrol as Council electors and vote on the Council elections. I have taken the opportunity, therefore, of completing for you a Legislative

Council electoral claim card. In order to become correctly enrolled I ask you to do the following:

- (a) sign the card as the claimant where indicated;
- (b) have your husband or wife or any adult sign as the witness, inserting his or her place of living;
- (c) insert details of your birth where indicated; and
- (d) immediately place this card in the enclosed envelope. Sign the envelope and post immediately. No stamp is required.

It is essential that in order to become correctly enrolled you take the steps outlined above at once. If you do, you will become eligible to vote in the forth-coming by-election for the Midland Legislative Council District.

Yours sincerely,
(Signed) Don Dunstan.

May I point out to enthusiastic members opposite that this is misleading information, and contains an incorrect instruction. Subsection (b), which indicates that the husband or wife or any adult can sign as the witness, is incorrect, because a proper and correct witness has to be another Legislative Council elector. Those who have followed the instructions of this letter will not be enrolled because, according to the member for Playford in his earlier reference, this is misleading information. However, that is the least important aspect, because it is straight Party-political campaigning that has come from the Premier's office, on the Premier's letterhead and in the Premier's envelope and, I assume, was paid for by the public and carries a postage stamp also paid for by the public.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. HALL: I am annoyed, to say the least, that the Premier has a much lower standard in the way he handles these matters than has the Attorney-General.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Leader is debating this matter.

Mr. HALL: I accept your advice, Sir, but I was prompted by the interjections of Government members. My question is based on the general premise held by my Party that one does not use Government funds for Party-political campaigning.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Who did?

Mr. HALL: Will the Premier say whether he sent these letters on paper supplied by the Government and posted at Government expense?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I did not. If the Leader wants to refer to the use of public funds for Party purposes, I could say

some things that would be very inconvenient to him.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Most embarrassing, too.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I can assure you, Sir, and the public that the allegation made by the Leader that the paper, envelopes, and postage of those letters was supplied at public expense is completely without foundation. None of it was supplied at public expense. They were, at my insistence naturally, supplied entirely at the expense of the Australian Labor Party, and it was never suggested that it should be otherwise.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Get up and apologize.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

GOODS SURCHARGE

Mr. McANANEY: A constituent of mine, who is starting a small business in the Hills, has received from a glass manufacturing company a letter that states:

We have recently had cause to survey the situation with regard to the economics involved in supplying you with small quantities of glass ware. The increased cost of handling and other inherent procedures to which small orders are subject gives us little alternative other than to apply a \$25 handling surcharge for each item on an invoice under \$75 value. This surcharge to be effective as from August 17, 1970.

Will the Premier, as Minister in charge of the Prices Branch, ask the Prices Commissioner to ascertain whether this is a justifiable charge?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will ask him to do so.

LOWER NORTH-EAST ROAD

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of July 28 about widening the Lower North-East Road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have much pleasure in telling the honourable member that it is intended to widen the Lower North-East Road in the section between Paradise Bridge and Grand Junction Road to provide for two 34ft. carriageways and a 16ft. central median divider. Depending on availability of funds, it is expected that this work will commence early in 1973.

LAWN MOWERS

Mr. EVANS: The Attorney-General has been kind enough to tell me that he has a reply to my recent question concerning the silencing of lawn mower motors by the use of mufflers, and I assume that this could also apply to other appliances, such as chain saws.

I shall be pleased if the Attorney-General will give me the reply about lawn mowers.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The honourable member asked whether it would be possible to place on the Statute Book a law providing that household motor mowers used in residential areas be fitted with a muffler. It would be unreasonable, and perhaps impossible, to require householders to fit mufflers at their own expense to motor mowers where the manufacturer's design does not provide for a muffler. If the law is to insist that motor mowers must be fitted with mufflers, it is necessary that the muffler be incorporated in the design of the mower as manufactured. It would seem, therefore, that any action in this matter would have to be on a uniform basis throughout Australia.

In 1967, as a result of approaches to the Ministers of Labour in each State, the Standards Association of Australia indicated that it intended to call a conference of interested parties to discuss the formulation of a draft Australian standard for the construction of domestic lawn mowers. This proposal was directed to safety requirements, and it was considered that the most appropriate course would be for the Standards Association to prepare a code concerning the safety requirements which should be observed in the manufacture of power lawn mowers. An Australian standard has, in fact, been published.

It would seem, therefore, that the appropriate course of action with regard to mufflers is to have the matter first considered by the Standards Association committee. I shall discuss the matter with my colleague the Minister of Labour and Industry with a view to ascertaining the cost and difficulty involved in incorporating mufflers in the design of power lawn mowers. If it seems to be practicable to do so, the views of the other Governments will be sought.

METRIC SYSTEM

Mr. SLATER: Can the Premier say whether the Government is to consider the introduction of the metric system covering distances, weights and measures, and whether the Government contemplates that it will co-operate with Commonwealth authorities in providing a public educational programme concerning this system?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I know that discussions concerning the introduction of the metric system have been continuing for some time and that action is to be taken soon, but

I cannot tell the honourable member at short notice what is to happen. I will have to obtain a report from the Minister of Lands.

Mr. Jennings: There has been a Senate Select Committee on this.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, there has been. I will obtain a report from the Minister of Lands and give the honourable member a detailed reply about the present course of the negotiations.

RAILWAYS INSTITUTE

Mr. NANKIVELL: When the festival hall site was selected and work was begun, the South Australian Railways Institute building was required to be demolished. I understand that certain negotiations took place between the previous Government and the institute concerning the siting, planning, and building of a new institute somewhere on the Railways Department's property. Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether it is correct that an agreement has been entered into, a site selected, and certain work undertaken towards planning a new institute? If it is correct, can he say what stage of development has been reached in this matter? Alternatively, if my understanding is incorrect, can the Minister say what is expected to be done about erecting a new railways institute in Adelaide?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No-one would be happier than I to be able to say "Yes" to all of those questions but, unfortunately, I have to answer "No". The previous Government, unfortunately, set about drawing up an agreement regarding the festival hall without properly considering the future of the railways institute, the future of railway employees' Returned Services League premises, the future of the railways laundry, the bakehouse, tarpaulin shop and, worst of all, the future access of motor vehicles to the South Australian Railways establishment. The negotiations concerning all of these matters are still being considered. It is a tragedy that construction of the festival hall has proceeded in such a half-baked way without all these ancillary matters having been determined by the previous Government. Although we have inherited this position, I assure the honourable member of one thing: we will proceed to re-establish those facilities that have been disturbed, including re-establishing the South Australian Railways Institute.

WEEKEND GAOL

Mr. HOPGOOD: It was announced in the *Advertiser* of June 18 that the Government was considering a system of weekend gaol.

Can the Attorney-General say whether the introduction of such a reform is imminent?

The Hon. L. J. KING: This matter is still being considered. There is a problem, as I indicated at the time the press asked me this question, regarding accommodation suitable for this purpose, and the matter cannot be considered seriously until such accommodation becomes available. I had a discussion with the Chief Secretary concerning a proposal in hand to erect some hostel-type accommodation designed for prisoners who were nearing the end of their sentence and who, it was thought, might be able to go to outside employment while residing at night and at weekends in accommodation more akin to a hostel than to the normal prison accommodation. It is hoped that the building being erected can be adapted to being used for the purpose of weekend imprisonment as well. But certainly, for the time being, serious consideration of weekend imprisonment cannot be entertained until it is known precisely what will happen regarding hostel-type prison accommodation.

STURT HIGHWAY

Mr. EASTICK: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on July 23 about the Sturt Highway? In seeking that reply, may I say that it is particularly pertinent, because another death occurred on this roadway as recently as last Sunday.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I regret to learn that another death has taken place. Unfortunately, these things occur, but it may be interesting for the honourable member to know that statistics show that the greatest portion of our road fatalities and casualties at present is attributed not to the condition of the road but to the inattention of the drivers. In reply to the honourable member's specific question, I point out that, subject to the availability of funds, it is proposed to commence reconstruction of this road in about 1975. The section of road, including the curve in question, will be constructed first. Improved warning signs and delineation at this curve will be installed within the next week.

TICKET TRANSFER

Mr. HARRISON: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on July 23 about ticket transfers on buses operated by the Municipal Tramways Trust?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Municipal Tramways Trust's fare scale has always been based on the principle that separate fares are

payable for travel on each vehicle, except in the case of buses operated on certain feeder services. The trust is not in a position to grant concessions by way of transfer tickets for journeys on two or more vehicles at a fare below that now payable; and, if such a system were introduced, it would be necessary for the trust to seek an increase in fares or to obtain financial assistance from the Government to offset the resultant loss of revenue. Experience in oversea cities where transfer tickets are or have been in use has shown them to be subject to abuses which are difficult and sometimes impossible to detect, resulting in a loss of revenue which leads to further fare increases. Many oversea cities have, therefore, discontinued the issue of transfer tickets as a means of keeping fares at the lowest possible level.

SCHOOL BUILDINGS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In an article in this morning's *Advertiser* that announces that the Government intends to spend \$3,000,000 on replacing primary school buildings, the following appears:

But he (the Minister of Education) stressed that the full implementation of the programme would be possible only if the Commonwealth honoured its promise to include an emergency grant for this purpose in next week's Commonwealth Budget.

As neither the members for Torrens and Davenport (the previous Ministers of Education) nor any member on this side is aware of the Commonwealth Government's having made any promise in this regard, can the Minister of Education say whether the Government, even before it has received an assurance that it will have the money available, has announced that it will spend \$3,000,000 on education? Therefore, is this announcement an example of the Government's using press officers to obtain publicity about matters that may not even eventuate?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: First, I point out that, in his policy speech made in October last year, Mr. Gorton said:

When the survey is completed, the States and ourselves will discuss the assistance we should each provide to promote the further development of education in all schools.

As a result of an agreement between six Liberal State Ministers of Education and the Commonwealth Liberal Minister for Education and Science, the survey was instituted. In view of the results of the survey and of the statement made by the Prime Minister before the last Commonwealth election, I fail

to see how the Commonwealth Government can refuse to provide some additional assistance.

Mr. Goldsworthy: But it hasn't promised.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The implication of the survey and of the Prime Minister's statement before the last Commonwealth election was that something better would be done in this area. Let me make it clear that we do not have the money to undertake this year all of the programme that has been announced; we will be able to undertake some of it. However, if the Commonwealth does not come good in the present Budget, the programme will be extended over a longer period. I want the people of South Australia to know what they are missing out on, not in terms of money but in terms of school buildings, if, in this current Budget, the Commonwealth does not come good with the kind of grant to which I, like my colleagues, believe it is morally committed.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The previous Minister of Education asked for an immediate grant of \$4,500,000 for this financial year. When I came into office as Minister of Education, I wrote almost immediately to Mr. Bowen saying that I believed that, as a consequence of tighter credit, the building industry in South Australia would be able to cope with an additional \$7,000,000 spent on school buildings. The programme we now have of 30 primary schools to get four-teacher or six-teacher open space units will cost \$3,000,000. We have a further immediate reserve list, involving another 40 primary schools and another 200 classrooms to be replaced, that will cost a further \$4,000,000.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Why don't you answer the question?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: We would be able to undertake a programme involving a further \$7,000,000 if as much were granted.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Have you got a promise?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A further point that the member for Kavel, because of his political prejudice, is incapable of comprehending—

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Why attack him?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As the honourable member does very well in his own quiet, little way, it ill-behoves him to rebuke anyone. A further point is that, if we waited until the Commonwealth Budget before we did anything, there would be precious little we would be able to spend in the present financial

year. I gave instructions two months ago for plans for additional works to be prepared. These plans have now been prepared and discussions have taken place, so why can I not announce the programme, having prepared this kind of programme, which I may add is designed to go into action quickly so that we can take advantage of additional funds? I know that the member for Kavel does not believe that the Commonwealth Government should provide the States with any additional funds.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Where did you get that information?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the honourable member believes that it should provide funds, I ask him to support in the meantime the application the State Government has made and the application made by the other State Governments for implementation of the recommendations of the survey.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I asked whether you had a promise.

The SPEAKER: Order!

ECKERT CREEK

Mr. CURREN: Over the weekend several property owners who draw irrigation water from Eckert Creek have approached me because at times excess water is discharged from the Berri evaporation basin into the creek. As this is a slow-running creek, it takes a considerable time for the highly saline water to return to a quality fit to be used for irrigation. Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Irrigation to have the matter investigated with a view to having the water quality improved for these unfortunate irrigators?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to have the matter investigated and to bring down a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

SUMMER CLOTHING

Mr. BECKER: Have you, Mr. Speaker, a reply to my recent question about summer clothing to be worn in the Chamber?

The SPEAKER: On Wednesday, August 5, the honourable member asked me whether I would be prepared to approve the wearing of shorts in this House. In 1968 the Standing Orders Committee recommended to this House as follows:

- (a) That a Standing Order to regulate members' dress is not desirable; and
- (b) that, as a general rule, the conventional dress for male members, which includes the wearing of a coat, shirt, tie and long trousers in the Chamber, should be retained.

This report was subsequently adopted by this House and, until the Standing Orders are altered by this House, the *status quo* should be maintained.

HOUSING TRUST TENANCY

Mr. WELLS: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about problems faced by a tenant of a Housing Trust shop in my district?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Investigations have now been completed relative to the proposed insulating of the ceiling of the delicatessen premises occupied by Mrs. I. Wiper at 15A Flinders Road, Hillcrest, and the trust will install insulating material in the premises at no cost to Mrs. Wiper.

APPETITE SUPPRESSANT

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Health a reply to a question asked by the member for Bragg on July 15 about appetite suppressant drugs?

The Hon. L. J. KING: My colleague has supplied the following report based on the assumption that the drug referred to by the honourable member in his question is the drug diethylpropion, which is available without prescription in this State at the present time:

Prior to the withdrawal from sale of certain powerful amphetamine stimulants, adverse reports of the drug in question were rare and isolated. In recent months, since the more powerful agents ceased to be available, reports of large scale consumption of this drug have begun to appear, and undesirable stimulant effects are being alleged. It has become an established pattern that, when a popular agent ceases to be available, a substitute is quickly found by those who feel the need for such substances.

Nevertheless, as it is aware that there have recently been cases of abuse of this drug, the Food and Drugs Advisory Committee is considering the restrictions that may be applied to it. It is expected that recommendations will be made by the committee in the next few weeks. The Dangerous Drugs Act is at present restricted to the narcotic drugs; various recommendations have been made for amendments to that Act in order that it can be extended to other drugs, including certain of the amphetamines.

As a consequence of the concern expressed by the member for Bragg, I spoke to the Secretary of the Food and Drugs Advisory Committee regarding the earliest possible date on which the committee could meet to consider the matter. Unfortunately, it is impossible for the committee members to get together for two or three weeks. However, I have been assured that as soon as the committee can meet it will consider the drug mentioned by the honourable member.

AIR POLLUTION

Mr. CRIMES: An article headed "Pollution control is new course for graduates" appears in the *Australian* on August 8, part of which is as follows:

Melbourne University will next year establish a pollution control course for graduate scientists and engineers—the first course of its type in Australia. The one-year course, leading to the degree of master of applied science in air environment studies, will be as extensive as the latest American teachings. Its main emphasis will be on air pollution.

As we must do all we can to combat pollution, will the Minister of Education say whether the establishment of a pollution control course for graduate scientists and engineers is likely to be considered by any South Australian university?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will discuss the matter with the universities and the Institute of Technology and let the honourable member have a reply.

CIGARETTES

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked recently regarding warning labels on cigarette packets?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As Western Australia, Victoria and Queensland are not proceeding with legislation on cigarette labelling at present, the Government does not intend to proceed unilaterally. The labelling of cigarette packets will again be discussed at the next Health Ministers' conference.

STUDENT TEACHERS

Mr. CARNIE: I noticed in this morning's *Advertiser* a report that a student teacher had been gaoled for using foul and indecent language in a public place. When arrested, this man was taking part in an anti-American imperialism demonstration, was carrying a red flag and a portrait of Mao Tse Tung, and was chanting the words that constituted the charge. Will the Minister of Education assure the House and the people of this State that this man and others who are convicted of similar offences will be dismissed from the Education Department?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: First, I assure the honourable member that no decisions will be taken on the basis of newspaper reports only. I am not familiar with this case, and I am not prepared to make any decision without having the whole matter thoroughly investigated, which I will do. I am confident that the teaching profession comprises a group of people who are prepared to approach their responsibilities with integrity. I believe that the only

criterion with which we must be concerned is the way in which teachers behave within the school environment. The particular political views that they may hold and express outside of the school are not of concern to the department or to the Government.

Mr. Carnie: Not at all?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I said, "The political views."

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We live in a democracy, you know!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I want members to understand what I am saying, and not just to take my words in the way they want to take them. The particular political views that teachers may hold and express outside of the school are not of concern to the department. What is of basic concern is the way in which they carry out their duties within the schools. Any charge involving matters other than normal political activity is a matter for close consideration and judgment in each case, and the matter to which the honourable member has referred will be considered in that way. I am not familiar with the full details of it other than what appeared in the newspaper report, and, until I have the full details before me and I have considered the matter, I cannot give a reply in relation to the particular gentleman to whom the honourable member has referred.

MINNIPA AREA SCHOOL

Mr. GUNN: About 12 months ago two officers of the Public Buildings Department said, after inspecting the Minnipa Area School, that \$2,500 worth of urgent repairs needed to be effected to the school so that it could operate reasonably efficiently. Until last week no repairs had been carried out, and what was the headmaster's office still had half its ceiling falling out. Also, holes in the floorboards require masonite to be placed over them. Will the Minister of Education take up this matter immediately and have the situation rectified?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think I am correct in saying that the Minnipa Area School will be replaced as soon as the new school at Karcultaby is completed. Consequently, I have issued instructions that only repairs necessary to maintain the school until it is replaced by the new school at Karcultaby should be undertaken. That matter is already in hand. However, I will inquire about the progress of urgent repairs of this nature at the school and furnish a report for the honourable member.

SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION COMMITTEE

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Last week, when I asked the Premier whether he had taken any further the matter of the representation of the Opposition in the House of Assembly on the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, he said that he had had discussions with members of another place on this matter and that it might be possible to get some resolution. Several papers, including regulations under the Petroleum Act, which run into 74 pages, were laid on the table of the House today. I do not think any private member has a chance to check such regulations: we are required to depend on the committee in this respect. As this Party has no representation on the committee—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You have, from the Upper House.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: —we naturally feel disquiet because regulations are going through without our being able to consider them properly. The Premier said that he had been unable to obtain agreement with another place, yet the Chief Secretary said that as far as he knew no approach had been made. When I raised the matter with the Premier again later (after those contradictory statements had been made), he said that discussions had taken place and he hoped to reach some finality. Will the Premier now say whether he has taken these discussions any further and whether he intends to do any more to ensure that the Opposition is represented on this committee?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Opposition is represented on the Subordinate Legislation Committee: it has half of it. I suggest that, if the honourable member is unable to look at these documents himself, he should open his channels of communication to the gentlemen in another place and discuss with them the results of their investigations. As far as my conversations with members of another place are concerned, I indicated the basis upon which the Government would be prepared to alter the position in this House in return for an alteration in the position of the other House if we could reach general agreement so that there would be a minority voice represented in each House. So far I have not had any further suggestions, although I was told that the matter would be considered.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You are now assuming that the other place is considering your proposal?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: So I understand. However, I will make a further inquiry for the honourable member. I was not surprised not to receive any further approaches; as the honourable member will know, the course of proceedings in another place is, to say the least, leisurely.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: I do not think you made any approach at all.

DRUGS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question arises out of the report on page 1 of today's *Advertiser* concerning the use of drugs by juveniles. Unfortunately, this is only the latest of a series of most alarming reports that have appeared in this State and in other parts of Australia about the use of drugs. In paragraph 24 of His Excellency's Speech the Government announced its intention to take action to bring to the notice of all persons the harmful effects of the taking of drugs without medical supervision. His Excellency also stated:

Measures will be introduced to provide for severe penalties for those who illegally distribute drugs.

That paragraph reproduces, I think *verbatim*, an undertaking given in the Government's policy speech before the election. As this is a matter of growing gravity and magnitude, I ask the Premier whether he is able to tell this House precisely what steps the Government intends to take to bring to the notice of people the harmful effects of drug taking, when it is intended that action will be taken on this matter, and whether it is intended to introduce legislation into this House soon to provide severe penalties for those who take drugs?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Instructions have been given relating to the drafting of legislation. The question of a campaign relating to dangerous drugs is in the hands of the Minister of Health and the appropriate forms of action are currently being discussed with the Director-General of Public Health. I am not able off the cuff to tell the honourable member exactly when we may expect action except to say that it will be as early as we can make it during this session. There is a very heavy drafting programme at the moment, but as soon as we are able to get legislation before the House we will do so. This is very early in the programme, and very little legislation has yet been introduced. As the honourable member realizes, we now have to deal with financial measures.

Mr. Millhouse: I was thinking more of the publicity campaign.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I understand that we are receiving recommendations from the department concerning this, but I will get a full reply for the honourable member.

PRISONERS' CLOTHING

Mr. McRAE: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question of July 21 about prisoners' clothing?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Chief Secretary states:

There are many different types of prison clothing, ranging from the daily wear for prisoners in cellular confinement to a quite smart evening uniform (including a tie and desert boots) for trainees in lesser security areas. There is also a variety of day wear ranging from overalls for trainees on certain duties to whites for cooks and stewards. No prison clothing of any sort is marked with numbers, and the only marking is a small stamp on the tail of the shirt and the inside waistband of the trousers. This is purely for housekeeping and laundry purposes, and defines the prison, e.g., "AG" denotes Adelaide Gaol. No khaki trousers are issued at all, the present uniform being blue-grey drill shirt and trousers, the shirts all having peaked collars. The boots are certainly Army surplus, but are maintained in good condition by our own boot shop, and cleaning materials are readily supplied. The caps are of a baseball type, but are washable and easily kept, and no complaints have been received about them. The coat is of black wool, is warm and comfortable, and although we discarded these some years ago in favour of a smarter type of battle jacket, we resumed the manufacture of the present coat at the request of the prisoners. All clothes and personal linen are changed twice a week, and all prisoners shower daily, and more often if they request it or are on duties of a nature which demand it.

With reference to remand prisoners, it used to be policy that they could wear their own clothes if they wished. However, this fell into gradual disuse because most wished to keep their personal belongings in the best possible condition for court appearances, and therefore preferred the clothing supplied. This applied particularly to those on appeal and lengthy remand, whose stay in prison sometimes rose to six to seven months. The attitude was not discouraged, because uniform clothing assists greatly in maintenance of security. Remand prisoners in the yards need not wear caps if they do not wish to do so.

The visiting justices make regular visits to all institutions and no reports of complaints regarding clothing have been received, although it has been suggested that pullovers should be provided for winter. This is at present being investigated.

That is the report that my colleague obtained in reply to the honourable member's question. I have discussed the matter with the Chief Secretary, who appreciates the honourable member's concern that prisoners' clothing should accord

with their dignity as human beings. He appreciates also that perhaps there is more than one opinion about the desirability of the present form of prison dress, and assures me that the matter will be considered carefully. The Government's proposed criminal law revision inquiry will embrace methods of correction and punishment, and penal institutions, and it seems that the most appropriate method of approaching the question of reform of prison dress is to refer that question to the proposed inquiry committee. That course will be taken.

MARKET GARDENERS

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my question of July 30 about the orderly marketing of produce from the Port Pirie area?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague has written to representative market organizations inviting them to confer with him on either Friday, August 14, or Wednesday, August 19, 1970, and is awaiting their replies.

KIMBA MAIN

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of August 6 about work to be done on the Kimba main?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: With any project of the size of the Polda-Lock-Kimba scheme, which is estimated to cost more than \$5,000,000, it is necessary to plan not only the physical side of building the scheme and laying the pipes but also the Budget provision of money to make this physical progress possible. Accordingly, the Engineering and Water Supply Department made \$175,000 available in 1968-69, \$575,000 in 1969-70, and, in its current budgeting, it proposes to spend \$575,000 each year until the scheme is completed.

Financial budgeting for the scheme until June 30, 1970, was thus \$750,000. Actual expenditure to the same date was \$763,000. Financial progress on the scheme has in fact been slightly greater than expected. Physical progress has also been planned, and this is also, to all intents and purposes, up to schedule. It was planned that 15½ miles of main would be laid by June 30, 1970. Actually, 14½ miles of main, including 1½ miles of m.s.c.l. main at the Polda trench, was completed and backfilled by June 30, 1970. In addition to this, a further two miles and 1,800ft. of trench had been excavated ready to receive pipes.

Although progress may have seemed slow, from the above it can be seen that the department is achieving its objective within the limits of the finance available. It is important to note that \$1,368,000 was spent by the Engineering and Water Supply Department from Loan money on water supply schemes on Eyre Peninsula in 1969-70, and \$1,684,000 is being sought for 1970-71. Of this sum, \$575,000 is to be spent on the Polda-Lock-Kimba scheme.

HILLS SCHOOLS

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of July 30 concerning the Ironbank and Cherry Gardens Primary Schools?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The future of these schools is being considered and a decision concerning their future will be made shortly. Any work on the up-grading of the Cherry Gardens Primary School has been stopped until a final decision is reached, but as soon as I am able I will give the honourable member further details.

DUTTON WATER SUPPLY

Mr. ALLEN: Recently, I asked the Minister of Works a question about the Dutton water supply, and the Minister was kind enough to give me a comprehensive reply, from which I gathered that there was no intention to carry out a further survey on this matter. However, having been in this area as recently as last Friday and having had a conversation with local residents, I believe that some of them have changed their minds and now have an opinion different from the one they held when the previous survey was carried out in 1966. As I understand that a talc mine may open up on the western side of Dutton which will require large quantities of water and that water could be supplied from the existing source, will the Minister consider having another approach made to Dutton residents to see whether their views have, in fact, altered since the previous survey was conducted in 1966?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I know the honourable member will understand that these surveys are not conducted without cost to the department or to the Government. Indeed, they are fairly expensive and time-consuming, and it is normally accepted, I think, that once a survey has been conducted and has proved that the people concerned are not particularly interested (indeed, they were not interested to any great extent in this scheme), it is not easy to come back relatively soon and say

that things have changed to the extent that a majority favours the scheme. However, although I will not give an undertaking that I am prepared to have another survey conducted, I will examine the matter and see what I can do.

STATE MUSEUM

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about catering for blind people at the State Museum?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The museum will be endeavouring to introduce a special service for blind visitors to enable them to feel objects on display and descriptions of the objects in Braille as soon as this becomes practicable. However, in the meantime, the museum will be happy to welcome classes of blind children and will make approaches to schools to see if such a service would be acceptable. This can be done without providing special space.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS WORKSHOP

Mr. COUMBE: Employees at the Public Buildings Department workshop at Finsbury are engaged mainly on constructing prefabricated school buildings. Although I am the first to agree that such buildings should be replaced as soon as possible, I note that figures issued the other day by the Treasurer disclose that prefabricated buildings and transportable units (there is a difference between the two) involve a total cost that is almost half that of the cost of other types of building. Can the Minister of Works say whether any retrenchments will take place at the Finsbury workshop, or whether some other work can be provided to keep the work force there fully employed in line with the steps that I took as Minister to see that it was, in fact, fully employed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member may rest assured that there will be no retrenchment as a result of the programme indicated in the Loan Estimates to which he has referred, at the Public Buildings Department's Finsbury workshop. It is intended to do more prefabrication work on Samcon buildings, and we are confident that this will absorb any labour that may not be engaged on the construction of temporary buildings. The honourable member need have no fears that, as a result of the programme's being cut, any workmen here will be retrenched.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION

Mr. VENNING: I guess the Premier is well aware of the extreme conditions existing at present in the State, particularly in the

northern part of the Rocky River District, where I understand many primary producers have not yet sown a grain of wheat and do not intend to do so. Indeed, many farm boys have left farms and gone to work at the Commonwealth Railways establishment at Port Augusta. In addition, I understand that several men have been taken on for construction of the concrete tank at Wilmington by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Will the Premier take up this matter, in conjunction with the Highways Department, and see what additional work can be made available to people in the northern part of the State in connection with road construction taking place at present. Will he consider programming work in advance of the five-year plan so as to help growers in the area over the difficult period they are experiencing at present?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall certainly be sympathetic to doing whatever we can to provide additional employment in the area. I will take up this matter with my colleague and see what can be done.

FRANCES SCHOOL

Mr. RODDA: My question relates to the recent announcement of the Minister of Education concerning houses for country schoolteachers and I refer to the schoolhouse at Frances which, for the want of a better word, is crummy but which nevertheless provides shelter for the occupants. Can the Minister say whether work on this schoolhouse will receive any priority and, perhaps while he is considering this matter, will he examine also the possibility of providing a consolidated area school at Frances?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As I am not familiar with the position at Frances, either in relation to the possible replacement of the schoolhouse or in relation to the provision of an area school, I will have both those matters investigated and, when I am able to reply to the honourable member, I will do so.

LOXTON SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Some months ago when I was at Loxton I visited the primary school and saw the site proposed for establishing a Burnside-type open-teaching unit. In fact, I believe that if the Minister of Education will look back through the records he will find that Loxton was one of the first schools referred to as a possible site for such a unit. Will the Minister find out why this work is being held up?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Have you been there recently?

Mr. NANKIVELL: No, but I have checked and my information is up to date. Although I understand that some officers of his department have visited the area, I ask the Minister of Education to inquire into the matter to see what has caused a delay and whether anything can be done to put the matter in hand so that this unit can be completed at the earliest possible time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The note that I had was that the flexible unit to be provided at Loxton involved the letting of a contract in February this year and, presumably, this contract was, in fact, let. However, I will check on the whole matter for the honourable member and bring down a report.

QUESTION TIME PROCEDURE

Mr. EVANS: I direct a question to you, Mr. Speaker, asking for guidance and direction. When the member for Mitcham was perhaps debating a question he was asking, you, Sir, rightly brought him to order. However, I was a little disappointed that, at that stage, three Ministers, who are also responsible people, were interjecting, and one persisted in interjecting after your call for order. I should like your direction regarding replies given by three Ministers today in which the Ministers concerned were, in my opinion, debating the matter, although I do not say for certain they were debating it. Regarding those replies, first I refer to a reply given by the Minister of Roads and Transport to a question asked by the member for Mallee about the South Australian Railways Institute buildings.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot express, an opinion. He is entirely out of order in doing so.

Mr. EVANS: This is not an opinion, Mr. Speaker. I am asking for your interpretation of Standing Orders Nos. 125 and 126. Standing Order No. 125 provides that no member shall debate a question, and Standing Order No. 126 provides that, in answering a question, no member shall debate the answer. I ask for your interpretation, Sir, for I supported your nomination and accepted your appointment, and I believe it is up to you to give a direction so that, in future, we may know what we should do as members.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member can be assured that I will give directions and interpret Standing Orders in accordance with what they provide.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The honourable member asks some silly questions.

Mr. Evans: Fair go, Des.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is entirely out of order in interjecting when the Speaker is on his feet: I will not tolerate members speaking when I am on my feet. If this type of thing recurs, I will apply the Standing Orders rigidly.

TRACTORS

Mr. EASTICK: I have a letter dated July 29, 1970, from the Minister of Roads and Transport to the General Secretary of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated that deals with matters relating to tractors and to the farm equipment that they haul. The letter refers to the fact that a provision in the Road Traffic Act empowers the Road Traffic Board to exempt motor vehicles (in this case tractors) from having to have front mudguards fitted. The letter states:

However, the Road Traffic Board does not intend to introduce an exempted class of vehicle, or vehicle user, but each exemption is dealt with on merit.

The situation is that manufacturers do not present tractors that have front mudguards: front mudguards are not even available as optional extras. Therefore, for farmers to comply with the Act, even when they cross a road in their tractor from one property to another, they must fit front mudguards to their tractor or obtain a specific exemption. On October 29, 1969, the then Minister of Roads and Transport in reply to a question in another place said:

I understand that the Road Traffic Board is at present considering amendments to the appropriate regulations. I am sure that the points made by the honourable member will be taken into account by the board in framing its recommendations.

Can the Minister say whether these recommendations have been made and whether the letter to which I have referred is in line with those recommendations? Also, will he receive further representations on this matter, having regard to the manufacturing difficulties to which I have already referred?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Dealing with the last question first, I point out to the honourable member that, as the Government will always receive representations from responsible people on any matter, the answer is "Yes": we shall be only too pleased to receive any further representations that may be forthcoming.

Mr. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may not take the opportunity to ask a question when he has not been called.

Mr. Jennings: It's a most reprehensible thing.

The SPEAKER: Order! I expect members to co-operate and not to be obstructive.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Government is certainly prepared to consider any matter that is brought forward. However, the letter referred to by the honourable member was written as a result of decisions made after due deliberation. I repeat that the matter is never completely closed; if some factors that have not been fully considered may alter the situation, I shall be only too happy to consider them properly, if the honourable member is prepared to bring them forward.

RAILWAY ACCOUNTS

Mr. McANANEY: Recently published accounts show that the revenue of the South Australian Railways has decreased by \$753,000, while expenditure has increased by \$401,000. In the temporary absence of the Treasurer, will the Minister of Works obtain a report giving the reason for this deficit and the financial result of the carriage of freight?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to pass on the question to the Treasurer for a report.

GLENELG TRAM LINE

Mr. BECKER: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of July 23 about the Glenelg tram line?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The private reserve of the Glenelg tram route is about six miles long and covers about 50 acres. The tracks cover about half this area. Over the past 10 years a considerable improvement has been made in the appearance of the reserve by eradicating weeds by poisoning, and by continual repairs and maintenance to the fences. However, it has been impossible to prevent people from using the reserve as a dump for garden clippings and other rubbish. In conjunction with the local councils concerned, parts of the reserve at tram stops have been converted to car parks for park-and-ride passengers, for patrons attending the Forestville Stadium and for shoppers in the Goodwood and Glenelg areas.

Large areas of the reserves would need to be filled and graded before couch grass and shrubs could be planted extensively. It would also be necessary to install a water supply along the reserve area for the purpose of watering the grass and shrubs and the cost of this work would be substantial. In addition, substantial annual expenditure would be involved in watering and maintaining a planted reserve of such

large size. It is not considered that this expenditure is warranted but the Municipal Tramways Trust will continue its efforts to keep the reserve area in a clean and tidy condition and improve its appearance by further eradicating weeds and maintaining the fences.

INTEREST RATES

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Deputy Premier, in the absence of the Premier, a reply to the question I asked recently regarding the Rural Advances Guarantee Act?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Prior to August, 1969, all mortgages given to the Savings Bank of South Australia under the Rural Advances Guarantee Act included a clause that prevented the bank from varying the rate of interest for a period of five years so that many mortgagors will go on enjoying the benefit of lower interest rates until this five-year period has expired. The person mentioned in the honourable member's question would have had the benefit of a rate of interest of 5¼ per cent during a period when all commercial rates of interest have been rising. He will now be required to pay 6¼ per cent, which is the rate allowed by the Reserve Bank for carry-on rural loans, and which is much less than the rate presently allowed by the Reserve Bank for other bank loans, including rural development loans or loans for acquisition. After August, 1969, the bank's mortgages were amended to permit it to vary the rate of interest after one year and, since April of this year, following the example of the State Savings Bank of Victoria and of the Commonwealth Savings Bank, the mortgages permit the bank to vary the rate of interest without waiting for any specified period.

The honourable member asked whether I would look into the matter with a view to ensuring that interest rates applicable to mortgages arranged with the Savings Bank under the Rural Advances Guarantee Act are not increased because such will increase the difficulties of primary producers concerned. I appreciate the difficulties involved, but it is not within my power to give the direction that the honourable member suggests. The Savings Bank has a responsibility to place its funds, within the limits set by its Act, to the best advantage, within reason, of its depositors. Plainly then, in times when interest rates are rising, it must review the rates it is charging so that it may pay interest to its depositors which is in line with interest payable by similar institutions. The Rural Advances Guarantee Act, however, does have regard to the problems that may be encountered by primary

producers through no fault of their own, and provision is made, in certain circumstances, for deferment of payment of instalments. Any person seeking relief in this way should approach the bank setting out full details of his difficulties.

OAKBANK AREA SCHOOL

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked recently regarding transport arrangements at the Oakbank Area School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Lenswood and Woodside to Oakbank large departmental school bus was originally driven by a teacher-driver. When he could not continue, another teacher was not available and a local man who had agreed to drive withdrew when he found that the daily rate was \$2.70. The bus is still not running but, because of reduced numbers due to sickness, the other buses are able to convey the children without exceeding the safety certificates. The scales of rates of pay for teachers and private persons driving Education Department school buses are based on the Government Drivers and Shunters Award, to which the Government is bound. The weekly award rate is reduced to a payment based on miles a day plus a loading for casual employment and allowances for cleaning the bus and for protective clothing. The scale of rates was approved by the Minister of Labour and Industry. The Headmaster of the Oakbank Area School and the chairman of the school committee are trying to obtain a permanent driver. The secretary of the school committee has agreed to drive the bus for the remainder of the year to relieve the situation if no other driver can be found. He will commence to drive the bus when the number of children increases beyond the capacity of the other buses.

EGG CARTONS

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Works received from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about egg cartons?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Chairman of the South Australian Egg Board reports that, following an exercise undertaken by the board to attempt a reconciliation of producers with selling permits, purchases of egg cartons and records of egg sales, discrepancies were found to exist. In this investigation, producers co-operated with the board inspectors in physical stock counts taken on farms. The absolute figure of the discrepancy between cartons purchased and sales recorded could not be established, but over a period of 27 months

indications were that approximately 352,000 cartons were involved. This represents a little more than 5 per cent of all cartons purchased over that period. The Chairman states that on completion of the investigations the board was advised that legally it had no power to take action against those producers who were considered to have rendered incorrect returns. However, the board has since decided on a procedure which, when introduced, should automatically effect a reconciliation at any given time.

WEST BEACH BUS SERVICE

Mr. BECKER: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on July 30 regarding the West Beach bus service?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Many houses in the West Beach area are some distance from the route of the Municipal Tramways Trust's West Beach bus service but previous investigations into this matter have shown that it is impracticable to reroute the service to bring it closer to the houses in question because roadways in the area are unsuitable for regular bus operations. Several discussions have been held on this subject with representatives of the West Torrens council but, whilst the trust has received full co-operation from council officers, it has not yet been possible to devise a roadworks programme which will meet both present and likely future public transport requirements. The trust is continuing its investigations into this matter and is prepared to reroute the West Beach bus service more centrally through the developed areas when suitable roadways are available.

DEBIT ORDER WORK

Mr. GUNN: I read with concern in Wednesday's edition of the *West Coast Sentinel* that Government funds for debit order work are to be cut drastically this financial year. Part of the article states:

Government funds for debit order work—work carried out by the district councils on behalf of the Highways Department—will be cut drastically in this financial year.

No doubt the Minister of Roads and Transport is aware of the serious situation in which this will place local government authorities, who may even be forced to retrench some employees. I was informed over the weekend that this cut had been made so that the Government could continue its planning of the metropolitan transport system and to enable it to purchase houses.

Mr. McKee: You got on to a crook grapevine.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member can explain his question but he cannot debate it.

Mr. GUNN: Very well, Sir. Will the Minister say— why funds for debit order work for district councils on Eyre Peninsula have been cut this financial year?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is not my habit to comment on press comments. However, this point was raised last evening at a meeting which I and the honourable member for Torrens attended. At that meeting I gave an undertaking to obtain the information and advise further. I shall be happy to let the honourable member know, but let me assure him of one thing: no money has been taken from country areas to go to the Metropolitan Adelaide Transport Study plan; in fact, the contrary is the position. We are not proceeding with M.A.T.S., if you can get that into your head.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. HALL: The Minister of Roads and Transport has just said that the Government is not proceeding with the M.A.T.S. plan. I therefore ask him this fairly simple question: if the Government is not proceeding with the M.A.T.S. plan, why is it having the plan investigated?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The greatest difficulty one has in replying to silly questions is trying to give a sensible answer.

Mr. Nankivell: You can't answer it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member does not want me to answer, I will sit down.

PORT LINCOLN DEEP SEA PORT

Mr. VENNING: I have expressed some concern to the Minister of Marine in connection with—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot express his concern; he can only explain his question.

Mr. VENNING: On perusing the Loan Estimates, I find that there is no mention of finance for work on the development of Port Lincoln as a deep sea port, although I understood that the Minister of Marine had said that money would be made available for this purpose. Can he say how much will be made available?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I did state in the House on one occasion that I was under the impression that funds would be

made available in the Loan Estimates this year for the commencement of work on the Port Lincoln deep sea port, but this was a mistake on my part. The programme shows no funds being available this financial year for the commencement of such work. I will have the matter looked into and tell the honourable member when the work will commence and when it is expected to be finished, although I thought the information had been given to the honourable member. Evidently it is not expected that it will be commenced before the next financial year.

DEPARTMENTAL CRITICISM

Mr. EVANS: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about whether public servants could make public statements about their departments the same as teachers employed by the Education Department?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have a report from the Public Service Board which I will give to the honourable member tomorrow.

At 4 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SWAN REACH AREA SCHOOL

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Re-establishment of Swan Reach Area School.

Ordered that report be printed.

RIVER TORRENS ACQUISITION BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the acquisition of certain lands comprising the Torrens River, or adjacent thereto, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

POTATO MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Potato Marketing Act, 1948-1966. Read a first time.

WILD DOGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Wild Dogs Act, 1931-1961. Read a first time.

AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND BANKING GROUP BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to supplement by legislation of the State of South Australia the Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Act 1970 of the United Kingdom which provides, *inter alia*, for the transfer to Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited of the undertakings of Australia and New Zealand Bank Limited and The English, Scottish and Australian Bank, Limited, and for other purposes incidental thereto and consequential thereon; to supplement by legislation of the State of South Australia the Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Act 1970 of the State of Victoria in so far as it relates to the transfer to Australia and New Zealand Savings Bank Limited of the undertaking of E.S.&A. Savings Bank Limited; and for purposes connected therewith. Read a first time.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It has the purpose of facilitating the merger between the Australia and New Zealand Bank Limited and the English, Scottish and Australian Bank Limited. A merger involving these two banks under a scheme approved by the High Court in the United Kingdom was introduced a year or so ago. The merger has been effected by the formation of a new company, the Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited, which has acquired all the shares in the two existing banks. Furthermore, as part of the total reorganization, the Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited desires to transfer the incorporation and domicile of the Australian and New Zealand Savings Bank Limited from the United Kingdom to Victoria.

On May 15, 1970, the Parliament of the United Kingdom passed the Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Act 1970 by which the merger is to be effected, and it conforms to the previous general pattern of legislation for the amalgamation of banks in

England. The merger of Australia and New Zealand Bank Limited (hereafter referred to as "A.N.Z.") and English, Scottish and Australian Bank Limited (hereafter referred to as "E.S.&A."), both of which are incorporated in the United Kingdom, involves the following:

(a) The formation of the new company named Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited (hereafter referred to as "group") in the United Kingdom, and the acquisition by group of the whole of the issued share capital of A.N.Z. and E.S.&A. in exchange for the issue of group's own shares. This exchange has been carried out and both A.N.Z. and E.S.&A. are now wholly-owned subsidiaries of group;

(b) The amalgamation of the banking undertakings of A.N.Z. and E.S.&A. (with the exception of certain excluded assets) by transferring the same to group;

(c) The transfer of incorporation of A.N.Z. Savings Bank (which is incorporated in the United Kingdom) to Victoria so that A.N.Z. Savings Bank may be deemed to be a company incorporated in Victoria; and

(d) The amalgamation of the banking undertaking of E.S.&A. Savings Bank (which is incorporated in Victoria and is a subsidiary of E.S.&A. Bank) with A.N.Z. Savings Bank, which is a subsidiary of A.N.Z. Bank.

In general terms, the United Kingdom Act referred to provides that on an appointed day the undertakings of A.N.Z. and E.S.&A. banks will (subject to the exclusion of the excluded assets referred to) be transferred to and vested in group, which thereafter will conduct the combined undertakings. A.N.Z. and E.S.&A. will continue to exist for limited purposes as property-owning companies holding the property excluded from the transfer of the undertakings (the excluded assets). The United Kingdom Act referred to also authorizes A.N.Z. Savings Bank to seek the transfer of its incorporation from the United Kingdom to Victoria.

Since the existing banks carry on business outside the United Kingdom and have substantial assets in the Australian States and elsewhere, the question arose as to the capacity of the United Kingdom Parliament to legislate effectively to pass the whole of the undertakings to group and, of course, the undertaking of the E.S.&A. Savings Bank was outside the legislative field of the United Kingdom Parliament. To overcome any disability arising in this respect, supplementary Acts are being sought in the Australian States and other areas to complement and give full effect to the provisions of the United Kingdom Act. This

supplementary legislation will, to the extent to which the United Kingdom Act may not itself be wholly effective to transfer the undertakings of the existing banks, render the transfer of the undertakings and the vesting of the assets wholly effective. In general, the scheme of the local legislation is the local enactment of the operative provisions of the United Kingdom Act other than certain provisions that are appropriate only in the United Kingdom.

The merger is being effected with the approval of the Treasurer of the Commonwealth, who, on May 22, 1969, gave his consent pursuant to section 63 of the Banking Act 1959 to the transfers of the businesses of A.N.Z. and E.S.&A. to group and the business of E.S.&A. Savings Bank to A.N.Z. Savings Bank. The State of Victoria passed supplementary legislation, entitled the Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Act 1970, on April 7, 1970, which has the following general effect:

(a) It confirms, so far as Victoria is concerned, the transfer of the undertakings of A.N.Z. and E.S.&A. Banks to group:

(b) It enables A.N.Z. Savings Bank to transfer its incorporation to Victoria and to become a company deemed to be incorporated under the Companies Act 1961 of Victoria:

(c) It then proceeds to transfer the undertaking of E.S.&A. Savings Bank to A.N.Z. Savings Bank.

The transfer of the undertakings effected by the United Kingdom Act and the Victorian Act referred to are intended to take effect on a day to be appointed (in the Acts referred to as "the appointed day") which is intended to be October 1, 1970. However, although the merger has been completed in the commercial sense, the two separate existing banking entities are continuing to carry on business independently, and it is desired to merge the banking operations completely. Similar mergers have been carried out in the past between comparatively small banks without any special legislative assistance, but it is now recognized, in the United Kingdom and in other jurisdictions throughout the world, that the sheer volume of paper work involved in preparing full documentation to effect such a union makes it almost impracticable.

In practical terms the merger of these banks will involve: (a) the transfer of well over 1,000,000 accounts; and (b) the transfer of borrowing arrangements for some hundreds of thousands of the customers of the two existing trading banks and E.S.&A. Savings Bank.

The time and effort involved in carrying out the changeover by means of separate transactions with each of the individual customers would be practically prohibitive and would involve not only the staffs of the banks but also the customers themselves and the officers of Government departments such as those in the Stamp and Succession Duties Division and the Lands Titles Office. It would be necessary, for instance, to obtain: (a) authority from each customer to transfer accounts from one bank to another, new mandates for operation of a variety of types of account, new authorities for periodical payments and new indemnities for various purposes connected with the accounts; and (b) new securities (guarantees, mortgages, liens, etc.) from customers and their sureties or authority for transfer of existing securities where practicable.

The work involved in preparing documents, obtaining signatures, stamping and registration in real terms would be totally unproductive, at the expense of and with delays to new transactions. The purpose of the legislation is threefold. First, it will reduce the volume of paperwork and cut red tape to a minimum. There are benefits for both the Government and the banks concerned: for example, it would be difficult for the stamps office and the titles office to handle all the necessary changes which would have to be made and which would cause a sudden flood of paper work to arrive at the desks of hard-worked officers. Secondly, it is desirable to preserve the rights of the staff of the existing banks and to give them complete continuity in relation to their employment. It is possible to do this by renewal of contracts, but a more effective and expeditious way to do it is through the form of this legislation. Thirdly, it is necessary for the special provisions of the law of evidence relating to bankers' books to continue to apply to the existing banks, even after they have ceased to hold a banking licence.

The saving of documentation is not intended by the banks to deprive the State of South Australia or any State of the Commonwealth of any revenue which might have been derived from the stamping and registration of such documentation. Accordingly, arrangements have been made with the State Treasurer for the payment by the banks of a sum considered sufficient to compensate the State for the loss of revenue involved. It is planned that the transfers of the undertakings under all the Acts, whether of the United Kingdom or elsewhere, will be made effective on one day, October 1, 1970, by appropriate timing of the

machinery steps necessary under the individual Acts. By this method (that is, the combined operation of the United Kingdom legislation and the local supplementary legislation) all the accounts of customers of the existing banks will be appropriately transferred on the appointed day and will thereafter continue to operate as accounts with group (or in the case of savings banks with A.N.Z. Savings Bank) without any further steps being taken.

Moreover, existing securities held by existing banks will continue for the benefit of group (or A.N.Z. Savings Bank, as the case may be) in respect of advances both prior to or subsequent to amalgamation. The Act of Parliament proposed for the State of South Australia may be explained as follows: The preamble recites the present situation regarding the relationship between the banks, the proposals for the merger, and the aims of the legislation, and it is self-explanatory. Clause 1 formally provides for the short title and citation of the proposed Act. Clause 2 sets out the division of the Act into parts. Clause 3 provides that the Act binds the Crown. The necessity for the clause arises from the need to ensure that the benefits of Government guarantees given in respect of certain securities held by the existing banks will continue with group. It would also ensure that any accounts which a Government department might have with any of the banks concerned were transferred in the same fashion as accounts of private customers.

Clause 4 (1) provides definitions of a number of terms used in the Bill. I invite particular attention to the following definitions:

“appointed day”—for the purposes of the Act the Governor is authorized by clause 4 (2) to appoint a day, termed the appointed day, upon which the transfer of the undertakings of the merged banks will become effective;

“excluded assets”—lands constituting bank premises are to remain in the ownership of the existing banks. The purpose of this definition is to exclude land held by the existing banks otherwise than by way of mortgage or other security, and also to exclude from the transfer of assets any records required to be kept by the present banks under the South Australian Companies Act;

“liabilities” is defined as covering all obligations whatsoever of the existing banks except such as relate to excluded assets;

“property” is widely defined to include all the property, assets, rights and powers of the existing banks;

“security” is widely defined to cover all types of security which might be held by the existing banks;

“the undertaking of an existing bank” covers all of the property and all of the liabilities of an existing bank on the appointed day with the exception of excluded assets and liabilities relating thereto; and

“the undertaking of E.S.&A. Savings Bank” is similarly defined.

The remaining definitions are formal and speak for themselves. Clause 4 (2) is a key provision of the Act enabling the Governor by proclamation to fix the “appointed day”, being the day on which the undertakings of the existing banks are to be transferred. It is confidently expected that the appointed day will be October 1, 1970.

As Parts II and III dealing with the trading banks and the savings banks respectively follow similar lines, the following comments refer to the relevant clauses of the two Parts: Clauses 5 and 13 are the principal operative clauses. The effect is that on the appointed day the undertakings of the existing banks (as defined) and the undertaking of E.S.&A. Savings Bank (as defined) will, by virtue of the legislation and without any further act, be vested in group or A.N.Z. Savings Bank (as the case may be). The clauses follow cognate provisions contained in the United Kingdom Act and the Victorian Act already referred to. By virtue of clauses 6 and 14, all rights and liabilities of the existing trading banks and E.S.&A. Savings Bank existing on the appointed day are transferred to group or A.N.Z. Savings Bank (as the case may be) and made binding on the transferee banks as if they had been originally parties to the transaction, but the provisions of this clause do not apply to any contract or other arrangement which relates to an excluded asset.

Clauses 7 and 15 amplify clauses 6 and 14. By paragraph (a) of each of those clauses the relationship existing between an existing bank and a customer will on the appointed day become a relationship between group or A.N.Z. Savings Bank (as the case may be) and that customer and all existing instructions or authorities given by a customer will be preserved until revoked or cancelled by that customer. By paragraph (b) existing securities will be deemed to be transferred to group or A.N.Z. Savings Bank (as the case may be) on the appointed day and the respective transferee bank will be entitled to hold the same for debts and liabilities thereby secured at the appointed day which are

transferred under the Act. Where the security extends to secure future debts and liabilities it will be available in the hands of the transferee bank for debts and liabilities which the customer may incur after the appointed day with that bank.

By paragraph (c) the transferee bank is given the same rights and priorities and is made subject to the same obligations and incidents as applied to the bank from which the security was transferred. Under paragraph (d) anything held in safe custody by an existing bank will after the appointed day be held by group (or A.N.Z. Savings Bank) for the same person and on the same terms. Paragraph (e) provides in effect that all negotiable instruments drawn, given, accepted or endorsed before, on or after the appointed day will be treated by group (or A.N.Z. Savings Bank) in the same way as they would have been treated by the present banks had there been no merger.

Clauses 8 and 16 have the effect that any actions or arbitrations which at the appointed day are pending by or against an existing bank may be continued by or against group (or A.N.Z. Savings Bank) instead of the existing banks. It further provides that causes of action which at the appointed day are in existence, and might be the subject of proceedings by, or against, the existing banks (or E.S.&A. Savings Bank), may, after that day be made the subject of proceedings by, or against, group or A.N.Z. Savings Bank (as the case may be). Thus, continuity of the rights both of the banks and of third parties having claims against them are preserved. The clauses further provide that if a judgment or award is made in any such proceedings against group (or A.N.Z. Savings Bank) it may also be made effective against the existing trading banks or E.S.&A. Savings Bank. In this manner the rights of the party in whose favour the judgment or award is made are preserved. However, the provisions of clauses 8 and 16 do not apply to proceedings relating to excluded assets, which are dealt with by clauses 9 and 17.

Clauses 9 and 17 provide, in effect, that any party to an action, arbitration or proceeding relating to an excluded asset who may have taken his proceedings against group (or the A.N.Z. Savings Bank) where the need arises may amend his proceedings by substituting the name of the existing bank (or E.S.&A. Savings Bank) as a party and is exempted from liability for costs occasioned by the amendment. Clauses 10 and 18 provide, in

effect, that the provisions of the Evidence Act, 1929, as amended, which relate to putting of bankers' books in evidence, are to continue in operation with respect to the books of the existing banks which are transferred under the Act so that those books do not cease to be available as evidence because of the existing banks ceasing to operate as such.

Clause 11 provides that except where the context otherwise requires any reference to an existing trading bank in any other enactment or in any document whenever made or executed is to be treated as a reference to group, but the clause does not extend to references to an existing trading bank in any pension scheme, provident fund or officers' guarantee fund, nor does it extend to any reference which relates to an excluded asset. The exclusion of reference to excluded assets follows from the general exclusion of excluded assets from the legislation. References to pension funds, provident funds and officers' guarantee funds are excluded because such schemes or funds are dealt with and preserved by clause 12.

Clause 12 deals with the position of bank staff. It preserves any right which at the appointed day had accrued, or was accruing, to an employee of an existing trading bank under any Statute, award or industrial agreement or under any pension scheme, provident fund or officers' guarantee fund. Rights will continue to accrue against group. Service with group will be regarded as continuation of the employment existing at the appointed day and the accrued or accruing rights will be enforceable against group in the same way, at the same time and to the same extent as they might have been enforced against the existing trading bank if there had been no merger. This clause has no counterpart in that part of the Bill (Part III) dealing with the E.S.&A. Savings Bank, for the reason that neither E.S.&A. Savings Bank nor A.N.Z. Savings Bank employs any staff of its own but the work of both savings banks is carried out by staff members of the existing trading banks.

Clause 19 applies the same provisions in respect to the E.S.&A. Savings Bank as clause 11 enacts with reference to the trading banks, save that clause 19, for the reason already stated, necessarily makes no reference to pension schemes, provident funds or officers' guarantee funds. Clause 20 ensures that, where an existing bank was occupying premises under any instrument which contains provisions restricting the transfer or subletting

of the premises, the occupation of those premises by group is not a contravention of those provisions. The clause also provides that no contract or security is invalidated or discharged by any transfer or vesting made by the Bill.

Clause 21 facilitates service of documents (which include summonses, orders and other legal process and notices) and enables them to be served on any of the merging banks, so avoiding any difficulty that might arise from similarity of names or from the exclusion of particular assets from the transfers made under the Bill. Clause 22 also arises because of the exclusion of certain assets from the statutory transfer effected by the Bill. It provides that persons dealing with the banks and the Registrar-General are not concerned to inquire whether property the subject of a particular transaction is or is not an excluded asset. And it further provides that if group (or A.N.Z. Savings Bank) deals with any person in relation to an excluded asset it will be deemed in favour of that person that group (or A.N.Z. Savings Bank) had authority to enter into the transaction. However, the clause also preserves the liabilities of the banks between themselves in relation to any such excluded asset.

Clause 23 is a machinery provision to enable the Registrar-General, on the request of the banks, to make appropriate entries in the Real Property Register recording the transfer of ownership to group (or where appropriate A.N.Z. Savings Bank) which is effected by the Act. Clause 24 is a saving provision designed to ensure that neither group nor A.N.Z. Savings Bank is by the Act relieved from any statutory provision relating to banking companies.

In conclusion, the provisions of this Bill are for all practical purposes identical in form and content with that currently being considered for presentation to the Parliaments of New South Wales and Queensland. To date, the pattern to be adopted in Western Australia and Tasmania has not been determined. This is a hybrid Bill and will, in the ordinary course of events, be referred to a Select Committee of this House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

GOODWOOD TO WILLUNGA RAILWAY (ALTERATION OF TERMINUS) BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the removal

of portion of the railway between Goodwood and Willunga. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to authorize the removal of the railway between Hallett Cove and Willunga. The removal of this railway is a step in the rationalization of railway services taken on the advice of the Transport Control Board. Rail services between Hallett Cove and Willunga have been running at a considerable loss for several years. That position applied some time ago, although no trains have been running on it for several years. The removal of this portion of the railway will, therefore, result in a considerable saving of Government expenditure. The portion of the railway to be removed is shown on a plan exhibited for the information of honourable members.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows. Clause 1 is formal, and clause 2 contains various definitions necessary for the purposes of the Bill. Clause 3 authorizes the South Australian Railways Commissioner to take up the railway between the points marked "A" and "B" on the plan, and to establish the terminus of the line at the point marked "A". Clause 4 incorporates the new Act with the South Australian Railways Commissioner's Act.

I should make it plain that, although this Bill will permit this portion of the railway line to be removed, concurrently with this, plans are afoot to provide for the extension of the existing line from the place marked point A on the line shown on the plan to serve the expanding population of the southern districts in accordance with the policy followed by this Government of providing adequate public transport as and where required. The question of this line was fully considered by the Transport Control Board and the Public Works Committee, and the information placed before those bodies showed conclusively that it was impracticable to continue the line on the existing route for several reasons, not the least of which was that some of the grades were so steep that it was impossible to run a fast economic train service under existing conditions. Also, the line had been allowed to deteriorate to such an extent that its rehabilitation would probably have cost more than the laying of the new line that we envisage. In fact, some work has already started on extending the existing line from Hallett Cove to Christie Downs.

Mr. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOAN ESTIMATES

In Committee.

(Continued from August 6. Page 570.)

Grand total, \$113,220,000.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): The document presented last week by the Treasurer is a remarkable tribute to the former Treasurer (Sir Glen Pearson) and to the previous Government, because this Government begins to plan its first works programme with over \$13,000,000 in hand in the Loan Account, a tremendous starting gift from the previous Government that was achieved despite that Government's providing a record previous Loan programme that extended public services to a degree not seen before in South Australia. Therefore, it is with great pride that I notice the surplus left in the Loan Account for the incoming Government. Of course, the revenue deficit must be discussed in conjunction with the Loan Estimates because of the bearing on it of the Loan funds held in reserve. At the commencement of the last financial year the revenue deficit was \$7,905,000; at the end of the financial year during which the previous Government was responsible that deficit had been reduced to \$4,579,000, a remarkable achievement in the face of the overall demands that are continually made on a Government. Therefore, not only did the Loan Account enjoy this tremendous surplus of \$13,000,000 but also the revenue deficit was reduced from almost \$8,000,000 to a little more than \$4,500,000. The new Government has inherited a most satisfactory financial situation that behaves it to act wisely in managing the resources handed to it.

This year, overall the Commonwealth allocation was most generous. Of course, because of the high rate of involvement that we enjoy in the distribution of Loan funds throughout Australia, South Australia fared very well. If members opposite are not convinced and tend to laugh at the overall figure, I invite them to do their own research into the percentage of Loan funds that South Australia receives compared with the percentage received by other States. They will find that, of the mainland States, South Australia gets the biggest percentage slice of the available Loan funds, a significant involvement of about 13 per cent.

Mr. McKee: Tell us about it. You are paying the Treasurer a compliment.

Mr. HALL: This will be of great assistance to the honourable member's district.

He knows that the previous Government approved a most extensive sewerage scheme for Port Pirie, and that could be approved only because of the satisfactory percentage of Loan funds obtained for the State by Sir Thomas Playford. That percentage of entitlement has benefited all Governments since then. The fact that the overall Loan allocation provided by the Commonwealth Government was raised by 65 per cent meant that, because South Australia received 13 per cent, our share was \$8,500,000. Because of our percentage figure, we are able to get a far greater sum than we would get if our involvement were on a straight per capita basis. This is one reason why public services in South Australia are so much better than those in other and wealthier States. Those who study the situation here know that the percentage of houses seweraged in South Australia is remarkably high when compared with the percentage seweraged in a city such as Sydney, where the figure is remarkably low. This achievement is based on South Australia's high involvement in the available Loan funds. We should protect this at all costs, and I shall have something to say later about further advantages to South Australia as a result of its 13 per cent involvement.

One factor which arose from the recent financial talks in Canberra, to which our new Treasurer was a new, newsworthy and vocal participant, and which was not put before the people of South Australia sufficiently was the Commonwealth Government's generous attitude. I have already referred to the overall offer made to the States that was commented on favourably by people who observe the Australian scene and not just the parochial South Australian scene. On June 27, Kenneth Davidson, the economist for the *Australian*, said:

Mr. Gorton is surprisingly generous to the States, but how to finance it? The Prime Minister, Mr. Gorton, may be a centralist but the inescapable conclusion which must be drawn from the results of this week's Premiers' Conference is that he has made a contribution to State finances which for generosity has never been equalled by any other Prime Minister.

How many people in this State are aware of the basis of this observation? How many people have been led astray by what the Treasurer said on his return: "We've got a lousy deal"?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Because he got a lousy deal—that's the reason.

Mr. HALL: Let the Minister of Roads and Transport observe the figures that provided the

basis for the Prime Minister's offer to the States, an offer made not haphazardly but on a formula based on growth, population increase and other factors. Let me inform honourable members what the basis of the offer was. I will quote from the Prime Minister's remarks.

Mr. Burdon: It will be very interesting.

Mr. HALL: It will be enlightening for the honourable member who, I am sure, has never read it.

Mr. Burdon: Then read it.

Mr. HALL: In addressing the Premiers, the Prime Minister said:

We have aimed at providing an average annual rate of increase in total Commonwealth revenue assistance to the States substantially above the increases that would have been produced if the present grants arrangements continued unaltered. On the basis of past trends in increases in average wages and population, the present grants formula would have resulted in the grants growing at an average of 9.9 per cent each year over the next five years. We have calculated that the overall effect of the Commonwealth's new proposals would be to increase that average rate of growth to at least 12.5 per cent per year.

A little later he said:

While we would appreciate from you an informal assurance that the funds will be used in this way—

he is referring here to assistance in Loan funds to the States by way of grants—

that is, for nonrecoupable purposes—there will be no specific or legal conditions attached to the expenditure of the grant.

So, in relation to the significant new assistance that the Commonwealth is giving by way of grants to the Loan programme, there are no strings attached.

Mr. Coumbe: No tags.

Mr. HALL: No tags, and the States may use these funds as they see fit. We cannot at the moment overestimate the importance not only of the raising of the growth factor in our annual grants from 9.9 per cent to 12.5 per cent but also of the new assistance that the States are getting, for which the Commonwealth has never had proper credit, in relation to the \$27,000,000-odd that South Australia will get this year for its Loan programme, free of interest. It will also get a large sum to offset existing debt. The public of this State has never been fully apprised of the significance of this on the Revenue Budget, and it will be the Revenue Budget that the Treasurer will, in a few weeks time, introduce into this House with figures showing a benefit of about \$3,000,000 a year to this State's revenue funds from the Loan Estimates we are now considering.

Mr. Coumbe: This is a new departure, isn't it?

Mr. HALL: A completely new departure, and the previous Government that I led was in the forefront of fighting for this in the two years of its existence. Honourable members know the argument that has gone on over many years because the Commonwealth Government was supplementing the Loan programmes of the States with revenue grants and how we used to resent the Commonwealth's charging interest on that money, which it had obtained without interest as revenue. This is the first real recognition of the source of that money, and it relieves the State's Budget of the debt structure. The Prime Minister went on to say:

On the basis of recent trends in increases in Loan programmes and of present interest rate patterns, we estimate that over the five years 1970-1971 to 1974-1975 the total debt charges savings to the States from this annual grant will be of the order of \$148,000,000.

In addition, the actual saving of the two debt proposals put together—this grant involved in this Loan programme and the assistance towards existing debt charges—will, over five years, result in \$320,000,000 extra being available to the States. We have heard very little about this from the Treasurer or anyone else in this State, and it is time it received full recognition.

It is interesting to revert to the heading in the *Australian* of June 27, which stated that substantial assistance had been given at the last conference by the Commonwealth but posed the question: how will the Commonwealth finance it? At present there is conjecture in our news media about what new forms of taxation may be applied by the Commonwealth to meet the obligations it has assumed on behalf of the States. This is drawing together a picture for the public of Australia and South Australia that, I think, it has lost sight of, that has been fragmented in the past—that is, that it does not matter from which source we get the money, whether a State or a Commonwealth source: there is only one taxpayer—the citizen of South Australia. When he sees that the increases that this State gets must be met by some additional form of taxation by the Commonwealth Government, he will begin to understand the simple arithmetic of it, that it all comes out of his pocket and there is no magic pocket from which the Minister of Education or anyone else can obtain his resources for the works he is planning through his department. I am

interested to note that the Minister of Education is getting up a case for what he will do if he gets the money. It is a pretty good political ploy. If he does not get the money, he will start hitting the Commonwealth. It will be a very convenient year for the Minister of Education to hit the Commonwealth, because he expects that there will be a Senate election later in the year. Why does he not make it \$20,000,000? Why not make it a bigger story? I hope the Minister gets the money, but he would have had a much better chance of getting further resources for his education programmes had the Treasurer adopted a more sensible attitude in Canberra.

One of the most publicized attempts by the Treasurer prior to his journey to Canberra was that he was going to ask the Commonwealth to vary sales tax throughout Australia to help the South Australian economy. Has anyone ever heard of a more futile approach: asking a Commonwealth Government, which has the responsibility of governing 12,000,000 people, to vary one of its most important forms of taxation among 12,000,000 people to assist 1,250,000 people?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Where is your quotation?

Mr. HALL: The Treasurer deviated from the general proposition we had put to the Commonwealth when we were in office, that South Australia should have and should obtain sufficient support from the Commonwealth Government to establish equal conditions in this State.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I want to hear the quotation.

Mr. HALL: If the Minister of Education had persuaded his Treasurer to adopt completely the programme that was left on the files for him, which was a proper case to put to the Commonwealth for establishing equal standards for South Australia instead of running off and adding to it, an impossibly futile approach, this State would have done a jolly sight better than it did. Figures that are available to every member opposite show the immense increase for both the Loan and revenue programmes that the Commonwealth Government has made available to this State for the next five years. If we got a lousy deal, the responsibility for it rests with the Treasurer, not with the Commonwealth Government. During the previous Government's term of office the Commonwealth Government proved that it was not unsympathetic to the South Australian story. When we approached it for special assistance—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Where is the statement that you referred to?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You've made an accusation. Where is the statement?

Mr. HALL: Everyone knows: it was in all the news media.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You quote the source of your information that I asked the Commonwealth Government to alter sales tax. It is a lie. I did not do anything of the kind. I said I wanted them not to put additional sales tax on.

Mr. HALL: The Treasurer has been running around the State for the last fortnight denying he said various things.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Name your source! You come in here and lie—that is what you are doing. Quote your source.

Mr. HALL: The Treasurer had better check his press statements.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: See if you can produce a statement to that effect. Why don't you do it? Where is your source?

Mr. HALL: I will produce it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: All right! Go on.

Mr. HALL: The Treasurer has said that he did not say it, but he knows very well—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I said nothing of the kind—not on a single occasion.

Mr. HALL: The press went to the Treasurer's staff and got the O.K. for the story.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order! The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. McKee: You will never get to Canberra if you tell lies.

Mr. HALL: The overall grants to the States were effectively and significantly increased, but South Australia apparently (according to the Treasurer's own words) got a "lousy deal". I do not know whether the Treasurer will repudiate those words: I do not have a press cutting in front of me, but I remember his statement. I do not know whether I have to substantiate every remark I make.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You do—when you have a reputation for making statements you cannot substantiate.

Mr. HALL: Because the Minister made many charges against the previous Government, he is no person to talk about the need to refrain from making statements that cannot be substantiated.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Quote an instance. You cannot do it! You say the first thing that comes into your head.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HALL: This State should be aware of the Commonwealth's new approach. New funds totalling \$88,420,000 are available for the general works programme, excluding the housing programme, which enjoys funds at a concession rate. Of this sum \$27,420,000 will be interest-free grants, which will ensure that appropriate projects can be accomplished without cost to the Government. This sum will not be sufficient to cover all the dead weight of the Loan programme as it develops, but it will be a very significant relief for the Revenue Budget in relation to interest charges that would otherwise have been made in connection with this year's programme. The balance that the Government inherited was \$13,032,000. The Revenue deficit had been reduced to \$4,579,000, leaving \$8,453,000, of which the Government is committing \$4,300,000 to its formal Loan programme, leaving \$4,153,000 uncommitted. This is the first point on whether the Government is conducting its financial affairs properly. The Government is leaving more than \$4,000,000 uncommitted and unspent after fixing its programme. To be entirely word perfect, I will quote from *Hansard* what the present Treasurer said last year (when he was Leader of the Opposition). I hope the Treasurer will not contest the veracity of *Hansard*. Last year he said:

Apart entirely from questions of consistency, it is quite clear that South Australia was in a position to be able to spend the money that the Treasurer has decided should be set aside from the Loan Fund, as against past and future revenue deficits. The Government—the present Treasurer was speaking about the previous Government—

was in a position to spend this money and it is in a position to spend it now. It is not necessary for the buoyancy or the viability of the Treasury for the Treasurer to set this money aside from Loan funds and to fail to spend it upon developmental works which would mean more employment for people and the use of more materials and resources in the State. Because the Treasurer has chosen to do what he has done, this State is worse off in employment, the purchase of materials and the achievement of developmental works (and particularly our vitally necessary schools and hospitals) than it would have been had the Treasurer not made these decisions.

The present Treasurer then amplified the statement he had made and strongly criticized the method that the then Treasurer had used of reserving a substantial amount of Loan funds against future contingencies. He made this his

main criticism of last year's Loan Estimates. What has the present Treasurer done this year? He has repeated the procedure exactly to the same extent. His policy this year is exactly what he said was wrong last year—and because it is in *Hansard* he cannot deny it. So, as last year we reserved sufficient funds to cover the deficit and enough to cover a possible future deficit of \$4,000,000, he has done the same thing. I do not criticize him for that: he has at last learnt to be a little prudent, at least in one direction, and has set aside something that he says is there in case he runs into deficit in respect of that \$4,000,000. I have an idea why it is there: I believe a substantial amount of it is set aside for the Dartmouth dam. When the Treasurer has sufficiently side-stepped the question and got some saving clause in the Dartmouth dam agreement (which will mean nothing), he will bring it into Parliament for formal approval and use some of the money he has secretly set aside for it.

I therefore do not criticize the Government's action in setting aside this money, but I do criticize the Government for its complete inconsistency in being so vocal in its criticism last year and then this year adopting the policy that the previous Government followed. The present programme goes into much detail. It is an opportunity for members to study the various works that may interest them on a State-wide basis, but particularly in relation to their districts. As such it is not usually the basis for a wide-ranging debate on the principles of State finance, which, in the main, revolves around the Revenue Budget to be introduced later. However, several points are emphasized: the remarkably healthy situation left to this Government, the rather remarkable assistance given by the Commonwealth Government to all States, the proper involvement that this State has had, the better deal that South Australia would have received had the Treasurer presented his case more efficiently, and the inconsistency of the Government in being so vocal in its criticism last year of a principle that it has now followed almost to the dollar.

These things, I believe, show a more prudent attitude to finance that I hope will continue and will be shown in the Revenue Budget that we shall be pleased to see when it is introduced. However, I should like to mention one specific point—the sum made available for school buildings. This matter is somewhat clouded by the Minister of Education's reference to the special funds that he hopes to receive but of which, as yet, he has had no confirmation.

It is interesting to note that during the recent election campaign we produced figures to show that when Labor was previously in office it had reduced substantially expenditure on school buildings.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's also a lie, because in the last three months we were in power—

Mr. HALL: The Minister cannot deny it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The previous Minister stated in a letter to the press—

Mr. HALL: The Minister knows very well that he will have to improve on that if he wants members to believe him. This year the Government intends to spend on school buildings a sum that is \$1,000,000 more than that spent on school buildings last year. Let the Minister deny that.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: And it's almost \$3,000,000 more than you proposed to spend last year.

Mr. HALL: I have dealt not with what expenditure was proposed for each year, but with what was actually spent, and the Minister knows that.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That is where you get a false picture.

Mr. HALL: That shows the mentality of the Minister.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Don't be stupid.

Mr. HALL: By comparing actual expenditure, I am getting a false picture! Let the Minister tell the public that.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Certain of the expenditure in 1967-68 was incurred when you were in power for part of the year, and you know that to be the case.

Mr. HALL: We are considering an annual accounting, as we do every year, and past annual accounts are on record for any member to study, and they show an absolute decline. I shall not quote a figure, because the Minister wants to be correct to one-half per cent, but the figure declined from \$11,000,000 to about \$8,000,000, or something.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You were in power for the last three months of that period.

Mr. HALL: The expenditure was raised significantly as soon as we returned to office, and the Minister knows that he is drawing a red herring across the path when he suggests that, because we were in Government for three months of that period, we could reverse the trend.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I'm tired of the way you distort the facts.

Mr. HALL: It is not a distortion.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Only one member is permitted to address the Committee at a time and, at present, that member is the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is absurd for the Minister to bring to the Committee an argument that actual expenditure can tell lies.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: No, you can do that.

Mr. HALL: I will rest my argument on actual expenditure; this is one reason why the Minister is shifting in his seat, because he does not wish me to refer to actual expenditure. Last year, after leaving the Minister a record surplus in Loan funds, we had spent \$15,500,000 (I think that was the figure, and the Minister can check it if he likes) from Loan funds on educational buildings in South Australia. This year the Minister is spending \$1,000,000 more.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Read what the Treasurer said on the Loan Estimates.

Mr. HALL: I have read what he said: he will spend more if he can get it. We said that earlier in the year, too. What I am dealing with is what the Minister put to us and not what he might think in 10 months' time. The Minister said that he would spend 6.4 per cent more on education buildings than the amount spent last year. Last year we raised the expenditure by 16 per cent, but during the recent election campaign we were roundly criticized by members opposite.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And by the electors: they gave you what you deserved.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You only spent that much under extreme pressure.

Mr. HALL: I am sure the Minister of Education did not exert extreme pressure on the actual figures: mythical figures, yes, because they are the figures that he deals with. We know from the figures that he has presented that he is planning to increase the expenditure on school buildings by at least 6½ per cent on last year's actual expenditure, whereas, by comparison with the previous year, our increase was 16 per cent. If the Minister can produce a 16 per cent increase in expenditure on educational buildings I will say at the end of the year, "Good work". However, the present programme, when considered in the light of the criticism levelled at the previous Government, is totally inadequate. The Minister knows it, but no doubt he can recall how my Government was criticized, because he had a hand in it as the education expert of the Labor Party.

Mr. Coumbe: Pseudo expert!

Mr. HALL: He puts his own value on his arguments.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That is your statement, not mine. You can make up your own fairy stories.

Mr. HALL: In considering actual expenditures, past and planned, they have proved to be grossly inadequate, but I will leave that subject until we debate the Revenue Budget, which may give us a further inkling of expenditure on education. In fairness to the Minister, I say that, if he can increase expenditure on school buildings to the rate that we established last year, good luck to him, and he will have the support of members on this side.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That'll be the day!

Mr. HALL: The Minister of Roads and Transport is muttering in his beard, but I notice that he is to spend \$1,000,000 from Loan funds on roads and bridges.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Do you oppose that, too?

Mr. HALL: I am sure the Minister will find a good avenue of expenditure for this sum. I approve the establishing of the ferry link to Kangaroo Island—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: How gracious!

Mr. HALL: —although it follows, as the Minister knows, a report which was commissioned by my Government and to which he has now agreed in relation to this study. It was interesting to receive, as late as today, some firm information from the Minister, who, when replying to a question, said that the Government would definitely not proceed with the M.A.T.S. plan. This was an interesting statement, because it is the most definite that the Minister has made, and to my knowledge he has not made that statement previously. Therefore, now that the public of South Australia know that the M.A.T.S. plan will not be proceeded with, we shall be interested to know what the Minister will substitute for the free-ways that have been planned. Nothing has yet been indicated, and it is too early to know what will replace the M.A.T.S. plan. Next year, when we study subsequent Loan Estimates, it will be interesting to know what the Government has in mind about its obvious major responsibility for transportation, a factor that will grow in importance as Loan Estimates are introduced in succeeding years. The attention that the Government will have to pay to transport will be considerable, and Government's overall responsibility of funding the cost of part of the transport system will be a tremendously heavy one. The railway

undertaking is receiving a slightly increased allocation and, in total, \$8,800,000 is being devoted to the various aspects of transport. I believe that the Government has a responsibility to examine the efficiency of its transport departments, and a major overhaul or revision may well be required to be undertaken by an outside group in relation to the Railways and Highways Departments in order to ensure not only that operating efficiency is being achieved but that overall direction and programming is in accord with the future needs of South Australia.

I am sorry that there is no reference in the Loan Estimates to a new Mines Department building. I should like to think that the Government would soon be able to provide new headquarters for one of its most important developmental undertakings. We have in the Mines Department a dedicated team of people, a staff that is being increasingly drawn on by private enterprise as the demand in the community grows for mining expertise. As it is necessary to keep that staff in happy and congenial surroundings, I think the Government should urgently investigate providing a new headquarters on the Glenside site in association with the complex to house the Mineral Science Foundation of Australia. No doubt this project still has to be referred to the Public Works Committee, but I would urge the Government to make all haste in providing what would be for this State a good investment in the way of headquarters for an important developmental team.

I should have liked to see also in these Estimates provision for a new Tourist Bureau building, but I accept the Treasurer's assurance, in replying to a question from this side recently, that all obstacles have been surmounted in relation to siting this building in King William Street, and I look forward to a speedy commencement of work on what is, again, a facility to be provided for a developmental project of the Government. The tourist potential of this State is as yet far from being fully tapped; in fact, that it will never be fully tapped is the subject of constant investigation. However, I believe that the Tourist Bureau needs the headquarters that the previous Government planned to provide for it. Having dealt with one or two individual items and commented on the overall financing behind the Loan proposals, I approve the first line and look forward to discussing the details as they are dealt with by the Committee.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): It is well known that the statement which the Treasurer gives on such occasions as this in introducing the Loan Estimates, as with the Revenue Estimates later, is prepared for him by the Treasury and, while he takes the responsibility for the statement (because it contains the Government's programme), it is, by and large, what one can call a statement without politics. The statement given by the Treasurer last week is no exception to this, and it is strangely at variance, as the Leader pointed out, with many of the things that were said by prominent members of the last Opposition, some of whom are now sitting on the front bench, and I think particularly of the Minister of Education.

The statement is markedly at variance with what was said by such members when they were in Opposition. The Leader has dealt with two of the matters that I intend to refer to briefly, merely to reinforce the points he has made. First, we were criticized when we were in office for not spending the whole of the moneys available to us for capital works. I remember during the election campaign (and I must apologize in advance: I cannot give chapter and verse for this, but I am absolutely confident that what I say is correct) that the member for Glenelg, as he then was (the present Minister of Education), chided us with not spending on education every cent that we could lay our hands on. We were told that we were socking money away to reduce the deficit when we could have been spending it on school buildings.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I didn't say that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am confident that the Minister did say that and that members on the other side all said this. They chided us, because it suited their purposes politically, with hot spending every cent we could spend on education. But what do we find now? I will quote the summary, which the Treasurer gave, of the proposals of the present Government, as follows:

May I repeat that the Government is planning a moderate current deficit on Loan Account which would use about \$4,300,000 of the accumulated balance.

In other words, the Government intends to reduce the balance that was left at the end of the year of \$13,000,000-odd. It intends to use about \$4,000,000-odd of that and to use a similar sum to reduce the revenue deficit. But, of course, when we planned to do this we were attacked by members opposite. I am glad that the influence of the Under Treasurer and the Treasury officers has had some effect on the

Government and that it has some idea now of commonsense State financing. Further, what do we find to reinforce the injustice of the attack made on us when we were in office: that, indeed, we spent (and this is on the Treasurer's own figures) about \$1,500,000 extra on school buildings than we budgeted for, and this is at a time when we were being attacked by the then Opposition for not spending on school buildings as much as we could have spent.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: When I became Minister, I was told the amount of spending for the year was likely to be \$14,800,000. We went hell for leather in the last month in the financial year and made some extra purchases of land, and this bumped it up to over \$15,000,000.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: So what?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You said you spent it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course we did.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You weren't in power at the time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope the Minister—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Would you like to see documentary proof of this?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I would. What does the Treasurer say? He does not mention this point in his statement.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: He thought he was dealing with reasonable human beings.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Is the Minister suggesting that I am not reasonable? I hope he will get up and justify his suggestion. What have I said so far that is not reasonable? This is what the Treasurer said:

. . . and as a result final payments were almost \$3,000,000 more than the first estimate. A little more than half of the excess was in school buildings, with the remainder in hospital and other Government buildings.

If the Minister of Education wishes to justify the claim he has made that that extra \$1,500,000 was spent after he came into office in the last four weeks—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You didn't listen to what I said.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister should not have been saying it, anyway, because he should not be allowed to interject. What is the Minister saying? The point I make is that we spent, on the Treasurer's own figures, \$1,500,000 extra on school buildings, and I understand the Minister to say, "No, you didn't spend it; I spent it in the last four weeks of the financial year after I came to office."

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The point I am making is—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister can make his point later on. The member for Mitcham!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister apparently takes unto himself the mantle of the Treasurer on such occasions as this and cannot resist (and newer has been able to, as you know, Mr. Speaker) the urge to interject.

The CHAIRMAN: "Mr. Chairman", not "Mr. Speaker".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Bad luck! Mr. Chairman, then. The Minister cannot resist the urge to interject whenever he feels called on to do so. But the first point I make that reinforces me (and the point that was made excellently by the Leader) is that they are now doing what they blamed us for doing last year and criticized us for doing in the campaign. The second point I make (and I suppose this is politics and somewhat uncharitable) is that the Government has played down to the absolute limit the concessions the Commonwealth Government made at the Premiers' Conference and the Loan Council meeting, namely, the allocation to this State of over \$27,000,000 for capital works as a grant, not as money on which we must pay interest. This is what the Treasurer said:

However, at this stage, members will no doubt be interested to know that \$27,420,000 of the new funds for capital works to be received in 1970-71 will be grants.

That is all he said. This, as the Leader stated, is a most significant concession and one which was certainly justifiable. I wish it had gone further, but, although this is a most significant concession on the part of the Commonwealth Government to the States (in this case to South Australia), not a word of praise or appreciation do we get from the Government, which has played this down to the limit. This has always been the Treasurer's attitude, and no doubt the attitude of Ministers opposite: never acknowledge that your political opponents do anything that is good or just; always ignore it or, if as in this case one cannot ignore it, play it down; always concentrate on what one regards as the weak points of one's opposition and criticize them. That may be good politics. It was good enough for the Party opposite to win the last election, but it is hardly good morality.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It was good enough for you for years.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No. I am always prepared to give credit where credit is due. I can think of many instances in the past (and

I am sure you could, too, Mr. Chairman, if you had voice) in which I have done just that; but not the present Government. Yet this is a most significant change in the financial relationship between the Commonwealth Government and the State Governments. It was certainly warranted, but I wish it had gone much further. I make one point because I am certain that no Government member will make it: the present Leader, when Premier, took a lead among the States in trying to get a better deal for them from the Commonwealth Government, and I have no doubt that it was as a result of the work he did at the meetings he convened here in Adelaide that part at least of the most satisfactory result achieved at those meetings in June came about.

At the time the Premiers prepared a statement on the financial relationships between the Commonwealth and the States it was sent to the Prime Minister and subsequently made public. One part of the statement deals with Commonwealth and State public debt. I will say something about this because we are dealing with a certain matter in this debate but, before I do that, I say that I was frankly disappointed with the result (as we all were) of the meetings in June because while the Commonwealth Government has been generous to the States to a degree in the changed arrangements it has made, the arrangements are not on a permanent basis. The federal system of Government in Australia will not be safeguarded or put on a healthy basis unless there is a permanent arrangement between the Commonwealth Government and the State Governments which safeguards the position of the States and removes them from the control and dependence on the Commonwealth they now have; but the Commonwealth Government apparently declined to do this. So far as one can tell from the reported statements, no State Premier (least of all the Premier of this State) fought to get a permanent arrangement with the Commonwealth Government along the lines proposed in this document. What does this document show regarding public debt? It shows that over the 19 years from June 30, 1950 to June 30, 1969 the Commonwealth public debt was not only extinguished but its account was put in credit by \$204,000,000; that is, the public debt was reduced by thousands of millions of dollars at the same time as the States' public debt was increased fourfold.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What is the figure?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Minister of Education wants me to find the figure, I will do so. The paragraph on the increase in State public debt states:

Over the past 19 years since June 30, 1950, there have been extraordinary changes in these figures. For the States the debts have risen to more than four times their former level from \$2,484,000,000 to \$10,676,000,000. For the Commonwealth over the same period the net debt has fallen from \$3,586,000,000 to a credit of some \$204,000,000. Over those 19 years the average annual increase in State debt has been about \$430,000,000 whilst the average annual reduction in net Commonwealth debt has been about \$200,000,000.

Certainly, on those figures (and they have not been contravened; I am confident they are accurate), the Commonwealth Government could afford the generosity it has shown to the States, and it could have afforded more. I wish the Commonwealth Government had done what the States asked it to do. Four points are set out on the last page of this document. The first point deals with the tax reimbursement grants for a transitional period from from July 1, 1970. It is as follows:

That the tax reimbursements grants for a transitional period from July 1, 1970, should be determined by adequately increasing the base total as determined under the present arrangements, and adopting a new system of increases upon that base in line with the observed rate of growth in income tax yields.

The second point is as follows:

That Commonwealth and State Treasury officers be instructed to devise a scheme whereby the States shall have access to income tax broadly along the lines of the system presently operating in Canada, but adapted to Australian circumstances and to the recognized needs of the less populous States.

The third point is as follows:

Upon re-entry of the States into the field of income taxation appropriate adjustments be made to financial assistance grants to offset the effects of the lower per capita yields available to the less populous States from income tax to preserve the financial equalization provisions presently available to the less populous States and to provide for escalation of the continuing financial assistance grants in line with the expected yield of income taxation.

The fourth point deals with special purpose grants. That is what the State Premiers asked the Commonwealth Government to do but, when it came to the crunch, none of them, least of all the Premier of this State, really fought to get a permanent re-arrangement along those lines. The Premier of this State returned to South Australia and said that we had got a lousy deal. Let not the Minister of Education deny that that was said, because I have checked on that in the last few minutes. The Premier

said earlier, in the first flush of success after the election, that he was going to Canberra to bring the Commonwealth to heel (that was the phrase he used). Apparently he failed to do that, but did not refer to the matter again on his return home.

Of course, one can expect the Treasurer always to criticize the present Commonwealth Government and one should therefore discount his criticism. I say that because, of course, the political colours of the two Governments are opposite; it is in the interests of the State Labor Government to criticize the Commonwealth Government because it wants to criticize the Commonwealth to reduce the Commonwealth's standing. This Labor Government wants the Commonwealth Government to lose at the next Senate election and at every election, because the State Government is the political ally of the Commonwealth Opposition. Therefore, it is perfectly predictable that, whatever the Commonwealth Government gives to this State by way of grants and whatever treatment South Australia gets, it will never be good enough, and the Minister of Education knows that that is the principle on which his Government is proceeding.

The Labor Government will always try to get out from under, whatever happens, by blaming the Commonwealth for its own shortcomings and for whatever it finds it cannot do in South Australia, irrespective of the treatment we get from Canberra. It is always important to remember this point when considering the criticisms of the present Government of the Commonwealth Government. It is in this Government's political interests to criticize the Commonwealth Government. Actually, we have seen a very strange process at work on the other side of the Chamber. We have heard members opposite (notable examples being the member for Playford and the Treasurer) championing the cause of the States. This is indeed a change of outlook by members opposite and is quite contrary to what I understand to be the policy of the Australian Labor Party. The member for Ross Smith can give me that strange, pitying look of his if he likes.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You deserve it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Do I? Honourable members opposite always try to run away from their own policy.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That'll be the day. At least we have a policy, which is more than you have.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Does the Minister deny that the Treasurer has been championing the

cause of the States? He is silent: he does not deny it, because he cannot. For political purposes, as it suited him because he knows that the people of South Australia and the people of Australia want to see the States preserved and with a large measure of financial independence, the Treasurer has been taking this line, but the platform to which he is tied by his Parliamentary candidate's pledge states:

Amendment of the Commonwealth Constitution—

- (a) (i) to clothe the Commonwealth Parliament with unlimited powers and with the duty and authority to create States possessing delegated constitutional powers; .
- (ii) to abolish the Senate; and
- (iii) pending the achievements of the aims set out in subparagraphs (i) and (ii) to remedy defects as they appear and to keep the Constitution abreast of changing conditions.

I do not know what that latter paragraph means, but there is no doubt whatever that the aim to which every member of the Australian Labor Party is pledged and the aim of the Party itself is the abolition of the States and the creation in their stead of bodies with subordinate powers.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You don't understand our policy, that's the trouble.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I admit that the objective is most vague and difficult to understand.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It's written for members of the Labor Party to understand.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: However, it is a straightforward statement, and I challenge the Minister of Roads and Transport and the Minister of Education, who has fallen strangely silent in the last few minutes, to deny the plain meaning of the paragraph I have read out.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: How long is it since the policy of the Labor Party has been included in the first line of the Loan Estimates?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Now the Minister is trying to get away from it. He will do anything to stop the policy of his Party from coming to the front.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to take his seat. I think his remarks are getting too far away from the subject under discussion. When he rose, the honourable member prefaced his remarks by saying that the terms of discussion of the Loan Estimates were usually wide. I think he would be justified in taking this view on the Budget debate but, although the discussion on the Loan Estimates is wide, it is still restricted to the contents of the Loan Estimates. I do not think that the subject of a greater or lesser

number of States or regional areas comes within the ambit of the Loan Estimates. I ask the honourable member not to continue along these lines.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Certainly, Mr. Chairman. I think I have made the point sufficiently well to cause some discomfort to members opposite.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You just showed how inept you are.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not need to go on, but I will certainly accept your implied invitation, Sir, to develop the theme at the next opportunity. That is all I have to say on the first line.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: So it ought to be.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Ministers on the front bench heave a sigh of relief. The fact is that the new Government is doing much as we would have done had we remained in office. The Government now has a measure of responsibility to discharge and is, I am glad to say, prepared to discharge it, but this contrasts starkly with what has been said before, and I refer again to expenditure on school buildings. I look forward to hearing the detailed explanations of the Minister of Education about the \$1,500,000 that he says he spent in the last four weeks of the financial year in the first flush of being back in office again.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You can't even quote me correctly.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will look forward to hearing the Minister speak for himself, at the proper time for once. I refer again to the criticism the Government makes of the Commonwealth Government and say that this is all we can expect from members opposite. I will no doubt have other things to say on the lines, as we come to them.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): Despite what the Minister of Roads and Transport said in this debate last year, I intend to speak to the first line. The then member for Edwardstown's speech occupied five pages of *Hansard* and he did not refer at all to the Loan Estimates. With his usual consistency, he has now tried to stop someone else.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I didn't; it was the Chairman. You are reflecting on the Chair.

Mr. McANANEY: This is typical of the Minister. Another big switch in attitude that he has taken concerns the Railways Department. Last year we heard him say how the Government of the day had neglected railway

lines, and he referred to the inquiry into derailments. He roundly condemned that Government for neglecting the lines, saying that millions and millions of dollars must be spent. Let us see what is done under this year's Loan Estimates. For "Special betterment of main lines", the sum provided has been reduced from \$600,000 to \$393,000. I think he said that at the rate we were progressing it would take 10 years. I am sure that, at the rate of expenditure the Minister is proposing, he will certainly not be here at its completion. Throughout the Railways Department estimates less money has been allocated to the total way and works grant.

In the year 1969-70, \$3,380,000 was allocated for this purpose; the Minister intends spending just over \$3,000,000, so he will neglect the railways even more perhaps than they have been neglected over the years. When the Minister's own Government got the report and recommendations of the Railways Commissioner over two years ago, that Government did not have the interests of the State at heart enough to have an inquiry into the proposed closure of railway lines. When we referred the matter to the Transport Control Board he said we were giving away the assets of the people of South Australia, and that should not happen. What do we find now? When he became Minister of Roads and Transport and the trade unionists at their annual conference wanted to move a motion that no more railway lines be closed, the Minister said, "Some railway lines must go." He has not yet told the people which railway lines must go, to give them some indication of what they can expect in the future. This is one of the biggest turn-about in policy that any Minister has made in Parliament in the years I have been here.

I am a little critical of the Transport Control Board in respect of the closing of railway lines. When the board investigated the Adelaide to Victor Harbour line and recommended its closure, the matter had to go before the Public Works Committee. As it was the Christmas holiday period, we were not given sufficient time to carry out a full investigation. The Transport Control Board did not ensure that there was a reasonable alternative service for the people in the area. I will read the relevant part of the Road and Railway Transport Act, which is section 10 (5):

The board shall not make any order closing any line of railway or part of a line of railway under this section unless it is satisfied that there will be, on and after the day on which the order takes effect, other transport

facilities for serving the area previously served by the railway or part thereof.

No reason was advanced to the Public Works Committee, which investigated this matter. Strong evidence was adduced before it that there was not a reasonable alternative bus service. For this reason, the committee recommended that the railway line remain open. It was its job to see that there was a reasonable alternative service. The Transport Control Board did not see that there was an up-to-date, modern road transport service to serve the passengers using that line; yet all the other evidence indicated that the railway line should be closed. The only body to put up a good case was the flour mill at Strathalbyn. This is a decentralized industry in Strathalbyn that would have experienced some difficulty had the railway line been closed, particularly in respect of wheat coming from other areas and being taken at concessional rates by the railways.

When a case like this occurs of a country line being closed, where there is a reasonable alternative service available, and when it affects one particular industry and will save the taxpayers of South Australia \$200,000 or more a year, there should be some legislation to the effect that a subsidy be granted for a decentralized industry to carry on. The fact that this railway line was not closed (the Highways Department had intended using the railway land for a new road between Strathalbyn and Victor Harbour but, when this could not be done, it decided to leave the railway line open) meant extra expenditure by the Highways Department of \$200,000 on constructing a modern road that would adequately serve the people of this district far better than the existing railway line does. It also means that the town of Goolwa will have to be bypassed by the railway line, at an expenditure of \$40,000 or \$50,000, so that a new ferry or some sort of crossing will be provided to Hindmarsh Island, which is a good tourist attraction. This would all be additional expenditure. We can criticize the then Minister of Roads and Transport for not agreeing to an extension of time of one month to two months to enable the Public Works Committee to investigate properly the closing of the railway line that the Minister said he wanted to close. He has said that some lines should be closed. We should set up an efficient administration or ensure that this problem is tackled efficiently.

School buildings have always been a sore point with the Minister of Education. The

Labor Party claims that the Liberal Government did not do its job efficiently in providing for education in this State. We can search the Auditor-General's Report and all possible records and we cannot see at any time during the three years that we were last in office that expenditure on education was decreased: rather was it increased. The Labor Party's advertisements before the last election dealt with the matter of old desks. For years we had a programme of old desks being replaced. The committee of a small school in my district asked me to look into the matter. I saw those desks: they wobbled 6in. each way, but this school could have applied over the years and it would have got a classroom of desks replaced every year. The fact was that the school itself did not take the initiative (whether or not that should be a requirement I do not know) but, judging from letters I have received from the teachers, we find that many schools have not taken the necessary steps to get new desks. Subsidies are available. Many school committees, and even headmasters themselves, do not know of the various items that can be subsidized or what requests to make. It would be a good idea for the Education Department to provide a full but compact list of the items that can be subsidized.

No doubt, if we went through all the Government regulations we would find them, but those regulations are probably 1in. thick when they are put together and it is difficult to find what one wants. I looked up the amount of money spent on school buildings from Loan funds in 1963-1964. In that year the Liberal Government spent 19 per cent of Loan funds on school buildings, but the present Government plans to spend only 14.7 per cent. Here is clear evidence that the Labor Government is going backwards. Last year the Liberal Government spent \$15,500,000 on education, which amount is to be increased by only \$1,000,000 this year. Despite the tremendous amount of additional funds made available by the Commonwealth Government to the States, the present Government is not devoting sufficient money to education.

Almost immediately after he took office the Minister of Education said that he had spent \$1,000,000 on buying land. Anyone who has had dealings with Government departments will know how long it takes for them to process all the documents involved in such transactions. It took me 15 months and 30 to 40 telephone calls to get some land transferred from the Education Department to the

Strathalbyn bowling club. It is a year after the Public Works Committee has approved a school building project before tenders are called and the necessary documents are prepared. I do not condemn the Government for taking this time: even an efficient private enterprise like Ansett Transport Industries has to spend considerable time in preparing plans and specifications after it has decided to build a motel almost opposite Parliament House.

The Minister of Education has talked sheer baloney. After the previous Labor Government took office in 1965 he tried several times to prove that in the last year of the Playford Government South Australia's financial position was disastrous. Admittedly, there was a slight deficit at that time, but some of the Playford Government's taxation measures had not taken full effect by April, 1965. We see evidence of this in the additional money collected during the previous Labor Government's first tragic year. I believe we receive a good deal from the Commonwealth Government. A publication dealing with Commonwealth payments to and from the States in 1969-70 shows that we received 11.5 per cent of the money available.

Because of the three tragic years from 1965 to 1968, our percentage of Australia's population has fallen to 9.28. In that period our rate of population growth fell from being the highest in Australia to the lowest. South Australia, with 9.28 per cent of Australia's population, receives 12.3 per cent of the capital grants. Yet the Treasurer says that we receive a "lousy deal" (that was what a newspaper headline said). The Treasurer would probably now say that the headline was incorrect. The reason why South Australia did not receive the same percentage increase as the other States is that the formula is based on average wage growth and population growth. The betterment factor is now 1.8 instead of 1.2; this will increase our future grants considerably.

Our rate of population growth is less than half that of Western Australia. If a State has a faster rate of population growth there is a bigger demand in that State for schools and other utilities; therefore, it should receive greater grants. The previous Government was succeeding in restoring the rate of population growth that had occurred prior to the previous Labor Government's term of office. If the present Government does not undo the good work of the previous L.C.L. Government, our rate of population growth will be restored to what it was formerly and we will receive further increases in taxation reimbursements

and other grants. The Treasurer said that the money being spent by the Commonwealth Government on works projects in South Australia had fallen to a level that was lower than that to which we were entitled, on a population basis. Before 1965 up to 20 per cent of what the Commonwealth was spending on works projects was being spent in South Australia. Surely the annual expenditure for this purpose must even out over the years.

In one year the Commonwealth Leader of the Opposition, on asking how much the Commonwealth Minister for Supply spent in South Australia, was told that 28 per cent of the total for Australia was spent in South Australia. I asked the Treasurer, who was Mr. Dunstan, two or three times how much was being spent in the various departments but he never produced the figures, because they would have been against his claim that South Australia was getting a raw deal. This does not mean that South Australia should not fight for its just entitlement. I congratulate the State Premiers on the little white book that they prepared last year to present to the Commonwealth Government. It contained a clear case that was full of facts and figures. As a result of that case the States received a very good deal.

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

Mr. McANANEY: This afternoon a question was asked about the Dartmouth dam. Information about the storages in the Hume reservoir and Lake Victoria for the previous 10 years shows that in most years there would have been 1,750,000 acre feet in those reservoirs. According to the agreement for the construction of the Dartmouth dam it was necessary only to have 2,000,000 acre feet in those two reservoirs plus Dartmouth and we would have been able to receive our extra 37 per cent quota of water. I think the member for Playford claimed that we would not get water out of Dartmouth dam for 10 years, but the figures for the previous 10 years show an average flow of 821,000 acre feet into the Dartmouth dam area. Even in a dry period water would be available in the first year that could be used to make up the existing quota. In most years, other than three really dry years together, an extra quota of water would have been available to this State from the Dartmouth dam.

Mr. McKee: This is a dry argument.

Mr. McANANEY: It will be if the Labor Government does not get off its seat and do something about the Dartmouth dam. I think it was the Treasurer who said that we should be

making plans for the Dartmouth dam. How could the River Murray Commission spend money on planning this dam when this Parliament would not accept the agreement which we had in the bag and which would have been of benefit to South Australia.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You sold South Australia down the drain.

Mr. McANANEY: And the honourable Minister sold the M.A.T.S. plan down the drain.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: So we ought to.

Mr. McANANEY: The Minister said that there should be no M.A.T.S. plan, but, if that is so, his Government is now wasting the taxpayers' money by bringing a gentleman from the United States of America. According to the Treasurer he is being brought here to advocate doodle bugs. Every time I have seen him on television he has been saying that by motor car is the only way that a person can travel from A to B. After the election the Treasurer said that there had to be a north-south freeway, and this and that freeway.

Mr. Venning: He is most irresponsible.

Mr. McANANEY: I think the Government should employ another group of public relations officers, because there always seems to be a difference of opinion. It seems that the Minister of Roads and Transport has changed his ideas about railways, so perhaps we will soon see him advocating the M.A.T.S. plan.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What did we say before the election?

Mr. McANANEY: The Minister said much that was inaccurate. Considerable sums are being spent on the Adelaide-Mannum main in order to increase its annual capacity from 21,500,000,000 gallons to 26,000,000,000 gallons. Also the completion of the main from Swan Reach to Stockwell, on which we have spent considerable sums in the last five years, will result in the provision of much more water. We must always allow for a severe drought but, judging from what happened during the last drought, it would seem that we perhaps constructed the Murray Bridge to Onkaparinga main earlier than we should have. I suppose that, when there is a 3 per cent increase in population growth, one expects this rate to continue but, when there is a political drought such as the one experienced in 1965-68, during which period the population did not increase to such an extent, the calculations are upset and money required for the main is lying idle.

Having had arguments about this matter, I do not think that the Engineering and Water

Supply Department pumps water, as it should, in the spring and early summer in order to fill the reservoirs. I know that the argument here is that if too much water is pumped it will overflow in the following winter, but statistics show that this would not happen often. If pumping took place so as to fill the reservoirs during this period, it would be at a time when the freshest possible water was going to waste at Goolwa. However, the department starts pumping operations when the river and the lakes are stagnant and building up in salt content, and this is not good water. The department must get away from this so-called safe formula in connection with pumping water. Prior to the last drought that occurred, the Labor Government did not pump to the degree that the previous Government had undertaken pumping and this was well illustrated by the fact that bad water was pumped later in the year.

I commend the Government for the fact that it will have more money available for low-cost and rental housing. However, we must face up to the fact that the more money is tied up in rental housing the less money there will be for the internal revenue of the trust in the following years. If a house is sold on a low deposit, capital is coming in year by year, and this enables more houses to be built in the future. The plan adopted by the Housing Trust and the Government over previous years in order to try to encourage people to own their own homes, after initially paying a small deposit and then making repayments, meant that continuing funds were coming in, so that more houses could be built in the future. I believe that the trust should allocate more of its funds to provide housing for people who are absolutely in need: at present many deserted wives and families in poor circumstances cannot obtain a Housing Trust house unless they can definitely show that they can pay the rent. As the trust enjoys interest rates lower than those available to the private building industry, I believe that more money should be set aside for people in need, for the trust at this stage is not providing sufficient homes for these people.

I am glad to see that more money is being spent on afforestation and that the Commonwealth Government is providing money for the purchase of land for forestry purposes. However, as most of my district is in the watershed in which extended areas of forests will be planted around the reservoirs, in addition to private land being bought for forestry purposes, local councils will experience a terrific hard-

ship. First, they will lose much of their area to the reservoir and will not receive rates, on this land, although they will not have to provide any roads, either. However, concerning forests that are planted generally in a district council area, that council loses the rates on the land in question but still has to provide roads for the Government industry which is being developed and which is making a profit, and I think that some account must be taken of this. If this land is within the area of a business enterprise, it must be rated, or heavy additional Government grants must be provided for these roads that serve the forestry industry in a certain area.

I am glad to see that money is still being provided for loans to producers. I also note that the producers pay back almost an equivalent sum each year, so that the actual sum outstanding at any time is not increasing. As I go around my district, I find that, if long-term loans at reasonable rates of interest could be made available to these people in a way similar to that in which loans are made available for housing, many of the problems they face would be solved. As they are over-optimistic (people have to be over-optimistic to go on the land; if they were not over-optimistic, they would not go on the land), perhaps they pay a little too much for their property. They borrow money from the Commonwealth Development Bank, agreeing to pay it back quickly. Thus they become involved in hire-purchase loans at high rates of interest and are unhappy people, scratching along. If money could be made available through the Commonwealth Government or the State Bank, these people could remain economically viable and could play a useful part in the community. It could be said that this would be tying up funds. People may ask whence the money would come. However, if the loans were repaid to the lending institutions, those organizations would have money to lend elsewhere, so keeping up the general purchasing power of the community.

Not much can be said about these Loan Estimates, other than that they represent a continuation of past Loan programmes. More money is available because the Commonwealth Government has been generous. The fact that we will now get certain Loan money free of interest has not been emphasized in the press. Perhaps relieving us of this interest burden is the biggest concession the Commonwealth Government has made. Members on both sides realize that we lack money for education and social services; we disagree only on the

priorities. We tend to prefer money to be spent on school buildings. The provision of four weeks' leave for Government workers meant a further loss to the Railways Department of \$650,000 in a year. We must make up our minds whether we will stagnate as a nation or whether we will work hard, producing the things that will enable us to provide a better standard of education for our children and so on. Statistics show that this country's growth rate is not the equal of that of Japan and many other countries. We are not making the best use of the opportunities we have.

Perhaps it could be argued that there is no incentive, but people are not willing to hop in and work as they should. In a recent Gallup poll it was pleasing to see that the average Australian is not lazy: he still wants to work 40 hours a week. Gallup polls show that the Australian people put better education standards and hospitals at the top of the list of things they want, and shorter hours and that sort of thing at the bottom. When our friends opposite advocate shorter hours, less work and fewer goods produced, this is the sort of thinking that will mean less education, fewer hospitals, etc., for the rising generation.

The Minister of Education has said it is morally wrong if the Commonwealth Government does not give him, in addition to all this extra money that has been handed to South Australia this year, another \$3,000,000, or whatever it is. But, somehow or other, the extra money that the Commonwealth Government has given the States must be provided by someone. Broadly speaking, the growth of 13.5 per cent in financial assistance this year and a growth of over 12 per cent in subsequent years mean that Commonwealth outlays to the State will grow faster than Commonwealth revenues. That has been happening. Perhaps our income tax reimbursements are not growing to the extent they should but the States are getting an increasing proportion of the Commonwealth Government's total revenue. Where is most of it going? It is not going into education or social services; it is going in increased losses on the railways, water supplies and drainage, on all of which the State Governments are making losses. From a sense of justice and fair play, why do we say we cannot afford to pay for water and railway services? We expect the Commonwealth Government to pay for them, but what is the Commonwealth Government but the taxpayers of Australia? So we are only diverting expenditure from one source to another. Surely the people who get the ser-

vices should be the ones to pay for. them rather than making them a charge on the general taxpayer.

There are three broad possible ways in which the Commonwealth can get money. First, it can cut back the rate of growth in other Commonwealth spending. We may get ourselves involved in priorities here, but no-one, when demanding money from the Commonwealth Government, says, "We want it for education; you give us more money for school buildings but cut down on such-and-such." People make claims in other directions and still expect the money to be handed out to them. Secondly, the Commonwealth can increase its taxation rates. But already people are objecting to paying higher income tax rates. Because of this, they are losing the incentive to work. Thirdly, the Commonwealth can decide to do neither, and just allow the rate of inflation to continue. What is holding Australia back at present is its rising cost structure—not higher living standards, because a higher cost structure is not giving anybody higher living standards. On the contrary, it is robbing us of our opportunity to trade in world markets. It is cutting back the primary producers, who once provided the things necessary for the growth of Australia. For many years, because of the high cost structure and despite their increased efficiency, the farmers have not been able to sell on world markets without getting into difficulties; they cannot pull their weight in making Australia great.

Inflation is harmful; it is responsible for our not doing more in education. I support the first line. We vote the sum of money set out here; we know we have to support this line. The Government can spend \$100,000,000 in any way it likes, and Parliament has no control over this spending. An improvement could be made in that Parliament could have a say as to how the money must be spent. On the other hand, it could be argued that such control would make the system too inflexible and would handicap the Government in its efforts to do the right thing.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): During the course of this debate there have been many references to statements made or allegedly made by various Ministers in various Parliaments at various times over the last few years. There was a series of angry exchanges across the floor as to who said what. It is reasonable to look at the recent history of this matter. The member for Mitcham expressed the wish and the hope that the States would in future

have greater financial independence; that wish I would endorse. However, at the same time he said that the fact that there was not greater independence was in some way attributable to a failure by the present Treasurer in his negotiations at the Loan Council meeting. He did not completely attribute this to the present Treasurer, because he also said (as I remember it) that as far as he was aware the other State Treasurers had not done any better or even raised the point.

The member for Mitcham said that the Loan Council meeting was a generous occasion on the part of the Commonwealth Government. With that I could not agree less: actually, it was one of the most lousy occasions on the part of the Commonwealth Government. The reaction in South Australia gave every indication that people here in all walks of life accepted the Loan Council meeting as being a lousy demonstration on the part of the Commonwealth Government. The public reaction was shown to be uniform by the fact that the Treasurer, the Leader of the Opposition, both daily newspapers and (I think it is fair to say) by far the great majority of the community all agreed that it was a lousy deal. We can vividly remember that, as a result of the *Advertiser's* comments on the Loan Council meeting, that paper was described for the first time in its history as being a paper that advocated Labor Party policies or was sympathetic to Labor Party policies. This happened after the *Advertiser* had categorized the financial allocation by the Commonwealth Government to this State as being unfair and unrealistic. A Liberal member of the Commonwealth Parliament (Dr. Forbes) vigorously attacked the paper for having made this editorial comment, but the *Advertiser* stuck to its guns. While expressing great surprise (and I do not blame it for this) at receiving the connotation attached to it by Dr. Forbes, it nevertheless stuck to its guns and continued to say it was a lousy deal.

At the same time I remember the Leader of the Opposition expressing his disappointment at what happened in Canberra although he, like Mr. Millhouse, implied that this was due to some extent to a failure by the present Treasurer. The member for Mitcham said that the Commonwealth Government was generous in one sense; he probably meant that any generosity was due to the present Leader of the Opposition rather than the Treasurer. It is far beyond my capabilities to assess Mr. Gorton's reasoning or his attitude towards this State: I can only say that his attitude to this

State seems to be marked by absolute vindictiveness beyond all measure.

The member for Mitcham also said that at the Loan Council meeting there was a failure to secure a permanent arrangement along the lines granted by the Commonwealth Government. If that was a failure, I think it was a glorious failure, because the arrangement was a disaster for South Australia. One has only to look at the total allocation to see just how unfair this situation is. The loan to South Australia in the triennium is lower than that to Western Australia, and there is no conceivable justification for this position. Western Australia has a significantly smaller population and a significantly greater potential and actual development in mining, oil and other areas. Notwithstanding that, we find a marked preference to that State compared with South Australia. As a result of comments made at the time, I can attribute that only to the inexplicable vindictiveness of the Prime Minister towards this State.

Mr. McKee: It does not attract many votes for him.

Mr. McRAE: It does not. Usually he does not get many votes in this State, anyway. If the present Premier did not get very much from him, neither did the previous Premier, so the vindictiveness I have mentioned is even more inexplicable. South Australia now has before the Commonwealth Grants Commission an application of great importance to the State, as the deliberations of this commission will greatly affect our monetary position. One of the reasons given for our smaller Loan allocation was what the Prime Minister called lack of self-help, or words to that effect. I took him to mean that this State had not made enough efforts to help itself in one way or another. That statement surprised me, because all parties must acknowledge that this State has an outstanding record for the way in which its funds have been administered. Although there might be disputes regarding priorities, no-one in his wildest dreams would suggest that there had been the slightest hint of corruption or mismanagement in this State regarding its allocation of public moneys, although such hints could well be made about some of the larger Eastern States.

The Prime Minister's statement surprised me, but a later comment seemed to me to give a clue to the issue. Although I do not think it was the Prime Minister who made the statement, certainly a member of his Cabinet said that one of the reasons for the lousy deal we had got was our lack of self-help in the tax

area, and that one of the matters that could be specifically delineated was the death tax area. After the Prime Minister had, on a comparative basis, unfavourably treated the State, he then specifically referred to a death tax area and used that to justify his vindictive action, saying that we had not looked after our public finances as well as we could. I assume that he could have been referring only to succession duties, and we all know the attitude adopted by the Party opposite when succession duties legislation was introduced. It is only in relation to succession duties, if one looks at it as objectively as one can, that the slightest hint of the lack of self-help (I do not accept that there has been mismanagement) can be found. With the money at their disposal I am certain that both Parties, when in Government, have used it to their best ability. No other State has to bring its gas, water, and electricity hundreds of miles, yet all of that has been done at a minimum cost. As a South Australian I am, therefore, angry to read and hear these comments made by the Prime Minister. We can only find one objective basis for what the Prime Minister said, and that relates to death taxes. I think it is fair to say that South Australia has a significantly lower rate of death tax a head than operates in any other State.

Mr. Gunn: Do you want it increased?

Mr. McRAE: I should like to see succession duties properly apportioned. When the previous succession duties Bill was introduced it contained a progressive taxation system by which persons succeeding to a less valuable estate would pay less death duty than would be paid under the previous system, but those in the higher death duty group would pay a significantly larger sum. That was the real situation, but that situation was deliberately distorted for the people of South Australia by various opponents of ours and, I am sad to say, was deliberately and viciously distorted by various members of the legal profession.

Mr. McKee: Merely because they represent big business.

Mr. McRAE: That may or may not be so, but I was surprised to find that certain members of the legal profession, who are noted for their expertise in these matters and in dealing with Bills that are quite simple and straightforward, should make the type of terrorist statements they did that indicated that the ordinary person who would succeed to property would be adversely affected.

Mr. Rodda: What about the rural position?

Mr. McRAE: The honourable member should be patient: I am trying to be objective about this. On any realistic analysis of the Bill it would have been found that those in the lower to middle income groups were being granted a death duty relief, whereas those in the higher groups were having imposed on them a higher death duty. That is just as it should be, and it is the same sort of relief that is being sought by organizations throughout Australia in regard to income tax. Concerning the question of people living in rural areas, I acknowledge that there should be some relief for the group of persons who are *bona fide* succeeding to a property that is owned by their parents so that they can go on to that property and work it. Far be it for me to suggest that we ought to have monopolies taking over South Australia. However, we find (and my questioner on the rural matter would probably say, if he cared to admit it publicly) that in much of this sector public or private companies have systematically taken over the rural holdings. This is well known to people in the country, and they will not be misled by this sort of propaganda.

I certainly support a succession duties Bill that will do something to grant relief for those in the lower-income group or lower-succession group, at the same time granting relief to those persons who are *bona fide* succeeding to rural holdings and who would be unfairly and adversely affected by the progressive system. By the same token, I must say that much of our State in the rural sector is being controlled by large investment corporations and companies and, to those organizations in terms of tax, I do not grant that there should be any greater concession than applies to their city competitors. If we are talking about the man on the land, I agree that it is a different matter. I think that the philosophy of members opposite would suggest that these investment organizations ought not to be given any greater tax advantage than is given the city corporation, but that will be an interesting matter for them to puzzle out.

I accept the prime proposition of the member for Mitcham that there is a great need in this country for the States to be given a far greater degree of independence because, frankly, whatever Party is in power in Canberra and whatever Prime Minister is there, I consider that in a country the size of ours these people are too far removed from the man in the street to come under the sort of scrutiny which they ought to come under.

I think the States ought to have a better and a more systematic freedom regarding financial matters. However, I do not agree with other premises put forward by the member for Mitcham. The deal we got was lousy and the statement that our allocation is insufficient because we do not take proper steps towards self-help is a stupid one that no-one in South Australia will stomach; in fact, no-one has stomached it, for the statement has been regarded throughout as being stupid.

If the Loan allocation is insufficient on the ground that self-help refers back to succession duties, then it must be insufficient because of the opposition and distortion that was used against the previous Bill by members opposite and by their colleagues in another place. I trust that in this Government's term of office something can be done to rectify that position. It seems to me, therefore, if one takes my theory, that Gorton as a Commonwealth Liberal is a lousy deal or, alternatively, that a combination of Gorton as a Commonwealth Liberal and Hall as a State Liberal is a lousy deal.

I turn now to two specific items in the Loan Estimates, one dealing with the South Australian Housing Trust. I was interested to hear the comments made by the member for Heysen about rental houses. I can well understand, looking at the matter objectively, that it is a good financial and social theory that people should own their own homes. First, the Housing Trust would be more viable if we could sell purchase houses, getting put of the rental field altogether. I accept that: it is obvious. As I lived in a Housing Trust rental home for about 10 years, I think, I am reasonably competent to comment about this, and I say that, as a social proposition, it is far better that we get out of the field. However, what the member for Heysen is not acknowledging and is shutting his eyes to is a fact that honourable members on this side are aware of and that is the desperate need for low-cost rental houses in the metropolitan area. On behalf of the people I represent and also, I think, on behalf of the people of South Australia generally, I express my bitter disappointment that, because of the lousy, rotten deal we got from Canberra, we cannot provide people in desperate need with the sort of housing they can afford on a realistic basis.

Mr. Millhouse: How much do you think we ought to have got?

Mr. McRAE: When it comes down to a question of putting a price on it I do not know, but I put the general proposition that

Canberra could have been more generous, particularly when the position of Western Australia is considered on a comparative basis.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Do you mean in comparison with other States or in total?

Mr. McRAE: I am looking at the position of South Australia as I see it in relation to Western Australia. If one looks at the population, the investment potential and the works that have been carried out in Western Australia, South Australia has received a comparatively unfavourable deal. Returning to the question of rental houses, I inform members opposite that families have been separated because they could not get such a house. I have letters written by people who desperately need a rental house but cannot get one. I do not blame the Housing Trust for this; it writes back saying that there is an enormously long waiting list of about 8,000 names and that accommodation cannot be provided. However, that is small consolation for families broken up through lack of a rental house. There are numerous cases of this type. We must provide for these people. What has happened has been forced on us by an unfair allocation of funds by the Commonwealth Government.

I acknowledge that the Housing Trust has done everything in its power to help people in this category but, by the same token, I am disappointed that the previous Government did not see the social need to cater for the people to whom I have just referred when it had the opportunity to reallocate the funds for this purpose. The member for Heysen may be interested to know that I have done an objective survey on the question of purchase houses, too. Not only did I consult the trade unions that he dislikes but I also consulted building companies in the field. I found that, at present, we have a bad situation in relation to Housing Trust purchase houses, in that journeymen in the building industry are being forced out of work because of rotten subcontracting deals made between the Housing Trust, its contractors, and so-called subcontractors to the contractors. It is a question of cutting costs at all costs, and I cannot abide that. Instead of dealing with reputable building companies that employ daily or weekly labour, the Housing Trust is dealing with a number of companies which I would not regard as particularly reputable and which are in turn using subcontractors. To cite one instance, if I may, a survey was carried out in the field of plastering at the Ingle Farm area of the Housing Trust's \$100 purchase house development. There, it was

agreed by both union and employer organizations that the proper rate for plastering would be about \$1.11 a yard, give or take a few cents. The actual sum being paid to the subcontractors was about 88c a yard. In effect, what is happening is that these so-called subcontractors (they are not in law subcontractors at all, because they do not supply their own materials or any skill; there is precious little skill involved if we look at some of their standards of workmanship, which is particularly lousy; but, leaving that aside, in no circumstances could they be regarded as proper subcontractors: what they are is a peculiar form of scab labour, under the name of subcontractors) are cutting the throats of their fellow employees. But, more than that, members opposite will be interested to know that they are also cutting the throats of genuine employers in the industry.

Mr. Gunn: Rubbish!

Mr. McRAE: It is not rubbish at all. Honourable members will find that in the building company area it is generally acknowledged that the system of subcontracting has done nothing but cut out the legitimate building companies and leave the shonky operators in.

Mr. McKee: At any price, too.

Mr. McRAE: At a lousy price. I turn now to my next point—the Loan allocation for Government hospitals. Once again, I must express my indignation that the allocation for hospitals is grossly insufficient (and, once again, we return to the original point) because the original allocation was lousy. We have heard it said and acknowledged on all sides that there is an explosion in education, and the total allocation of funds for education is the greatest single allocation; but, believe me, we are shortly to run into a desperate period with public hospitals, and an explosion is about to hit us in no uncertain fashion.

The current position for elderly persons is very poor and, unless something is done in the Commonwealth Budget, it will continue to degenerate. The position is that it is barely possible for the State to deal with the many geriatric cases it has, and greater problems are being experienced every day. Even adding the Commonwealth Government's grant and taking the whole of the pension, leaving the geriatric patient with nothing at all, the existing hospitals just cannot cope. I am horrified to find that we are in the position now that no forward planning can be done to deal with the situation of persons resident in the Elizabeth and Salisbury areas

in respect of a public hospital. We are providing for the Modbury Hospital, but the funds are just not there to deal with the problems of 100,000 people, in the fastest growing area of the metropolitan area, who have not even one Government hospital. What they have got is a Government-subsidized hospital that is conducted and administered magnificently, but at great personal sacrifice. The surgeons and doctors at the hospital are coming to the end of their tether. Only one thing can be done: that is to provide that the Lyell McEwin Hospital should become a public hospital and thereby give the people in the area the facilities they deserve and are now rightly demanding. It is pathetic to find that we have been ground by the Commonwealth into the position where only \$100,000 can be provided for a hospital servicing 100,000 people in the Salisbury and Elizabeth areas.

Mr. Clark: And farther north, too.

Mr. McRAE: Yes. In *Hansard* of September 4, 1969, the then Treasurer was frank enough to admit that, whatever he did with his Budget (and his Budget was not approved by all, as we heard this afternoon), as soon as he achieved growth it would be cut away by the unfair taxation system. Whilst categorizing this State's deal from the Commonwealth as lousy, I support the first line of the Loan Estimates.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): I will not be lousy, and I will not accuse anyone of being lousy. I will deal with the matter before the Committee without using such an epithet. I have heard four Treasurers present Loan Estimates in this Parliament but on this occasion I have encountered complexities in following some items. If one searches the Treasurer's statements one finds that some conflicting comments have undoubtedly been made. It is clear that the new Government has inherited a much healthier position than the previous Government inherited when it came to office in 1968.

I publicly acknowledge the debt that this State owes to Sir Glen Pearson, one of the outstanding Treasurers of this State. It was due to his good housekeeping that this State attained the financial position disclosed in the Treasurer's statement. Consequently, the Government has got off to a good start. This good start has been enhanced by the new financial arrangements with the Commonwealth—arrangements that the previous Government did not enjoy when it came to office. These arrangements include debt relief, non-repayable grants and interest-free grants. I only hope for South Australia's sake that we do not have

a repetition of the 1965-68 debacle under the Walsh-Dunstan Government when this State went into deficit in only three short years. It took the Hall Government only two years to get South Australia back on to a decent footing.

Members interjecting:

Mr. COUMBE: I thought I would have a few bites on that one. I looked at the statement prepared by the present Treasurer and presented to this Committee last Thursday and compared it with the statement made by Sir Glen Pearson in presenting his first Budget in 1968. The present Treasurer said:

... the balance of unspent Loan funds held at June 30, 1970, was increased by a small margin to \$13,032,000.

In 1968, the figure was \$5,600,000, so this Government's financial position regarding Loan funds is nearly twice as good as the position in 1968, and the Government is off to a good start. The Treasurer then went on to refer to the revenue position, giving details of how it was worked out. In 1968 Sir Glen Pearson said that the deficit inherited by the Hall Government, which the Labor Party had achieved in three short years after Sir Thomas Playford ceased to be Treasurer and left the Treasury almost square, was \$8,365,000, and that this had been reduced to \$4,579,000. In other words, in less than 2¼ years the Hall Government halved the deficit. As a result, I say that the present Government has inherited a fairly sound financial position, and I only hope that we do not have a repetition of the financial debacle that occurred between 1965 and 1968.

Mr. McKee: You will not experience it again for a while. We will be here for a long time, so you will not have any worries.

Mr. COUMBE: I was on the Opposition benches for three years when the member for Pirie was sitting on the Government side, and during those three years this terrific deficit was accumulated by his Party. When my Party came to office the position improved, as I have illustrated.

Mr. Langley: You do not really believe what you say is correct, do you?

Mr. COUMBE: Don't I! I am quoting from what the present Treasurer said last Thursday and from what Sir Glen Pearson said on August 8, 1968. I prefer to rely on those figures rather than on the specious arguments put forward by the member for Pirie, who has a fertile mind at times and does not give very much credit for things that happen in his district or in other parts of the State for the benefit of the people.

The present Government took office on June 2, 1970, so the Hall Government was in office for the whole of that financial year except for 28 days. For the greater part of the financial year 1967-68 the Walsh-Dunstan Labor Government was in power. I think it was April 17, 1968, when the L.C.L. Government came to office.

Mr. Millhouse: That's the very day.

Mr. COUMBE: Therefore, that is the comparison one can make. I read with some interest the comments the Treasurer made when presenting his Financial Statement. Several times he said that he wanted to keep reserves in the Loan Account. I wonder why he repeated this statement. It seemed to me to be almost an apologia, because I recall with great vividness that Government members (some now sitting on the front bench) who spoke 12 months ago criticized Sir Glen Pearson, the then Treasurer, when he said that he wanted to hold reserves for a rainy day. The rainy day came more quickly than he thought it would when the Labor Government took over.

I recall that members opposite criticized him for providing reserves. Yet, we have the same thing today with the present Treasurer saying that he wants to keep reserves. I agree with him, but I wonder why he repeated this statement three times. If one reads the statement correctly, the Treasurer has criticized the Commonwealth Government rather trenchantly (and I listened with interest to the member for Playford on this point), but in another statement he has referred to the increased grants that we are to receive, many of them for the first time, and most of them unmatched, interest free, and with debt relief clauses.

Even the Treasurer today (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) very obliquely acknowledged these conditions, and has gone so far as to introduce a new Public Finance Bill to give effect to the grants that this State is receiving for the first time. Not only is the Government inheriting a better financial position (and good luck to it), but it is in the position (in which the previous Government did not have the advantage of being) of having extra debt relief being granted and interest-free grants being available. This is a good situation for South Australia, but I am high-lighting and contrasting the circumstances that have faced the two Governments in the last two and a half years. On page 1 of the Treasurer's statement, when referring to a department that I had the honour to administer for two years, he says:

For the Public Buildings Department work flowed very smoothly with few of the normal hold-ups and as a result final payments were almost \$3,000,000 more than the first estimate. A little more than half of the excess was in school buildings, with the remainder in hospital and other Government buildings.

I take that to be a commendation not of the Minister (because I know the present Minister is carrying on the work that both the member for Victoria and I carried on) but of the work that has been and is being done by this department. This was not always the case, however. We have had violent fluctuations in the past in this department's spending, and not all of these fluctuations were within its control. Then the Treasurer went on to make some interesting comments about the assistance that is being given, and said:

... members will no doubt be interested to know that \$27,420,000 of the new funds for capital works to be received in 1970-71 will be grants. . . . grants free of interest and repayment instead of as loans subject to interest and sinking fund requirements.

In welcoming this assistance to the State from the Commonwealth Government, I only regret that we did not have a similar privilege or opportunity when we were in Government. As I said, the Treasurer made several contradictory statements in this regard. I am pleased to see the increased allocation for the Engineering and Water Supply Department and it is interesting to note that the present Minister is continuing some of the work that I started regarding the approach to be made to the Commonwealth Government for assistance in connection with country water schemes under the National Water, Resources Development Programme. The Tod extension is one such scheme, as is also the project involving the Kimba main. I remember negotiating for the assistance received for the Tailem Bend scheme, when we received \$6,000,000 from the Commonwealth Government, and this meant that the main could be completed much sooner. The Kimba main was considered, as the Tod main is now being considered.

Several members having referred to the Dartmouth issue, I intend to refer to it also. If the Bill considered in this Chamber had been passed, the Minister of Works would have had a line in the Estimates relating to planning. It would not have related to construction, because South Australia would have been an equal partner, and it was made perfectly clear during the previous debate that planning could commence as soon as the enabling legislation had been passed by the South Australian Parliament, similar legislation having already

been passed by the other three Parliaments concerned. This matter is one of regret, about which we cannot do anything at present. All we got out of the Treasurer when he was asked a question on this matter earlier today was that a letter had been written and some letters had been received, and we do not know where we are going from there.

I am most interested in the item under the Public Buildings Department dealing with school buildings, to which other speakers have referred, because I see that the Minister of Education has prevailed on the Treasurer to increase the sum to \$16,500,000, and good luck to him! I understood from an earlier comment, which I think was made during Question Time today, that the Minister was basing this figure on an expectation that some of the money would be received from the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: No.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It will be in addition.

Mr. COUMBE: I wanted to get that point clear. It was brought out in Question Time that the present Minister of Education has asked for \$7,000,000 whereas I, on behalf of the previous Government, had asked for \$4,500,000. I do not know what figure will be received, but I hope it will be as high as possible. If the Minister gets \$7,000,000, good luck to him. I shall be the first to congratulate him if he gets that much, but I do not think he will. Although I was confident of getting a grant, I was not confident of getting all of \$4,500,000. Let us be frank about that. However, at the same time, whatever we get will be welcome and will not be enough.

I was intrigued to see that the Loan Estimates provide for work under 30 projects with a total of \$13,880,000 being in progress and, for the coming year, we have the same thing (30 projects with a total value of \$13,880,000), yet some buildings have been completed during the year. This must surely be a coincidence. I have taken the trouble of reading Treasurers' statements over the past few years. I realize that the sum spent on these projects last year is about \$6,200,000 whereas this year it is about \$5,700,000.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: If you look at the two items, you will see that provision is made for work under 30 projects with a total value of \$13,880,000 still in progress at June 30, 1970, and on those 30 projects \$6,257,000 was spent last financial year. Then you will see that 30 projects are still in progress at June 30, 1970, at a total of \$5,712,000.

Mr. COUMBE: I can see that, and I am saying that it is a coincidence in that this is the first time the same figure has appeared, because I have gone back year after year and the sum has always varied. After all, several projects have been completed during the year; I hope this is pure coincidence. The sum spent last year on the completion of 20 projects and the sum spent on these 30 projects totalled \$8,873,000. The sum to be spent this year under those 30 projects and the 21 new projects comes to \$8,970,000, so the figure is about the same for what is being spent. Frankly, when we look at the sum spent in recent years and remember the furore that went on last year, I should have thought that the present Government would include a greater sum in these Loan Estimates. By interjection earlier today, the Minister of Education had much to say about the sum spent. I shall deal with the controversial sum referred to of \$8,678,000 that occurred in the last year of the Dunstan Government.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Part in our term and part in your term.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, we had two and a half months. I inferred that the Minister said this afternoon that in the first two and a half months we were in office we managed to underspend by \$1,250,000, and I take it that that is what he is saying now. In other words, by some miraculous method we stopped all contracts and work and did not let any more contracts.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What happened was that we were informed by the Under Treasurer that underspending of about \$300,000 had occurred at the end of March. If you remember, at the time you got into office—

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: What's going on here?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan): Order! Interjections are out of order. I ask honourable members to refrain from having conversations.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It was a wet winter.

Mr. COUMBE: Whatever the Minister cares to say about this matter—and he would be completely out of order in interjecting again—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It was a wet winter.

Mr. COUMBE: It was a wet winter; I am glad the Minister remembers that. The very day I happened to be appointed Minister of Works it started to rain, and the reservoirs filled: but the Minister now says it was a wet

winter. However, be that as it may (to use a famous statesman's words), about \$8,600,000 was the amount spent. That was nearly \$2,000,000 underspent. What was spent the next year, the first full year of the new Government? It was \$13,269,000—not a bad increase, from \$8,600,000 to \$13,200,000. This year it was increased again to \$15,499,000 (roughly \$15,500,000), so we got substantial increases under the previous Government—and at a time when some members of the Thirtieth Parliament (some of them sitting on the front benches at the time, and some sitting elsewhere at the moment) were castigating the then Government for not spending enough on education. What was the figure? It was in last year's Budget for spending on school buildings: it happened to be \$13,800,000, and we overspent that to the extent that we finished up with about \$15,500,000 expenditure, an increase of a mere 12.3 per cent. That is our "deliberate underspending". Let me take the Minister back to what he mentioned—a wet winter. His Government happened to be in office for 28 days in the last financial year and he did not get a \$2,000,000 increase in 28 days.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: But we spent \$500,000 on the last day of the month.

Mr. COUMBE: Oh, did you? Now we are hearing things!

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: We spent half a million "bucks" on the last day of the month.

Mr. COUMBE: Why was that?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Mainly on land purchases.

Mr. COUMBE: What was the reason for that?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: We wanted to give you something to talk about.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan): Order!

Mr. COUMBE: I was interested to see why the present Government on the last day of the month, June 30, the day of stocktaking, deliberately spent half a million "bucks" (to use the vernacular of the Minister) on buying land. That means there was a 3.2 per cent increase on the allocation approved by Parliament this time last year. Both Ministers are concerned. The Minister of Works has to find and spend the money; he has to let tenders, see that the work is done and then hand over the school to the Minister of Education, who gets the glory. Then the Minister of Works has to maintain that school forever. So the record of the previous Government in expenditure, despite this half a million "bucks" that

the Minister of Education so readily talks about, was progressive. It meant that the Government as a deliberate policy over-spent on school buildings. Ministers, particularly the Minister of Works, have only to look through the records to see that this occurred. When I was Minister of Works and, later, when I was Minister of Education, I encouraged it, because that was the previous Government's policy. After all the furore, the increase this year is about \$1,000,000. The increase in the proposed expenditure this year is 6.45 per cent greater than what was actually spent last year. It will be interesting to see what happens when the Government receives the Commonwealth grant for the crash programme that we all hope will be forthcoming in the Budget.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We are planning already, on the assumption that we will get it.

Mr. COURCE: The Minister of Works will then have the job of getting this work physically done. Of course, I know the position—

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr. Acting Chairman, I draw your attention to the state of the Committee.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan): Ring the bells.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. COURCE: If the Minister of Works has his plans ready and if he gets the extra money, he will have the job of letting the contracts. Because I keep my ear close to the ground I am not sure he will be able to spend all the money during the year. If the Government gets the money, good luck to it, but I point out that there was a dramatic increase in expenditure on education during the previous Government's term of office. During that period expenditure on education increased from \$8,600,000 to \$15,499,000 in a little over two years. Several speakers have referred to the national survey, as a result of which we hope to get this additional money.

This year there will be a considerable increase in the matched grants that are being made for buildings for universities and advanced education, because the triennium has reach its peak. It appears to me that this State faces a total expenditure of \$20,000,000, half of which will be found by the Commonwealth Government. Here again is an example of Commonwealth assistance. The question of the triennium and the adjustments under it is ticklish. The Minister spoke about this the other day, and I am well aware of it. Even before the Minister came into this House as a private member, when I was chairman of

the building committee of the South Australian Institute of Technology I had dealings with the Commonwealth on this matter, and the committee laid a foundation for future grants to that institute. It is pleasing to see the amount provided this year for this purpose.

There is no doubt that it is necessary that reserves be kept, and I would be the first to criticize the Government if it did not keep them. I have compared the position in 1968 with that in 1970. I have also stated that there was a surplus in Loan Account in 1968 of only \$5,658,000 and that at the end of the last financial year there was a surplus of \$13,032,000. This improvement occurred in only two years under the Liberal Government. In 1968 the accumulated revenue deficit that we inherited was \$8,365,000, and this was reduced to \$4,579,000, which is not a bad effort in two years. In that time the Liberal Government spent well and wisely on projects that helped develop the State. My only regret about these Loan Estimates is that nothing is provided for Dartmouth which, as members know, was a pet subject of mine and of many other members. I sincerely hope that next year's Loan Estimates will contain some provision for planning this dam, even if the Government has to bring in special legislation to provide for it.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I think we will manage.

Mr. COURCE: Then I hope the Government does not have to cease work on some water mains, as it did in 1966. Do members remember that when the Chowilla dam was to be built work on the Keith main came to a stop? Then there was a terrific row about getting it started again and, when work recommenced, someone objected to paying rates and there was quite a furore.

Mr. Venning: We had better not dig up the past.

Mr. COURCE: No; rather, we had better dig up the ground and put in mains. I hope that, work on major water mains does not have to stop. In two years there was a wonderful recovery in this State's financial position, and I hope we do not have a repetition of what happened previously and go downhill again. I hope South Australia will continue to progress upward and that it will not slide downward under a Labor rule. I support the adoption of the first line. .

Mr. EASTICK (Light): I am disappointed that I have to speak to an audience that does not appear to constitute the necessary quorum.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan): Is the honourable member drawing attention to the state of the Committee?

Mr. EASTICK: Yes, Sir.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: A quorum of the Committee is present.

Mr. EASTICK: I imagine that there is likely to be a flurry in the Agriculture Department because of the urgent need for large quantities of pesticides to be provided to clear the lice that have created the lousy situation mentioned by the member for Playford on several occasions.

I am pleased to see there is an increase in the number of houses estimated to be built in the Gawler area. Unfortunately, Saddleworth is the only other town within the District of Light that will receive any Housing Trust buildings. I agree with the member for Playford's suggestion of the urgent need for low-rental houses, and I draw the attention of the Minister responsible to the fact that it seems that in the past (and more particularly in the District of Light) many Housing Trust houses have been built on land that is unfit for normal house buildings and in areas where much drainage work and other works have to be undertaken.

We have the situation in the area of the District Council of Mudla Wirra, which is adjacent to the area of the Corporation of Gawler, where houses have been built, particularly for the Education Department and Police Department, with foundations below the road level. Much difficulty has been experienced here and in other places in Gawler, Kapunda, and Saddleworth, where pipe work has to be lifted above ground level and deposited at the front fence line of the house in order to allow water to run in open channels to reach the gutter. It is impossible, because of the quantity of water and the lie of the land, to deliver water into the gutter by normal means.

I suggest that the present activities of the Housing Trust in seeking to purchase land on which to build low-rental houses (particularly for pensioners, and I agree with this activity) is being directed to purchasing land which is a reclaimed quarry and which was used for many years by the Corporation of Gawler to provide rubble, but was subsequently filled with refuse and materials from demolished buildings. If this is the type of land that is to be used by the Housing Trust on which to build low-rental pensioner units, considerable difficulties will be encountered. Although I am

pleased that additional houses are to be built in the area, I suggest that the question of ensuring that the land is suitably serviced should be seriously considered.

The Evanston area, on the southern side of Gawler, has been notorious for the difficulty of disposing of effluent, because of the flat land which has a heavy clay content. I am more than happy that the first major work on installing sewerage in the Gawler area has relieved this situation. The fact that the Housing Trust caters mainly for people with younger children increases the difficulty experienced in this area. This difficulty arose a few years earlier in another area known as Gawler West in which, if we bear in mind the fact that there were many children in this newly-developed Housing Trust area, there was a tremendous effluent problem.

Although the estimate for sewerage works in the Gawler area in 1969-70 was \$350,000, the Treasurer said there had been an expenditure of \$651,000 on this work, and this represents 186 per cent of the estimate for that year. Whether the Minister of Works will be in as fortunate a position as that of his immediate predecessors in providing over-estimate works, particularly to the extent of 186 per cent, is a matter that we will view throughout the year with considerable interest. The sum allocated for this financial year is \$101,000 below that spent last year. The annual percentage increase in expenditure on waterworks and sewers in 1967-68 was 5.3 per cent; in 1968-69, it was 8.3 per cent; in 1969-70 the increase was only 5.5 per cent; and for the current year the increase is only 5.2 per cent.

Therefore, it seems impossible that the Minister will be able to increase spending on sewerage works above the estimate because of the infinitely smaller increase with which he has to work. Having regard to the sum lost immediately through increased costs, I do not think we can hope to see any great improvement on this position.

I note that \$200,000 is required for the completion of the winery at Roseworthy Agricultural College, it having been originally stated that the total cost of this project would be \$295,000. As \$245,000 was provided in 1969-70, one would expect to have seen only \$50,000 provided this year. However, as the work may not have proceeded as rapidly as the former Government had hoped, I would ask the Minister in due course to say why \$200,000 has been allocated. In fact, we could have expected to see much less

provided, after allowing something for increased costs.

In the provision for education, no expenditure whatever is recommended for schools in my district. Although a satisfactory and successful adult education centre (the first of its kind in the State), a high school, and a primary school were established not long ago in Gawler, the Minister will know from letters he has received that other schools are crying out for attention, particularly the Kapunda High School which is situated in the house that was originally the home of Sir Sidney Kidman and which was never designed as a school. Various other schools in my district need some assistance. I support the first line.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra) ; These very orthodox Loan Estimates are marred by a stream of abuse from Government members about the Commonwealth Government. The fact is that the State Government has not done badly in its Loan programme. In his explanation, the Treasurer said:

At the meeting of the Australian Loan Council in June last the Commonwealth agreed to give its support to a total programme of \$823,000,000 for State works and housing. This is an increase of \$65,000,000 or about 8½ per cent above the 1969-70 total of \$758,000,000. South Australia's share of the total determined is \$112,420,000, which is \$8,500,000 more than the allocation of \$103,920,000 for 1969-70.

Incidentally, this increase is well above the Australian average, yet we have had a stream of abuse of the Commonwealth Government by the State Government not only in this debate, as characterized by the member for Playford, but ever since the Government took office. Nothing much is said by this Government without some reference to the Commonwealth; only the good news is not connected with the Commonwealth. Nothing is ever said about what the Commonwealth does for the State: reference is made only to what it does not do. I have become rather tired of seeing letters, such as one from which I shall quote, that are sent out to everyone who inquires about education problems that were raised initially by the South Australian Institute of Teachers. The last paragraph of this letter states:

The rate of progress is going to be determined by financial limitations and the time at which we receive direct Commonwealth Government grants for Government primary and secondary schools.

The Prime Minister might very well say, "What the dickens are you doing making a statement

like that?" As a matter of fact probably rightly, he ignores it as being nothing but cheek. Everybody knows the constitutional position and that it would be appropriate for us to receive funds properly from the Commonwealth, for whatever reason it was willing to make them available to us; but we have no constitutional right to demand that, and it is nothing else but blatant buck-passing. The insults that the Treasurer and members of his Party throw at the Commonwealth Government only add to South Australia's problems.

Mr. McKee: You will never convince me on that argument.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Treasurer says, with the utmost arrogance that I do not think can have been exceeded by anybody, that the Commonwealth must come to heel. If anybody can think of a more arrogant statement by a State leader, I should like to hear it. It would be a museum piece. The Ministers, who always reply to questions, "Oh well, if the Commonwealth would only give us some more," join in the campaign. Mr. Gorton is described as vindictive. That is the sort of adjective being used. The Treasurer is fond of using the expression "a lousy deal", and that adjective was taken up so enthusiastically by his supporter, the member for Playford, that he used it in almost every sentence towards the end of his speech. It is not good enough to blame the Commonwealth for our troubles. It is fair enough to treat the Commonwealth Government as it should be treated—with courtesy and strong advocacy—but the members on the other side of the House, led by the Treasurer and his Ministers, are not prepared to take the slightest cognizance of the Commonwealth's responsibilities. They are interested only in political advantage. Not one member opposite is prepared to acknowledge the need for defence expenditure and the need—

Mr. McKee: That is a debatable question.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Members opposite use these undignified expressions. Of course, if we could get more money from the Commonwealth we should all like it, but we should ask for it in a properly argued and dignified way, not by insulting the Commonwealth Government. The Treasurer accused the Prime Minister of making a decision on purely political grounds; the Prime Minister denied it straightaway, quite rightly.

Mr. Ryan: But even the *Advertiser* supported the Treasurer on that.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Treasurer repeated it several weeks afterwards.

I do not think it is good enough coming from a Government that has now been in office for several weeks and has done absolutely nothing except accuse the Commonwealth of not giving it the money it needs to put its policies into action. It has done nothing about the urgent matter of the State's water supplies. Having switched its vote in the last session of Parliament most blatantly, it has tried to forget the Dartmouth dam issue altogether. The Dartmouth dam is waiting to be built. Everybody in this Parliament knows that we will ratify the agreement. We said that long ago. We know that the Treasurer will have to come here and say, "Please ratify the Dartmouth dam agreement." The rest of it is a lot of window-dressing. This is, very unconvincing. It is unconvincing to the people along the river. Even people who at the time were confused about the issue are now even more confused, because absolutely nothing has been done. These are fairly orthodox Loan Estimates, except that the Government has applied the available funds badly. I support the Loan Estimates, but I will have more to say after the first line has been passed.

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): I rise to speak on the Loan Estimates in the knowledge that far more capable and experienced speakers than I am have already covered most of the important points. However, I must mention one point. I read in this morning's press that an extra \$3,000,000 will be spent on school buildings—a very laudable plan. However, we find that this money will be spent only if the Commonwealth Government provides it. Fancy publicly announcing a plan such as this without being sure that the money is available! Is the Minister being genuine or is he just playing politics? Such a statement really covers the bets: if the money is available the Minister of Education will take the credit. However, if the money is not available, he will say that it is the Commonwealth Government's fault. Despite the remarks of the Treasurer and the member for Playford, I believe that the Commonwealth Government has already been extremely generous to the States. I hope the money is made available, but let us have the decency to give the credit to the right quarter.

I wish to speak mainly on more parochial matters, matters concerning my electoral district, which to my disappointment received no mention in these Loan Estimates. I refer first to the establishment of the State's first "super" port at Port Lincoln. On July 21 the

Minister of Marine, in reply to a question from the member for Rocky River, said:

However, money will be allocated in this year's Loan Estimates for work to be carried out at Port Lincoln. Although I am not aware just how much has been set aside, the honourable member will obtain that information when the Loan Estimates are introduced. When we received the Loan Estimates last Thursday, as the member most directly concerned, I naturally looked eagerly to see just how much the Government had allocated to this very important project. And what did I find? I could find no mention of Port Lincoln at all. In my innocence and being unfamiliar with the format of the Loan Estimates, I thought that it might be hidden in an item such as "Sundry Works". But no! Today we heard the Minister say that he made a mistake on July 21 and that there is no allocation for the development of Port Lincoln harbour. No-one can deny the importance of this project, which calls for the expenditure of \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000. The project must be proceeded with as soon as possible, yet it has been deferred for at least a year. We in Flinders are getting used to having major projects deferred whenever a Labor Government comes to power.

Last time we had a cut in the allocation for roads in the western division from over 14 per cent of the State's total to 101 per cent. Also, we had the shelving of the Port Lincoln High School project. I am sorry the Minister of Education is not here at present. I have mentioned the Port Lincoln High School several times in this place, and I give fair warning that I will continue to mention it until it is built. Its construction was approved by the Public Works Committee and funds were allocated in February, 1965. I suggest that the Minister of Education should resurrect the docket on the Port Lincoln High School: the most interesting part shows that from February, 1965, there is no entry on it, with the exception of an unsigned entry in, I think, August, 1965. From February, 1965, there is no entry until April, 1968—a lapse of over three years, the three years of the Walsh-Dunstan Government.

Mr. McKee: What happened in the next three years?

Mr. CARNIE: There was no money left. In August, 1969, the then Leader of the Opposition (the present Premier and Treasurer) visited Port Lincoln and fulminated about the Port Lincoln High School. He was reported in the local press as having said it was the worst in South Australia. Perhaps he will now deny

making this statement: this seems to be the thing to do at the moment. Although I mentioned this statement in Question Time a week or so ago, the Treasurer did not deny it, so I assume he was accurately reported. One would think that after he had made a statement like this the present Government would keep the Port Lincoln High School high on the priority list, or does this mean that others that are not as bad (let us face it—if this school is the worst high school in the State, all the others are better) are being moved up the list at the expense of Port Lincoln?

When I first questioned the Minister of Education on this matter, he said that tenders would not be called until late 1971, and this was despite the fact that the project had been down for tender call in the 1970-71 financial year. When I later asked the Minister the reason for this apparent delay, in his usual exemplary fashion he spoke for five minutes but did not answer my question. He said that the people of Port Lincoln could rest assured that this project would be proceeded with as soon as possible. What an empty remark this was: it could have meant anything. I repeat that I was bitterly disappointed to see that no funds were allocated for this school in these Loan Estimates. If the Liberal and Country League Government had been returned, this school would have been ready for occupation in February, 1973.

I notice from Appendix 1 that the Port Lincoln High School and the Tumbly Bay Area School are both included in major works for which planning and design is proposed for 1970-71. I suppose we must be thankful for small mercies, but preliminary plans are ready and estimates have been taken out, so why cannot full planning be done so that tenders can be called in this financial year, as originally planned?

Mr. McKee: How long have the people been complaining about this high school?

Mr. CARNIE: It was ready to be built and was approved in February, 1965.

Mr. McKee: How long has this been causing a problem?

Mr. CARNIE: The honourable member's Leader had much to say about it last year, and it was definitely scrubbed.

Mr. McKee: A Liberal Government was in office for 34 years out of the last 37 years.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Flinders is making the speech.

Mr. CARNIE: I support the first line, but in so doing I express my disappointment at the poor deal given to my district.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support the first line. I know that this Government came into office when the Treasury was in a good financial position, and it found that a surplus of funds existed. The Liberal Government rectified the finances of this State: it took two years for it to put them into such a good position that the present Government went into office with a tidy sum at its command. I hope that the adage that fools and their money are soon parted does not apply to this Government. It is pleasing to know that, as Minister of Education, in 1969 Mrs. Steele was responsible for going to the Commonwealth and for forming a committee of all Ministers of Education to make a survey of the educational needs of the States. Because of the formation of that committee and of visits to Canberra by Mr. John Coumbe, (the then Minister of Education) we should be confident that, when the Commonwealth Budget is introduced soon, the case put by our Ministers, and followed up by Mr. Hugh Hudson (the present Minister) will result in the Commonwealth Government's considering favourably the needs of education in this State. The Loan Estimates have been drawn up to cater for future planning with the assistance that will be received from the Commonwealth Government. If considerable financial assistance is not received, it will mean that the building programme will take more time to complete.

However, the Labor Government is able to take action because, when we were in office, we were able to administer the finances of this State in a proper manner. At present, about 12 houses are being built in the District of Rocky River, and about 13 are to be built this financial year. That is not many, but if additional finance is available we hope that the number will be increased. Also, a new police station, residence, and courthouse is to be built at Gladstone, and it is expected that a new high school will be available at the beginning of 1972. It is hoped that the sketch plans of this new school will soon be presented to the Public Works Committee for its consideration. However, I was concerned when I realized that not one cent is to be spent on developing Port Lincoln as a deep sea port.

I apologize for speaking about matters outside my electoral district but, because of my

association with the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, I consider that it is most urgent that I should say something about Port Lincoln. In 1965, when the Labor Government was in office, it appointed a committee to obtain details of the additional bulk facilities that were required at terminals in various parts of the State. This committee recommended that Port Lincoln should be developed as a major deep sea terminal. In about 1968 another committee was appointed, and it reaffirmed the need for Port Lincoln to be developed as a major terminal for Eyre Peninsula. However, not one cent has been allocated in the Loan Estimates for work to be done at Port Lincoln. A few days ago, when replying to a question I had asked of him about Port Lincoln, the Minister of Marine said:

The honourable member says that we in this State are in a difficult position regarding grain shipment because of our lack of deep sea ports, but I would go even further and say that we are in this position mainly because of lack of planning, particularly over the last 10 to 20 years. However, money will be allocated in this year's Loan Estimates for work to be carried out in Port Lincoln. Although I am not aware just how much has been set aside, the honourable member will obtain that information when the Loan Estimates are introduced.

Not one cent is provided in the Loan Estimates for work at Port Lincoln. On July 28, in reply to a question, the Minister said:

I think this project involves the expenditure of \$7,000,000 or \$9,000,000, which will be spread over three years. However, I will check that for the honourable member so that his information is accurate, and bring down a report as soon as possible.

I sincerely hope that the Minister brings down something that is accurate and that it is much better news for Port Lincoln than what we have heard so far. I thought I made the position fairly clear to members during the Address in Reply debate when I referred to the rural position in Australia, particularly in this State, and to the need to establish deep sea ports in South Australia. I said that if something was not done soon South Australia's base quota would be reduced from the 45,000,000 bushels that had been established for this State. It has been estimated that South Australia will have a carry-over this year of 118 per cent of the base quota, and the authorities may well say, "Because of your shipping facilities in South Australia, among other things, your base quota will have to be reduced."

I cannot emphasize too strongly the need to have money allocated to develop the facili-

ties at Port Lincoln. I am concerned at the lack of sympathy and thought of this Government in this regard. The Government is not, by a long way, conversant with the needs of the rural community. During the election campaign, my opponent distributed a little card, which I understand was a replica used by all Labor candidates, on which the question was asked: "Do you need help?" I thought what hypocrisy this was and what a mockery the whole thing had been. I told my opponent at the declaration of the poll that, although he had not been successful, even though his Party had been, I hoped that his Government would do something about what was stated on that card and that it would help people in rural areas. However, this evening, when we examine the Loan Estimates, we find what is not there.

Mr. McKee: What do you mean?

Mr. VENNING: I think the member for Pirie has the message. He is fully aware of the problem regarding our ports. The creek that runs up to his city is fairly significant in relation to the limitations placed on the draught of ships coming to this State. Only a few days ago, it was stated that at ports in New South Wales seven or eight ships were waiting to load wheat. When do we see that situation here? The other day, a ship was at anchorage near Port Pirie only because there had been a refusal to load bagged wheat; the bags were too heavy. Unfortunately, through problems associated with the chartering of this ship, the deal slipped through and the ship went to Thevenard, where it was loaded with bulk wheat. The bagged wheat had to be bulked at Port Pirie for the simple reason that the bags were too heavy.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I, too, support the first line. The member for Playford joined the band waggon in attacking the Commonwealth Government, which he said was rotten and lousy; he used those terms often. I think that if anything is rotten and lousy it is the attitude he has adopted. Whatever assistance the Commonwealth Government had given the State Government, it would not have satisfied the Treasurer, who is blaming the Commonwealth Government purely for political purposes.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: We got the dirty end of the stick.

Mr. GUNN: All that members opposite do is blame the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Tell us why we haven't got the Eyre Highway.

Mr. GUNN: The Government's plan to spend over \$500,000 on the Kimba main is significant in that it will continue the main only another 15 miles; at that stage 30 miles will have been completed. The present indication is that it will be several years before the people of Kimba can expect any assistance whatever in this regard. I wonder what the Government intends to do. I wonder whether it will spend large sums in carting water to the area by the railways or by road transport. Money spent in that way is money wasted. Anyone who has had experience in carting water knows that nothing is more futile.

Mr. Burdon: Much has been carted over there in the last 30 years.

Mr. GUNN: In the last 30 years the need for diversification was not as great as it is today. Farmers in the Kimba area have grown wheat, and barley to a certain extent. With the necessity for the rural industry to diversify, they have wanted to have sheep and cattle. However, it is completely impossible for them to diversify to any extent. Many farmers have tried to provide water schemes for themselves, but the nature of the country makes this impossible, as there is no underground water and the country is not suitable for the building of dams. Obviously members opposite have no regard for the rural industry.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What gives you that impression?

Mr. GUNN: I gain that impression from the way members opposite are carrying on. I hope that before it is too late those members will realize what a valuable part the rural industry plays. I hope the Government will consider letting out work on the Polda-Kimba extension by private contract. I know that only a limited sum is available to spend. I

realize that the programme of the Engineering and Water Supply Department is that as one mile of main is completed consumers living along that mile are connected. Many people are looking anxiously for some progress and, with the way in which the Engineering and Water Supply Department gang is working, it does not appear that the main will ever get to Kimba. I think that if some of the work were let to private contractors at least some progress would be made and some consumers would be connected.

I turn now to Thevenard harbour, which is of great benefit to the wheatgrowers in that division. If the Government could expedite the work at Thevenard, it would assist the wheatgrowers not only in my electoral district but also in the whole of South Australia. We are all aware of the problems facing them. Because of the lack of depth of water at Thevenard, it is impossible for big ships to get in there, so it is difficult for the farmers to dispose of their products. I hope the Minister will not only have Thevenard harbour deepened but will also investigate the turnaround so that it can be improved to enable more ships to enter the harbour for the benefit of the rural industry of South Australia. I have pleasure in supporting the first line.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no further speakers on the grand total of the Loan Estimates, members will now have the opportunity to ask questions on the first line, and from then onwards there will be questions only on the lines as they are put from time to time until general discussion has ceased.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.48 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 12, at 2 p.m.