

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 14, 1973

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

QUESTIONS

WARDANG ISLAND

Dr. EASTICK: In the absence of the Attorney-General, I ask a question of the Premier because it involves money matters. Can he state the reasons for a press statement headed "Wardang Island Project Flops" and appearing in the *Sunday Mail*? The article states:

Wardang Island, South Australia's only Aboriginal-run tourist resort, is on the verge of collapse.

On October 10, 1972, I asked the Attorney-General what was the cause of the delay in taking bookings from tourists for the facilities on the island, and he said that it was correctly a matter for the Aboriginal Lands Trust but that he would, on my behalf, seek information and bring it back. Following a subsequent question on November 2, 1972, the Attorney-General read the following letter from the Aboriginal Lands Trust:

The tourist facilities of Wardang Island were not used over the Labor Day weekend. The facilities are not at present being used. The trust has fully investigated the potential use of the existing facilities and how best to make use of these facilities to ensure that something like profitable operation is achieved. As far as the trust has been able to ascertain, the use of these facilities under the management of Mr. H. G. Pryce were operated at a considerable loss. The trust is therefore anxious to ensure as far as possible that the organization and operation of the tourist facilities will enable it to form an integrated part of a successful long-term tourist venture. After having commissioned and paid for a management programme through a firm of management consultants, the trust now understands that the matter is being considered by the resources branch of the Community Welfare Department for a recommendation to be made to the Minister that the trust's request and recommendation to the Minister be approved. Until this information is known, the trust is unable to say that it has any firm plans as to when or how the existing facilities will be utilized.

The Attorney-General then continued:

The last statement is correct: certain proposals have been made and are being examined by my department, with a view to the department's making a recommendation to me about what part the Government can play in relation to the development of Wardang Island. Until that decision has been made and communicated to the trust, I cannot say anything further.

I ask the Premier whether, in fact, the assistance required by the Aboriginal Lands Trust has been denied it and whether this is the basic reason for the announcement that the Wardang Island project has flopped.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No; applications for funds in respect of the project have not been made to Government and denied by it. As a result of the election of a Commonwealth Labor Government, for some time now we have been having a series of discussions on the taking over of Aboriginal affairs activities by the Commonwealth Government. These discussions are continuing and, in consequence, long-term decisions on developments such as Wardang Island are dependent on the conclusion of these discussions. I point out to the Leader that Wardang Island was first sought by the Aboriginal Lands Trust during the period of the previous Labor Government in South Australia, and at that time the island was under lease. During the period of the Hall Government, a lease was granted to Mr. Pryce for which he paid a small sum.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He made no capital payments—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He paid a total of \$3,500 to obtain the lease. There was an immediate protest in this House about that, because Wardang Island had been part of the Point Pearce Reserve and had been removed from the Aborigines without compensation by the Playford Government and leased without any compensation being paid to the Aborigines. Despite protests in this House, a perpetual lease was then granted to Mr. Pryce.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: By the Hall Government.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. It was a disgraceful—

Mr. Millhouse: Nonsense!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was one of the most shocking and disgraceful actions in relation to Aborigines that this State has ever seen.

Mr. Hall: You've got to find someone to blame.

Mr. Millhouse: The Aboriginal Lands Trust was not interested—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: —and you know it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is not the case.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham knows the rulings of this House, and I warn him accordingly. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Aboriginal Lands Trust had expressed its interest, it maintained its interest, and it asserted its interest on the return to office of this Government. Then over a period we were approached by Mr. Pryce, who was not making an economic go on Wardang Island and who wanted Government assistance to develop facilities there. We were not willing to grant that assistance.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It cost us \$115,000 to get Wardang Island back for the Aboriginal people.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: At the cost of the perpetual lease—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We got the island back for the Aborigines, and its control has been handed to the Aboriginal Lands Trust. The Government has provided a management consultant programme in relation to the development of Wardang Island, and we have had discussions with the Commonwealth Government about its development. The Commonwealth Minister for Aboriginal Affairs has just visited Point Pearce to discuss the total development of the area, control of which is now, of course, in the hands of the Aboriginal Lands Trust, and I am quite certain that the area will be developed in a proper way in trust for the Aboriginal people of South Australia. I know that some sensationalists and newspaper reporters could not care less about Aborigines in South Australia and will do anything for a headline.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: They didn't ask the Government for comment, either.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They made that report without any reference to the Government or the Aboriginal Lands Trust. I think that is pretty poor journalism.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The subject on which I desire to make a personal explanation is Wardang Island, which was canvassed by the Premier in the reply to the question

asked of him by the Leader of the Opposition. I desire to make clear, because the Premier mentioned the lease that was entered into during the time of the Hall Government of which I was a member, that, as Minister of Aboriginal Affairs in that Government, before that lease was entered into I discussed with members of the Aboriginal Lands Trust the matter of Wardang Island and whether or not the trust was interested in the island. I was informed by the trust that it was not interested in the island—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Didn't you—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I did not hear the Premier's interjection. I am sorry; I might have been able to reply to that, too.

The SPEAKER: The interjection was out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My recollection is that the Aboriginal Lands Trust at a meeting actually minuted the fact that it was not interested in Wardang Island, but my recollection may be faulty and I should be glad if the Premier would check it. It was not until after that had been done that Cabinet, of which I was a member and to which I reported about the matter, approved the leasing of Wardang Island to Mr. Pryce. I desire to make that perfectly clear because the Premier's reply reflected gravely on the actions of the Government of that time and was quite inaccurate.

MAN AND WOMAN

Mr. DUNCAN: In the absence of the Attorney-General, will the Premier tell the House what measures can be taken to prohibit false advertising in publications that come from other States and are being sold in South Australia? A constituent has approached me about a full-page advertisement in the magazine *Fix* for what was described as a new sex book for adults, *Man and Woman*, which in the advertisement was described as a beautifully printed, illustrated and fully-bound publication. The constituent forwarded \$10 to the person who had advertised in that magazine and subsequently received in return a publication that was duplicated, held together with staples, and clearly not \$10 worth of book. I ask the Premier to tell the House what can be done to stop this kind of advertising.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On the face of it, I should think that was a breach of the Act. If the honourable member gives my colleague the details, I am sure the matter will be taken up.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S ABSENCE

The SPEAKER: I have been told that, in the absence of the honourable Attorney-General from the House today, any questions for him may be directed to the honourable Minister of Education.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether his attention has been drawn to the comments of His Honour the Chief Justice, in a decision handed down yesterday, regarding the town planning legislation in this State and the criticism (couched in rather picturesque terms, I thought) referring to some sections of the Act and the workings of solicitors in this field, likened to a jungle. Does the Minister agree with those comments by the Chief Justice, and will he say what action the Government intends to take on the problems criticized by the bench?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I have seen the report. I do not know whether that accurately describes the judgment that has been given and, accordingly, before I make any detailed reply in this House, I should like to

see the judgment. I have contacted the Crown Law Department, seeking that department's comments on the remarks attributed to the court by the newspaper. I think I ought to add that the interim report that I have received supports the view that there are some weaknesses in the Planning and Development Act that have been drawn to my attention. However, I understand that the phrases used were a considerable exaggeration of the position, because my view is that the Act has, since 1967, worked reasonably well.

Mr. Coumbe: You are joking!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: This is the first occasion on which any difficulty of this kind has been referred to, and the honourable member is probably aware that the matter before the court was extremely complex and, as a result, created certain problems. I think that most members of this Parliament who have debated the Planning and Development Act since 1967 fully appreciate that, in the interests of the community, much discretionary power is left in the Director of Planning or the State Planning Office because it seems apparent (and I think this fact is borne out because of the support of members on both sides of this Parliament) that in planning matters it is extremely difficult to distinguish clearly the standards that should be applied. To do this, to take away the discretionary powers that must be available, would create a situation where members of the community involved in the purchase of land or seeking to subdivide it could be faced with completely hard and fast rules and would find themselves in a situation in which they could be disadvantaged. However, because discretionary power is applicable, tests can be taken to the satisfaction of the State Planning Office and the Government, and development can proceed. It is impossible to spell out in legislation all the tests involved. I intend to obtain a copy of the decision, together with a report from the Crown Law Department, drawing to my attention the need for any amendment that may have especially moved the court on the matter before it. As soon as the report is before me I will give the House a report on the decision. Further, I know that some members and the Government are concerned about the delay in dealing with applications to subdivide land. This problem was not involved in the hearing before the court yesterday. The main reason for the delay is specifically related not to problems created by the administration of the Planning and Development Act but to the number of applications to the State Planning Office for subdivision. In recent months this number has been 21 times greater than the number in the corresponding period 12 months ago. This has strained considerably the administration of that office, and the Government has accordingly recognized the criticisms resulting from these delays and has requested every department involved with the various steps of subdivision to take every means to ensure that such delays are kept to a minimum. Additionally, the Government intends to provide the services of consultants, separate from Government departments and semi-government bodies, for councils involved in the machinery of subdivision, and steps have already been taken in this direction. These consultants will be engaged for the purpose of drawing the Government's attention to areas where delays can be reduced. These two actions (immediate consultation with all the Government departments involved with subdivision and, as a short-term measure, the employment of consultants to point to other areas where subdivision measures can be speeded up) are an indication of the concern of the Government in this matter and of its determination to reduce this waiting period as much as possible.

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister say what specific action he or the Government has taken to increase the speed of the passage of the various documents through the State Planning Office and the Lands Titles Office? The Minister says it is recognized that there is a problem, mainly associated with the increase by 2½ times in the number of documents being presented to the departments. The problem is also magnified by the number of departments through which documents must pass, including the Agriculture Department in cases of determining what is a viable agricultural area. In all these matters there is an indeterminate delay. For instance, one person who paid for a parcel of land in the Birdwood area at the end of October last still has not had the title delivered to him, even though the piece of land that he undertook to purchase was on an individual title. The space on the title had been taken up completely and, even though this document and other associated documents have been sent to the office, this man still has not received a clear title to the land which he purchased and for which he paid his money last October. Many other instances can be cited and doubtless the Minister knows of them, as do many other members. I ask the Minister whether positive action has been taken to improve the position on behalf of the people of the State.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I thought I dealt with this matter fairly comprehensively when replying to the previous question. I pointed out that, generally, the delay that has been evident in the past few months has been brought about by the dramatic increase by 21 times in the number of applications being dealt with. I think I ought to point out that in most of these matters the Director of Planning merely acts as a co-ordinator of the tests which other authorities make and which must be properly undertaken under the Planning and Development Act in respect of subdivisions. Often the Director of Planning is required to send out reminders to other Government departments or councils, asking for a reply to the approaches that the State Planning Office has already made to those authorities to consider specific aspects of a proposal. I think I ought also to point out that, when any specific hardship or financial difficulty has confronted an individual, the Director of Planning has dealt with those matters as sympathetically as possible and has sometimes tried to short-circuit the procedures laid down. With the prime objective of relieving the waiting period that causes difficulty for developers, large and small, we have written to all Government departments (and I have asked the Minister of Local Government to prepare a letter to be sent to all councils) asking them to bear in mind the difficulties that the delays occurring at this level are creating. The honourable member would appreciate that, if an approach by, or recommendation from, the State Planning Office was directed to a council and the matter missed a council meeting by a day or two, naturally the matter must wait until the next council meeting. A similar sort of problem exists in several other areas of Government administration. I have written to all Government departments and we will write to all councils, through the Minister of Local Government, asking these authorities to do whatever can be done to hasten the consideration of applications of this kind. In addition, because of the seriousness with which I view the matter, it has been decided that consultants shall be engaged to consider all the procedures involved in these applications and to make recommendations as to how the process can be hastened.

SPENCER GULF

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Marine ask the Chairman of the Spencer Gulf Water Pollution Co-ordinating Committee (Dr. Inglis) to seek the co-operation of the Institute of Technology at Whyalla to assist his committee's investigation of the northern area of Spencer Gulf? As the Principal of the institute has told me of his keen interest in the intended activities of the committee, I believe that, with proper negotiations, a helpful relationship may be initiated between these two parties to the benefit of all concerned.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to refer the honourable member's suggestion to the Director of Environment and Conservation (Dr. Inglis), who is the Chairman of the committee established to investigate the question of pollution in Spencer Gulf. No doubt the Chairman will confer with institute personnel as soon as possible. I think the honourable member's suggestion has merit; certainly if facilities are available we should use them. I take this opportunity to say that this morning I noticed in the newspaper a report that the Port Pirie council would raise, at a local government conference in Whyalla today, the subject of Spencer Gulf pollution. I am sure that the member for the district has informed the council that the State Government took steps about 18 months ago to initiate a survey by the Engineering and Water Supply Department into all aspects of pollution in Spencer Gulf, the results of that survey having been published only recently. In addition, the Government recently established this high-powered committee to oversee any moves that might be made to deal with the situation that currently exists in relation to the gulf. I hope that the council knows about these facts, which have had wide publicity. I am surprised that the council is now suggesting that certain things be done. If it has any suggestions, it might refer them to the committee that the Government saw fit to appoint after taking action on this problem about 18 months ago.

OODNADATTA SCHOOL

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about a fence at the Oodnadatta school?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The five-wire fence at Oodnadatta was erected for the sole purpose of delineating the boundaries of the school. However, consideration has been given to the erection of a wire-mesh fence at this school, and following consultation with officers of the Education Department it has been agreed to provide a fence of this type. Arrangements are in hand for the work to be undertaken as soon as possible.

EFFLUENT USE

Mr. OLSON: Can the Minister of Works say whether effluent currently being pumped from the treatment works at Royal Park into the Port River could be diverted and used to water playing fields? Constituents have suggested to me that the reclaimed water could be used to water numerous playing fields near the pumping station, including the Port Adelaide reserve, the ovals of the Riverside Football Club, the rugby club, and the LeFevre school, and the par-three golf course.

The Hon. I. D. CORCORAN: I shall be very happy to have the suggestion examined. Members know that the effluent which was normally discharged into the sea from the Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works in the height of summer is now being re-used with great success on the West Beach trust land, the aerodrome and the Lockleys Oval. In fact, 90 per cent of the total output is used in this way. I believe the treatment works referred to by

the honourable member is of a tertiary nature and is identical to the Glenelg treatment works. I see no reason why the effluent cannot be re-used in the same way as that from the Glenelg works. Certainly I am keen (as is the Government) to see this water re-used, if that is possible. I shall be happy, if necessary, to consult with the education authorities and other people involved to see what can be done about using some, if not all, of the effluent.

INGLE FARM ROADS

Mr. WELLS: My question is addressed to the Minister of Environment and Conservation, in the absence of the Minister of Transport. In view of the enormity of the development of the Ingle Farm area, will the Minister obtain a report on the progress of the reconstruction of Montague Road and Nelson Road, and also information about the current plan for school crossings on these two very busy thoroughfares?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be very pleased to get a report for the honourable member on both those matters.

POINT McLEAY RESERVE

Mr. NANKIVELL: A report in the *Murray Valley Standard* of Thursday, August 9, is headed "\$240,000 for Point McLeay". This report followed a visit by the Commonwealth Minister for Aboriginal Affairs to that reserve. Can the Premier say whether it is correct that \$240,000 is to be made available to the council and to the Point McLeay Building Society? If it is, can he say whether the money will be administered through the State department or by direct action between the Commonwealth authority and the Point McLeay council? If the latter is the case, is there to be a separate Aboriginal Affairs Department of the Commonwealth Government (or, as they call themselves, the Australian Government) set up in this State? With many other members, I have been concerned about the standard of Point McLeay for many years. I appreciate very much what the present council in conjunction with the department, has been trying to do to upgrade this reserve. I also accept that, in so doing, they have tried to upgrade substandard buildings, and I am much impressed by the proposal that improved housing facilities are to be provided. Also, I should like to make this comment.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot comment.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Then I will not comment. I ask the Premier, when considering this matter and replying to the question, to say whether further consideration has been given to the retention of a police officer on duty, even at intervals, at Point McLeay, because this request was made by the Point McLeay council as an essential feature in re-establishing the area as a village, as it intends to do.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As to the last matter, I do not know but I will inquire. As to the setting up of a Commonwealth department, the Government received a request from the Australian Government to transfer its officers to the Australian Government at its expense, as that Government would take over the responsibility for Aboriginal affairs in South Australia. However, a condition of that transfer was that we should maintain our welfare expenditure in this area which is now apparently to be administered by Commonwealth officers. I had to point out to the Prime Minister that that was administratively impossible, because we could not leave a day-to-day discretion in the expenditure of State moneys in the hands of officers we did not control. Consequently, discussions are proceeding between this Government and the Commonwealth Gov-

ernment about the nature of the take-over of Aboriginal affairs. I point out that the consultative council of Aboriginal affairs set up by the Commonwealth has recommended the take-over by the Commonwealth Government of responsibility for Aboriginal affairs, and the South Australian Government has stated that it will facilitate this action. After all, the Commonwealth Government has constitutional power in the matter following a referendum, and if this move is recommended by the Aboriginal people we will co-operate. However, it has to be co-operation on a realistic basis. As to the nature of the Commonwealth Minister's offer of \$240,000 for Point McLeay, at this stage I know no more than the honourable member knows, but I will obtain a full report for him.

COMPULSORY CAR CHECKS

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether the Government has considered introducing compulsory annual motor vehicle checks? My question stems from the statement by an officer of the South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce as reported in an article appearing in the *Advertiser* of August 13 under the heading "Compulsory Car Check Wanted". I believe that similar action is taken in another State.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I saw the report in yesterday's *Advertiser*, and it would be fair to say that the comments of the General Manager of the Royal Automobile Association (Mr. Waters) generally summarize the Government's position. Although we have not considered at length the suggestion that there should be compulsory periodical checks of motor vehicles, we believe that such a system would be of value only on the day of the check. Because of the habits of drivers and car owners, there would be no control over any deterioration of the vehicle after the day on which it was checked. Accordingly, we believe that the system of on-the-spot checks now being used is most satisfactory. Also, I have been told that the State and the Territories that have annual inspections, which are being promoted in the article to which the honourable member has referred, are New South Wales, the Australian Capital Territory, and the Northern Territory. Because of the deterioration that could take place in the vehicle after it had passed an annual test and then had not properly been cared for, a proper standard could not be maintained, and the cost involved would not warrant introducing such a system.

DOCTORS' FEES

Mr. HALL: Can the Premier say whether he, as Treasurer, or the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs has transmitted any information regarding doctors' incomes to the Commonwealth Medical Fees Tribunal? A news report of the Australian Broadcasting Commission last evening began by stating that evidence had been given to the Commonwealth Medical Fees Tribunal in Sydney that doctors' incomes had risen by 60 per cent in the past four years. The report ended by stating that the Acting First Assistant Director-General of the Medical Insurance Services Division (Mr. Holgate) had said that the percentages were based on figures from the Taxation Department. I was first inclined to think that that referred to income tax, but the Income Tax Assessment Act, 1936-1972, expressly forbids such information being made available, in which case it would then have been an illegal act. Therefore, I ask the Premier whether, assuming that this gentleman did not have information that was given him illegally by a Commonwealth public servant, it was supplied in any way by the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The report gives no basis for the honourable member's question, and it has no basis.

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Premier say what specific instructions have been given to officers of the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch to respect at all times the confidential nature of medical records when conducting investigations into doctors' affairs under the terms of the Prices Act? I received last week an assurance from the Deputy Premier, in the absence of the Premier, that the confidential nature of medical records would be preserved. However, the Minister accused me at the same time of tub thumping.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That's right.

Dr. TONKIN: Nevertheless, in spite of this assurance, which was not received well by members of the profession in view of the Minister's allegations of tub thumping, there is no doubt that, under the terms of the Act, officers of the branch can, in fact, examine all records: no provision is made in the Act for the exclusion of any records at all. This is a rather peculiar case. It is a matter of concern to many doctors that, because of Government intervention and the issuing of an order following a proclamation, any complaints could lead, under the powers provided by the Act, to the inspection by officers of the department of confidential medical records.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has already received an assurance, and that assurance stands. There is no question of officers of the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch investigating or being interested in medical records. We have no intention of doing anything of the kind, and the same thing applies to the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs and his officers. The words that the Deputy Premier used last week in relation to the honourable member's suggestion were thoroughly justified.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier say whether it is intended to issue prices orders against any other medical practitioners as a result of the supply, to the Government, of lists of those doctors who do not intend to stick to the 15 per cent increase in fees recommended by the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs and, if it is so intended, when this will take place? Last Thursday I asked the Premier whether action had at that time been taken to prosecute any medical practitioner for charging fees above the limit set, and the Premier pointed out that it was too early for anything like that to have been done. Since then the General Practitioners Society has made it clear that there will be no secrecy about the intentions of its members in this matter, and I understand from this morning's paper that the list of doctors increasing their fees beyond the 15 per cent has been supplied to the Government, the object of the exercise on both sides being to test the validity of the Government's action. I therefore put the question to the Premier to see whether he intends to respond to the action of the General Practitioners Society by issuing prices orders against doctors on the list and, if he intends to take action, when he intends to take it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not received a list from the General Practitioners Society.

Mr. Millhouse: Don't you think—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What is more, I know no more about it than has appeared in the newspapers. I should have thought that the honourable member, as a member of the legal profession, would well know that what is contained in the newspaper report of the so-called petition, if it is an accurate report of that petition,

would form no basis for prosecution at all, nor in fact does it indicate that the practitioners concerned intend to exceed in their charges the amount recommended by the Commissioner. It does not say that and, when I receive evidence that people are not complying with the recommendations of the Commissioner, action will then be taken accordingly. In the case of Dr. Whiting—

Mr. Millhouse: What about—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He has received a prices order. Where we have clear evidence that other people intend to charge in excess of the Commissioner's proposals, prices orders individually will issue. When we receive evidence that there has been a breach of the prices order, those people in breach will be prosecuted. I point out to the honourable member that there are proceedings issued by another group of practitioners, but they do not seem to be proceeding very fast.

MODBURY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of July 31, about sewerage Grote Street and part of Radar Street, Modbury?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: To serve Grove Street, Radar Street, and the adjacent area at Modbury, it will be necessary to extend a trunk sewer through an area that is only sparsely developed, and through streets that are already served by a common-effluent scheme. The resources of the department are fully committed for the 1973-74 financial year, and it would not be possible to consider a sewerage scheme for this area until at least the 1974-75 financial year. A petition for sewerage for this area has been received by the Engineering and Water Supply Department and is being investigated.

MURRAY RIVER

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about Murray River storages and possible flooding?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The present holdings in storages in the Murray River system are as follows:

	Capacity acre feet	Storage as at August 8, 1973 acre feet
Hume reservoir.....	2 480 000	2 224 800
Lake Victoria.....	551 700	540 200
Menindee Lakes.....	1 470 000	1 468 700

Current information would suggest a possible maximum river flow of 25 000 cusecs. If above-average rains are experienced for the remainder of August and September, this estimate could be exceeded. River levels downstream of Mannum are expected to rise by less than 2ft. (.61 m) as a consequence of these flows. Downstream of Murray Bridge, no appreciable rises are expected.

Later:

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Minister of Works any additional information on the likelihood of high river levels reaching the Murray system within South Australia and the effects this will have on normal river management?

The SPEAKER: A similar question to this question was asked by another honourable member and answered by the Minister earlier this afternoon.

SOUTH-EAST TOURISM

Mr. RODDA: Will the Premier, as Minister in charge of tourism, say what are his thoughts on the case put to him by the tourist committee at Naracoorte about a fortnight

ago? Arising from the Premier's recent visit to Naracoorte, especially to the caves, and from the report by William Reschke appearing in last weekend's *Sunday Mail*, great interest has been shown in the rare fossilized caves in the area in which have been found the remains of animals such as a zygomaticus, the cave lion known as the thylacoleo, and the marsupial horse, these remains having been preserved for an estimated 30 000 years. As the area has now become a focal point of increasing interest, local authorities may well be unable to cope with the increased number of tourists coming to see these rarities, which are of world renown. Can the Premier say what has been the result of the representations made to him about a fortnight ago?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I was very much impressed with the Naracoorte cave area, and I received the submissions of the council. I have referred those submissions to the Tourist Bureau, especially to the tourist development section of the bureau, for evaluation and action. It is too early yet to make an announcement but I hope to be able to make one soon.

NATIONAL PARKS STAFF

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether it is a fact that the National Parks and Wild Life Service does not have any permanent scientific staff and, if it is, will this unsatisfactory position be improved? When natural bushland was destroyed recently for the purposes of upgrading the Belair Recreation Park, it brought to my notice the fact that no permanent scientific staff was available to the Minister's department. I believe that the services are required of people such as a botanist, a zoologist, a person with some knowledge of soils (a soil scientist), and a person with a scientific background who could consult with the public so that we would avoid an incident such as the recent controversy concerning the Belair Recreation Park. Had this staff been available in that case, I believe that the end result would have been much more satisfactory to the community, as well as to the Minister's department. Last week, I asked the following Question on Notice:

Was the site of the proposed upgraded golf course at the Belair Recreation Park inspected by members of the National Parks and Wild Life Advisory Council?

The Minister replied:

Not specifically. Aerial photographs and plans of the area were made available to the council. As council members are knowledgeable of the area, they did not make a request to visit it.

As this matter has raised many doubts in the minds of people in the community, I believe that the specific services of the personnel to whom I have referred should be available to the department at all times.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Although no such officers are directly employed by the National Parks and Wild Life Service, people with similar qualifications are available through the Museum and through the Environment and Conservation Department for the purpose of advising the National Parks and Wild Life Service. However, I point out that people with such qualifications as those to which the honourable member has referred are, in fact, members of the National Parks and Wild Life Advisory Council, and their services would be directly available to the National Parks and Wild Life Service. Nevertheless, there is a need to consider employing directly within this service people with the sorts of qualification referred to. Until this service was established, divorced from the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department as it was until about two years ago, there was an appalling lack

of manpower available for the administration, control of parks, and other activities, including scientific examinations, within the National Parks and Wild Life Service.

However, we have made dramatic changes by increasing the number of staff available to the service. But despite the considerable increase in staff over the last two years, constant demands are being made on the service for improving the amount of study to be undertaken of not only national park areas but also problems involving fauna and flora, and of research work associated with both those fields. Although I believe that we should increase the number of staff working in those areas, there are pressures on us to purchase more parks and to ensure that they are properly fenced, as well as to undertake proper weed eradication, etc. Therefore, the priorities for providing increased staff must be treated in accordance with the availability of funds. I hope that, following the action of the present Commonwealth Government in establishing a task force to report to it on the national estate, additional funds will be made available to purchase national parks within the State and that we can direct our attention to employing additional staff within the service.

ONKAPARINGA MAIN

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Minister of Works say whether the Murray Bridge to Onkaparinga main, as it passes through the designated area of the city of Monarto, is to be placed underground and, if it is to be, will he say at what cost?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have not yet considered this matter and I do not think my officers have considered it, but I understand what the honourable member is driving at and I will certainly have the matter examined. Of course, at this stage I cannot say what the cost would be, and I will also examine that matter. To my knowledge, there has been no suggestion by the planners of the city of Monarto that this be done. When I have examined the matter, I will let the honourable member know what is the position.

MORPHETTVILLE PARK SCHOOL

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question regarding the siting of the new classrooms at Morphetville Park Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The site for the new open unit at Morphetville Park Primary School has been selected following discussion between an architect from the Public Buildings Department, the Headmaster, and the Deputy Headmaster. The school occupies a site which is flat and low-lying, and drainage has always been difficult and has posed a considerable problem. It was agreed that the site chosen was acceptable despite drainage problems, which would exist wherever the unit was placed. Funds are not available to enable this unit to be erected at present and, until additional finance becomes available, it is not possible to indicate when building of the unit will proceed.

SHOPPING HOURS

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether the Government intends to lift the curfew on Friday night shopping in the outer metropolitan areas and whether it intends to introduce, during this session, legislation to improve the position?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: No, Mr. Speaker.

ANTI-DISCRIMINATION COMMITTEE

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry explain the terms of reference of the committee that has been established to avoid exploitation in industry? Although I realize that this committee has been established by a

Commonwealth Minister, there is a connection with the Labour and Industry Department, not only by way of membership of the committee but also by way of assistance to it. As I understand that the terms of reference involve the avoidance of exploitation because of colour, creed, sex, and other reasons, I should have thought that the South Australian anti-discrimination legislation would cover this position. Therefore, I ask the Minister what are the terms of reference of this committee so far as South Australia is concerned and whether the committee's function overrides or overlaps the State's anti-discrimination legislation.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: As I have not received a full report regarding the actual purpose of the committee, I cannot give a detailed account of its activities. Therefore, I will obtain these reports before making an announcement.

MOUNT BARKER HOUSING

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Premier, who is in charge of housing, obtain a report from the Housing Trust on the scheduled completion date of 20 houses currently under construction by the trust at Mount Barker? Can he also say when the first house will be completed and when the last house will be completed? Further, when these houses are tenanted what will be the waiting time for additional trust houses at Mount Barker? While at Mount Barker yesterday, I saw that many of the houses are all but finished. There were, I think, only about three tradesmen working on the 20 houses. This delay involves a great waste in capital lying idle, and little effort seems to be made to complete these houses.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The General Manager of the Housing Trust has reported that the trust commenced building on the present site, Mount Barker 6, in April, 1972, and has currently 21 houses in various stages of construction and a further 27 approved. The trust is well aware of the housing needs in Mount Barker and is doing everything possible to solve the problem. I have ascertained that the honourable member telephoned the trust on June 12, 1973, for a report on the progress of building on this site. In response to that request the following information was conveyed by letter to the honourable member:

The trust programme for housing at Mount Barker is for approximately 30 houses a year. There have, however, been delays in having houses occupied because of various engineering factors, and extensions to the town's effluent scheme. The majority of these matters have now been resolved and it is expected that once weather conditions permit, houses will be handed over at a reasonably high rate, particularly during the next six to 12 months. You may be aware that deep drainage is being considered at this stage and, therefore, occasionally delays could occur when installation of the present septic systems is discontinued and a sewerage scheme is operational. It is anticipated, however, that with careful planning this should not affect the continuity of the programme.

To enlarge on the engineering factor, before water services could be laid, the level of the main access road, Daw Avenue (a local government responsibility), had to be lowered. Although this work was completed in June this year, it has been subsequently learnt that installation of deep drainage is programmed to start in October. Trenching for this purpose will restrict access to the properties and delay roadworks.

TEA TREE GULLY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of August 1 regarding the sewerage of Wattle Street and neighbouring streets in Tea Tree Gully?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Wattle Street and neighbouring streets in Tea Tree Gully must be drained through an area which is at present undeveloped. However, a subdivision in this area has been approved and it is anticipated that it will be sewered during the 1973-74 financial year. An investigation will be made as soon as possible to enable a sewerage scheme for Wattle Street and neighbouring streets to be considered.

SHAREHOLDINGS

Mr. HALL: Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to implement the policy adopted at the Commonwealth Conference of the Australian Labor Party at Surfers Paradise earlier this year regarding members of Parliament and Ministers of the Crown making public all shareholdings, directorships and shares held in trust on their behalf in public and private companies? If it does, when does the Government intend to proceed with the implementation of this policy?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report for the honourable member.

COOPER BASIN

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question concerning the Cooper Basin?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I believe that it would be desirable to consider some form of permanent agreement between Queensland and South Australia when we have a fuller assessment of the hydrology of the Cooper. The Engineering and Water Supply Department is now involved in a study of Cooper River flows. As the honourable member knows, I did not make a special visit on this occasion. As officers of the department were going into the area to check the gauges at the stations on the Cooper, I also went to see the basin for the first time and to look at the gauging stations. Any agreement will undoubtedly involve some formula for sharing the resource. Information is needed to establish the grounds on which this State can go into negotiation.

ELIZABETH HOUSING

Mr. EVANS: As Minister in charge of housing, can the Premier say whether the house at 59 Goodman Road, Elizabeth South, is a Housing Trust house or a departmental house, and whether it has remained vacant and furnished since February this year? In asking this question, I do not wish to intrude on local issues in another honourable member's district. I raise the matter because there is a housing shortage throughout the State. Each week all members have constituents asking whether rental houses are available. The Housing Trust tells us all that the waiting period for rental houses in some areas is from two years to two and a half years. I am led to believe that the house to which I have referred was originally intended to be made available to an Aboriginal family, but apparently there have been no takers. It would be interesting to know whether, since February, any rent has been paid for the property, how many times it has been unlawfully broken into, and whether any losses have been sustained through damage or theft. The Premier may be able to say whether it is intended that this house be used by any family soon.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report for the honourable member.

LOBSTER FISHING

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Fisheries a reply to the question I asked last week about an investigation regarding lobsters?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The annual catch of southern rock lobsters in South Australia is about

2 400 000 kg (2 803.5 tons) producing an export income in excess of \$5,000,000. Since 1960, an extensive market measuring programme on rock lobsters has been operating in South Australia. The usefulness of the data collected has been limited through lack of knowledge of basic biological information. In January, 1973, the Fisheries Department effectively commenced biological studies with research in the South-East on the western population of the southern rock lobster, following the receipt of a research grant from the Commonwealth Fishing Industry Research Trust Account and the appointment of a research officer. A technical assistant has since been appointed to assist in the programme. Following a general survey of the South-East region, four sites between Cape Jaffa South and Port MacDonnell that were considered the most suitable to study the growth of undisturbed populations of rock lobsters were selected and proclaimed as closed waters on July 26, 1973. The objectives of the research programme are as follows:

- (1) To determine the density and pattern of the puerulus stage of the rock lobster at the selected sites.
- (2) To determine the growth and movement of marked rock lobsters at the selected sites, ultimately to enable a stock assessment of rock lobsters in the region.

The objectives as outlined for larval lobsters, if achieved, will give a measure of the rate of natural recruitment to stocks, and comparative data accumulated over a number of years should lead to an understanding of the important factors responsible for variation in recruitment from year to year. This will ultimately lead to an understanding of fluctuations in the catch of southern rock lobsters in South-Eastern waters.

The purpose of stock assessment is to determine the sustainable annual yield from the available stocks and so permit the optimum level of effort and appropriate legal minimum length to be fixed. No field research has previously been carried out in South Australia on the southern rock lobster before this programme, and these studies will be used to establish a proper basis for management measures. The programme is being financed entirely by a Commonwealth grant from the Fishing Industry Research Trust Account. A sum of \$27,792 was spent last year, and a grant of \$31,100 has been approved for 1973-74. The programme is tentatively scheduled for completion in November, 1975.

MINISTER'S OVERSEAS TRIP

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Premier say whether there is any specific reason why the Minister of Transport has gone overseas at this time, while the House is in session, rather than when the House was not sitting? Is it intended that any other Minister shall be away from the State for long during the present session?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The answers are "Yes" and "No".

GROWTH TAX

Mr. GUNN: In view of the serious financial situation facing South Australia this financial year (there could be a deficit of \$13,000,000), can the Treasurer say what consideration the Government has given to approaching the Commonwealth Government about returning to the States another growth tax, along similar lines to the way in which the McMahon Government returned to the States the pay-roll tax? In this regard, excise duties come to mind.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Although the Government has examined the matter of growth taxes, the possibility

of the return to the States of excise duties is regarded as remote. The Commonwealth Government is not disposed to return duties of this kind to the States. Over some period, there has been general discussion at Premiers' Conference about growth tax areas. In fact, the only serious proposition made by the States was a proposal to introduce the Canadian tax-sharing scheme, and that scheme has not given any great joy to the Canadian Provinces. When I discussed this matter with Ministers of Canadian Provincial Governments, they let out rather hysterical screams of laughter when they heard that Australian States were proposing to enter into such a scheme. The additional amounts per capita available to the Provinces in Canada above those available to us per capita do not derive from the tax-sharing scheme: they derive from special purpose grants, which are about twice the rate per capita that they are in this country. I point out to the honourable member that, under the present Commonwealth Government, special purpose grants are being increased markedly.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister of Works say when it is expected that the new Government Printing Office will be completed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although the date is not far away, I am not certain exactly when it will be; I will find out and let the honourable member know, perhaps tomorrow.

PARLIAMENTARY BROADCASTS

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Premier say whether the Government has changed its policy in relation to broadcasting the proceedings of Parliament in this State? Last session, when I asked the Premier whether he would consider this matter, he refused even to do that. In view of the new policy of the Labor Party (it now believes in open Government, with all matters being open for the public to see), and in view of the greater interest of people in the proceedings of Parliament, I ask the Premier whether his policy has changed with regard to the broadcasting of proceedings.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No; I do not intend to include in the Budget the cost of broadcasting the proceedings of this House. I must confess that I am somewhat surprised that the honourable member should suggest that proceedings be broadcast; in view of the present state of the Opposition, I cannot believe that he is being serious.

PATAWALONGA BOAT HAVEN

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say when the Coast Protection Board will take action to have cleared the entrance to the Patawalonga boat haven, and what remedial action it is intended to take? Since about 30 000 tons (30 480 t) of sand has been dumped on the beach at Glenelg North, a considerable amount has been washed southwards, partially blocking the entrance to the Patawalonga boat haven. In view of the impending important yachting season and the large number of pleasure craft using that entrance, can the Minister say what permanent action will be taken by the Coast Protection Board to overcome this problem in the interest of safety?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Some time ago one of the proposals that the Coast Protection Board was considering was the installation of equipment to pump sand around the Patawalonga boat haven to ensure that the sand drifted further northward towards the more attractive beach at Henley Beach. I am not sure of the current thinking of the

board about this matter but I will certainly inquire and bring down a reply for the honourable member.

EFFLUENT SCHEMES

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question on effluent schemes?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The recently formed Drainage Liaison Committee has been discussing, among other things, a method of providing a sewerage system to towns in the catchment areas. They will make certain recommendations shortly to the Director and Engineer-in-Chief and the Director-General of Public Health, who, in turn, will report to the Government. The towns of Williamstown and Lyndoch could be adequately served by a common effluent drainage system as presently being designed by the Public Health Department.

ISLINGTON SEWAGE FARM

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about work being done at the old Islington sewage farm?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Lands states that, excluding all other land that has been set aside for other Government purposes, the project covers 277½ acres (112 ha) of which 252 acres (102 ha) is for industrial purposes. Development is being done in three phases, and the first phase will be completed in October, 1973.

Progress with the provision of services is as follows: stormwater drainage completed; sewers completed; water supply will be completed in August; roads will be completed in October; and Electricity Trust power will be available when required. It is intended that the land will be advertised for sale either at the end of September or early in October, 1973.

The area is zoned "light industry" and "general industry", and the "light industry" land fronts South Road extension. The land will be priced and sold in parcels to meet the requirements of the individual applicants. The area available in phase I will comprise 841 acres (34 ha) for industrial purposes, and 20 acres (8 ha) west of South Road extension has been made available to the Crippled Children's Association for development.

A number of inquiries are being currently received for the land that will be made available, and the Lands Department is dealing with all inquiries. It is proposed that development of phase II will commence when sales of phase I indicate that further land is required.

SANGSTER REPORT

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Minister of Works say whether the Government intends to make public the Sangster report now that it has decided to reject all the recommendations in that report? On Thursday last I asked a few questions on water rating, and they were answered respectively by the Minister of Education and the Premier. It transpires that the Government has now decided not to act on the recommendations in the Sangster report, which up to now has been kept secret. I am indebted to the member for Glenelg for the phrase "open Government", and in the interests of open Government I ask the Minister whether it is intended to release the report so that all members of this House and the public may be able to scrutinize it and form judgments on it?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am surprised and, indeed, amazed by the fact that the honourable member, with such an inquiring and inquisitive nature, was not aware that I had made the Sangster committee's report public some six months ago.

Mr. Millhouse: Did members get copies?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No. The report has not been printed, but if the honourable member cares to take the trouble he is invited to my office where he can peruse the report if he wishes to do so.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Will he get a cup of tea?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not think he will get a cup of tea, but the report is available to him. However, it will be of little use unless he studies the evaluations of which he was so critical from time to time in this House, made by officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department over a period of, I think, 15 to 18 months. Unless that is done, the report is of little value, but he can look at it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Minister say when printed copies of the Sangster report will be made available? I came a gutser with my question.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member rephrase his question?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, I made a mistake in my question, as I understood that the report had not been published. I apologize to the Minister for thinking so ill of him. I must have confused him with the Attorney-General. In the course of his reply, the Minister said that the report was in the process of being printed. As I am anxious to study a copy of the report (and although it may be inconvenient, it would be pleasant to visit the Minister's office), can he say when printed copies will be available and whether he intends to have copies made available to all members?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member is incorrect again—

Mr. Millhouse: Again!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: —in saying that, during the course of my remarks, I said that the report was being printed. I did not say that. The reply to his specific question is "Never".

QUESTION TIME

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say under what conditions it is proposed that Questions on Notice should be answered during Question Time rather than at the end of Question Time on Tuesdays? Last week the Premier moved the suspension of Standing Orders at 3 o'clock to give the answers to Questions on Notice, and I supported him in that and said that I considered this to be an extremely useful practice and helpful to private members in this place. On that occasion I think there were more than 20 Questions on Notice. The reason given by the Premier for taking that action was that there were so many questions that Government time was not to be cut into by the reading of the replies. I notice that on the Notice Paper today there are one dozen questions, but so far (and it is now nearly 3.30 p.m.) the Premier has not moved to suspend Standing Orders to give replies during Question Time, much to my regret, and I therefore ask in what circumstances he intends to follow the practice that he adopted last week.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If there is a large number of Questions on Notice, they will have to be taken during Question Time. I agree that the list today is getting very close to the limit, but I intend today to take them in the normal way without suspending Standing Orders. I assure the honourable member that if the list gets longer we will revert to last week's procedure, until the matter has been dealt with by the Standing Orders Committee.

THIRD PARTY INSURANCE

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Premier say whether the State Government Insurance Commission intends to take over all third party insurance in South Australia? When I went to renew my motor registration this morning I was told by the Motor Vehicles Department that the company with which I had been doing business for 45 years was no longer listed as a company handling third party insurance. This surprised me, so I rang the company and was told that it had withdrawn from this type of insurance, first because of heavy losses and, secondly, because the State Government Insurance Commission would be taking over all third party insurance next year. The company officer went on to say that it was generally accepted by insurance companies in this State that this would happen next year.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is not the intention of the State Government Insurance Commission. A certain number of private insurance companies have not found this area of insurance profitable and would like to load it on to the Government. I have no doubt that that was the basis for the statement made by the honourable member's insurance company. That company was not told to withdraw: there has been no suggestion by the Government or the commission that it should withdraw, as we do not think it is proper for the commission to assume responsibility for all third party insurance.

ENFIELD CEMETERY TRUST

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier say whether consideration has been given to offering land held by the Enfield General Cemetery Trust to churches with strong European memberships? I have received a letter dated May 29 from the President of the Master Monumental Masons and Sculptors Association of South Australia referring to a press announcement that about 30 acres (12 ha) of cemetery land is to be offered to the Enfield council to be used for recreation purposes. The letter suggests that this land could be offered to various religious denominations, particularly with European backgrounds, so that they could obtain land for burial purposes if administrative, grave digging, and cemetery care personnel were available.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not remember a proposal concerning certain denominations. The Enfield General Cemetery Trust has had financial difficulties for some time. However, I will obtain for the honourable member a report, which I am sure will be of interest to the member for Torrens.

CLEARWAYS

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether additional clearway systems are to be introduced soon and for how long it is estimated that the present metropolitan area clearway system will be able to handle the rapidly increasing volume of traffic during peak periods?

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

STREAKY BAY SCHOOL

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the Streaky Bay Area School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Public Buildings Department states that it is expected that a contract for this school will be finalized within the next few days. It is usual for contractors to begin work within three or four weeks after being notified that they have been awarded a contract.

FISHERMEN'S CO-OPERATIVE

Mr. HALL: Will the Premier say whether he is aware of an article that appeared in the *National Times* at the weekend concerning a report that there may be a link between South Australian Fishermen's Co-operative Limited and an oversea company and, if he is, whether he is pleased at the possibility of such a link? I draw the Premier's attention to the fact that this company is important to the fishing industry in this State and has developed a valuable industry based on this resource. Such link may be of great advantage to the company and to the producers involved in it, but I ask whether the Premier is aware of this possibility and whether he is satisfied with what he knows about it. If he is not satisfied, will he ensure that the company has every facility made available to it for assistance from the Commonwealth Government before it is forced into an oversea link that it may or may not want?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Although I did not see the article, the Government is aware that an interest has been taken in the cannery section of this company by two oversea organizations. Circulars concerning capital have been sent to members of the co-operative by the company. We have tried to discover what the situation is, but the honourable member will know that it is not necessary for the Government to be provided with complete information about bids of this kind. It is not only in relation to this company that this matter has given us concern. However, we are pursuing our investigation, and the honourable member may be sure that the Government will do everything it can to ensure that, where it has influence and is able to provide assistance, South Australian equity in a South Australian concern will be maintained.

PINNAROO-PORTLAND ROAD

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say what provision will be made this year to complete what I understand is known as the Pinnaroo-Portland road? I refer to a four-mile (6.4 km) stretch of open-surface road a few miles (kilometres) north of Frances, between Frances and Bordertown. I understand that this road is sealed from Renmark to Portland via the South Australian border except for this stretch of open-surface road, and this part of the road could be a hazard because of the nature of its formation. Although it has been built almost to the sealing stage, for some time its completion has been delayed. This is an important road in the area and, if it is decided that the Frances police station will be closed, it will be used by mobile police patrols, and, therefore, it should be given reasonable priority. I should be grateful if the Minister would discuss this matter with the Highways Commissioner to ensure that this part of the road is sealed.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will ask what is intended to be done on this part of the road, and inform the honourable member.

HOUSING AGREEMENT

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say what are the specific forms of community amenity for which the Housing Trust may make bridging finance available under the terms of the new housing agreement with the Commonwealth Government? The Premier read a document relating to this matter last week but gave no details of the alteration of the agreement, the type of bridging finance involved, whether the provisions were different from previous provisions, and, if they were different, what changes were effected by the new agreement?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A Bill to ratify the new housing agreement will be introduced soon, and I will then be able to provide the Leader with the information he requires.

NORTH TERRACE SUBWAY

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether consideration has been given to building a subway under North Terrace from Adelaide railway station to the vacant block at the corner of North Terrace and Bank Street owned by Ansett Transport Industries? Because of increased motor vehicle traffic on North Terrace and in the city, such a subway would be more practicable (particularly if a concourse of shops was included) than holding up traffic with two sets of traffic lights as is done at present.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I know that this matter was considered about 12 months ago, but I am not sure of the result of investigations made at that time. However, I will inquire and inform the honourable member of the result.

BARTON TERRACE SPECIAL SCHOOL

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about Barton Terrace Special School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is intended that Barton Terrace Special School should be closed when the new Special School for Mentally Retarded Children is built at Modbury South; this project is currently being considered by the Public Works Standing Committee. When Barton Terrace Special School is vacated it is intended to use the premises for guidance officers of the Guidance and Special Education Branch of the Education Department and for specialist teachers providing services to schools.

KEITH-NARACOORTE ROAD

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation consult with Highways Department officers regarding the safety of a bend known as the Slumber Downs bend between mileposts 23 (37 km) and 24 (38.7 km) on the Keith-Naracoorte road? This stretch of road, which is marked by broken white lines and which goes over a sharp curve in a south-east direction, breaks away to the right. Several near-misses, which could have led to bad accidents, have taken place at this point. The road is an open road over which most drivers travel at speeds of up to 100 miles (161 km) an hour. It would be advisable to have a continuous line placed at the bend, otherwise fatalities could occur at this extremely dangerous location.

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

ABORIGINAL HYGIENE

Dr. Tonkin, for Mr. GUNN (on notice): What plans has the Community Welfare Department to educate in personal hygiene the Aboriginal communities on State Government reserves?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson, for the Hon. L. J. KING: Since the announcement in 1968 of the proposal for Commonwealth Government financial assistance for Aboriginal advancement in housing, education and health, the Public Health Department has developed a continuing health education programme throughout the State in conjunction with the Community Welfare Department, the Education Department and other authorities concerned with Aboriginal advancement. The programme has been essentially concerned with preventive health work, but it has been necessary to integrate this programme with existing medical and health services, and responsibility

for the provision of clinical nursing staff and facilities was transferred to the Public Health Department from the Community Welfare Department in 1972.

The department has at present about 45 persons, comprising public health nurses, public health inspectors and Aboriginal persons employed as home visitors and hygiene assistants, employed exclusively on Aboriginal health work throughout the State under the direction of a medical officer. The number of persons employed on this work will be substantially increased as suitable staff become available, particularly Aboriginal people, who are being encouraged to accept responsibility for the continuity of the programme aimed at improved standards.

Emphasis is placed on health education and supervision of hygiene standards, and the programme is aimed at teaching improved nutrition, food hygiene, home hygiene, personal hygiene and basic sanitation. In addition to the continuing work of the field staff, other officers of the department visit all reserves and Aboriginal settlements in various parts of the State on a regular basis and conduct health education programmes. Special courses on health and hygiene are also held regularly to train Aboriginal people, resulting in the appointment of increasing numbers of Aborigines to work amongst their own people. An elementary home hygiene manual prepared by the Public Health Department is used for training purposes in other than tribal areas, and visual aids and similar material are used in tribal areas.

Provision has been made with Commonwealth financial assistance for the establishment in the current year of a new medical centre at Indulkana to provide complete clinical and health education facilities; this will be followed by similar centres at other reserves. The current programme also provides for additional staff and equipment and for upgrading sanitation on various reserves and settlements by the provision of common effluent drains and improved refuse disposal.

HOSPITAL BEDS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. How many beds are there currently available at the Modbury Hospital and what numbers are there in each section of the hospital?

2. What has been the average daily bed occupancy rate in each section over each of the months of April, May and June, 1973?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson, for the Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1.

	Beds currently available	Beds total number
General medical.....	32	64
General surgical.....	64	64
Children.....	16	34
Maternity.....	22	42
Post-operative.....	—	12
Intensive Care.....	—	8
	134	224

2.

	Daily average occupancy rate		
	April 1973	May 1973	June 1973
	%	%	%
General medical.....	69	79	90
General surgical.....	73	74	79
Children.....	29	27	57
Maternity.....	16	40	69

There has been a dramatic increase in the maternity daily average occupancy rate.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Dr. TONKIN (on notice): What were the numbers of:

- (a) lay staff;
- (b) nursing staff;
- (c) resident medical staff;
- (d) visiting medical staff;

(e) inpatients; and
 (f) outpatient attendances,
 at the Royal Adelaide Hospital as at June 30 in the years 1940, 1950, 1960, and 1970 respectively?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson, for the Hon. L. J. KING: I have the following table:

Year	Lay staff	Nursing staff	Resident medical staff	Visiting medical staff	Inpatients admitted	Outpatients attendances
1940*	267	382	23	112	13 162	119 582
1950	551	649	45	144	15 890	239 177
1960	779	811	90	156	17 987	210 624
1970	1 654	1 762	177	162	23 225	247 188

* As at December 31, 1940.
 Statistics were based on calendar years until 1944.

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Is it intended to review the present sign posting and direction indicators and the inquiry facilities at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, now that redevelopment is virtually completed?

2. When will any necessary improvements be implemented?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson, for the Hon L. J. KING: It is intended to incorporate in the south wing project a rationalization of pedestrian and vehicular traffic, a more conspicuous inquiry centre, and a consequential reorganization of directional signs. It is not known when this rationalization will be commenced. In the meantime, all suggestions received for the improvement of directional signs are carefully appraised and are implemented without delay if they are considered to be of benefit.

RU RUA HOSPITAL

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Has work commenced at the Ru Rua Hospital, recently acquired by the Government to house certain patients currently being cared for at Strathmont Centre?

2. If not, when will it commence, and when is it expected that the hospital will be ready to receive patients?

3. How many of these patients will ultimately be housed at Ru Rua and how many will remain at Strathmont Centre?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson, for the Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Work has not yet commenced on the alterations necessary to enable patients to be accommodated. The occupation will be achieved in three stages, and only minor alterations will be needed in the east wing to enable stage 1 of the occupancy to proceed. A total of 45 totally dependent patients will be transferred from the Strathmont Centre in stage 1.

2. Preliminary cost estimates are currently being taken on the work required to enable stage 1 to proceed. Following this, funds will be requested and work commenced. Provided there are no major problems associated with the supply of the necessary plant and equipment and the recruitment of staff, Ru Rua will be ready to receive patients before the end of the year.

3. Ru Rua will provide accommodation for a total of 160 totally dependent intellectually retarded children when fully operational. Since the Strathmont Centre is a training centre for the intellectually handicapped, this type of patient will not be accommodated there once Ru Rua has become fully established.

STATE AID

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is the Government satisfied with the method used in the classification of independent schools by the committee

appointed to make recommendations to the Minister of Education on the distribution of aid to those schools with secondary grades? If not, what method is preferred?

2. Is the Government satisfied with the classification recommended by the committee?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The State Government, in establishing the Cook committee, laid down certain criteria, but provided also that the committee could take into account other criteria which it considered relevant. At various times the criteria have been discussed with the committee in order to improve the assessment of schools. The committee has recommended grants in terms of the criteria ultimately adopted by it, and in each case the Government has accepted the committee's reports. It is considered that the committee's recommendations have achieved a high degree of acceptability, and the Government is appreciative of the very valuable service rendered by the Chairman and each member of the committee. Some unnecessary confusion has arisen because the Karmel committee categories are concerned only with payments made to schools to help with recurrent costs. Separate programmes of capital assistance to independent schools for school buildings, libraries, etc., have been prepared by that committee and accepted by the Australian Government.

It is possible that a school receiving no or little support towards recurrent expenses may qualify for a building grant, while a school receiving higher recurrent assistance did not qualify for assistance with buildings. On the other hand, the Cook committee determined its categories without any separate programme for buildings. Capital factors generally, along with recurrent ones, are taken into account together in determining the category of any school. For these reasons, the categorization of schools by the two committees is bound to be different. Furthermore, two committees, which are constituted separately, asked to assess grants on a needs basis, are likely to vary to some extent in the manner in which educational priorities are evaluated.

DIAL-A-BUS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What has been the total cost to the Government so far of all work in connection with studies of and experiments with dial-a-bus and how is this amount made up?

2. Is it expected that any further amounts will be spent? If so, how much and on what?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill, for the Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. \$31,473.24, made up as follows:

	\$
Paid to:	
(a) Infoplan Public Relations and Advertising Consultants for planning the publicity which was to accompany the opening on August 1.....	2,352.44
(b) Dialabus Pty. Ltd. for conducting a field trial on a charter basis	3,712.80
(c) P. G. Pak-Poy and Associates for reports on various dial-a-bus systems	25,408.00
Total.....	\$31,473.24.....

The answer to question 6 (2) on July 31 referred to (b) above. The answer to question 6 (3) on July 31 combined (a) and (b) above. The answer to question 3 (3) on August 7 gave the original estimated cost, while the answer to question 6 (4) on July 31 provided the actual expenditure, shown in (c) above.

2. No.

AYERS HOUSE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What are the terms of the agreement under which Mr. Philip Harold Cramey occupies all the restaurants in Ayers House?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Chairman of the Ayers House Management Committee has reported that, in view of the competitive nature of restaurant operations in Adelaide, he considers it inadvisable to disclose rental conditions contained in the lease between the Minister of Works and the lessee (Mr. P. H. Cramey). The Chairman is the Auditor-General.

RAILWAY TAKE-OVER

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Who are the members of the committee, established by agreement between the Prime Minister and the Premier, to establish whether a mutually satisfactory basis for the transfer of the non-urban portion of the South Australian Railways can be devised?

2. When was the committee established?

3. Has it met? If so, when and where?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill, for the Hon. G. T. VIRGO: To answer the question properly the three parts of it must be taken together. On April 27, 1973, the first meeting of the committee was held in Canberra. Present were: Mr. M. M. Summers, Secretary, Commonwealth Department of Transport; Mr. K. J. Cosgrove, Commonwealth Department of Transport; Mr. C. W. Freeland, Commonwealth Department of Transport; Mr. K. Smith, Commonwealth Railways Commissioner; Mr. J. Enfield, Commonwealth Treasury; Mr. R. Kelly, Commonwealth Treasury; Mr. M. Killeen, Commonwealth Attorney-General's Department; Dr. D. Scrafton, South Australian Director-General of Transport; Mr. E. Carey, South Australian Treasury; and Mr. M. L. Stockley, South Australian Railways Commissioner.

The Canberra meeting appointed three subcommittees (the Management and Organization Subcommittee, the Financial Arrangements Subcommittee, and the Conditions of Employment Subcommittee) to report back on each aspect to the main committee. Each of these three subcommittees comprises an equal number of South Australian and Commonwealth officers, representing Railways, Treasury and unions. It is understood that the preliminary work of the subcommittees is nearing completion and that they expect to report to the main committee probably in September, 1973.

MATRIMONIAL FEES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How much revenue does the Government estimate has been lost to date as a result of the non-collection of fees in matrimonial suits?

2. How much is the Commonwealth willing to pay to make the loss good?

3. When is it expected that arrangements to this end will be settled?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson, for the Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. \$44,394.00 to August 9, 1973.

2. The Commonwealth has indicated that it will make good the whole of the loss in revenue.

3. Not known. A meeting of Commonwealth and State officers will be held shortly to discuss arrangements.

TREES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What is the nature of the survey about to be initiated by the Environment and Conservation Department to obtain adequate information on which to base further tree promotion proposals?

2. Who is to carry out the survey and when?

3. What is the estimated cost of the survey?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The replies are as follows:

1. A detailed questionnaire is to be forwarded to all local government authorities and Government departments which undertake tree-planting programmes.

2. The Environment and Conservation Department immediately.

3. The survey will be undertaken as a normal function of the Environment and Conservation Department and, therefore, no specific costs will be involved.

M.V. TROUBRIDGE

Dr. EASTICK (on notice): Does the fact that the State Government operates the *Troubridge* service cause any reduction in the grants recommended for this State by the Grants Commission?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In terms of section 32 of the Highways Act the cost of operation of the *Troubridge* is met from moneys in the Highways Fund and, therefore, it has no impact on the Revenue Budget. The Grants Commission directs its attention to the results of the Revenue Budget, to the levels of taxes and charges which contribute thereto, and to the standards of services financed therefrom. Accordingly, the special grants as otherwise calculated are not expected to be varied by the commission on account of the *Troubridge* operation.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

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

That the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation have power to adjourn from place to place, and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting its concurrence.

This action is necessary to give the committee authority to proceed outside the metropolitan area on inspections and to take evidence, if necessary. It is intended that similar action be taken in the Upper House.

Motion carried.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION BILLS

The Legislative Council intimated its concurrence in the appointment of the committee and notified the selection of its representatives.

CONSTITUTION CONVENTION

The Legislative Council, by message, intimated that it had passed the following resolution:

Whereas the Parliament of South Australia by joint resolution of the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly adopted on September 26 and 27, 1972, appointed 12 members of the Parliament as delegates to take part in the deliberations of a convention to review the nature and contents and operation of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia and to propose any necessary revision or amendment thereof and whereas the said joint resolution provided that eight such delegates should be appointed by the House of Assembly and four should be appointed by the Legislative Council and whereas the said joint resolution further provided that the four delegates appointed by the Legislative Council should be the Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, R. C. DeGaris, L. R. Hart and Sir Arthur C. Rymill and whereas the said joint resolution further provided that each appointed delegate should continue as a delegate until he ceases to be a member of the Parliament or until the House by which he has been appointed otherwise determines now it is hereby resolved that this House hereby appoints the Hon. J. M. Cooper in the place of the Hon. L. R. Hart, who has ceased to be a member of the Parliament.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 9. Page 284).

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The document presented to us by the Treasurer last Thursday is cunning and deceitful—cunning in the sense that it suggests that the funds forthcoming from the Commonwealth for South Australia will allow for a tremendous increase in State works. However, if we look more closely at the document, we find there are many comments indicating that the projects will be subject to, in anticipation of, or assuming that moneys will be forthcoming from the Commonwealth. Clearly, many of the pronouncements and statements made by members opposite preceding December 2 of last year that, given a change of Commonwealth Government, there would be no further worries have not come to fruition. We have the situation, which has become the consistently unfolding pattern, of announcements by the Commonwealth Government of promises made being set aside and of the magnitude of the sums of money to be made available being eroded.

Constantly, we are being informed through the press and by Ministerial statements and statements issued by Commonwealth Ministers that, whereas they said they were going to undertake a certain project, its cost had been shown to be too great, and so it had had to be reviewed. Clearly, in the document that the Treasurer placed before us last Thursday this tone shows through. We have almost a situation where the Treasurer has iced the cake before he has had the cake to ice. The people of South Australia have been assured of a \$17,000,000 upgrading of the facilities at the Northfield wing of Royal Adelaide Hospital, but there is no appropriation for that work; also, there is no appropriation for the \$400,000 required for Glenside, but these matters will be considered in the event or when we are informed of what moneys will be forthcoming from the Commonwealth.

The Treasurer clearly outlined various aspects not only of the Loan Account but also of the Revenue Account in the area where the two must be considered as one. He has pointed out that the Government intends to maintain a surplus in the Loan Account so that that money may

be made available, if necessary, to balance a major deficit in the Revenue Account. To this moment (reference is made to this in the Loan Estimates) we have had no indication from the Commonwealth what will be the total final grant for 1971-72 or what will be the grant for 1973-74.

The Treasurer believes \$5,000,000 will be made available by the Commonwealth to complete the grants for the financial year 1971-72, but there is no guarantee of that. This document is couched in such terms that no statement is forthcoming from the Commonwealth that that will be the actual sum received. Last year the Government and the people of this State were informed in July of the \$21,000,000 then made available to the Government of South Australia—\$7,500,000 as a final payment for the year 1970-71 and \$13,500,000 as the forward payment for 1972-73. Now, some 12 months and three weeks later, under a new Administration which was going to make vast sums available to the States, we have had no indication that any sum will be made available other than the Treasurer's statement that he thinks he will obtain \$5,000,000 to complete the grants for 1971-72.

Time and time again, Commonwealth Ministers have announced sums of money to be made available in a wide area of public spending, both Commonwealth and State. One has only to turn up the pages of the press to find \$500,000,000 will be made available for the transport systems of Australia. On February 17, 1973, in the press under a Canberra date-line we read:

The Federal Government will spend \$500,000,000 over the next five years to improve Australia's urban public transport services. The Government will provide two-thirds of the cost of improving urban public transport services on condition that it is given a voice in State public transport authorities.

The sting is in the tail, and the noose is around the neck of the State Government when it is told it may have the funds only if it is prepared to accept an intrusion into its own State affairs by people from the Commonwealth attending and being part of the State public transport authority.

It is Big Brother every day of the week. The South Australian Minister of Transport looked at this announcement and immediately stated that we could expect 10 per cent of that sum of money, that we in South Australia would receive \$50,000,000 of that total sum—and then, within a matter of 24 to 36 hours, the Commonwealth Minister said he had not made that announcement, that the sum indicated was far greater than he intended to submit to the Commonwealth Parliament for ratification and distribution. We find that the amount available to South Australia had been whittled down from that original percentage based on a total sum of \$500,000,000.

There was a strong suggestion at the time that South Australia would be lucky if its total income from that source exceeded \$28,000,000. There is a big difference between \$50,000,000 being available for this purpose and \$28,000,000, which was a further figure suggested as being available. Such a large amount of money, which would be made available and for which the Commonwealth Government and the State Government started to claim credit, has been eroded, but what has the Treasurer told us in his explanation of this Bill? He has stated clearly, dealing with the transport system, that the Government hopes to undertake various activities in the railway accommodation field, totalling \$9,900,000 in Loan expenditure for 1973-74. The Treasurer also stated:

Of this amount, \$2,908,000 is for the project which envisages duplication of the track from Brighton to Port Stanvac and the extension of the railway from Port Stanvac to Christie Downs. An amount of \$2,119,000 is for normal

development such as re-laying railway lines, construction of bridges, culverts, buildings, signalling and safety devices and minor works, and \$763,000 is for continuation of a special programme of upgrading main lines. Provision for rolling stock includes \$313,000 for new passenger vehicles, \$1,460,000 for new freight vehicles and \$858,000 for improvements to the existing stock.

The next part of the explanation is important. It states:

The Government has made a submission to the Australian Government for special grants towards improving urban transport. We understand—

the Treasurer has said not that grants will be provided but that “we understand”—

that such grants are to be provided in 1973-74 up to two-thirds of the cost of approved projects...

By whom will the projects be approved? Will they be approved by the State Government, recognizing and knowing its local requirements, or by and subject to the direction of Big Brother in Canberra? The Treasurer also stated:

...but we do not know yet what extent of support will be available for South Australia.

This statement follows announcements by the Commonwealth Minister and the State Minister clearly stating that we will be progressing with Commonwealth Government funds and doing this and that. I claim that the Treasurer's statement is cunning and deceitful because of these references that I have been bringing to the attention of the House. Later in his explanation the Treasurer stated:

We are hopeful of getting more than \$2,000,000 from the Australian Government and, if those additional funds are forthcoming, the railways programme will be reviewed immediately to see what extra work can be done this year.

Why must the Treasurer couch the statement in those terms? Why has he had to spell out the position last Thursday on the basis that we are hopeful of getting more than \$2,000,000, when he has not yet said that we will get \$2,000,000? He suggested that there was a possibility that we would obtain funds. In many parts of the Treasurer's explanation there is this double standard, this backing-off from announcements that have been made and kudos that has been obtained before, during and subsequent to the last State election campaign. Promises have been made by the Australian Labor Party in the Commonwealth sphere before December 2 last and subsequently, and obviously Ministers have been shooting their mouth off and making good fellows of themselves, without having any clear indication or knowledge that they would be able to fulfil their promises.

Certainly, in transportation we can see that sticking out, and it does not stop with transportation. South Australia and New South Wales were singled out for special assistance in housing. Statements were made that, because of the recognition of the housing industry in those States and the co-operation that had been given by the State Government to the Commonwealth Government, those States would obtain a special dispensation, a special amount of money for housing. An amount of \$800,000 was mentioned in a press report on January 18. The report, headed “Minister told South Australia needs \$800,000 for homes”, states:

The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) today told the federal Housing Minister (Mr. Johnson) that South Australia needed \$800,000 immediately to spend on Housing Trust development. The Premier said his talks today with Mr. Johnson were “very fruitful”. Mr. Dunstan revealed there were 10,000 applicants waiting for South Australian Housing Trust homes under rent-and-buy or rental schemes.

Dr. Tonkin: He's always having fruitful discussions.

Dr. EASTICK: They are so-called fruitful discussions that do not prove fruitful: they are great kites in the sky

from which the Treasurer and the Commonwealth Minister back off quickly. We have the statement about \$800,000 and about there being very fruitful discussions.

Mr. Jennings: What about the portable deep sea port?

Dr. EASTICK: I ask the honourable member not to get me on to portable houses.

Mr. Jennings: I'm talking about Playford's portable deep sea port.

Dr. EASTICK: I will come back to that. I am pointing out that we were going to receive \$800,000 because it was necessary, and the amount had been approved. Subsequently, we received \$500,000. We are thankful for that amount of money but, because of this State's particular involvement, we were to receive special consideration and get a greater slice of the cake than other States because we had a favourably disposed Australian Labor Party Government in Canberra. What has happened? This can be gleaned from the information given by the Treasurer in his explanation last week. He stated:

For purposes of comparison between 1972-73 and 1973-74 it is appropriate to think of the South Australian allocations being increased as follows:

Housing—a programme of \$30,000,000 last year increased by \$2,750,000, or 9.2 per cent, to \$32,750,000 this year.

Works—a programme of \$105,128,000 last year increased by \$15,884,000, or 15.1 per cent, to \$121,012,000 this year.

The Treasurer also stated:

The Housing Trust also had available \$500,000 of a special loan—

not the \$800,000—

from the Australian Government so that a total of \$30,000,000 of new funds was employed. The allocation of \$32,750,000 for 1973-74 is about 9.2 per cent above last year's figure. South Australia has had a long-standing practice of allocating a large proportion of its capital funds to housing and, accordingly, the Australian Government, in its efforts to increase activity in this field, did not determine for us an increase as great as that for the other States. The all-States increase is about 26 per cent. However, the Australian Government did support a greater than normal increase in our works programme.

The total amount made available by the Commonwealth Government showed a decrease in the allocation for housing. Indeed, this was not the magnificent increase about which we were told, which was highlighted in the press, and which was described as the benevolence of the Commonwealth. In fact, it is a decrease. True, a greater percentage was allocated to overall works, and for that we can be thankful, but I point out that the total amounts received for housing and for general works are about the same percentage of the total as we have received in the past. In other words, we have received only the same percentage (gratefully accepted by the Government) of the total national cake as we have received under previous Administrations in Canberra. There has been no difference; except that we suddenly find ourselves being told by Canberra where we can spend our money. Instead of making the same percentage available and the Commonwealth telling the State that it knows its own needs, that it should determine its own priorities and decide what it will put its funds into, Big Brother in Canberra has said that the State can make a certain amount available for housing.

Mr. Nankivell: This is a sell out to the Commonwealth Government.

Dr. EASTICK: True; it is part and parcel of the centralist plot, aided and abetted by the decision taken at Surfers Paradise six weeks ago, when our own Treasurer sold out this State and its future by agreeing (in opposition

to the Premiers of Western Australia and Tasmania) to allow certain States' rights to pass to Big Brother in the Commonwealth when it said, "Come, I want you."

Mr. Jennings: You know he did not do that.

Dr. EASTICK: This is the direction not of this Government, of this Parliament or of the elected members in the other Parliaments of Australia, but of the union movement and the Labor organization, aided and abetted by the majority of its Parliamentary wing, to sell out the States through a centralist Commonwealth plot.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You sold out to oversea competitors.

Dr. EASTICK: We will find a marked increase in the concern felt by the Australian public whenever the Commonwealth Government sees fit to call an election. The one issue in the Balcatta by-election in Western Australia some weeks ago, causing a 30 per cent reduction in the Labor vote—

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Tell us about the by election last week.

Dr. EASTICK: I can tell the Minister about the by-election last week and the gerrymander by the State Labor Party. It is easy to analyse that situation. The A.L.P. is determined to drive wedges in and cause upsets. Indeed, this is acknowledged by many Labor stalwarts in the areas involved in that by-election.

Mr. Harrison: That's touchy.

Dr. EASTICK: No; I will analyse that result for the honourable member later, and elaborate on what I have just said. The major issue in the recent Western Australian by-election was the selling out of the States' rights by the Australian Labor Party (not by the Western Australian Premier (Mr. Tonkin), because he had the intestinal fortitude to stand up for his State, as did Mr. Reece in Tasmania). But for 16 people voting for the Labor Party, the result would have been different.

Mr. Keneally: It was similar to the Commonwealth vote.

Dr. EASTICK: The honourable member is calling it a blue-ribbon Labor seat, yet there was a 30 per cent swing at the by-election. The member for Stuart wants to pull the wool over our eyes and say that the result in the Balcatta by-election was a reflection of the December 2 results. That is absolute rot, and he knows it. If the result was the same, why did the A.L.P., the press and everyone who analysed the position applying at that by-election say how surprised they were at a 30 per cent swing against the A.L.P.? It was clearly shown that there had been a sell out of the principle of federalism. There was a sell out of the principle of maintaining the three-tier system of government, and the A.L.P., including the Australian Council of Trade Unions and others, was directing Mr. Tonkin on what he could do in the future regarding his State. At any time that the Premier of Western Australia sees fit to go to the polls, he will be right out.

Mr. Mathwin: He's on his way out.

Dr. EASTICK: This is only one of the areas where the people of Western Australia are ready and waiting to show what they think of the situation.

In Victoria, too, a major aspect was the argument that the Australian Labor Party was trying to centralize all power in the hands of fewer and fewer in Canberra, bypassing the State Administration by offering Commonwealth Government money to local government and also bypassing the State Education Department by making funds available subject to their being distributed by a regional group. The

State housing authority is now being bypassed; it is necessary to allow Big Brother in Canberra to have a say in the expenditure of the money.

No wonder members opposite are keen to draw red herrings across the trail; they are embarrassed at the failure of the Commonwealth Labor Government to keep its promises to the people of Australia, particularly promises that funds would be available to benefit the community. Almost daily we have fresh evidence of a further back-off. What about the promise that a person on an income of \$4,000 or less would receive a taxation concession in respect of interest paid on housing loans? That promise went out of the window. It was a giant carrot dangled before the electors prior to the election but, when it was subsequently examined, it was costed at \$100,000,000. So, the Labor Government has backed off.

Almost daily we have announcements that funds that were to be made available have suddenly become unavailable. It was previously announced that there would be no alterations in income tax this year and no increased costs to the community when more benefits were provided, but prominent Commonwealth Ministers are now openly stating that there will be increases to enable them to fulfil some, but not all, of the promises they made. So, there is no reason to doubt the qualifications, such as "it will be subject to" and "if supported by the Commonwealth Government", that the Treasurer made in his second reading explanation. Clearly, the Government does not know whether it will be able to carry out any of the projects. Frequently in his second reading explanation the Treasurer said that, if money was not forthcoming from the Commonwealth Government, the State Government would have to alter its priorities and rearrange the programme for important public works.

Mr. Coumbe: Yet we are expected to approve the Bill.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes. This afternoon I asked the Treasurer about the requirements in respect of the bridging finance that the South Australian Housing Trust could make available to the community, only to be told that I would be informed when he introduced a Bill to ratify the arrangement between the Commonwealth and the States. Yet I am asked, as is every other member, to support this Bill, even though we have not been given the opportunity of knowing what it involves. This afternoon I asked the following Question on Notice:

Does the fact that the State Government operates the *Troubridge* service cause any reduction in the grants recommended for this State by the Grants Commission?

The Treasurer replied:

In terms of section 32 of the Highways Act the cost of operation of the *Troubridge* is met from moneys in the Highways Fund and, therefore, it has no impact on the Revenue Budget. The Grants Commission directs its attention to the results of the Revenue Budget, to the levels of taxes and charges which contribute thereto, and to the standards of services financed therefrom. Accordingly, the special grants as otherwise calculated are not expected to be varied by the commission on account of the *Troubridge* operation.

The key words in his reply are "not expected". If the Treasurer is so sure of his ground in saying what he said in the first part of his reply, it is strange that he finds it necessary to answer my question by saying:

Accordingly, the special grants as otherwise calculated are not expected to be varied by the commission on account of the *Troubridge* operation.

Clearly, the Treasurer does not know the answer. He has tried to convey the impression that South Australia's position is strong and that there is no problem, but he has

been unable to indicate clearly that there will be no alteration in the grants recommended for this State by the Grants Commission as a result of the Government's takeover of the *Troubridge* service.

We laud the fact that there will be additional money from the Commonwealth Government for welfare housing, even though South Australia has been denied the percentage increase received by the other States. We look forward to the expenditure of that money, but under what restrictions will it be spent? Will we be better off or worse off, will the expenditure really help the people it should be helping, or will it impose ties on them that will not allow them to advance their social status when their circumstances change? The Treasurer's second reading explanation says that only 30 per cent of the funds can be made available for houses that will be purchased; 70 per cent will be used for rental housing. A married couple may rent a house for 10, 15 or 20 years; in that time their income may have increased but, after their children have moved out and are no longer a financial burden on them, they may seek to purchase the house in which they have been living. That right has been available to them in the past and is available now. However, will they now be denied this right to buy a house, after having paid a large sum in rental? Will these proposals that we are being asked to support prevent people from receiving this benefit? What will this allocation, which the Treasurer points out is 9.2 per cent greater than the sum available last year, be used for?

It has been clearly spelt out that the rate of inflation in the housing industry is 18 per cent a year. How much additional accommodation can therefore be provided from this increase of 9.2 per cent in the funds available? As a result of certain activities of the Government, the cost of land is escalating. Delays are being created in respect of services provided by the Engineering and Water Supply Department in particular, and there is some delay with regard to services supplied by the Electricity Trust. Reference was made earlier this afternoon to the difficulties being encountered at the Lands Titles Office and the State Planning Office with regard to making areas of land available when they are needed. Because of these delays, people have to face a quarterly escalation in building prices of 4.6 per cent—over 18 per cent a year. Inadequate staff in vital areas is having this effect. That staff is necessary to complete what was started in this House, when all members supported the major features of legislation designed to provide for advances in this sphere.

In the Treasurer's explanation, we can find statements such as the following:

Because of delays in design and in proving prototypes of rolling stock, and because of the financing of some work from stocks which had been charged to Loan Account previously, the railways undertaking actually spent \$2,682,000 less than had been appropriated.

Over the last 21 years, the Minister of Transport has told the House consistently that he is getting on with the job of planning the necessary transportation needs of the State, yet we now have this statement by the Treasurer about that Minister's administration. Almost three years ago, this House gave the Minister authority to create a design or projects office to help in meeting the transportation needs of the State. However, we now have this statement pointing out the Minister's inability to get on with the job. The Treasurer also stated:

The Engineering and Water Supply Department received a grant of \$420,000 from the Australian Government to speed up work on the Lock-Kimba main ...

There is not a word at that point of the Treasurer's explanation about the fact that the sum available from the Commonwealth Government over some time is \$2,100,000; one has to read on further to find that that is the total available. No reference is made to the fact that that allocation by the Commonwealth is the result of direct intervention by the member for Eyre and by the Hon. Arthur Whyte, who represents Northern in the Legislative Council. Using an allocation of funds from this Parliament and money from their own pockets, they made representations to the Commonwealth Treasurer and the Prime Minister for funds for this project. At that time, they were ridiculed by our Treasurer and other Ministers, who claimed that they were merely grandstanding. Now, \$420,000 is immediately available and \$2,100,000 is available over a period for this vital service. The Treasurer also stated:

The Government's review of possible revenue receipts, including those which will result from the increased taxes and charges already announced, and its examination of departmental submissions for expenditure to carry out policy, to maintain and operate services, and to upgrade and extend them in some areas, indicate that a deficit is in prospect even before allowing for the costs of new wage and salary awards which may come into force in 1973-74.

Why does the Treasurer use the word "may"? In every other statement of this type that he has presented to the House, the Treasurer has clearly indicated that it is expected that during the course of the year salaries and wages will increase and have to be provided for. Is the Treasurer trying to say this year that there will be an overall salaries and wages freeze? Has he at last come face to face with the reality that, if there is to be an effective solution to the inflationary problem, there must be an overall plan of attack that deals with wages and salaries as well as with prices? Is the Treasurer saying that it is essential for the benefit of the Commonwealth as well as the State that there must be a freeze of wages and salaries? Members will await with great interest further revelations associated with that statement by the Treasurer.

The Treasurer has said that, as he is concerned about the welfare of the State, he is always willing to consider matters which may be of advantage to the State and which are brought forward correctly. Yet, when in response to a request by him he received a hand-delivered letter on July 19, 1973, on such a subject, he did not, until August 9, even acknowledge the existence of the letter or give any reason for turning it aside. Previously, I had read the letter, but I intend to read it again because I believe it is pertinent. It shows that Opposition members were willing to get around the table and consider the major problem of inflation and its effect on people in this State and our willingness to play a part in considering it realistically. On July 19, I wrote to the Treasurer as follows:

I refer to publicity which has been given to a meeting which I proposed yesterday between parties interested in the current inflationary spiral. It is my contention that the utmost co-operation is required by all responsible groups, and in this category I include Government, Opposition, commerce, industry and the trade union movement.

Surely, that is the complete spectrum of people involved. The letter continues:

I believe a worthwhile starting point for discussion would be a consideration of the papers prepared by State and Commonwealth Treasury staff following the special Premiers' Conference on May 10. Whilst it was clearly indicated at the time that the findings of the detailed inquiry would be tabled at the Premiers' Conference in June, the public (including groups other than Government) have not been acquainted of the contents.

We in South Australia have had no indication of the contents of those prepared documents. The letter continues:

Since calling for a discussion the announcement of the 25 per cent tariff cut highlights the urgency of the leaders in this State initiating responsible discussion for the ultimate benefit of the community which we all serve. I await your advice as to when such a meeting can be held.

I referred to this letter during the Address in Reply debate, but there was no response from the Treasurer. However, there was a real flutter among some of his Ministers (apparent by their conduct), because an important document offering assistance on behalf of the people of this State had not been acknowledged. On August 9, I received the following letter:

Dear Dr. Eastick, I acknowledge your letter of July 19, 1973, in which you propose a meeting of parties interested in the current inflationary spiral. I can see no purpose in such a meeting unless there is something new to suggest to it. I notice that your letter does not contain any constructive proposal to put to such a meeting.

Yours sincerely,
(signed) DON DUNSTAN, Premier

Whom does the Treasurer think he is fooling? It is certainly no-one on this side and not the people in the community. Clearly, two issues were raised that required urgent and frank discussion: the inflationary spiral and the documents prepared by Treasury officials in this State and in other States. The Treasurer said that he agreed that the 25 per cent reduction in tariffs would have the greatest effect in this State, and he referred to the effect it would have on the motor vehicle and the electrical goods industries. This was a public acknowledgment that there was grave concern in these matters, but a responsible offer from members on this side to assist in considering the realities of this matter was ignored by someone who, claiming to stand above everyone else, said that he could see no purpose in such a meeting. After publicly stating that concern had been expressed about the inflationary trend and the 25 per cent tariff reduction, the Treasurer then wrote a letter stating that he could see no purpose in such a meeting.

Mr. Coumbe: Couldn't be bothered.

Dr. EASTICK: Of course not, and did not want to help in improving the situation. Perhaps the truth of the matter centres around the word "may", to which I referred just now, and around the Treasurer's recognition that a wages, salaries and prices freeze was just as important as was the freezing of costs. We cannot have a freezing of costs unless we have a freezing of wages and salaries. Obviously, the Treasurer has left himself a way out in the explanation that he gave last Thursday by stating:

. . . even before allowing for the costs of new wage and salary awards which may come into force in 1973-74. Many other aspects of the Bill could be referred to, but no doubt other members on this side (and I hope Government members, too) will pronounce their understanding of this Bill in the interests of the people of South Australia. Several questions will arise when we are discussing the lines, and, in order to allow the Bill to reach that stage, I support it so that there can be more detailed examination in Committee.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): It is apparent that the State Government is not proceeding with some of the costly undertakings referred to prior to the election in March. This action is similar to the actions of the Australian Labor Government, which has deferred many of its extravagant promises made last year. Having gained power, that Party suddenly finds itself confronted by the facts of life and has had to back off, and the large sums that were to have been made available to the States are now not forthcoming.

This Bill indicates that the Treasurer is not receiving the money that he hoped to receive from the Commonwealth Government. The Treasurer said that, because the Australian Government was not giving as much assistance as he had expected, this State would be a mere \$20,000,000 in revenue down the drain, and some of this Government's election promises are already being reconsidered.

I have looked in vain for details of any capital expenditure in my district, apart from normal grants to institutions. Therefore, I shall have to speak about the more fortunate districts of the State in which money is being spent. A large trunk sewer is being laid right through the middle of one of the most attractive parts of the Torrens District. The trunk sewer, which passes the Adelaide Oval and the Cross of Sacrifice, goes through the golf links near the restaurant at the Torrens weir. As far as I am concerned, it will be out of sight, and no significant part of my district will be served by it. It will serve principally districts across the Torrens River in the Norwood area.

We are now debating the Treasurer's second reading explanation of the Loan Estimates, which this year consist of large and significant sums. I found it difficult to find my way through the financial statements that have been presented to us, because of one or two factors in particular. One is the changing circumstances in education and school buildings, whereby the Commonwealth Government is to be responsible for tertiary education as from January 1, 1974. The other factor is the rearrangement of the explanation of the housing provisions and the Treasurer's comments, which provide a great deal of huffing and puffing about what funds we may or may not get from Canberra.

Mr. Nankivell: Do you think that Canberra is the big bad wolf?

Mr. COUMBE: Yes. There are many ifs and buts in the documents. Provision has been made in many areas based on semi-promises, but not on fact. This means two things: we, as a responsible Parliament, are being asked to consider seriously some items for which no supporting funds are available at present. In addition, we must consider the lines, for which we may not get funds if certain eventualities come about. At the same time, we are considering a significant sum; in fact, the highest ever spent by the State. This is a fundamental weakness in Parliamentary principle and finance; we are being asked to approve record expenditures without having the full knowledge of the financial backing that the Government may get. What will be the position if some of the promises we are now considering are not fulfilled? I realize the Government's dilemma, but this position is just not good enough, because the sums we are considering are not peanuts by any means, but record expenditures approaching the \$200,000,000 mark.

Last year's Loan Estimates provided for a then record estimated expenditure of \$159,560,000, whereas actual expenditure amounted to \$164,853,000. This year the comparative sum on the lines is \$157,480,000. Last year the special loan for housing, apart from housing moneys, was \$500,000, making a total expenditure of \$164,853,000. In the short time that has been available to me since last Thursday afternoon, I could have easily got mixed up in the arithmetic of these sums unless I had been extremely careful. This year, \$32,750,000 is provided for welfare housing (to use the term being used now), which will bring the grand total up to \$190,230,000. In his second reading explanation the Treasurer said that last year he had planned for a nominal deficit of about \$32,000; in other words, there was almost a planned

balanced Loan Budget. However, the final consequence is that, as a result of over-expenditure in some lines and over-recoupments in others, we finished up with an actual deficit of \$1,859,000. It is interesting to examine the Loan Fund, which is very important in view of the big deficit the Treasurer has forecast. In 1971-72, it stood at \$14,811,367, in 1972-73, it stood at \$10,350,362, and in 1973-74, it is expected that it will stand at \$11,452,946.

The Revenue Budget's deficit next June 30 is expected to be about \$13,000,000, despite the already announced and predicted savage State taxes. I agree with the Treasurer's contention that we should put moneys aside in the Loan Account to cover these anticipated deficits, but I also recall that, when my Party was the Government of the day, it did the very same thing. We were criticized then, but we are benefiting today as a result of the excellent moves made by Sir Glen Pearson (who was one of the best Treasurers this State has ever had), who salted money away in this manner. At that time, the Labor Opposition went to town in no small way in criticizing the Liberal and Country League Government for doing this very thing. However, the Labor Government is now doing it, thereby continuing a practice that began a few years ago. Although I concur in the Treasurer's action in this regard, it is hypocrisy on the Government's part to do this when it is merely following the practice we started when in Government.

Housing matters are somewhat complicated, because one must go right through all the documents, which are liberally sprinkled with references to housing, which is placed in several categories. The Treasurer's second reading explanation states:

The allocation for housing for 1973-74 of \$32,750,000 is about 9.2 per cent above last year's figure.

In the second reading explanation of last year's Loan Estimates the Treasurer said:

The increase of 10 per cent is the most liberal increase supported by the Commonwealth for many years.

At that time we had received a record allocation, and the Treasurer acknowledged this by saying it was the greatest increase received, about 10 per cent. This year we are getting 9.2 per cent on housing, and the Treasurer tried to qualify the reduction and explain it away as best he could by saying that it had been our practice over many years to spend more on housing than the other States had spent. I quite agree. He also said that the all-States increase was about 26 per cent and made a curious apologia by saying that the Commonwealth Government supported a greater than normal increase in our works programme.

It was interesting to see what transpired, apparently, at the Premiers' Conference where these figures were worked out. The Treasurer said that the Australian Labor Government's first offer to the States was an increase of 8.3 per cent for works programmes, and not the 10 per cent previously given by the former Government. Of course, this was unacceptable to him, and I do not blame him one bit. I support him in seeking more money. We have been able to get a better allocation for works, but the Commonwealth Government had to beat last year's record hand-out by Treasurer Snedden, which was a substantial increase on previous allocations, as our Treasurer here had to admit. The Treasurer went further and rightly pointed out that next year we could not expect such increases as we had had this year. In view of the announcement of the \$13,000,000 revenue deficit and the very savage State taxes, next year

we could face a most serious fiscal position. Let us not put our heads in the sand or close our eyes to what may be the position next year.

The overall effect of this statement is that greater amounts will be available for capital expenditure this year. We welcome that news, but we must be most careful and prudent because last year saw greater competition between contractors and an excellent run of fine weather, with the result that some lines relating to building, particularly school buildings, were overspent. The vagaries of the weather are always with us in the building trade and can have very damaging effects on programming, as unfortunately we experienced in 1968-69. However, experience is now showing that contractors' prices are rising fairly steeply, due to other factors, including growing industrial unrest in the building trades and also the alarming escalations in costs because of inflationary trends.

At the moment we have a shortage of skilled tradesmen in some areas of the building industry, but unwise capital expenditure merely pushes inflation along, especially if large doses of capital works are injected suddenly into the economy. Only a small proportion of Loan funds can be revenue producing, as we know; the remainder is, of necessity, for developmental or social purposes. The important thing is to see what volume of permanent and desirable assets is produced from the funds we are considering. A fair proportion can be absorbed in cost escalations, and I have no doubt all honourable members would agree. I am disturbed, for instance, by the costs of individual school buildings, and I am sure the Minister must be disturbed by this, too. We all want the best standards and conditions for the students in our schools. In the allocations this year, after allowing for the adjustments by the Commonwealth for tertiary education, one wonders whether we are getting more schools *in toto* or the same number of schools with each one costing more. It is a frightening and worrying problem.

The Public Works Committee does a fine job in vetting the proposals coming before it. However, the schools then go to tender and I am worried that this year we will find that, almost without exception, the new tenders will be higher than the figures put to the Public Works Committee in evidence, despite the best efforts by officers of the Public Buildings Department accurately to estimate the increased costs. Unfortunately, the Public Works Committee has no check on the finished cost after the school project or other building is approved by it. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, for any member in this House outside Cabinet to check the figures of actual costs. Even the Auditor-General's Report does not help very much in this regard. Inevitably, doubts are raised, in view of the fantastically high costs of some schools, as to whether we are getting more schools despite the increased allotment in this most necessary area.

A question was raised last year as to whether the money spent on schools and other Government buildings was being spent in the right manner. I think I raised the matter myself. In other words, one wondered whether the Government had its priorities right. The Minister of Education interjected at that time, saying, "Surely Cabinet is best qualified to decide how to spend the money." Of course, Cabinet has the facts before it and can make the decisions, but it is this Parliament that is being asked to approve the Estimates prepared by the Treasurer. It is the responsibility of this Parliament and of every member in it, on either side of the House and irrespective of the

Party to which he may belong, to probe these figures and to see that the funds are correctly applied in order to get the best possible value.

Speaking now of some specific items in the Treasurer's speech, I return again to housing. It is disturbing to see the deletion of the allocation to the permanent building societies. I applaud the amount of money made available for social housing, but the former provision for permanent building societies is being deleted. Last year \$2,100,000 was made available from recoveries in the Home Builders Fund. However, there is none this year because the new agreement between the Commonwealth and the States on housing does not provide for permanent building societies participating in the distribution of special funds. Mr. Johnson has, apparently, seen to that and of course concurs in the Australian Government's philosophy in this direction. I suggest it dislikes in principle many of these societies, because there was quite a feature in the national press a little while ago about this.

Mr. McAnaney: And a stupid remark was made by Mr. Crean.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, but we will not go into that now. These permanent building societies play a most valuable and significant part in providing houses in this State. I said just now that I agreed with moneys being freely made available for what we now call "social housing", but a large proportion of our population in this State wants eventually to own its own houses. That is a basic desire of many married couples. It seems to me that the attitude of the Commonwealth Minister for Housing does not agree with that basic outlook that I have just mentioned. In fact, it almost seems that we are going back to the days of the former Commonwealth Minister, Mr. Dedman—and we all know what happened to him! He said that everyone who owned a home in Australia was a little capitalist.

The new housing agreement lays down that only 30 per cent of housing finance may be devoted to dwellings for sale, so new houses for sale will be restricted to the Housing Trust, the State Bank, and the other institution we all know—the Savings Bank. It is significant that 30 per cent of available housing finance is restricted in this way. That is the housing policy that this State will be following for the term of the agreement. I point out that people who want to own houses are restricted to 30 per cent of the money available for housing, and no funds will be made available to the permanent building societies.

I turn now to the Engineering and Water Supply Department. I have looked at what has been going on in the works programme for the last three years in this important department. For the metropolitan waterworks (which includes the Murray Bridge to Onkaparinga main, a most important undertaking) in 1971-72 the allocation was \$10,400,000; in 1972-73 it slipped a bit to \$10,100,000; and this year, believe it or not, it has dropped to \$8,907,000. That is for metropolitan waterworks, including the big Murray Bridge to Onkaparinga main. For country waterworks, for 1971-72 the allocation was \$7,931,000; for 1972-73 it was \$8,359,000; and for 1973-74 it is \$8,160,000. For metropolitan sewerage we see an improvement, because in 1971-72 the allocation was \$7,018,000; in 1972-73 it was \$6,697,000; and in 1973-74 it has increased to \$8,097,000. For country sewerage the allocation in 1971-72 was \$2,526,000; in 1972-73 it was \$2,167,000; and in 1973-74 it is \$2,269,000. So we see that the increase has occurred only in metropolitan sewerage, for which one can appreciate the need as more houses are being built in that area. Metropolitan waterworks has gone back, country water-

works has decreased from last year, and country sewerage remains about the same. It is significant that this is a major developmental department of this State. From the escalation of labour and material costs alone in that 12-month period of which we have been talking, it seems plain that in some areas of the State and of these undertakings to which I have referred less actual construction work will be undertaken physically simply because of the escalation of costs of material and labour. This I much regret, because the Engineering and Water Supply Department is a major department in this State, and we look for its development to keep pace with the development of the State.

I now refer to the Municipal Tramways Trust and metropolitan public transport, and particularly road transport. We have made pleas in this House many times and yet, after the 3½ years that this Government has been in power, still no plan has officially been presented to this House or to the public, except for dial-a-bus.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the Breuning report?

Mr. COUMBE: Last year the Treasurer had this to say about the M.T.T. finances:

It was earlier intended to advance \$3,000,000 over three years to the M.T.T. to finance the replacement of its older diesel bus fleet with modern diesel vehicles for one-man operation. Sums of \$1,000,000 were advanced in each of the past two years but a recent review of the trust's capital programme and cash flows indicates that \$400,000 will probably suffice for 1972-73. Further advances will need to be made in 1973-74, by which time the trust's programme and cash situation will have been reviewed again.

Well, I take it that they have been reviewed again, because this year once more the trust is to get only \$400,000, the same as last year. What is the Government really doing about metropolitan road transport? If it was really dinkum it would be spending money upgrading and increasing the M.T.T. fleet. That seems to be obvious but, where it was making \$1,000,000 available, now it has cut it back to \$400,000 for a whole year.

When will the Government wake up and do something besides getting the Breuning report and introducing dial-a-bus? When shall we have a definite plan? I warn the Government that the people are becoming restive in this connection and disillusioned. We all want upgraded public road transport, whether it is operating radially from the city or whether it be cross-urban or a series of ring routes around the city itself. Obviously the Government has no immediate plans, or else it would have provided more than this \$400,000, which is the same as it provided last year. Certainly, transport research attracted an allocation of \$500,000 last year, but only \$131,000 of that sum was spent. When we look at metropolitan public transport, I make no apology for pressing this as hard as I can because it is important, and I recall the ravings of the present Minister, when he was in Opposition, about this very matter. I searched to find out what the Government had done or had not done and what it promised to do. I recall that the Treasurer, in the policy speech that he delivered before the 1973 State election, said much about road transport and public transport. I am speaking only about road transport, not about rail transport.

In that policy speech the Treasurer stated that he wanted to proceed with the introduction of express routes, using reserved bus lanes, to suburbs such as Ingle Farm, Grange and West Lakes. Have we seen anything of that? The Treasurer also stated that he wanted to introduce improvements to metropolitan bus operations, including a pilot city-centre distribution system.

Dr. Tonkin: Are you sure he didn't say he was going to set up a committee to see whether it was feasible to set up another committee?

Mr. COUMBE: I am quoting directly from the policy speech. The Treasurer also wanted to provide a bus service linking major transport terminals and shopping and business areas, and an experimental demand-activated bus system in the metropolitan suburbs. I wonder whether anyone knew what the Treasurer was talking about when he used that phrase about a demand-activated system. He also stated as the Government's policy:

The preparation of two major planning documents covering public transport in the metropolitan area, and passenger and goods transport for the State.

That sounds nice, but what have we seen? He also wanted to introduce new reforms in the control, financing, and administration of transport, including a programme of public participation in transport planning. Has anyone heard of that one? This was to be the great plan and it went over well, in that many people were gulled by it. In his second reading explanation, the Treasurer stated:

The Government has made a submission to the Australian Government—

Mr. Gunn: The Commonwealth Government.

Mr. COUMBE: I am quoting the explanation verbatim. The Commonwealth Government is now called the Australian Government, and I have also noticed that the letters O.H.M.S. are not being used on some Government envelopes. The explanation states:

The Government has made a submission to the Australian Government for special grants towards improving urban transport. We understand that such grants are to be provided in 1973-74 up to two-thirds of the cost of approved projects, but we do not know yet what extent of support will be available for South Australia. For purposes of these Estimates we have assumed that we will receive about \$2,000,000 towards the cost of the Christie Downs extension, and that amount has been included in the estimate of repayments. Needless to say, we wish to push on as rapidly as practicable with improvements to urban transport. We are hopeful of getting more than \$2,000,000 from the Australian Government and, if those additional funds are forthcoming, the railways programme will be reviewed immediately to see what extra work can be done this year.

There is not a word there about public road transport, although rail transport is mentioned. I intend to say more about this matter, because I am concerned about what has happened regarding the Islington railway workshops, where many of my constituents and many constituents of the member for Ross Smith are employed. When I compared what was provided last year with what has been provided this year, I was dismayed at the figures.

Under the item "rolling stock", an amount of \$4,260,000 was provided for the Islington workshops in 1972-73, whereas this year \$3,013,000 has been provided. The provision this year is about \$1,250,000 less, disregarding the extra cost of materials and wages. This position concerns me greatly, because, whilst the Treasurer went to some length in his explanation about this matter, about \$1,250,000 less is being provided for capital works at the Islington workshops this year.

Regarding the individual items in the provision, last year \$74,000 was provided for new locomotives, whereas no provision is made this year. That may be because of electrification, but we still need locomotives. For new passenger vehicles, the provision this year is about half what was provided last year. The provision for new freight vehicles this year is less than the provision last year. So it goes on, and I submit that we will need an explanation of this serious problem when we are dealing with the lines.

The provision for the Electricity Trust is the same as the provision last year, namely, \$3,000,000. In 1972-73 the total programme for the trust, as set out in the Estimates, was \$29,650,000. Of that amount \$3,000,000 came from Loan funds, \$6,000,000 from loans to be raised by the trust from financial institutions and the public, and \$20,650,000 was to come from the trust's internal funds. Incidentally, although \$29,650,000 was provided last year in the Estimates, only \$24,000,000 was spent and of that amount the trust had to find \$20,650,000 from its internal sources.

This year the total programme is expected to be \$36,350,000, an increase of about 30 per cent compared to last year. This is certainly a record: the programme is about \$12,000,000 more than last year. However, again only \$3,000,000 is being provided from Loan Account and \$6,000,000 by way of loans from institutions and the public and incidental borrowing, leaving \$27,350,000 to be found from the trust's funds. This seems a staggering amount for the trust to find, especially in view of its trading result last year and the Treasurer's announced intention again to increase the Government levy on the trust's operations. For how long can the Government expect to milk this cow, particularly as the action it intends to take will lead automatically to increased electricity tariffs?

I have pointed out one or two matters that disturb me greatly and I am sure that they also disturb other members who have taken the trouble to examine the Loan Estimates, as opposed to those who merely accept them out of hand as gloss statements. When a member starts probing some of these matters, he gets some strange results and I have tried to highlight them this afternoon.

In supporting the second reading, I indicate that, whilst we have a record provision for expenditure year by year and as the needs of the citizens require, it concerns me that we, as serious members of the Legislature, are required to pass a document in which there are several matters for which there is no financial backing. We are asked to pass this Bill on the hopeful supposition that some of the funds will be available. I know that in Australia the timing is unfortunate in that this document must be dealt with before the Commonwealth Budget is introduced. As a former member of this House often said, "This is not the best way of putting forward a financial document." Yet, this document concerns a figure approaching \$200,000,000.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I support the second reading. This is a highly significant Treasurer's report, being more significant for what it does not say than for what it spells out. A key phrase appears throughout the report and it is "Special Grants". On the surface this report appears to be as innocuous as any Treasurer's report can be: it refers to increases in works for the State, and it is almost now a standard procedure to show how much better the Government is doing by quoting how much more money is being spent this year than was spent in the previous year. This has become a standard measurement of a Government's success. Indeed, a Government is going from strength to strength if it is able to show it is spending more money, or if it intends to spend more money, in the next year of its office.

Mr. Keneally: You used to say that when your Party was in office.

Dr. TONKIN: A Government must spend more money simply to keep up with the increased natural demand of the State, the demand which naturally arises from an increase in population and the additional facilities required.

Members interjecting;

Dr. TONKIN: I notice from the by-play of members opposite that they are canvassing the suggestion that perhaps a Government would look foolish if it restricted spending. Looking more closely at the provisions outlined in the Treasurer's report, I find that the proposed spending to be influenced by this Government will be less than that spent last year, because we are going to spend less of our own money (money over which we have total control), and we will be spending more money over which the Commonwealth Government has total control. Perhaps I should be calling it the Australian Government, but we will be spending more money which that Government is providing for us to use on its behalf with absolute and strict controls on the way in which it will be used. Perhaps honourable members opposite were not quite so far out when they made their comments. Perhaps the spending of increased Loan funds in some fields each year is the best way of dealing with the natural demand for increased facilities. However, increased spending on capital works does not necessarily provide the best solution to these problems and, in this regard, I have two examples: first, the need for more doctors in the community and the fact that the best hospitals and the best equipment that money can buy are of no value if there are not sufficient trained people (both doctors and nurses) to staff those facilities.

Secondly, education is a major area of need also, and I believe that more use should be made of existing facilities. As I have previously predicted, we will sooner or later have to use our existing capital works in schools (our buildings and other facilities) on a two-shift basis. I believe that the semester system must be introduced in universities to provide three four-month terms (eight months of study constituting a year's work), and that it should be possible to start a year at the beginning of any one semester. By so doing it will be possible to cope with half as many students again as we now cope with at universities with the same capital facilities. True, this matter has been the subject of a report which has been considered seriously by various universities. Although the implementation of the report has been set aside for the time being, it will have to be considered again.

In just the same way I believe there must be a two-shift system in schools, although there may be staffing problems involved with this. These problems will be large, but they will not be so large that they cannot be overcome, and I return to the point I previously made: an indication of increased spending is not necessarily an indication of successful Government administration. Some increase is necessary, but the use made of the increases is the important consideration.

The Treasurer's report must be unique because of its continued reference to its key phrase of "Special Grants". The Premier has stated that the \$8,500,000 remaining at June 30, as well as other moneys, are to be set aside from this year to allow for an estimated deficit of \$13,000,000 in the general revenue account. Need I point out that this is money on which interest must be paid? Certainly, it is money which, by the withholding of it, will seriously impair the capital works programme of this State. Nevertheless, the seemingly frequently forgotten fact is that Loan funds will be held back in reserve for a general revenue deficit estimated to be as high as \$13,000,000. The \$13,000,000 seems to be a familiar figure, because I believe that that figure was postulated as being the deficit in the last financial year. What is so magical about \$13,000,000? I know only that if this \$13,000,000 estimate becomes fact, it will establish some sort of record for this State; but it is not a record that the Labor Government can be proud of.

The Loan Fund and the general revenue account must be considered in conjunction, as the Treasurer has done in his report. It is undoubtedly clear that this Government has already sold out South Australia and is prepared to act simply as an agent for the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Rodda: The Australian Government!

Dr. TONKIN: This is getting to be difficult, but the reference to the Australian Government is, I believe, also significant. This is the other significant feature of the Treasurer's report: this Government is not only prepared to act as an agent—it is prepared to play-act. We saw this happen when the Treasurer returned from the Premiers' Conference crying that he got \$20,000,000 less than he had asked for. I shed tears when I watched the Treasurer on television: tears of laughter. He was no more concerned about that \$20,000,000 less that he got than he was concerned about whether it was raining or not, because this is what he expected to get: he expected to get \$20,000,000 less than he asked for. The Treasurer's report reflects his attitude and brings into focus the new Commonwealth-State financial arrangements entered into by two Socialist Governments, the State Government and the Government that is now referred to as the Australian Government. The State Government, by its acceptance of these arrangements, is in fact abrogating the responsibility of Government.

It was rather strange to watch the Treasurer. The phrase "lousy deal" was frequently used by members opposite when referring to the results of Premiers' Conferences when a Commonwealth Liberal Government was in power. It is rather a change to hear the Treasurer's comments after Premiers' Conferences nowadays. I would be interested to hear the comments of the member for Playford on this matter, because he dwelt on it at some length in the last session of the previous Parliament, when he spoke about the "lousy deal" given to the State Government by the Commonwealth Liberal Government. The Treasurer's protest was very "faint" (a word that the Attorney-General frequently likes to use). The Treasurer was obliged to show some reaction, but he did not do it well; he returned from the conference with \$20,000,000 less than the sum he had wanted, and he says he must keep back Loan funds to the tune of \$13,000,000 for the deficit he is expecting.

The Commonwealth (or should I say the Australian) Treasurer obviously is controlling the States' activities by keeping firm control through the Commonwealth Government's purse strings; this has happened before, but it has never happened before for the same motives. In particular, the Commonwealth Treasurer is controlling the States' initiatives in capital works by reducing the capital moneys generally available to the States, and he is increasing the capital moneys available as long as they have strings attached to them. Indeed, most of the special grants made have been made with Government directions as to how they shall be used. In other words, the Australian Commonwealth Government (I prefer that term) is telling the States what they can and cannot do, simply by controlling the States' finances. In his second reading explanation the Treasurer said:

The present Australian Government wishes to influence in a direct way the volume of funds going to house construction and finance, the conditions under which the funds are employed and the kinds of people to be assisted by these special funds.

I shall have more to say about housing later. The Treasurer also said that there were three other items for which the Commonwealth Government was making special grants or their equivalent available. He said:

The first three items are as follows: expected increased grants by the Australian Government towards school buildings as a result of the recommendations of the committee headed by Professor Karmel; increased special grants by that Government as a result of its proposal to assume responsibility for financing tertiary education from January 1 next; and increased recoveries by Public Buildings Department from Flinders University on account of the Medical School building. The fourth item comprises expected special grants from the Australian Government for specified new purposes.

This covers a multitude of sins, but at least we get the further comment, as follows:

We have not received final advice yet as to what special funds may be available this year in areas such as urban transport improvements, sewerage services and activities of land commissions. For purposes of these estimates we have made a judgment that special grants are to be offered towards urban transport and sewerage services, and that special loans will be made for land commission purposes.

The Government has made a judgment! If it does not know by now whether it will get those special grants, it will be in serious trouble. The State Government obviously knows perfectly well that it will get special grants in respect of those items. Indeed, Ministers have gone on record in this House as saying that the grants are coming. Consequently, I do not feel very impressed by the statement, "We have made a judgment." The Eyre Highway has not been mentioned in this debate by members opposite, but it is heartening to see provision for it in the Loan Estimates. I cannot help wondering whether anyone from the other side will speak in this debate. One would have looked forward to further questioning from members opposite.

Obviously, some of the more erudite back-benchers on the other side must be questioning some features of the Treasurer's second reading explanation. Of course, members opposite are not entitled to query such matters, but I would have expected some discussion from the other side. Instead, we have had a stony silence. I should have thought that someone on the ball over there might have asked, "What about the grant made for completing the Eyre Highway?" Was it not a special grant made by the Commonwealth Liberal Government?

Mr. Gunn: It was.

Dr. TONKIN: It was indeed a special grant, but it was made for a special purpose and it was a non-recurring item. The Commonwealth Government is now making grants in respect of recurring items, and the State Government's finances will become so dependent on the recurring grants that, if the Commonwealth Government wants to, it can simply say that it will withdraw the grants at any time, and the State Government will then have no option but to come to heel. That is the iniquitous part of this entire arrangement, and it is a part that members opposite know very well.

This strategy has been planned for a considerable time. If one's political philosophy dwelt along those channels, I suppose one would be proud of the tactics now being employed, whereby the Commonwealth Treasurer is assuming total control over the States by taking control of their financial arrangements. It was a sad day when the States gave up their taxing rights to the Commonwealth Government. If they could have seen ahead and seen what use would be made of their decision, they would never have done so. The Leader has most thoroughly dealt with the details of the Loan Estimates, and I shall refer only to some major items.

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

Dr. TONKIN: Before the adjournment I had summed up the present position as represented by the introduction of the Treasurer's report. I had not used the word "conspiracy", but I believe a conspiracy has been concocted between the Commonwealth Australian Government and this State's Socialist Government to take over the effective control of this and other State Governments. I point out, as a matter of interest, that although the Commonwealth Government is referred to as the Australian Government throughout the report, someone forgot in one part of it, and at page 5 we see, "At a meeting of the Australian Loan Council the Commonwealth agreed to support a total Loan programme." I think that that is the only place in the report in which the Commonwealth Government is referred to as such: from then on it becomes the Australian Government. As the Leader has dealt in great detail with the various aspects of the Treasurer's report, I do not intend to refer to it in the same depth as he did, but I have an interest in some items that should be referred to. The first is transport. I cannot do more than recall the speech that I made in this House about the actions of the Minister of Transport during the previous Parliament. This is the Minister who has fought a perpetual rear-guard action, the Minister who replied to questions by evasion, the Minister who did nothing other than appoint committees, and, as I interjected earlier today, the Minister who was guilty once of appointing a committee to examine the feasibility of appointing a committee. It was a disgusting performance from a Minister of the Crown and one of which the Labor Government cannot be in any way proud.

Mr. Hopgood: Wait until he comes back!

Dr. TONKIN: I wonder why it was necessary for the Minister to travel overseas at this time whilst the House was in session. There may have been a special reason for his going now, but the question I asked this afternoon was skilfully and rather rudely evaded by the Treasurer. It would have done the Minister of Transport far greater service if the Treasurer had replied to a question asked in good faith rather more fully and less rudely. I do not believe that the Minister of Transport has anything to be proud of in this State, and I think the dial-a-bus fiasco has put the lid on his career. The Minister managed to fight his rear-guard action for about three years, and the day has now been saved by a special grant of \$500,000,000 to be spent on transport throughout the Commonwealth, and South Australia is to receive its share.

When that announcement was made (although the Treasurer's report states, "We can only judge that it will be available") plans were announced in Adelaide for the electrification and the duplication of railway services, and the Minister made a feature of the fact that now the Australian Government (he meant the Commonwealth Government) had come to the party. I would rather this State found its own finances and determined its own priorities as a sovereign State than be told exactly what it has to do by the Commonwealth Government, specifically to further its political needs, because that is what is happening. It would be much better to place our transport system in its correct perspective. I admit that the Minister of Transport has never placed his Transport portfolio in the same priority that it would have been placed by my Party. However, the people of South Australia are fed up with the lack of an efficient public transport system and are not impressed with the efforts that have been made.

Mr. Wells: What about—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Bragg.

Dr. TONKIN: I am not in any way deterred by the out-of-order interjection. The Minister of Transport is totally wrong: he has never put the public first. All he has been interested in is playing politics at the expense of the welfare of the South Australian community. We find now that the Commonwealth Government has come to the party and saved the Minister's skin. The price we are paying for this is that the Commonwealth Government is now calling the tune: it will give the money for these special grants, providing it has a say in how the money is spent, to what sections of the community it will be given, and in what spheres it will be applied.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It is a pity that these funds were not made available 20 years ago by the Commonwealth Liberal Government, and you know it.

Dr. TONKIN: I emphasize that this State in its present condition is going to be dictated to by the Commonwealth Government, but I would rather we made our own arrangements and decided where we needed to spend our money, because the money comes from the pockets of the taxpayers of this State. This is just the beginning of the take-over bid that the Australian Labor Government is making for the States of Australia: Government members cannot deny this fact for one minute. I wish the Government would be honest enough to state in this report exactly what are its aims and objectives.

I refer now to housing: once again the Commonwealth Government dictates the mode of spending the money for housing in this State. It states virtually that, unless the State Government agrees to spend the money in certain ways, the money will not be provided. The Commonwealth Government will not give money to permanent building societies, and it will specifically restrict the amount available for home ownership. We know the Labor Party's policy on that: it does not suit that Party and therefore it will discourage home ownership. This is nothing more than a blatant political move, but we are being forced as a Government to follow the Commonwealth Government's dictated line.

I refer to hospitals: the Deeble and Scotton report, that masterpiece of medical and health care written by two economists, proposes that half the running costs of public hospitals will be provided by the Commonwealth Government, provided that the South Australian Government decides that it will agree to participate in this scheme. The amount will be more than \$15,000,000 this financial year and more for next financial year. On paper it sounds very good, but we do not see (and are not told about it) in the Treasurer's report that the Commonwealth Government (or Australian Government: call it what you will) will want to have, and will have, a significant say in exactly how that money will be spent, and because it controls the purse strings it will have absolute control over our public hospitals. Once again, South Australian Government agencies will be acting as agents for the Commonwealth Government, and there is no way of disguising that fact. I am pleased that work on the Flinders Medical Centre and hospital is well up to schedule. This is most encouraging, because I believe that this is the most important single step that has been taken in this State for many years to further the health and welfare of our community. However, no matter how much any Government spends on hospitals or their facilities, it is of no significance without adequate trained medical and nursing staffs.

A serious shortage of doctors exists in the State. The quota for admission to the medical faculty when I started medicine in 1947 was 120. That was, I believe, the first year that quotas had been placed on any faculty for

admission to a university. As we all know, the quota for the medical faculty last year was reduced once again to 120. In other words, although the State's population has been climbing steadily in parallel with the increase in the world's population generally, the numbers of doctors being trained in the State has remained virtually the same. Is it any wonder that medical services have been hard to obtain on occasion? Is it any wonder that, since doctors are selected on academic ability (that is, the ability to pass examinations), fewer and fewer of them have moved out into general practice? All the nationalized health schemes in the world and all the brand-new hospitals with all the most up-to-date equipment will not provide better medical services until more doctors are available to work in them. That is a fundamental fact of which the Government appears to have lost sight.

The Treasurer's report refers to "Certain other projects". On the surface, I suppose one may say, "This is a very fine thing. The Government considers certain of these other projects to be urgent." I am pleased to read about the redevelopment of Glenside Hospital at an estimated total cost of \$4,000,000, the first stage of this scheme (this is always a let-down, because it looks as though it is a total redevelopment at a cost of \$4,000,000, whereas it is to be done in stages) being the replacement of psychiatric sub-acute wards at a cost of \$360,000. The redevelopment plan, which has been sitting in the Public Works Department for some time, is imaginative.

I am pleased to see that the plan is to be implemented, but there is one little snag. The same thing applies to the major redevelopment of the Royal Adelaide Hospital Northfield Wards, to be carried out in three stages at an estimated cost of \$17,000,000 at current prices. The first stage will include the erection of a 200-bed nursing home. Then comes the crunch: these projects have not been referred to the Public Works Committee and no provision has been made in the Loan Estimates for their financing. That is reminiscent of the typical policy we have come to expect when the Labor Government makes its election speeches and promises, it is sheer window-dressing. I would be more impressed if I had read that some firm proposals had been put up. I hope I am wrong, and I hope that the Public Works Committee will examine these two projects as soon as possible, because they are both extremely urgent.

However, I do not believe that the Government should include proposed items in a Treasurer's report which read well but for which no money is currently being set aside. I do not believe that such proposals should be brought forward until the Public Works Committee has examined them, because it looks to me as though the committee is being short-circuited and that its findings are being taken for granted. That is something we cannot afford to have regarding that committee, which does a wonderful job and which I think is the hardest-working Parliamentary committee.

Mr. Hopgood: No, the second.

Dr. TONKIN: Opinions may differ, but I believe that it is one of the hardest-working committees, which I think deserves more consideration than this sort of shabby treatment. Summing up, it seems to me that Loan funds are to be held back to allow for a possible revenue deficit of \$13,000,000, which will come about because the Commonwealth Treasurer is holding the purse strings so tightly that he will not give the moneys which are so badly needed by the State for general revenue. He will, on the other hand, use the deficit to induce the State to accept special grants in the various spheres about which we have talked.

In this way, the Commonwealth Government will intervene further and further into areas of this State's responsibilities, and the Government opposite whose Leader has made such play of State responsibilities and State rights and whose colleagues in Western Australia, led by a namesake of mine, I am embarrassed to say—

Mr. Becker: No relation.

Dr. TONKIN: Not as far as I know, but it is extremely embarrassing to me. The Western Australian Government is in exactly the same position as ours is. They come crying "Shame" because they do not get enough money from the Commonwealth Treasurer. They stand up for State rights, whereas all the time the Western Australian Government and this Government (and any State Labor Government) are being so hypocritical that it is just not true. They are putting up a sham, a fight that does not mean a thing, because all they are interested in is a take-over of State Governments by the Commonwealth, which is doing it in a bloodless way by controlling the economies of the States. This Treasurer's report is the first step along that way. There are no two ways about it: the Commonwealth Government will phase out State Parliaments; that is Labor Party policy.

Mr. HOPGOOD: You'll be looking for a job then, won't you?

Dr. TONKIN: I will not be the only one. I do not see why the people of this State should not be entitled to their continued representation on a local level, because I believe that they deserve representation that will fight for the industrial development and the general well-being of the State. I see no reason why the people of this State and their interests should be swamped by the interests of people in the Eastern States, because that is what will happen. It is all very well for the member for Mawson to say "Oh!", but this is what the member for Mawson and his colleagues are advocating, and they cannot and do not deny it. I resent this Treasurer's report. It is a sheer political document backing up an ideology that I find quite repugnant. With some reluctance, I support the adoption of the Loan Estimates.

Mr. HOPGOOD (Mawson): Unlike my usual offerings in this House, my comments will be brief and will centre largely on the parish pump; but I think it would be a little remiss of me if I did not voice some disappointment at the offerings that we have so far had from members opposite. However, I think I should apportion praise before I apportion blame. I support, to a large degree, the remarks that the member for Bragg has just made about the provision of doctors in this community. True, our academic institutions have not been geared to produce the number of doctors that we need in this community, and we could add to that various other professional services. It is also true that the approach of these academic institutions has not been sufficiently geared to general practice. It is not simply economic considerations that have forced more and more medical practitioners to go into the specialist field. It is further true that the whole tenor of teaching in the universities tends to seduce medical practitioners away from this necessary field in the medical services.

So far as I am aware, the only campus which over a reasonable period has seriously attacked this problem is the Monash campus in Victoria, which has attempted to introduce to the students the concept of community medicine and, from comments I have heard from those people who know far more about this field than do I, this has had some effect on making students more enthusiastic about going back to general practice. However, generally speaking, our academic institutions have not been sufficiently

geared to produce the number of medical practitioners and other professional people that we need, and the whole trend of teaching has been away from general practice.

Did I hear the member for Bragg say that this was something that the Labor Government had lost sight of completely? If I did, to which Labor Government was he referring? I imagine that he introduced those remarks by talking about the very expensive facility that is being built at Bedford Park and the expansion of enrolments of medical students that it will provide. This, of course, is something that this Government is carrying on. I understand one of the very first signatures that the late Frank Walsh made when he came to office was for the purchase of land for this hospital. It cannot be said that this Labor Government has been at all remiss in its duty to provide a facility that will considerably increase the facilities for the training of medical graduates. So, if he was talking about this Labor Government, he was completely off the track.

They were the sensible things he said: he also said a lot of drivel about Commonwealth-State rights. We are used to hearing from members opposite the cant that we on this side are ideologically hidebound whereas they on that side are pragmatic and flexible. Yet, when it comes to the provision of basic services for the people of Australia, we listen to a speech such as we have just heard and we realize how ideologically hidebound members opposite are. When it comes to the provision of these facilities and who is to control their provision and who is to provide the money for their provision, I think the approach of the Australian Labor Party would be that whatever works best is what should be made to work. If this means that the Commonwealth must continue to expand its frontier at the expense of but in co-operation with the States, we would say, "This is the way we must indeed go". But oh, no—not the member for Bragg! He wants to go back to those halcyon days when the States had their own income-taxing powers; he wants to turn the clock back.

If that is not sticking to the old way and being hidebound and, in a sense, being ideological, wanting to maintain the colonial contract which our great-grandfathers were able to negotiate with the Imperial Parliament, I do not know what is. I hope the approach of modern Governments, be they the Australian Government or the State Governments, will be flexible and pragmatic in this field. I welcome the moneys that are coming from the Australian Government, be they with strings attached or not, provided they are going to the provision of the sort of basic services that this community requires. So far as I can see from the Treasurer's statement, and from the announcements we have had from Commonwealth Ministers, from which we can make certain presumptions about the forthcoming Commonwealth Budget, that aim is being achieved.

Let us, for example, consider transport in this State. I am particularly interested in this because the jewel in the Minister's crown is a project occurring within my own electoral district—the extension of the Christie Downs rail spur. Commonwealth Minister Jones has spoken to the Australian Transport Advisory Council, and we all know that moneys are to be made available for works and electrification which will enable this project to proceed more expeditiously than it would have if the moneys had not been available to us. That does not mean that the rights of this Government are being trampled on, because it is not at all clear to me that the Commonwealth Government has said, "We will provide money for electrification provided it is the Christie Downs rail spur". That decision is one that the State Government

has made. It may well have been the line out to the electoral district represented by the member for Elizabeth; or it may well have been the Port line or the one up into the Hills, which I take it is occasionally patronized by some people from the Bragg District. That decision was not foisted on this Government: it was made by the State Government.

The Commonwealth provides the money for electrification, and the State Government determines the priorities for electrification. That, to me, does not suggest a precipitate end to the rights of the States.

Mr. Mathwin: Socialism!

Mr. HOPGOOD: It is co-operative federation, if I may put it that way, in a realistic late twentieth century sense and not in an unrealistic, hidebound, ideological, late nineteenth century sense, as has been preached by the member for Bragg and the member for Glenelg, the latter of whom has to get ideological by using labels and talking about Socialism. I guess he means centralism, another label which is empty of content until the speaker has put some sort of content into it. Let us have more than ideology from the other side, and let us have more than labelling from them.

I should like now to move on to some of the Loan projects that are occurring and will occur in my electoral district. Looking at the Loan Estimates, one gets the idea that the southern areas of the metropolitan area appear to be considerably favoured in this programme. I hope that this is true but I must say that much of it is a response to necessity. I have spoken previously in this House on the very rapid increase in population that is occurring in my district, and it is obvious that, with this type of population build-up in a section of the metropolitan area, it is necessary that many basic public facilities be provided in the area.

I should like to speak about one or two individual projects that are dealt with in the Loan programme. For example, I note the allocation of \$50,000 to upgrade the grounds at Seacliff Primary School and, because I know that the Minister of Works and the Minister of Education will follow closely this debate in *Hansard*, I should like to refer briefly to certain problems at this school. Being in the oldest part of my district, it is, like many old schools, limited as to the area of its grounds. It is bisected by a street that is blessed with the name of a former Premier of this State (I refer to Barwell Avenue) and, in addition, the Brighton council is reclaiming the nearby land, which the school hopes eventually to be able to use for school recreation facilities.

Mr. Mathwin: Now you'd better start being nice to me!

Mr. HOPGOOD: I am aware that the member for Glenelg is involved in this whole matter, as not long ago he was one of my constituents. I hope that, through co-operation by the council, the Minister and the parents of children at the school (and the parents are a very hard-working group), it will be possible to do more to provide recreation facilities for the student. These facilities are sadly lacking at present. There is one medium-size oval, but that is about all.

In addition, the council has had problems because Barwell Avenue bisects the general school area. The council's response to this problem has been to make Barwell Avenue a one-way street. However, the sign has been placed in such a position that many motorists are committed to making a turn before they see that the sign has been erected. Similarly, in the next street north, which is a one-way street for the traffic moving in the opposite direction, there is a difficulty, and I think there

is a need to reposition these signs or to put a part blockade across the streets so that motorists, particularly those who are not local residents, will know that these are one-way streets.

I shall deal now with the reference in the Loan Estimates to major works for which planning and design is proposed during 1973-74. I note that five primary schools in my district are listed, namely, Christie Downs, Hackam South, Hallett Cove, Morphett Vale West, and Port Noarlunga South. I am extremely pleased that Port Noarlunga South Primary School is in this list. I have approached the Minister several times about this project. In contrast to some other schools, this school will be placed in an area which has been populated for a long time but in which development has been fairly slow and scrappy. As a result, there has not really been sufficient development to merit providing the school. Therefore, the children have had to be driven by bus (often in an over-crowded bus) each day to the existing Port Noarlunga Primary School on the northern side of the Onkaparinga River.

This has caused various problems, because, with the best will in the world, the bus proprietors have not been able to provide the sort of service that the parents would like. With the opening of this school, which it seems from the Loan Estimates will be at the beginning of 1975, this problem confronting parents in the area will probably be eliminated, so I greatly welcome that decision.

Other projects listed, particularly the primary schools at Morphett Vale West and Hallett Cove, show the rate at which private building in these areas on new estates is expected to continue in the next year or so. These areas were mostly open paddocks even six months ago, yet it is expected that they will develop at such a rate as to merit the early provision of primary schools, and I think this again highlights the rate at which development is occurring in my area.

I want to refer now to sewerage, which is an issue in my district, as it is one of the remaining parts of the metropolitan area that has reasonably large unsewered areas. I think the Minister of Works has shown a welcome flexibility concerning sewerage projects in that area. Projects have been approved despite the fact that, technically, they have not quite reached the 70 per cent build-up that traditionally the Engineering and Water Supply Department has demanded. I think the Minister's approach has been reasonable and sensible.

In one area everyone may live in houses on sand, where there is good soakage and where a septic tank is able to continue to operate for many years. In another area, houses may be more or less sitting on bedrock, on Bay of Biscay soil or soil with a high clay content; a septic tank is installed one week, and it has to be pumped out the next week. Here there is a much more urgent need for proper sewage treatment. I think that the health aspect should be paramount and that this was one of the reasons for choosing the 70 per cent build-up in the first place. However, other factors come into the matter so far as the health aspect is concerned, and the absorption rate of liquid material into the soil is one of those factors.

Therefore, I welcome the flexibility that the Minister has shown in this matter. He has already made commitments regarding sewerage in the area, but the problem still remains where certain mains must be enlarged to take the outfall of sewage. I look forward to the time when most of these areas will be seweraged. Therefore, I do not share the concern of the member for Torrens about the increase in allocations for sewerage being almost completely for

the metropolitan, area. That is exactly where I want to see the provision of sewerage occur, preferably in the extreme southern part of the metropolitan area.

Mr. Nankivell: You're somewhat biased, aren't you?

Mr. HOPGOOD: For the benefit of the member for Mallee, I say that I am particularly biased. I note that the Loan Estimates include an allocation for the Industries Assistance Corporation. During the short time I have served on the Industries Development Committee, I have seen something of the work that this corporation does as a branch of the industrial development programme of the State Government. In fact, I think it true to say that, since the new members have come on to the committee, we have been very busy considering and approving or otherwise the various projects that have come to us from the Industries Assistance Corporation or from the Housing Trust under the Housing Improvement Act.

Mr. Keneally: Your predecessors set a high standard.

Mr. HOPGOOD: I think our predecessors did set a very high standard and I think it is true to say also that, speaking mainly for my colleagues rather than for myself, we are able to maintain that standard. I welcome the development that the Industries Assistance Corporation has been able to help and I welcome the amendment to the Act allowing the corporation to take up equity capital in businesses. We have had propositions for this very thing since we went on to the committee, and I think that amendment to the Act was wise, despite what some gentlemen opposite may say about it from an ideological point of view.

I also notice that there is a further allocation for the Coast Protection Board. This is a branch of Government which is as yet only in its infancy, yet I believe it has a most important future. It is a great pity that the whole of our coastline (and I refer here not only to the metropolitan coastline but to the coastline of the whole of the State) was not put under stringent planning controls many years ago. Had these controls been instituted, we would still have had a decent line of sand dunes along our metropolitan coast, and we would not have had a rash of commercial buildings going right down to the waterfront in many places—commercial buildings, which inevitably are harmed by storm damage, thereby provoking demands on Government for repairs when the inevitable storm damage occurs.

I have been told that building virtually on the beach front is taking place at Surfers Paradise despite the storm damage that occurred there only two or three years ago. This is sheer lunacy, and any Government which allows people to invest their money in this way should reconsider the position. I do not know who is responsible here (it may not be the State Government; it may be local government, and I believe it is). However, it goes further than this: I would be sufficiently flexible and pragmatic to believe that the Australian Government should step in at this point. I almost hesitate to say that, because the member for Bragg may tax me with again inviting the Australian Government to invade the prerogative of the State. I believe that, where any Government (be it this Government or any other Government) acts in this way, then other levels of Government should step in and try to repair the wrong that is being done.

Our coast has lost its scenic value at many points, because of lack of foresight of previous generations, and I hope that the Coast Protection Board will be able to show that it is imaginative, that it has teeth and that it is prepared to use these teeth, even against the sacred rights

of property, if indeed the outworkings of these sacred rights of property are such as to lead to the further deterioration of our coast.

I hope that we will get something a little more constructive from the Opposition that we have so far received. We have not really been told what the Opposition would do if it were in Government. I am aware that it is limited in this respect and that members opposite do not have the sort of research capabilities to enable them to set out a full programme (and nobody is asking them to do that).

Mr. Keneally: Nobody expects them to be in Government.

Mr. HOPGOOD: True, no one expects them to be in Government. Did I misinterpret the member for Torrens when on the one hand he lamented high Government spending leading to inflation, yet on the other hand he lamented that only the same amount was being spent on certain projects which meant, in turn, that there would be less development? Do we want more Government expenditure or less Government expenditure? Do we want more Government expenditure when it suits us to say so, or less Government expenditure when it suits us to say so? That seems to be the message that comes across.

Mr. Coumbe: More real work and physical achievements.

Mr. HOPGOOD: I do not quarrel with more work and more physical achievements, but if that is what is wanted there must be Government expenditure. We want some indication from the Opposition of exactly where it stands in these matters. The Leader said last year when it was announced that the deficit for which we had budgeted would fortunately not be realized, and we came out fairly close to an even Budget situation, that that meant the people had been taxed too highly. If that is the standard of economic comment that we are to get on these matters, then I am afraid that the Opposition, which is here to oppose (and we understand that) but also to assist in the government of this State, is not giving a great deal of assistance. I support the second reading.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): It was indeed refreshing to see that there is someone on the other side who is willing to get up and defend his Government, even though the task is difficult for him. The honourable member started out to say that he did not deny that he was pleased money for development was coming forth from the Australian Government, but that is a different tale from what we heard this time last year, when members opposite were expecting (and lauding) the change on the Commonwealth Treasury Benches that has eventually taken place.

The member for Mawson referred to the jewel in his Minister's crown: ugly and venomous is the toad who wears but a jewel in his head! The honourable member became extremely academic when referring to the progress in his own district and to the Christie Downs railway, which will be completed "much more rapidly if money is available than if it is not".

Mr. Coumbe: That is a truism.

Mr. RODDA: The honourable member then proceeded to chide my colleague the member for Bragg, the shadow Minister of Health. He could not deny the charge that my colleague made that there was a conspiracy between the Commonwealth Government and the State Labor Government to take over from the States the financial responsibility, hoping to make State Governments redundant. We waited for the honourable member to deny this, but a denial was not forthcoming.

Mr. Coumbe: You weren't surprised?

Mr. RODDA: So we live in fear and we proceed to do something about it. The Premier did not suddenly put

the sting in the tail, because the sting was protruding for a long time. I refer to the Treasurer's report as follows:

The Government's review of possible revenue receipts, including those which will result from the increased taxes and charges already announced, and its examination of departmental submissions for expenditure to carry out policy, to maintain and operate services, and to upgrade and extend them in some areas, indicate that a deficit is in prospect even before allowing for the costs of new wage and salary awards . . .

He informed the House that despite all of this he had no alternative but to budget for a deficit of about \$13,000,000. That is after taking into consideration the fact that water rates, electricity charges, pay-roll tax, harbor dues and other taxes have been increased. Indeed, I refer to that memorable evening when the Treasurer was waiting in the wings for a conference between the two Houses to be finished so as to decide the future of this Parliament regarding the franchise issue, which caused so much argument in this State. The Treasurer was waiting to catch a plane to wing his way to Canberra, only to find 24 hours later that these prognostications of which we heard so much last year were not correct, and he then talked about a deficit of about \$32,000,000.

Mr. Coumbe: He was an angry young man.

Mr. RODDA: Now, with \$13,000,000 being held back and about \$16,000,000 to be derived from increased charges, it appears that there must be some more "hidden goodies" in the legislation to be introduced by the Government.

However, I give the member for Mawson credit for having stood up for his Government. It was interesting to hear the Treasurer say that he would hold in reserve on Loan Account \$8,500,000 as the nest egg for a rainy day. I well remember the chiding that the Liberal Government received in 1968-70 for doing the same kind of thing.

Regarding the new housing agreement, the Treasurer sounded a note of warning that permanent building societies would be denied participation in the distribution of the special funds available for housing. So, the Government has a responsibility to ensure that the lag that could be caused is overcome. Regarding the provision of \$3,300,000 for afforestation and timber milling, I note that the establishment of 4 500 acres (1 821 ha) as the 1973 plantation is in progress. At present the demand for timber is so great that the mills are hard put to maintain a sufficient supply.

The Auditor-General's Report of last year states that the area planted in the 1971 season was 6 217 acres (2 516.02 ha), of which 75 per cent was in the South-East. In the 1972 season the area planted in the South-East was only 3 394 acres (1 373.54 ha). In view of the serious shortage of timber and the establishment of the new town of Monarto, we will obviously have to import timber to meet our needs. I chide the Government for not planning a bigger expansion. Only \$200,000 is provided for land purchases for afforestation, and at current land prices in the area only about 1 000 acres (404.7 ha) can be purchased for that sum. Instead of this downward trend, the Government should realize that land is available if it decides to go out and get it. The shortage of timber will be further aggravated if the Government is not very careful. The provision in the Loan Estimates for afforestation will not nearly cope with the demand for timber, the second biggest import into the country.

I commend the Government for making a feasibility study of stock-selling centres, and I stress the need for expanding the railway facilities for moving cattle from the South-East. People in the industry like to see stock

transported carefully, but there is no mention in the Loan Estimates of upgrading railway centres in the areas in which cattle trains will undoubtedly be needed. Regarding harbor accommodation, it is pleasing to see that a further \$2,550,000 is proposed for the bulk loading facilities at Port Lincoln. The Port Lincoln terminal, which was planned by the Hall Government in 1969, is coming to fruition and will provide a useful and much needed asset for the people of Eyre Peninsula. I hope that the project can be brought into full operation sooner than had been expected.

Regarding the provision of \$33,120,000 for waterworks and sewers, the Treasurer referred to the completion of the 86 miles (138.36 km) of branch main from Tailem Bend to Keith. That scheme includes 560 miles (901.26 km) of branch mains which were laid to serve farmlands in the area, involving 2 000 000 acres (809 400 ha). The other evening I was privileged to attend (with the member for Mallee, the Minister, and members of the committee that originally requested the main) a dinner that celebrated the completion of the main. However, I draw the Government's attention to the need for indirect services. The Engineering and Water Supply Department has said that, until it knows the output of the main, it is not willing to look at providing indirect services, but there are quite a number of productive farms that need water from indirect services. I point out to the Minister that this matter should be looked at quickly and carefully.

Regarding the provision of \$8,160,000 for country waterworks, it is pleasing to see that there is provision for further work on a 67 mile (107.83 km) main to connect the Tod trunk main near Lock with Kimba. People in this area set out 30 years ago to have their own system of dams, but the system proved inadequate, and the Lock-Kimba main will result in increased productivity in an important part of the State. I am sure that the member for Eyre is pleased that better facilities are being provided for the area, and I share his pleasure.

Regarding country sewerage, in my district much has been said about water pollution. Although some country areas will be sewered, nothing is said in the Treasurer's second reading explanation about unsewered towns in the South-East. The member for Mount Gambier and I were privileged to attend the meeting at which the Minister of Works met responsible people from the South-East to put forward the Government's policy concerning water control in those areas. I am disappointed that no allocation has been made to sewer some towns, as this lack may aggravate water pollution in that important part of the State. An increased amount seems to have been allocated for spending on schools, but we must bear in mind that the Commonwealth Government will take over some of this responsibility with a reduction being made in moneys appropriated by the Commonwealth Government.

I draw the Minister's attention to the needs of two major schools in my district. The Lucindale Area School is the last on the line in the Victoria District, but it serves an important area. The school building has outlived its usefulness, but this school is not referred to in the list shown in the schedule, and I draw the Minister's attention to its special needs. The Naracoorte High School, set in ideal surroundings (probably some of the most scenic for a school in the State), has suffered from many privations recently, not the least being the overcrowded staff room. This is being re-arranged, so that I hope that disadvantages to the teachers at this centre will disappear before the end of the year. I hope that in

this financial year the main school building, which was constructed about 17 years ago, will be completed.

The references to the Agriculture Department proposed buildings disappoint me. The appropriation for buildings for the department totals \$265,000, and this amount is in keeping with the 1 per cent appropriation last year on revenue for agriculture generally. It seems that this is still regarded as the Cinderella industry. However, both the State Government and the Commonwealth Government will benefit from additional taxation that the Commonwealth Government will receive from extra production. Perhaps this added return should cause the Government to consider a much greater appropriation than the present one for works at agricultural research centres throughout the State. The Struan Regional Research Centre in my district has had a miserable \$10,000 granted to it. It had been announced that the centre would be moved from Naracoorte to Struan and that there would be courses for farmers to attend each day and inservice courses for young and old farmers, but it may be some time before this scheme can be implemented.

An amount of \$1,200,000 is provided for the redevelopment of Parliament House, the total cost of the project being \$1,720,000. The work is to be undertaken progressively, and major disruptive activities will be carried out during the summer adjournments in the next two years. Parliament House has become inadequate as a home for the Government and for the working of Parliament in this State. When my Party was in office we considered two schemes, the first costing about \$2,500,000. The other, more elaborate, would have cost about \$6,000,000, and was to provide an additional tower on the north-west corner to blend in with the festival theatre. That scheme has been scrapped, because I think the Government feared what might be the consequences of its spending so much money on Parliament House.

The number of members will probably increase, as I consider that State Parliaments will exist for a long time. I endorse the policy of placing members' offices in their districts, but adequate facilities should be available in Parliament House. The only way to provide these facilities is by a more grandiose scheme than that proposed at present. I believe that the many people who serve members, such as the *Hansard* staff, journalists, and others, must be provided with facilities. I favour the construction of a non-members' bar in Parliament House. At present, if I wish to have a drink with a member of the *Advertiser* or the *Hansard* staffs, we have to go outside to a hotel, but in other Parliaments we would be able to visit the non-members' bar and discuss any matters to which I wished to refer. I believe that this expenditure would not be extravagant, but would provide a needed facility. This site is crammed, and perhaps our forefathers did not have the foresight to take up a large piece of land so that we could now have adequate facilities. I believe that the present plans do not go far enough. Although we were banished from office before we could implement our scheme. I accepted the grandiose plan, and was willing to argue with people in my district to show that it would provide an adequate home for our Parliamentarians.

It is interesting to note the references to Monarto, and I appreciate the need for this town. The Government awaits special contributions from the Commonwealth Government and information about the conditions under which the contributions will be made. It is interesting to read that the Government has appointed the present Agent-General to be the big chief sitting bull. I think he is called the grand ram at large but, if anyone can make a go of

Monarto, Ray Taylor is the man to do it. I will follow the development of Monarto with interest. It will be free of pollution on the other side of the ranges.

I have been approached by some of my constituents who have said that Parliament House should be transferred to Monarto, but I do not think that that is a good suggestion. No doubt it would suit the Deputy Speaker, the Minister of Works and me. The allocation of money this year is a start in the right direction, because the biggest journeys start with the smallest steps. The nitty gritty of this Bill relates to the capital works that will make the State progress: it is the blueprint setting out what the Government's capital works will be in the following year. I should have been pleased if the Government member who took up the cudgels on behalf of his Ministry had answered the question asked by the member for Bragg about the conspiracy between the two Governments. As he did not reply, he left us all wondering. In supporting the Bill, I await further developments.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): When one studies the Loan Estimates and the subsequent press reports, one suddenly realizes how dishonest the Government really is. In his second reading explanation, the Treasurer said that the expenditure proposals in the schedule aggregated \$157,480,000 which, added to the \$32,750,000 allocated for welfare housing under the new agreement between the States and the Australian Government, gave a total proposed expenditure of \$190,230,000, compared to \$164,853,000 in 1972-73 (the latter sum includes expenditure on a special loan of \$500,000 for housing). When one looks at the 1972-73 Loan Estimates, one finds that the \$30,000,000 allocated for housing in that year was not included. In actual fact, the sum for 1972-73 was \$194,352,755. Compared to the \$190,230,000 this financial year, there is an overall decline in Loan Estimates expenditure of \$4,122,755.

The Government was willing to allow a statement to appear in the press that it had budgeted for a record \$190,230,000 works programme in the 1973-74 financial year, to be financed through money provided by the Commonwealth Government, and that a record \$32,750,000 had been allocated for housing. The Government should come clean and tell the people what it is doing. Why does the Government not come clean and say that the cash loan to be raised this financial year is \$79,587,000 compared to \$100,544,000 in 1972-73 and that the interest rate of about 6 per cent will add \$4,775,220 to the Revenue Account, to be repaid over a 53-year term as has been the practice in the past? That will work out at a repayment of \$1,501,641 a year, and the Revenue Account will be charged \$6,276,861. If one studies the documents, one will see that the Treasurer has warned the citizens of South Australia that they could be faced with a Revenue Budget deficit of \$13,000,000.

Mr. Gunn: The Government is incompetent.

Mr. BECKER: Yes, and the incompetency of the Cabinet and the Treasurer is now coming home to roost. The Government must be guided by its Treasury officials as any normal Government would be, but it can override anything they advise. We find that South Australia will be \$13,000,000 down the drain. The member for Mawson said that the Opposition had said little in this debate, because it did not know what its policy was. As I believe that there should be open government, I should be grateful if the Government would allow the Opposition to have access to the Treasury so that its members could talk with Treasury officials and study Treasury documents in order to ascertain details of the Government's forward

planning and commitments. The Opposition would like to know what the Government's priorities are, because it does not consider that they are in the right order. A vital part of the Opposition's policy is the setting of priorities. If the Government believes in open government, I challenge it to allow Opposition members to talk with Treasury officials who, after all, are employed by the State and who are paid out of the taxpayers' money.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You ought to demonstrate that you can read documents before you do that.

Mr. BECKER: The North Sydney economist has his own views and I have mine; he is a theorist, and I am practical.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You have overlooked \$30,000,000; it's in front of you.

Mr. BECKER: The Minister should not worry about that. The Government should allow Opposition members entree into the Treasury so that they could examine certain documents.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Would you want Treasury officers to educate you?

Mr. BECKER: The simple fact is that the Opposition should be entitled to study the workings of the Treasury. It is all well and good for the Government to sit pat and throw all the rubbish it likes, but it will lose ground eventually. The Opposition, which should be able to represent the public equally as well as the Government does, is entitled to have more evidence of the Government's belief in open government and of its performance.

Mr. Coumbe: Do you think they'd be game?

Mr. BECKER: I do not think that the present Government would welcome open government, because we might discover certain things that would be embarrassing to it. It is always interesting to hear the Treasurer say that the works programme on education always exceeds the Budget, and I think the figure in question this year is \$6,470,000. We know about how much a school building costs, but nowhere in the document is the final cost of each individual school building or addition given. All we get is a rough idea of what will happen in the next financial year. I should like to see the actual figures; some revealing results would come from them. The exact figures are not contained in the Auditor-General's Report for any particular school.

We are never told the exact cost, so I can only observe from this that the \$6,470,000 may have built a few more classrooms or provided for a few more extensions; but it could also mean that the original estimates were exceeded considerably. We know what happened on the North Esplanade in relation to the beach shore walling there, when the estimated cost was \$90,000 and the actual expenditure was \$150,000. So these things can happen, sometimes through no-one's fault. I return to the Treasurer's explanation of the Bill, in which he said:

It is clear that we have no alternative but to budget for a significant deficit, probably of about \$13,000,000.

A very responsible Government! I now refer to the *Advertiser* of July 5, where we see:

Water rates up 13.6 per cent. Electricity is next. Water rates and electricity charges are going up. And other increases for services will follow. This was announced yesterday by the Premier (Mr. Dunstan). Mr. Dunstan said the Government would: increase water rates, raise the electricity levy, lift hospital fees, levy higher port charges. And he indicated worse was yet to come in the wake of last week's Premiers' Conference. The 1 per cent increase in payroll tax announced immediately after the conference will raise \$8,250,000 in 1973-74—

Mr. Mathwin: It follows the policy of Socialist Governments in high taxation—

Mr. BECKER: The McMahon Liberal Government gave this State and other States these powers and I predicted what the States would do, and we know that pressure was exerted by the South Australian, Western Australian and Tasmanian Governments to increase the payroll tax. We can see what is to come: with the high rate of inflation, this will exceed \$8,250,000—it will probably come close to \$10,000,000. The States will grab as much as they can in this financial year.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hanson is making this speech. There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber and I ask members on both sides to assist me. The member for Hanson.

Mr. Mathwin: If the Government—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Glenelg will be dealt with if he persistently ignores the Chair. I warn the honourable member.

Mr. BECKER: We also note in the Treasurer's remarks about housing the additional amount of money that will be spent on housing in this financial year, and it is encouraging—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BECKER: —to see that there is a figure of about \$32,750,000 this year, an increase of 9.2 per cent on last year's figure. The housing situation in this State, and particularly housing provided by the Housing Trust, has become embarrassing. We have no emergency housing whatsoever. We have a waiting list of about 31 years for people wanting rental housing accommodation, and those people wishing to purchase houses have a wait of at least 12 months, and probably the biggest demand I now have would be from constituents endeavouring to obtain reasonable housing.

We hope that the Government and the Housing Trust will step up the programme of providing additional housing in those areas of the State where it is so urgently needed and where it has been disregarded during the last three years by the present Government. The Government must make a greater attack on the housing shortage for the benefit particularly of those people in the lower income groups. It is interesting to find in the Treasurer's explanation the following:

We have not received final advice yet as to what special funds may be available this year in areas such as urban transport improvements.

We know how before the Federal election the present Prime Minister made great promises of what he would do, how much he would provide for the States and how he was going to ensure that urban transport would be improved throughout the Commonwealth; but then we find that, after his Party is elected to Government and he becomes Prime Minister, the figure he promised the States has been cut almost in half, and at this late stage the State Governments do not know how much they will receive towards urban transport improvements. We have the promises and forward-planning statements on the electrification of the metropolitan railways, something that we on this side of the House would support. We hope a move can be made in that direction in this financial year.

I now turn to various subheadings in the Loan Estimates and come first to the South-Western Suburbs Drainage Scheme, where an additional \$900,000 has been provided to complete the whole scheme in this financial year. On behalf of my constituents I say "Thank goodness for that!" because this has been something that has interrupted at least one-third of my electoral district by reason of the tremendous amount of work involved. It is a scheme I have never supported and never will support because all we have done is to transport large volumes of water from

other suburbs into the Patawalonga Basin and, in doing so, we have created the filthiest cesspool and the most polluted waters in any metropolitan area of Adelaide. Any Government that will support that type of action should be ashamed of itself. Something must be done and the Government must act quickly either to control or to take some steps to prevent the pollution we are experiencing in the Patawalonga Basin, which is eventually washed out to sea and comes back on to the beaches, and at certain times and in certain weather conditions people can swim along West Beach and other beaches and find they are swimming in mud. If anyone can justify that type of scheme, which has cost the State and local government \$11,100,000, I shall be surprised. I know my constituents would be grateful if this scheme could be completed quickly. It is all very well to say that this Government was not in power when the scheme was started, but it was in Opposition and we did not hear too many strong cries then against the proposal.

Urban drainage is important. In Glenelg and parts of West Torrens that were established many years ago (probably before the turn of the century) the drainage systems are not now adequate. They are still subject to much flooding from what is now recognized as normal winter rain. I know that the councils in my area are endeavouring to improve their floodwater drainage systems to cope with present-day needs, and the provision of funds in the shape of a \$1 for \$1 subsidy would be of great assistance to them. This is still a tremendous strain on council resources. Unfortunately, it is a part of progress that money must be spent in this way. When we allow high-rise development in normal residential areas, this adds to floodwater problems.

It is interesting to note that a further allocation of \$1,638,000 is being provided this financial year to continue work on the new trunk main from Darlington to Port Adelaide. Probably one of my first complaints when I became a member of this House was about the poor water pressure along the coast and in suburbs as far as $\frac{3}{4}$ mile (1.2 km) inland. This main will improve the water pressure. However, it is a large main and is causing much disruption to the areas affected during construction. I understand that the main will come down Gordon Street, across Anzac Highway, into Adelphi Terrace, under the Patawalonga Lake, and into Military Road.

A disappointing feature of the whole problem of laying this main is that the worst road that it will run under is Military Road at West Beach. The Henley and Grange council and the Highways Department do not seem to be able to take any action between now and the time of laying the main to repair the road. The road between West Beach Road and Burbridge Road is the worst in the metropolitan area and should be rebuilt. However, that work is being delayed because of the projected laying of the main. One would have thought that the department would lay the main on that strip of road and would then completely rebuild the road. However, work will start at the Anzac Highway end and proceed along Adelphi Terrace, and this will affect the tourist trade during the summer period. A large trench will be dug down the centre of the highway, affecting local business, and it will be a general nuisance in the middle of the tourist season.

We have become accustomed to work being done in this way in our area in the past four or five years. Where the main goes through Gordon Street and from my district into the District of Glenelg, some trees will have to be removed. This has been kept hush hush, but it has been the subject of inter-departmental memoranda. It has been

said that the trees will not be touched until necessary. Beautiful Norfolk Island pine trees will have to be knocked down. It will be interesting to see which will be the first tree removed for this main and how its removal can be justified.

A further \$1,009,000 is proposed for the Glenelg treatment works. Initial provision of \$3,809,000 for the works was approved by the Liberal Government that was in office before the present Government came to office, and the provision now made should bring this work to completion. The idea is to increase the capacity of the treatment works to serve an additional 75 000 persons, to a total population of 250 000. A big problem is caused at the works, particularly at this time of year, by the floodwaters that go into the sewerage system and consequently into the sewerage works. Somehow and at some future time action must be taken to prevent floodwaters from running into the sewerage system and overloading the treatment works. Regardless of the amount of money that will be spent to upgrade the works, floodwaters from house roofs enter the sewerage system and cause the problem.

I am disappointed that St. Leonards Primary School is not included on the list of additions and project works at schools and that no statement is made about the future of the Camden Primary School. One would have thought that, after the visit by the Minister there last year and after various discussions, Camden Primary School would be high on the list and would be included here. I will pursue this matter later. Perhaps the Minister has forgotten, but Camden Primary School should have been included and I should like to know what has happened. The open unit at St. Leonards Primary School is also not included.

It seems to me that getting a school on the list of proposed works is about as hard as getting into the State cricket team. Once one gets into the team, it is hard to get out of it, but it is extremely difficult to get in in the first place. With schools, it seems that we must run the gauntlet of whether the Government considers it advantageous to have the school where it is sought, but I hope that that is not the position in my district.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That is rubbish and an insult to the officers of the Education Department.

Mr. BECKER: No. I am challenging the Minister, who knows as well as I do that action, must be taken about the Camden Primary School, but nothing has been done in the past few years. We were under the impression that it would be given top priority, but it is not being considered. It will take an election to get the school there.

The progress made with the Government Printing Office at Netley is encouraging. The initial problem about pylons having to be pulled down has been solved, I understand, and the project is now going ahead. I think it will be a printing office of which we can be proud. When it is completed, the present Government Printing Office at the rear of Parliament House will be demolished and we will not have to park our motor cars a long way down the road. I do not think we can continue to enjoy the luxury of parking our cars on North Terrace in front of Parliament House. I consider that, in the interests of road safety, it is not desirable for members to angle-park their cars there, and action should be taken about this matter. The Loan Estimates do not mention the Glenelg trams and the Government does not seem keen to replace some of those old cars. Although they have been refurbished, they do not give a good ride and they are fairly uncomfortable for a man as tall as I, at 6ft. 3in. (1.8 m). There is nowhere to put my knees, except behind my ears.

Mr. Keneally: Why not ride a bike?

Mr. BECKER: When one rides a bike from Glenelg to the city, one understands the pollution problems. Even when the petrol strike was on, the pollution was bad.

Mr. Langley: There's pollution in this speech, too.

Mr. BECKER: The member for Unley is an expert on pollution of most kinds and I will be interested to hear his contribution to the debate. I know that he is most concerned for the future progress and development of South Australia, and his comments will be listened to by members on this side!

Mr. Payne: He's done more for South Australia than you have.

Mr. BECKER: He has played Test cricket, and I cannot hope to do that. He was a fairly good wicketkeeper and not much got past him. I think his success in that regard has been recognized by the people of this State, particularly those in his district.

Mr. Mathwin: Do you think he would be a good Minister of Sport?

The SPEAKER: There is no reference in the Loan Estimates to the member for Unley.

Mr. BECKER: I think that any new portfolio or department dealing with sport would come under the Minister of Education. The Coast Protection Board is allocated \$450,000 in the Loan Estimates. I should have liked to see the board allocated an increased amount, because I know the protection and preservation of our foreshore is going to cost millions of dollars, and \$450,000 is not all that much. True, it is better than nothing and I am grateful as are many of my constituents, because we have had \$150,000 spent on the foreshore wall at Glenelg. This wall has stood up to the winter's seas and, if it makes the grade during the next two months (in addition to the 30 000 tons (30 480 t) of sand deposited six weeks ago), we will have a first-class beach. As another 20 000 tons (20 320 t) is to be removed from the boat haven entrance and also deposited there, it will be a beach of which we can be justly proud.

Of course, some of the \$450,000 will have to be spent on beaches in other areas, namely, Henley, Glenelg, Brighton and Somerton, and not before time. Yet, there is one strip of foreshore that badly needs protection, north of Anderson Avenue towards West Beach. The Engineering and Water Supply Department has experimented with a small stone wall, which has proved somewhat successful. However, the only way we can protect that last area of our sandhills in the West Beach area is to construct a wall similar to that which we have on the North Esplanade. This will be considerably longer than the North Esplanade beach and could cost about \$250,000, and perhaps we will see this in the next financial year, as I hope that the board has plans in hand to commence work there. Part of the protection of that area will involve the pipes from the sewage treatment works. The sand covering these outlet pipes has been severely eroded and several fractures have occurred along the joints in the pipes, and much work must be carried out to protect these pipes. Therefore, the greatest danger in the area of the Glenelg treatment works is that this foreshore area will be unprotected, and something must be done about it.

The sum of \$500,000 is provided for transport research, and I should like to know what we will get from that sum. The Minister of Transport has again decided to go overseas and has taken one or two of his departmental officers with him. I do not begrudge the Minister or public servants from continually travelling to overseas countries to investigate and collate as much information as they can.

Indeed, I believe that our public servants should be given greater opportunity to travel to overseas countries, no matter what area they are involved in.

Transport in South Australia is in a real mess, and the public transport service is not good enough. We have old-fashioned and uncomfortable trams, and we have huge buses which are not a credit to our transport system. Further, our railways need improving and, no matter what we do, we must come up with a system now that will overcome our transport problems of the next three to five years, yet at the same time we must consider and implement a transport system sufficient to meet the needs of the next 30 years. The only way that will be done is to seek and find out ways and means to overcome transport problems. Interlinked with the problem of urban transport is the problem of road planning. No-one likes to see the creation of freeways or to see the metropolitan area cut up by them. Adelaide may need freeways, but it may be better off with a city ring route and an outer ring route system through the metropolitan area. Whatever is done, we must send public servants overseas in order to bring back ideas for the ultimate means of providing satisfactory public transport in the metropolitan area.

The motor vehicle will never be replaced. It will always be our main mode of transport, and we must therefore have a good road system, and we must have all other facilities that go hand in hand with it. The history of the previous Commonwealth Liberal Government proved that it was an extremely generous Government to this State, especially in the last few years. We find now that we have a situation where the Treasurer is critical of his own colleagues in Canberra. He is playing a cunning game and is trying to shelve the problems of this State on to the Australian Government, the Commonwealth Government, the national Government, or whatever name one cares to call it. Whatever it is now, it will be different tomorrow.

The Liberal Party has always endeavoured to keep taxes at a level the community can afford. It has always carried out a works programme that meets 'with a simple common-sense approach, and so will my Party when it returns to the Treasury beaches after the next State election. I support the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I support the Bill and, as I mentioned last year, I think we had a general discussion on it, but unlike the situation which surrounds the Budget, we have no influence on how the funds are to be spent, it being just a matter of our commenting on the individual lines. This has always amazed me because, if one item is left out, an entirely new line can replace it, so we do not have much chance to debate the Loan Estimates in depth. There should also be opportunity for Parliament to discuss on certain occasions reports of the Public Works Committee. I refer to one case in particular where a minority report was submitted regarding the closure of the Semaphore railway line. I believe that that matter should have been debated in Parliament when there was a difference of opinion on the committee on what should be done, because those who submitted the minority report had no opportunity in Parliament—

Mr. Jennings: You could have raised it here.

Mr. McANANEY: I was informed by the Clerk that I could not do so. Whether I was misled or not, I do not know.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not make any reference to an officer of Parliament.

Mr. McANANEY: I was advised by a leading authority that I could not do anything about it. We are talking in generalities in dealing with the Loan Estimates. The

Treasurer has referred to the Keynesian theory regarding the expenditure of money, and for a State Treasurer during conditions of over-employment in South Australia, when it is difficult to obtain materials, not to put something away in the kitty for the day when it is needed is indeed strange. The Treasurer made a public statement that he had to spend money to avoid taxation, yet in the same breath he said that he had to increase taxes to take it away from other people. He is robbing Peter to pay Paul and is not achieving anything. He made that public statement a month or two ago, but he now says he will budget for a deficit when, in these circumstances, it is the wrong thing to do in the interests of the community.

I cannot find any reference in the Treasurer's second reading explanation to a new building for the Emergency Fire Services. Some time ago the Minister of Agriculture assured us that he had received a report on the matter and that additional funds would be made available so that a new building could be built at Keswick. The E.F.S. has done so much good work at such little cost to the South Australian community that it is high time it had a home of its own. The Minister of Transport frequently says that the Railways Department is starved of finance, but in these Loan Estimates \$9,900,000 is provided for railway accommodation. Parliament has already approved the construction of a railway line from Port Stanvac to Christie Downs. If funds are made available, the line may be electrified, but I do not believe that that will speed up travel on the line. People will be induced to use the railway service only if they can reach Adelaide more quickly by rail than by car, and there would have to be a satisfactory means of taking them from the rail terminal to their place of employment.

I hope the Minister of Transport returns from overseas with suggestions that are better than those with which he returned after his previous overseas visit. Last time he came back with the dial-a-bus proposal, which all the experts, including Pak-Poy and Associates, said would not work. If the Minister cannot come back with something better than that, we should ask the Commonwealth Minister for Immigration (Mr. Grassby) to debar him from returning to this country, so that a new Minister can attempt to solve the transport problems of South Australia. As soon as possible we must have a fast north-south route, be it a rail route or a bus route. There must be an expressway type of service with no cross-overs, so that people using it can reach a destination more quickly than they could reach it by car. It has been suggested that rail transport should be free, but people would not use it even then if it meant inconvenience for them.

In the past the Loan Estimates stated how many houses were being built and how many were planned, but I cannot see any such figures in these Loan Estimates. The Housing Trust has given many excuses why, after a long time, there are 21 houses in Mount Barker almost completed and people are waiting to move into them but very little work is being done on them now. Only a few years ago a common effluent scheme was suggested, but now some authorities are saying that there must be a sewerage system. There must be better co-ordination between departments. The Housing Trust has done a fine job in the past, but there should be an investigation into the time taken to complete houses, during which time capital is lying idle.

I am glad to see that work is proceeding on the construction of a container ship terminal at Outer Harbor; when that project is completed, we will attract more shipping here. Such projects incur losses for a number of years and, from the short-term viewpoint, it may be

better to send containers through Melbourne but, from the long-term viewpoint, it is necessary to have a container ship terminal here. I shall have more to say during the Committee stage, but at this stage I support the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. HALL (Goyder): I do not want to say much in this debate because I do not want to add to the great nothingness contributed by previous speakers.

Mr. Nankivell: What do you think—

Mr. HALL: The Southern District by-election held last Saturday did not give the honourable member any hope for the future. He has only two more sets of Loan Estimates to go, so I advise him to speak to these Loan Estimates while he is still a member of the Party which represents so little of the community. However, let us get away from the parochial attitude of the honourable member to the Loan Estimates. In his second reading explanation the Treasurer said:

The present Australian Government wishes to influence in a direct way the volume of funds going to house construction and finance, the conditions under which the funds are employed and the kinds of people to be assisted by these special funds.

What a turnabout this is in Commonwealth Government policy, and it is the first real instance in the document that has concerned this State since the accession of Labor to Government in Canberra of the real effective move to centralism in Australia. Before this, States could accept the Loan allocation and apportion it for social housing as they desired. It was a flexibility that I should have thought the State Governments were endowed with the common sense to use, so that they could make a choice. I would assume that every Government would have properly considered the Treasurer's recommendation concerning the portion of the Loan Estimates that that Government wanted to give to housing, but now the Commonwealth Government has stated, "You will take the amounts for housing that we say you can have." Why is the Commonwealth Government insisting that it will apportion the amounts that the States may have for their housing programmes? I believe that all States have benefited from the flexibility that they have had in the past, and South Australia in particular has chosen to make a large percentage of its Loan funds available for social housing. That was a programme initiated by a non-Labor Government in South Australia and followed by the present Government. It must be somewhat demoralizing to the Treasurer of this State (who belongs to the same political Party as the Commonwealth Prime Minister and Treasurer) to read this document to the House in these terms, because, for the first time for many years, he is receiving absolute dictation as to what amount he can spend on housing in this State. The Treasurer stated:

The present Australian Government wishes to influence in a direct way the volume of funds going to house construction and finance, the conditions under which the funds are employed ...

That would take a very important power from this House and this Government. The humiliation is even more bitter when one reads on page 6 the sentence inserted by the Treasurer, who stated:

Needless to say, South Australia cannot expect in future years an increase in new money for works programmes as great as the increase of over 15 per cent secured this year.

He also stated:

It is appropriate to mention that, while our housing increase was not as great as in some other States and our works increase was greater than in some other States, our share of aggregate funds was very close to the share we have had in recent years.

From that sentence one realizes that the Treasurer no longer has the choice to say what his proportion will be. If people in this State, because of some peculiarity of geographical position or of Government administration, require a higher percentage of Loan funds to be devoted to housing, the Government cannot answer their call.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That doesn't follow.

Mr. HALL: Of course it does, and the Minister knows it. The Minister is not listening to what his Leader and Treasurer has said, and, as I have read it twice, I shall not repeat it. He can read it in *Hansard*. The Treasurer said that the Commonwealth Minister wants to control it all: either the Treasurer means it or he does not mean it, but the conditions and the amounts have been laid down. The Minister cannot get around that point.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Yes I can.

Mr. HALL: The Minister is pretty slippery.

Mr. Venning: Is he your friend?

Mr. HALL: The honourable member is introducing politics. If he insists on doing that and follows his Leader with the myth that the Labor Party supported my Party at the Southern by-election last weekend, he will go to his own demise much more quickly, because the facts of the weekend are that his Party, which received 12 500 votes at the previous by-election received only 9 000 this time.

The SPEAKER: Order! We are debating the Loan Estimates. The honourable member for Goyder.

Mr. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was about to refer, before being obstructed by the member for Rocky River (who also has only two more Loan Estimates debates in this House), to the point concerning the Commonwealth Government's support for tertiary education. During the years whilst the Labor Party was in Opposition, it shamelessly used the education needs of this State for its political benefit, and did not care to what extremes it went or how it used the teaching profession or the children's needs for its political benefit.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: No.

Mr. HALL: The Minister of Education was the greatest stirrer in this matter that South Australia has ever known. The great cry was "Commonwealth money for education", so that the load would be taken off the State Budget and Loan Estimates and this State could do more. However, in his report the Treasurer stated:

The Australian Government has offered to take over responsibility for the financing of tertiary education from January 1, 1974...

That is a good statement, and one would think as a citizen of this State that we would be able to do many other things in this community because the Commonwealth Government has assumed responsibility for financing tertiary education. However, the Treasurer then added:

...on condition that reductions be made to State general purpose revenue grants and Loan allocations corresponding to the relief given to Revenue and Loan Budgets from the take-over.

That is all it has been, a take-over of responsibility and function. That is the move, but the Minister of Education will not say anything about that. The States will be no better off financially if the Commonwealth Government takes over tertiary education, because it will be taking away money that the States would otherwise have received. It is only another step towards centralism by a Labor Government, and the figures prove it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Askin and the others agreed to it.

Mr. HALL: All the more silly they are to accept it. One thing that Whitlam has got is tremendous public relations, and that goes back to his Party first coming to

office when it picked up all the notable press people in Canberra so that they could work on behalf of the Labor Party. I believe that the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security will spend about \$250,000 of taxpayers' money in promoting the national health scheme.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Loan Estimates are being considered by the House. The honourable member for Goyder.

Mr. HALL: I draw to the Minister's attention this most important part of the Treasurer's address, as it shows how false is the claim that relief will be afforded to the State, and how false has been the advocacy of the Minister of Education during the years of stirring the South Australian community. The Labor Government is now in office here not only because of that activity but it will be in office for a longer period because of the ineffectiveness of those who sit opposite. However, it obtained office first because of this type of stirring. The Government knows that the States are having taken from them all the money they would otherwise have received from the Commonwealth in revenue and loans. These Loan Estimates carry on the work of the Under Treasurer who has advised the Government over the years. The Loan programmes are continuous and not easily altered, and there is not much flexibility.

I have referred to the major issues as I see them: the major changes in policy should interest the House and not the parochial interests of a bridge in someone's district. When the first line is debated we should deal with policy matters and major differences of the operation of the Loan Account, where we are to obtain money, how it is to be disbursed, and who controls the disbursement. I have referred to two major changes not only for this year but for many years, and they show the sham of Labor advocacy in the past concerning education, and Labor's policy, both State and Commonwealth, to aggregate all power in Canberra.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): If the member for Goyder had been in the Chamber and had listened to the remarks of the member for Bragg, he would not have made the comments he made. The member for Bragg and the member for Torrens clearly outlined the Opposition's attitude and pointed out the many anomalies in the Loan Estimates.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Are you suggesting that other speakers did not do that?

Mr. GUNN: No. What is noteworthy is the lack of interest that Government members have taken in the debate. They are willing to come into the Chamber and be yes men to the front bench, but they are not interested in or do not know what is contained in these Estimates.

Mr. Coumbe: I wonder how many of them have read them.

Dr. Tonkin: They are not allowed to speak.

Mr. GUNN: That is right. When one honourable member was speaking, some Government members were holding a subcommittee meeting. Only five of them were in the Chamber, and the member for Glenelg got into trouble, but that is by the way. When reading the document, the first two items that drew my attention were matters which affect my district, namely, the Kimba main and the Eyre Highway. They would not have reached their present stage if it had not been for the generous assistance of a former Liberal and Country Party Government in Canberra.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Ha, ha!

Mr. GUNN: It is all right for the Minister of Education to laugh.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I am laughing at your peculiar view of history.

Mr. GUNN: It was the McMahon Government that provided the funds for the Kimba main after the Hon. Mr. Whyte and I went to Canberra and spoke with the Prime Minister.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GUNN: It is all very well for the Minister to laugh. We could have told him if he was interested. We told the Treasurer that we believed that the funds would be made available. Mr. Wallace, the friend of the member for Stuart, was talking nonsense. We were confident, after speaking with the Minister for National Development (then Mr. Swartz), that if the State Government provided the necessary information (and we assured the Minister our information was correct), the money would be provided. However, it took many months for the State Government to provide it, but when it provided the information the money was forthcoming.

Mr. Keneally: You provided second-hand information after Mr. Wallace had provided information.

Mr. GUNN: That is nonsense: when we spoke to the Minister and the Secretary of his department, they were amazed at the information we gave them. It is all right for Government members to laugh. The member for Grey certainly did not provide the information: all he did was criticize the L.C.L. Government.

Dr. Eastick: It's results that count: we received \$2,100,000.

Mr. GUNN: When the water was turned on in the Kimba main, the Minister of Works saw fit not to be present.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I think you and Mr. Whyte were grandstanding.

Mr. GUNN: I have already covered that topic. The other project that drew my attention was the Eyre Highway, which is one of the most important projects in my district. I believe that, if the McMahon Government had not provided the funds, the highway would have been left by the wayside. In view of the way in which the Commonwealth Government is spending money, it would not even have considered the Eyre Highway project. The only places in which the Commonwealth Government is interested in spending money is in the western suburbs of Melbourne and the western suburbs of Sydney; it is not interested in the other parts of Australia, which it says do not count.

Mr. Keneally: Last year you said that the Commonwealth had no responsibility and that the State should provide the money.

Mr. GUNN: The member for Stuart should read what I said last year. I am not interested in his illogical interjections. If he is interested in the debate, why does he not take part in it instead of being a yes man for the Government?

Mr. Keneally: So many have made fools of themselves already.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member can speak for himself. I wish to canvass only two areas, namely, this Government's attitude and the Commonwealth Government's attitude towards housing in this State. I am well aware of the attitude of the present Commonwealth Government, which does not want to encourage people to own their own houses; it has the typical Socialist idea that they should be encouraged to rent, so that all their lives they will pay rent and, after 20 or 30 years, they will not own their own houses. That is a step in the wrong direction, because people should be encouraged to own a little piece of Australia and have something to be proud of, instead of having the Socialist idea that people

should not own anything. Under the present agreement the State Government has accepted from the Commonwealth Government, at least 30 per cent of the money the Commonwealth has provided must be spent on rental accommodation. However, I believe that the Government should encourage at least 75 per cent or 80 per cent or 90 per cent of the money to be spent on the purchase of houses. Why should people be encouraged to rent houses? If the Government provides money cheaply, it should be used by people to purchase their own houses.

Mr. Duncan: Would you leave them in the streets?

Mr. GUNN: I would not do anything of the kind; that has never been my Party's policy. The honourable member should be realistic. Why encourage people to pay rent for 30 or 40 years when instead they could use the money to pay off their own houses and have an asset at the end of that time? It is complete nonsense to advance the argument that the member for Elizabeth has put forward about people living in the streets. My Party has a proud record on housing. The Playford Government established the low-deposit housing scheme.

Mr. Keneally: Slum housing.

Mr. GUNN: Nonsense. The only Government to propose slum housing is the present Government in its proposals for houses on the transportation corridors.

Mr. Duncan: When did the Dunstan Government advocate that? You are talking rubbish.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member has not read his own Government's policy speech. He is talking rubbish. Almost \$10,000,000 is allocated for railway accommodation. One would expect that, before that money was spent or programmes were drawn up, the Government would get a return on the capital. If one examines railway operations one is made fully aware of the financial position of the railways. One is amazed at the Government's spending this large sum and not taking action to rectify a serious situation. I have heard the Minister of Transport criticize primary producers on Eyre Peninsula for not using the railways.

Mr. Keneally: Are you going to make some recommendations?

Mr. GUNN: I will have one or two suggestions to put forward if the honourable member will just listen.

Mr. Coumbe: You always try to be positive.

Mr. GUNN: I do.

Mr. Jennings: As you have only a few ideas you don't want to throw them around, because they must last you for a long time.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member is irresponsible. When the Minister arrives back from his five or six weeks overseas trip, I hope he will have something constructive to put to the House, because, in the three years in which I have been a member, he has not made any progress towards improving the railways or the State's transport system: all he has done is abuse anyone who has made any constructive comments about his department. I suggest to the Government and the Minister that, if they want people to use the railways, they must provide adequate facilities and services. The Premier should dismiss the Minister if he does not see to that, because he is completely incompetent and has failed to inform the House of these things. That is my first point.

Mr. Payne: Why did you wait until the Minister was away before saying that?

Mr. GUNN: It is not my fault that the Minister is away. The Treasurer introduced the Loan Estimates; we on this side did not choose the time. We are exercising our democratic right to take part in this debate. If the

Minister is not here, it is not our fault. I was endeavouring to make one or two comments about what the Railways Department could do. The Minister has threatened to close the railways on Eyre Peninsula. The first requirement surely is sensible facilities such as bulk superphosphate facilities at Kirton Point, similar to the facilities provided in the South-East. I know a superphosphate company provided facilities in the South-East, but at present only one company is supplying superphosphate in this State. If the Government wants to encourage the farmers and the rural community to use the railways, that is the first step to be taken, because people will not use the railway system to cart superphosphate at present: it just is not on.

People can get superphosphate carted by road and dumped in sheds on their farms without their having to touch it. These facilities are not available in the present railway trucks and a farmer would have to spend between \$1,000 and \$2,000 to provide himself with a truck. The Government took a positive step when it provided the hopper trucks in the South-East.

Mr. Venning: Who provided them?

Mr. GUNN: It financed that venture by charging an extra rate for all the wheat carried in those trucks. If the Government wants to recoup some of the costs outlaid in that respect, I do not think the rural community would mind having a similar system. The Minister should consider this, but, when I put a question to him about it, he merely wiped off the whole scheme; he would not even consider it.

Dr. Eastick: None of his other schemes has ever amounted to anything.

Mr. GUNN: No. There are many areas on Eyre

Peninsula where it pays people to by-pass silos.

Mr. Venning: If they replaced the Minister, whom would they put in his place?

Mr. GUNN: I leave that to the member for Rocky River; it could be anyone. I am endeavouring to point out to the Government that it will have seriously to consider reducing the freight differentials in many parts of Eyre Peninsula if it wants the farmers to continue to use the railways. The present system is inefficient, and the railways cannot compete with road transport. It is no good saying one thing and meaning another: the railways cannot compete. If the Government is to continue to spend money of this magnitude, it should spend it on projects that would assist the Railways Department to earn more revenue and provide better services. This Treasurer's report is a typical Socialist document, in which a lot of language has been used. When I first considered it seriously, I was made fully aware of the fact that the great marriage between the Commonwealth Government and the State Government had suddenly to come to an end and the Treasurer had been put right back to square one. Whom could be blame? He could not blame the rotten Liberal and Country Party Government in Canberra, which the Minister of Transport and others used to blame for nearly everything when they could not think of an adequate answer. Now the boot is on the other foot. This centralist Government in Canberra makes a certain sum available, but it attaches all the strings in the world, not like the Liberal Government, which made available money for two important projects in my electoral district (the Eyre Highway and the Kimba main) with no strings attached. That is the kind of financing

that is required in this country today.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That Government would not allow the Eyre Highway money to be spent on the Brighton Road, so it attached strings.

Mr. GUNN: I put it to the Minister that, regarding the highway from Kingoonya to Alice Springs to join the Stuart Highway—

Mr. Keneally: That's in my district.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member is always interfering with other members' districts.

Mr. Keneally: Someone has to look after your constituents.

Mr. Mathwin: He was in my district a couple of weeks ago.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member should be pleased, as no doubt it will increase his majority substantially at the next election. I shall have more to say when we deal with the lines, because there are several areas that should be canvassed.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I shall refer mainly to local issues within my electoral district, but first I pay a tribute to our Under Treasurer, Mr. Carey, for the first Loan Estimates that he has placed before us; with him, I include his staff. Credit is due to them all, and on behalf of the Opposition I give it. I was interested in the comments of the member for Mawson in expressing thanks on behalf of his constituents for the extension of sewerage services that will take place in his district. He was appreciative of the help he was getting in that area; I, too, would be appreciative if I could get similar consideration for my district.

I note particularly that in the Braeview area, which I was fortunate to represent for a while until the boundaries were changed, one of the goals I set out to achieve will be completed next year—the sewerage scheme for that area, for which this year's allocation is \$348,000. I hope the member for Mawson and I, working in that field, have helped to satisfy that community to some degree. The allocation last year on the Blackwood district scheme was \$400,000, and this year's allocation is \$493,000. That does little more than keep pace with the inflationary trend. The overall allocation for sewerage in the metropolitan area is \$8,097,000 this year, and last year it was \$6,697,000, an increase of about 20 per cent. What did the Treasurer say at the end of his statement in relation to metropolitan sewerage? He said:

The Government is proceeding on the assumption that a grant of at least \$2,000,000 will be received from the Australian Government in 1973-74 towards a speeding up of the sewerage programme.

In other words, even with that allocation, the Government cannot see its way clear to speeding up the work in my district. I know it is represented by a Liberal and Country League member, but the people's health is just as important there as it is in any other area. The Treasurer made the point that we might not even be able to spend as much money as he had allocated. Is he going to take away the \$493,000 from that area and do nothing? Some of the areas referred to in the Loan Estimates, where sewerage facilities are to be provided, were created much later than some of the areas in my electoral district. Most of Hawthorndene was developed as a subdivision many years ago, yet it still has not sewerage facilities. The Mitcham Hills, Monalta, Coromandel Valley, Blackwood, Belair, Eden Hills and a small section of Bellevue Heights have, in the main, a health hazard, yet the present Government has forgotten them.

The member for Mawson and other members who represent districts in the plains area of the metropolitan section of Adelaide virtually have been promised that most of the leeway in their areas will be caught up by 1975. The people in my area, particularly in Monalta and Coromandel Valley, have been told that the department will

start considering the programming for them in 1975, which means that they will be lucky to have sewerage by 1980 if the present Government stays in office. They are the circumstances operating at present.

The member for Mawson has said that he is pleased that the department has changed its policy and does not require, as the only criterion, that there be a 70 per cent build-up of houses in an area before a sewerage facility can be provided. He said that the department now considers the absorption rate of the soil, whether it is a clay soil, whether it has a rock base, and whether there is a health hazard. That certainly has not operated in one case in my district, and the health risk is greater in my district than in any other part of the metropolitan area. It is a disgrace that present and past Governments have allowed this position to occur. I first represented the area in 1970 and before that time I did not have the opportunity to see what was happening or to have the position brought before me. It is no credit on anyone that in the past the area was able to reach the stage that it has reached now.

I also want to refer briefly to sewerage in the Stirling district. In some small parts of the council area, the health risk is as bad as in the Blackwood area, but it is not nearly as serious as in the Mitcham Hills area. I wish to refer briefly to the present Minister's proposal to establish a small treatment works in the main street of Stirling. The reason for doing that is that the Commonwealth and State Government authorities could not arrive at a satisfactory means of disposing of effluent from septic tanks because the effluent might have affected some of the bores in the area and polluted some of the water supplies used for human consumption and stock.

Therefore, the present Minister of Works decided to approve a scheme to treat the sewerage from the Stirling area in a residential part of the main street of Stirling. A petition from the people objecting to that will be presented soon, but I am speaking out now on their behalf. When we speak of the amenity of society and the health risk and then, as Parliaments, Governments, or departments, we say, "Yes, it is all right to treat it there amongst a group of people in a residential area", we are dealing in double standards.

We should move the plant out into broad acres, which could be done readily. That would be a little more expensive but the mains could be used later when the complete Stirling district scheme was put into operation. I know that this plant is only temporary, but in this case "temporary" means for four or five years and, in a way, money is being squandered. I hope that the people of my area will receive the same consideration as has been received by the people in the District of Mawson, represented by an Australian Labor Party member, in regard to sewage facilities.

It would be wrong of me to leave the matter of sewage without referring to one of the greatest areas of concern in this field, and I refer to the practical application of providing that facility. Doubtless, the Engineering and Water Supply Department must either introduce double or triple shifts during the summer months or let a major part of the work out to private enterprise. We have reached the stage where we need about 9 000 to 10 000 allotments a year to give a selection to young people who require land. Under its present operations, the Engineering and Water Supply Department has not the capacity to carry out the work to cover that number of allotments, and I consider that that is one element in the increased price of housing allotments in the metropolitan area. It is no good saying one thing and meaning another. The problem is not the fault of the operator of the trench digger: the fault lies in

the total approach that we have had from this department over the years.

All Governments have allowed these conditions to operate and have given annual holidays to most of the men at Christmas time, in the summer months, when we should be using the plant. Private enterprise would overcome the problem, as the Americans make more effective use of their plant and equipment. A capital investment is involved, because Loan money is used on plant that is left idle. It is doubtful whether the average machine in the Engineering and Water Supply Department works more than six hours a day for five days a week. The money lost in that way would make us all shudder and wonder why some changes had not been made in the past.

I want to comment briefly on the \$300,000 being made available to acquire land in the Mount Bold reservoir catchment area. No reference is made to money being made available to acquire land in the proposed Clarendon reservoir catchment area. This amazes me, because I know that the department would like to acquire properties there and that the landholders who own the properties are still living in jeopardy, not knowing what will be their future. The longer they stay in that area the greater will be the cost of trying to buy a replacement farm farther out.

Unfortunately, in general the prices paid by the department for land in the reservoir catchment areas in the Adelaide Hills have not increased at the same rate as the normal present inflationary trend. The problem has been that people have said, "You are in a catchment area and your land has depreciated a little because it is in a catchment area, so you will not get as much." This is unfair and unjust and should not be the practice. The reverse should be the case. We should say, "We are taking your land for the benefit of the majority of people and, as you are a minority, we recognize the sacrifice being forced on you, so we will pay you slightly more than the valuation on a property in that area."

Of course, that does not happen. Big Brother Government, regardless of what Party is in office, can march over the individual and say, "Bad luck, but there is no way in which you will get more, because the compensation laws are such that, if you go to court, we will have to pay you only the valuation. We can argue that your property is not worth any more, because no-one other than the department is allowed to operate in this area."

I now refer to schools and I am sure the Minister of Education, who is interested in his portfolio, will later refer to my comments. I am pleased that work is to continue on Blackwood High School as planned and that that community will have the facility available to help in the education of that community's children in the foreseeable future. However, I am disappointed that the people of Coromandel Valley, who had the honour and privilege of having the Minister come to meet a deputation of them at their school (and they appreciated it) will not have that school as early as they would have liked, because it has been pushed back on the programme to 1976. The Minister will well remember that, at that meeting at Coromandel Valley Primary School, he said there was every possibility that the school would be available in September, 1974, but, just to be on the safe side, he would promise that it would be available at the beginning of the 1975 school year.

Tn fairness to the Minister and his department, I point out that in the interim period it was brought to notice that land was available adjacent to the existing primary school, and that land, if required, could be used for a high school to be developed with the primary school.

The department is now moving to acquire that land to build the high school and to incorporate the primary school in it, but I do not believe that that is a just reason for delaying the building of the primary school for 12 months. The change of plans necessary is small, and that school could be built as promised by the Minister if his departmental officers and he wished to plan it that way. True, additional work would be required but there has been an oversight of a promise made. In fairness to the people of that area, the Coromandel Valley school should be programmed for completion at the beginning of the 1975 school year.

I appreciate that Bellevue Heights Primary School is now in the planning and design stage, and I know that the residents of the area will appreciate the eventual building of a school in their area. I am sorry that the promised new school for Aidgate and Bridgewater combined has not yet reached the planning and design stage. I had hoped that this would be included in this year's Estimates. As it has not been included, I hope it will be included in the programme for next year. These two schools have poor playing fields in comparison with modern playing fields elsewhere. True, the terrain in this area is not good, but it is a pity to see the children in the wettest part of the State having such poor playing fields.

I now refer to public transport, which is not available in many cases for children who attend schools in the Adelaide Hills. In this area we have a rainfall of between 45in. (1 143 mm) and 50in. (1 270 mm) annually, and it is impossible during much of the school year for children to walk to school without being drenched. I believe it is important that the department bends its regulations for children who live closer than three miles to a school. At Bellevue Heights and Eden Hills the public transport systems are totally inadequate, and this situation applies also in areas such as Iron Bank, Cherry Gardens and other small communities. Even in the inner areas such as Stirling, free transport for schoolchildren is just not available.

The State Planning Authority has received an allocation of funds to acquire broad acres to make land available for housing development. There is no doubt that, because of the community's attitude regarding subdivision, Government departments and local councils have tended to become afraid of the word "subdivision", or any suggestion of subdivisions. This word has become a dirty word, and people are now afraid to say, "We should subdivide land in the correct and proper manner so the community will later have available to it a decent way of life, or the opportunity of having a decent way of life." Often it is the fault of human beings and not of the subdivision that problems are created.

We should be saying that we must create subdivisions, that we want more subdivisions now, not next year. Indeed, if we subdivide all the available land in the Adelaide metropolitan area as shown on the 1962 plan, there would be insufficient allotments to serve the demands of the city for more than seven years. I believe that we should be rezoning more areas for residential purposes, but we should be doing it in a sensible and well planned manner. However, because of the attitude in the community generally and the inability of Government departments and local councils to handle all the applications and abide by all the rules and regulations by which they must abide, the average young couple today must pay more than \$1,500 extra for a building allotment. That is something of which no community should be proud.

Any economist who worked out the figures would agree that I was right, and possibly would say that I had even

under-estimated the actual cost to young couples today. We have 11 000 allotments tied up between the situation of broad acres and the position when approval is given and a single title can be obtained. The only way we can stabilize prices is to create allotments, and all members realize that. Indeed, we have perpetuated a disservice to our young married couples and potential young married couples by our narrowminded approach towards subdivision in the immediate past.

I believe in well planned and well designed subdivision, but we should not make the same errors that have been made in the past. The Treasurer has said that he does not wish land prices to increase by more than 7 per cent a year on allotments of less than half an acre, at least, not until we catch up with the shortage and have more allotments on the market than are required. I have here an unimproved value assessment dated July 1, 1970, for a property of less than half an acre (0.20 ha); the value placed on that property by the Government Valuer (as he was then called) was \$6,570. In April of this year the valuation of same property was \$22,000, an increase of nearly 300 per cent (nearly 100 per cent a year). In the light of that, how can any member say that he believes in only a 7 per cent annual increase in connection with allotments of less than half an acre (0.20 ha), when the Treasurer's own valuer makes valuations that involve an annual rate of increase of 100 per cent over three years? It is a case of double standards.

The Government should show by example what it believes in: it should not, on the one hand, say that it will tax people to the limit to get more revenue and, on the other hand, say that it does not want anyone to get an increase of more than 7 per cent on allotments of less than half an acre (0.20 ha). I believe the Treasurer now wishes he had tried to unclog the pipeline in which applications for subdivisions are processed; if that had been done, there would be no need to limit the increase in the prices of allotments.

In the Loan Estimates debate last year I referred to the proposal to build a restaurant at Windy Point. Last year the first \$30,000 of a total allocation of \$300,000 was provided, and another \$200,000 is provided this year. I admit that it will be nice to have a place where tourists can go to wine and dine, and I admit that Windy Point has a beautiful view, but how can we contemplate spending that sum there (half as much as we are willing to spend on sewerage facilities in the Mitcham Hills area) when the health of our citizens is at risk? We should not contemplate such an unreasonable proposition. The restaurant can wait, but the health of the community cannot wait.

The member for Mawson said that members on this side should stand up and say something practical. Well, I am saying that the \$200,000 allocated for the restaurant would give the people in the Mitcham Hills area 50 per cent more sewerage connections; that is something practical. We have had enough of projects like the Ayers House project. The Government should concentrate to a greater extent on protecting the health of the citizens. The sum of \$90,000 has been provided for upgrading the golf course in Belair national park. One must doubt the wisdom of that type of spending when there is a health problem on the other side of the road. In a sense, one can sit and watch a child catch hepatitis while at the same time watching someone hit a golf ball down the fairway.

Regarding the provision for road development in the Loan Estimates, the Australian Labor Party has made proposals for upgrading the metropolitan transport system, but nothing is happening, except the proposal to construct

and electrify a railway line in the Mawson District. To give the dial-a-bus organization credit, it gave it a go, but unfortunately the plan did not work out.

In my district the Highways Department is investigating the possibility of building a four-lane arterial road to connect the Crafers area of the freeway to industry in the southern residential areas; in other words, to upgrade the Sheoak Hill Road to a four-lane arterial road to Florence Terrace, and from there to Gloucester Avenue, to upgrade Gloucester Avenue to a four-lane road, and then down to Panorama. It is strange to hear that proposal from a Minister who fought so violently against the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan, a Minister who set out to stir up public opinion against M.A.T.S., because he said it would interfere with the way of life of the people who lived in the path of the freeways and expressways. The Minister should stop and think of the effect of a four-lane arterial road in the wettest part of the State; that road would be used by heavy transports and a great deal of commuter traffic.

The department has said that it is considering other proposals; for example, it may be a proposal to upgrade the Upper Sturt main road on the southern side of the Belair recreation park, beginning at the same point, the eastern end of the Waverley Ridge junction at Crafers, continuing down Sturt Road into Hawthorndene Drive, into Shepherds Hill Road and down to South Road. The same points apply to that proposal. I will not go into the effect that such a proposal would have on the Belair national park and the ecology of the area. The way of life of the people would be seriously affected.

I am pleased that a committee in the Hills is working keenly toward finding a route for another main road south of the Mitcham Hills area, from Morphett Vale to Hackham, skirting the main towns, and going towards Strathalbyn and Woodchester and the main eastern highway. That is the correct route that we should follow. The department would do a service to the community if it ventured in that direction. Such a road would serve the Mawson District and give the people there the opportunity to commute to Monarto. Further, it would give the people of Monarto an opportunity to commute to southern industries.

In letters to me the Minister of Transport has admitted that the proposal for a four-lane arterial road through the Belair and Blackwood areas was intended to take commuters from Monarto to the metropolitan area. No doubt it would be a better route, would not have the steep grades that the main freeway has, would not have the problems of fog or the wet and dangerous conditions, and would be of total benefit to the State in helping all sections of the southern community. I hope that the Minister will consider such a proposal. Members will have the chance later to refer more specifically to other issues, but I pay a tribute to the officers who prepared the report. I support the Bill.

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): I, too, support the Bill. Many aspects of it could be enlarged on, but I intend to refer to three matters only. The first concerns facilities at Parliament House. A total of \$1,200,000 has been allocated for this purpose and members will agree that this will be money well spent. The facilities are far from perfect for members with such a responsible job. Three or four members in one room with the possibility of the same number of telephones operating at the same time means that conditions are far from satisfactory. If a constituent visits a member, an interview room has to be found so that the interview can be carried out in private, but often it is

difficult to find a room. I thank the Minister of Works for allowing the member for Eyre and me to have our secretarial facilities in this building, and this practice is working well. However, with one interviewing room available it is often necessary to take a constituent into the lounge, which is sometimes occupied. Many constituents leave this building with a much different impression from the one they had when they first entered it, and I hope that additional money will be available to further upgrade the building so that members can perform their duties in comfort.

I am extremely satisfied with the amount that has been allocated this year to schools in my district, as a result of many questions I have asked, submissions made by school councils, and deputations to the Minister during the last year, pointing out the inadequacies of some school buildings. The Burra High School has been placed in the planning and design list for this financial year. I am disappointed, because this school was in the same schedule last year, but, after an inspection by the Public Works Committee, the site was disapproved and negotiations had to be undertaken in order to find another site. This delayed construction for 12 months but, despite the delay, the district will obtain a modern school built in the new concept of education. The people of the district will be rewarded despite the delay in building this school.

The new Peterborough Primary School has been allocated \$480,000. The Minister has stated several times in the last three years that he was fully aware of the difficulties at this school. It was almost 100 years old, but I am pleased that it is on the list for attention this year. The sum of \$85,000 has been allocated for the Further Education Centre craft block at Peterborough. Many people attend this centre, and the craft block is needed. An open-space unit is being constructed at Peterborough High School at a cost of \$110,000, making a total of about \$675,000 to be spent on education buildings in this town during this financial year. I am sure that the people of Peterborough will be gratified, because they have been waiting many years for this to happen. Although the Loan Estimates were introduced last Thursday, tenders were called for the craft centre at the Peterborough High School in Saturday's *Advertiser*, and that is fast work indeed. For the Quorn Area School changeroom, \$32,000 has been allocated, and the craft centre from Brinkworth is to be transferred to this school. This will enable the Quorn school to have two crafts for boys and two for girls, at the same time servicing the Hawker Craft Centre. About \$1,000,000 will be spent on education in my district this financial year.

A loan of \$3,000,000 is to be made to the Electricity Trust. I hope that provision will be made for the single wire earth return system to be extended to the Mount Mary and Florieton area, which is east of Eudunda. People in this area have been waiting for some time for power to be connected, and I hope that provision for this will be included this financial year. It is necessary for the trust to extend the s.w.e.r. service into the more sparsely populated areas, in order to provide people living in these districts with better facilities. This will encourage them to remain in country districts, and it would possibly stop the drift to larger centres. I could refer to other matters, but I will leave them to be discussed in Committee. I support the Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I, too, support the Bill, and it would be remiss of me if I did not refer to some matters. However, first I refer to the Government's getting further under the heel of the Commonwealth or Australian Government, which will now dictate what money will be

allocated, where it will be used, and for what it will be used. Here one sees under housing the conditions that the Commonwealth Government has laid down for the spending of these funds. Great emphasis is placed on rental housing. Although I agree that a need exists for rental housing, most people prefer to own their own house. The Treasurer's second reading explanation states:

As to the programme of the Housing Trust, the new agreement lays emphasis on rental housing, and restricts to 30 per cent the proportion of family dwellings built with the special funds which may be sold.

That is disappointing, because I believe that most people prefer to own their own house, and it is only right that they should. Most people should be encouraged to buy their own house so that, at retirement, they would own something of their own. Probably most of us are buying our own house.

The sum of \$900,000 is allocated for work on the south-western suburbs drainage scheme. I have been pleased to see that this work has made good progress over the years, because it will fill a great need. This project was started some years ago by the Playford Government at a time when serious drainage problems existed in the south-western districts. However, these problems have now been alleviated to a great extent and little work remains to be done on the scheme. It is pleasing to me to know that work on the water main under Brighton Road to West Lakes is proceeding at a satisfactory pace, possibly because of the suggestion I made in the House last year that the main should be installed to enable work on the road to be completed. We all know the bad condition of Brighton Road.

Mr. Coumbe: What about trams?

Mr. MATHWIN: They are not even mentioned in the Estimates, although trams are a form of transport, which is mentioned in the Estimates. We have a good tram service from Glenelg to the city. Only last week I travelled in one of those dark brown and cream trams, which are popular with the Government, whereas overseas they try to make the trams as bright and comfortable as possible.

Mr. Coumbe: Do you think they should be painted black and yellow?

Mr. MATHWIN: There might be good reason for that after this year's grand final, when the tigers win the premiership! Mention is made in the Governor's Speech of the Flinders Medical Centre, for which \$11,000,000 is allocated and on which \$3,306,000 had been spent to the end of June. The Speech states that rapid progress is being made on work at the centre to provide the State's second school of medicine as well as urgently-needed hospital beds for people in the south-western districts. I doubt whether the beds will serve many people in those districts, because the hospital, which will be a teaching hospital, will deal with many emergency cases. As there is a great need for hospitals in this area, I am disappointed that the Government is not doing more in this regard. The Government cannot get away from this matter by saying that the centre will provide beds for people in the south-western districts. I am surprised that the member for Mawson did not have more to say about this matter, because he is well aware of the great hospital problem we have in that area.

Although \$28,500,000 is allocated for school buildings, I am disappointed that the Paringa Park Primary School does not even rate a mention in the Estimates either as a major or minor work. However, it appeared as a major work for which planning and design was proposed in the 1972-73 Loan Estimates. It is most unfortunate what has happened. We all know that the Public Works

Committee rejected the replacement of the school because it was unable to satisfy itself that it was necessary to replace the school's existing accommodation. The committee recommended against the school's replacement at an estimated cost of \$430,000 after the project had been included in the planning and design programme for the 1972-73 year.

Mr. McAnaney: What about the railways?

Mr. MATHWIN: As the member for Heysen is a member of the Public Works Committee, it is disappointing to me that he did not see fit to proceed with work on the school that I believe is of great importance. When studying Mr. Kearney's report on the school to the committee and what he said about the need for this school, one sees quite a different aspect, with which I agree. Mr. Kearney's report states:

The primary school consists of 15 classrooms plus library, activity room and administrative facilities in solid or permanent-type construction. There are also three classrooms and a canteen in timber construction. The infants school, which is wholly housed in wooden buildings, has nine classrooms plus administrative facilities. Separate toilet blocks which serve the children of this section of the school have been built some distance from classrooms and are most inconvenient, particularly for little children in wet weather.

Yet the committee saw fit to pass the school as a good school and did not recommend its replacement. Many of its buildings are temporary and have a limited life. Mr. Kearney's report continues:

The only really solid part of the primary school is the eastern part made up of four classrooms and administrative facilities, which was rebuilt as a result of a fire which occurred in 1964. In rebuilding, this section was designed to become part of the infants school and to provide administrative facilities. The general plan was to rebuild the primary school on another site in Bowker Street, approximately 200yds. distant from the existing site. The remainder of the primary school is housed in an aluminium Bristol-type building similar to the school which is being replaced at Enfield.

The aluminium Bristol-type building is not permanent but temporary. The school was built at about the same time as the Enfield school, which has since been replaced. According to the report of the Public Works Committee which was accepted by the Government, the school is a fit and proper place for children to attend. Mr. Kearney's report continues:

This section of the school has required substantial and frequent maintenance and it is envisaged that it has but a limited life. The classrooms in this part of the school are all standard 24ft. by 24ft. (7.32 m by 7.32 m) classrooms and severely restrict the type of educational activity which can be organized by teachers who complain of the lack of space, the inadequate storage and the poor quality of many of the facilities . . . The layout of the present school is poor with its long passages, distances from facilities and difficulties of organization and supervision. This building does not cater satisfactorily for modern educational needs.

That is the evidence given by Mr. Kearney of the Education Department, of which the Public Works Committee took no notice at all. It is a great pity that this happened: it is an even greater pity that the Minister and his department took notice of it and inspected this school. One wonders just how far the inspection went. What were the criteria used for saying that timber classrooms were in good condition—merely because they had recently been painted? Painting, etc., could cover many things, which could be in a seriously bad condition.

The layout of the school is, of course, not conducive to the use of open-teaching methods, yet the committee said it was convinced that that was not essential for the efficient education of children. So that reference in the report really has no bearing on the matter. The report states that the

surrounding paved areas were in good and sound condition. I was there only yesterday and saw the paved area, and I would say it was far from being in a good condition. How thorough was the inspection of this school? Another reason given is that the enrolments were declining. The enrolments this year have increased in the infants school. Is that an argument for rejecting the complete replacement or major upgrading of a school—that the enrolments have declined? The timber buildings have been there since the inception of the school. There is a limited period for timber buildings and, as I mentioned earlier, for the aluminium Bristol-type building.

The administration block and office of the Deputy Headmaster are located in the book-room, and the office staff is located in a store-room. This project has been scrubbed off the list; it is not even on the list for next year. Female staff members are required to use toilets provided for the female pupils in this school. The library is a converted classroom and completely inadequate. The school is willing to provide many more books each year, but there is nowhere to put them. There are no facilities for them—the space is totally inadequate.

The school canteen is open to all weather and the flies. The school has a particularly fine welfare and ladies committee, and these people work hard to raise much money for the school. Through the hard work of the parents of students in the school, excellent teaching aids have been supplied, together with sporting equipment, yet there is available only a measly area for the storage of those things. I sincerely believe that, because this school has the benefit of interested and hard-working parents and a good school committee, it has been penalized. I humbly suggest that the Minister reconsider the decision made on the Paringa Park Primary School, because there is a great need for it to be upgraded. If the authorities are not to build a new school (and it is now obvious they will not because we know that Bowker Street, which was to be the site of the new school ground, is now being organized between the Brighton council and the Education Department as a sporting area) the existing school must be upgraded so that it can be used properly and will be a building of which people will be proud.

The next matter I come to is the Coast Protection Board, for which a further \$450,000 is to be allocated. I, like the member for Hanson, am disappointed at the meagre amount of money set aside for this board, which has done a good job in the last year in protecting the foreshore in my area, but just on the boundary of the area, extending into Brighton and Seacliff, there is a small area about 50 m long and adjacent to the Esplanade, with no protection at all. Something should be done in that area. The report states:

The Coast Protection Board has engaged consultants to prepare a comprehensive management plan for the Metropolitan Coast Protection District, which extends from Sellick Beach to the Gawler River. It will take nine to 12 months to complete the study and formulate recommendations for a long-term foreshore protection plan. Nine months is as long as it takes a baby to be born. There has already been a five-year study of this matter, which was instigated by the Seaside Councils Committee, which approached the Playford Government initially and was granted \$10,000 for a study to be undertaken by the university; we have had all this investigation into the drift of sand and the wind and now a committee is to be set up that will take another nine to 12 months to report on this important matter. I am surprised and disappointed that it will take so long and it will be such a long time before some further action is taken along the

foreshore. That \$450,000 is not sufficient, and I am disappointed that that is the amount included in the Loan Estimates.

When the member for Eyre spoke about high-density housing, which was suggested by the Government, the member for Elizabeth scoffed at it and did not believe that such a thing would happen. Perhaps he is not familiar with the fact that the Treasurer stated that, when the Government was going to build these units on the transport corridors at Smithfield, it would put 55 units on 7½ acres (3 ha) of land. Where on earth in the metropolitan area would we be allowed, under the Planning and Development Act, to put 55 units on 7½ acres (3 ha)? Nowhere else! I remind the member for Elizabeth (who is not here now but who will probably read *Hansard*, because this is very near to where he lives or the area that he represents) that he should investigate this matter if he knows nothing about it. I say that 55 units on 7½ acres (3 ha) is disgraceful. I support the second reading and will speak again when we are dealing with the lines.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support the Loan Estimates. I wish to refer to the provision of \$415,000 for three hospitals in my district. At Port Broughton the hospital board has been trying to carry on under most adverse conditions. The building is an old house which has been added to and in which facilities have been provided for hospitalization. As members know, there is a large increase in population at Port Broughton in the holiday period, when about 600 holiday houses there are occupied, and I regard Port Broughton as the Victor Harbor of the North. Therefore, it is pleasing to me and to the people of Port Broughton to know that \$150,000 is provided on these Loan Estimates for the hospital at that centre.

Also, \$140,000 is provided for extensions to the hospital at Clare, and \$125,000 is provided for the hospital in my home town, Crystal Brook. However, I am concerned about reports regarding the hospital at Port Pirie. Whilst Port Pirie is not in my district, many taxpayers in South Australia are concerned about what is happening there and I consider that a full report should be obtained on those building activities. The Gladstone High School is nearing completion and is occupied. The total cost of that new school is listed at \$679,000. The Minister has agreed to go to Gladstone, I think in October, to officially open the new school, which is a great asset to the northern part of the State.

Previously the old school had to carry on in rather adverse conditions, with temporary buildings, and I am particularly pleased that the new school is now occupied and giving excellent service to the area. I understand that agricultural subjects are being taught, but only in theory.

I am concerned about other schools in the area. I introduced to the Minister of Education a deputation seeking a new school at Port Broughton, and I have asked questions concerning my local school at Crystal Brook. However, one gets the same reply, namely, that sufficient finance is not available, and so these schools must wait for an indefinite period. Because of that, it irks me to see how the Government wastes money. The amount spent on dial-a-bus could have been put towards upgrading one of these schools.

I am pleased that the Port Lincoln harbor is mentioned in the Loan Estimates. Whilst Port Lincoln is outside my district, I have an interest in the bulk handling facilities there, and the Government has made available another \$2,500,000 for work there. As honourable members know,

at Port Lincoln we have one of the largest silo complexes in the State, and one of our largest contractors is completing a programme of which the growers of this State are extremely proud. When people from other States come to South Australia on bulk handling matters, we like to take them to Port Lincoln to show them what a company, which comprises the primary producers of the State, has done there. We are particularly proud of those facilities.

Mr. Nankivell: It's one of our largest companies.

Mr. VENNING: As the member for Mallee reminds me, South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited is one of the State's largest companies.

Mr. Nankivell: With \$60,000,000 worth of assets.

Mr. VENNING: Yes, and it is owned and supported by the primary producers not of Australia but of South Australia. It is also pleasing to mention the facilities at Port Pirie. This week we met Mr. Sainsbury and Mr. Dennis O'Malley, from the Marine and Harbors Department, at Port Pirie and, with the General Manager, they made available an area for additional bulk storage of 1 000 000 bushels (36 400 m³). It seems that one would imagine that the facilities required to handle bulk grain in this State were almost complete. At Wallaroo a 1 000 000 bushel (36 400 m³) complex is being constructed at present and another complex is being provided at Port Adelaide.

I am pleased that the Government is making money available to deepen the Port River so that we can get larger vessels into the port to handle grain. The economics that can be achieved through loading these larger grain vessels are well known. The Coast Protection Board has been mentioned and it is good that \$450,000 is provided for the board on the Loan Estimates. However, only the areas adjacent to the metropolitan area are mentioned: there is no mention of our northern beaches.

I remember being approached by the Port Broughton council only two years ago about some problems there and at Fisherman's Bay. We had to wait a long time before we could get any satisfaction from the Minister, because it was necessary to establish the Coast Protection Board, and then to provide an engineer, and so on, for it. Consequently, work had been delayed for about two years but as recently as a month ago we received from the Minister information that an engineer had been appointed and that he would visit some of our northern beaches and confer with councils there about taking action on the problems that have existed for some years. I hope that through the Coast Protection Board work will be undertaken at our northern beaches to preserve them and to assist councils to improve facilities at their beaches. Other speakers have referred to the railways, and I am concerned that no mention has been made in the Loan Estimates of rail standardization. As this is so important, I should have thought that reference would be made to it. How much longer will it be before a start is made on further rail standardization? The Premier in his policy speech at the election before last referred to this matter, yet at the last election this matter was not referred to at all.

The member for Eyre had much to say this evening about rail freights and how the railways could improve its financial position. The member for Frome also had much to say about rail freights. The Governor's Speech refers to the railways and to legislation to be introduced. Primary producers are concerned about the railways, transport, silos and zoning and many other similar matters. Indeed, it will be pleasing when the Minister of Transport and the Government make clear to the people what they are really thinking. The South Australian Railways should look

seriously at the matter of rail freights because, if it hopes to achieve anything at all and to justify its existence, it must be more progressive regarding them. Only about 18 months ago—

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow the honourable member to enter into a long debate on freights. The honourable member can link up the item of freights with Loan expenditure, but freights are a matter concerning another document, not the Loan Estimates. The honourable member for Rocky River.

Mr. VENNING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the Minister of Transport, in servicing his portfolio, would be doing justice to the situation if he gave serious thought to the matter of rail freights. This matter has been referred to time and time again, and railway finances would be improved considerably if a positive approach were adopted to this matter.

Mr. Hall: What do you suggest?

Mr. VENNING: Reducing rail freights across the board. The member for Frome referred to the current alterations at Parliament House. I believe we should have implemented the original plan for alterations to Parliament House. Although at that time the amount involved seemed large, in retrospect I believe it would have been the right course of action, as it would have been cheaper in the long term, and would have assisted members much better than the present plan being affected by the Government, especially regarding members on this side. True, for many members opposite, their areas are more confined and the situation may be different. However, for members who represent large districts the programme of updating Parliament House should have been proceeded with as originally planned, because the work would now have been completed and would have provided the facilities to enable us to best serve our district and our constituents as we wish to do. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

First schedule.

State Bank, \$4,400,000.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): Can the Treasurer say whether a further \$2,000,000 will be necessary to allow for the transitional period during which a land commission is being established?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): A schedule has been prepared for the Commonwealth Government regarding proposals for land acquisition in the metropolitan area, and estimates have been made regarding amounts and timing. This has received sympathetic consideration from the Commonwealth Government, but we cannot know the exact amount to be made available to us until the Commonwealth Budget is introduced. However, we do expect to receive considerable funds during this financial year. I was in touch with the Minister for Urban and Regional Development only yesterday about the constitution of the land commission. The Bill will be introduced to the House shortly, and I expect the land commission to be established within a month. In the meantime it is necessary for us to be able to negotiate for land purchases. In order to achieve a greater supply to the market, we must have the necessary land.

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Treasurer say whether the finance which is now available and which has already been made available, particularly the sum of \$1,000,000 in June, is likely to be recouped to the State Government from Commonwealth funds made available for the land commission? Is the sum we are now dealing with virtually a temporary loan?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am seeking a recoup, but it is not expected that the Commonwealth Government will do the total funding of the land commission. Some burden will necessarily fall on the State. I am endeavouring to negotiate a satisfactory recoup.

Mr. EVANS: I take it that some of the land will be made available, subject to limitations, to developers with the necessary expertise. What percentage is likely to be passed out to that sector?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot give an idea of the percentage, but certainly a proportion of the land will be available to developers on stringent conditions as to resale, profit margins, etc. There are developers who are willing to co-operate with the land commission and who are experienced in the field. It is expected that their assistance will be sought in getting the land on to the market quickly.

Mr. EVANS: Will any of the land acquired and developed by Government authorities be made available on a leasehold basis for house construction, as against a freehold basis?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Mr. GUNN: Is the Treasurer aware that there will be a reduction in the number of houses made available for purchase? I believe that only 30 per cent of the funds will be available for houses for purchase. Consequently, does the Treasurer believe that there will be a shortage of houses for purchase?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The reduction in the percentage refers only to the percentage of houses built with the aid of concessional interest money; that is, money provided by the Commonwealth Government at a greater concession than that previously applying. The Commonwealth Government has said that this money must go primarily to rental housing, because that is the area where there is the greatest need. We are able to use 30 per cent of the money for houses for purchase, and we can use some non-concessional interest money to build houses for purchase. So, we have been able to take some of our Commonwealth Loan money and some semi-government Loan money, entirely apart from the concessional interest money, to maintain our rental-purchase system. Therefore, there will not be any substantial reduction in the number of houses available for purchase. What is provided in the agreement is that the proportion of concessional interest money going to houses for purchase will be reduced.

Dr. EASTICK: The Treasurer said earlier that there was a 9.2 per cent increase in funds for housing. However, we must remember that the inflationary spiral in the building industry is running at the rate of 18 per cent per annum. Does the Treasurer agree that a reduced number of units will be completed as a result of the inflationary spiral?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The inflationary spiral certainly worries us. The increase in building costs is the subject of constant talks between the Government and the building industry. Inflation will possibly result in a reduction in the number of units completed, although the programme we have outlined will be pretty close to what we could conceivably get built with the building resources available in South Australia at present. We will use

our best endeavours to see that everything we can do to get a maximum building programme is done.

Dr. EASTICK: I take it that, in referring to building resources, the Treasurer is referring to labour resources as well as physical resources. I have previously referred to the reduced number of apprentices in the building industry and the reduced number of skilled building workers entering Australia through the immigration programme. What efforts has the Government made, through the Commonwealth Immigration Department, to obtain more labour resources for the State?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have already outlined the survey of work needs in South Australia which is being undertaken and which is being communicated to the Commonwealth Minister for Immigration. It is one thing to undertake a survey and say we have a need, and it is another thing to provide the people to meet the need. If the Leader checks the situation in Great Britain and the delay in the availability of building materials, he will find that we can get no joy from that source. This is a problem throughout Europe and in the developing and affluent countries, and it is difficult to recruit people in this area of national need at present.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Premier give details of the period of time for which a land lease will be available and what advantages he can see in a leasehold system compared to a freehold system? It seems that, if the land is leasehold at a small rental, the commission will be subsidizing that purchase, compared to the person who pays taxes and acquires a freehold property. Once houses are built the area becomes totally developed, and as demand is placed on the area it seems that the prices would be identical.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Its basis is to specifically obtain control over resale and prevent speculation. Whilst some result could conceivably be obtained by placing conditions on freehold title, psychologically there is a greater acceptance of that control with leasehold than there is with freehold. It is likely that the Commonwealth inquiry into land tenure will favour leasehold, with control provisions to prevent speculation. It seems that, in the foreseeable future, land will be permanently scarce in the metropolitan area. The end of development of land here is conceivably in sight: it will not be tomorrow, but it is within the foreseeable future. In these circumstances a provision is necessary to assist the general control of the sale of land and prevent a speculative series of resale proposals. Basically, the exercise is to keep the price of land down and to make it possible for people to buy houses. If the land or houses are provided by State finance, it is essential for us to do that.

Mr. MATHWIN: I understand that skilled building tradesmen wish to migrate from the United Kingdom, and I am surprised that the Treasurer said that skilled tradesmen were difficult to obtain.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member has names and addresses, I shall be pleased if he will give them to me.

Line passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.37 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 15, at 2 p.m.