

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, August 30, 1966.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. L. H. Densley) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

MURRAY RIVER SALINITY.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked on August 23 about Murray River salinity, particularly with regard to the Block E evaporation basin?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: My colleague, the Minister of Works, has supplied me with the following reply:

The breach in the Block E evaporation basin embankment was discovered on Monday, July 4, by the Benmark Irrigation Trust and was immediately repaired by the trust. The circumstances were reported to the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and this department carried out salinity tests and kept river salinity conditions under close observation. No appreciable increase in salinity in the main stream was noticeable until nearly a fortnight later when the salinity at Berri began to rise, in spite of the fact that tests made of the water at Lock 5 on the opposite side of the river to Benmark had not disclosed any appreciable increase.

An assessment was made of the overall situation, bearing in mind the following factors:

- (1) Breaching of the embankment had released a "slug" of saline water, which had to pass down the river in any case.
- (2) No general irrigations were in progress although there were special irrigations in some areas.
- (3) The combined storage in Hume reservoir and Lake Victoria at that time was 1,192,000 acre feet, representing only 39 per cent of the storage capacity.

The prospects for the coming season appeared very unfavourable and it was apparent that, unless substantial rains fell in the catchment area, the River Murray Commission would be obliged to impose severe restrictions. In view of these circumstances, it would have been unwise to release substantial quantities of water from Lake Victoria for dilution purposes at that stage, thereby reducing the amount available for use and dilution during the main irrigation season. Although there has been some improvement in the total storage situation, it has not yet been possible to fill Lake Victoria. South Australia will depend to a great extent on this storage during the irrigation season, and every effort is being made to bring it up to its full capacity.

RENTAL HOUSES.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Local Government representing the Minister of Lands.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I recently asked the Minister representing the Minister of Housing a question regarding the provision by the Housing Trust of rental and low-deposit purchase houses in country towns. Since asking that question (and I must say that the answer I received was satisfactory) I find that in many instances, such as in the Upper Murray irrigation areas where the land available for building houses is held under Crown lease and is under the control of the Department of Lands, a long delay often occurs when such land is being made available for the building of houses and the extension of housing areas. This appears to be one of the major problems in establishing new housing areas and new Housing Trust houses in such districts. Will the Minister take whatever steps are possible to expedite the availability of land for the purpose of building houses?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I will refer the question to my colleague and obtain a report as soon as possible.

GUM TREES.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Last week I asked questions of the Minister concerning the gum trees on Montacute Road in the Campbelltown area and the Minister gave replies. From the daily press it appears that at some time between then and now the Minister bowed to public opinion and deferred a decision to cut down those trees. Will the Minister disclose his present intention in this matter and say how long it is likely to be before a further decision will be made?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The answer is "No". As far as I am concerned, I have said enough about these gum trees on the floor of the House and I have nothing further to add at this stage.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Last week I asked a question of the Minister of Roads in relation to some trees on the Main North Road at Pooraka that had been marked, presumably, for destruction. At the time the Minister said that he did not have an answer. Is he now

in a position to give further information to the Council?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Again, the answer is "No".

FISHING BOATS.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: A short time ago I asked a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Marine concerning a survey of fishing boats. Has he a reply to that question?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I have a reply supplied by my colleague the Minister of Marine, as follows:

The honourable member has been misinformed, as no such undertaking was given, either by the Minister or the Harbors Board. The regulations governing the survey and equipment of fishing vessels apply to fishing vessels of a length of 25 or more feet, and there is accordingly no power to require vessels less than 25ft. in length to be surveyed. However, a request that boats less than 25ft. in length should be subject to survey has been made by fishermen. Following a full investigation by the Harbors Board, Cabinet declined the request, but further evidence has been submitted by the South-East Fishermen's Association and this is now being considered.

SALINE WATER.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Labour and Industry.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: For some time the need has been apparent for an alternative system for the disposal of saline effluent water from the Murray River irrigation scheme, because the present method of ponding water near the main stream is having a detrimental effect upon the scenic beauty of the river and the water lower down the stream. Can the Minister representing the Minister of Works give me any information regarding this matter and the suggestion that some alternative should be found to the present method of deep strata surveys to find out whether the water cannot be disposed of in that manner?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The honourable member asked a question a week or two ago about these matters and a report that the Minister of Works has supplied to me may answer the question asked today. My colleague says:

The problem of subsurface disposal of seepage water from irrigation areas in the Murray River basin is a complex one and is not capable of a short-term answer. Subsurface drainage has been practised for many years in the Loxton district and is also being employed in various irrigation areas near Waikerie. There has been a serious build up of the ground-water level in parts of the Waikerie district,

presumably as a result of this practice, and the productivity of such areas is endangered. The Mines Department is conducting a detailed hydrological investigation of parts of the Waikerie district and sinking test holes to obtain geological data on the composition of the subsurface strata and to carry out deep drainage tests. Special requirements for subsurface saline water disposal involve the search for a bed or stratum of considerable extent, continuity and high permeability but not containing fresh water, nor having any access to the river. The Mines Department is collaborating with the Departments of Lands, Agriculture, and Engineering and Water Supply on a technical level in studying this problem, and moves have been made to form a technical committee drawn from these departments. However, any major long-term investigation to deal with this problem will require the allocation of substantial special funds for the purpose. At present all costs are being supplied from Mines Department's funds, which are quite inadequate for the large-scale investigation required.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary, representing the Treasurer.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: In view of the reply I have just received, I take it that this is now a matter for the Treasury, because the reply indicates that the Mines Department is prepared to carry out the detailed survey for which I asked earlier. The reply also mentions that there is no short-term answer to this matter. We know that, but this is a long-term country and, if we are to preserve the river as it ought to be preserved, we have to look at the long-term aspect. I consider that money could be and should be made available for the survey. Will the Chief Secretary take up with his colleague, the Treasurer, the matter of making funds available to the Mines Department so that the long-term survey can be carried out?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall be happy to refer the question to my colleague, the Treasurer, and see what can be done regarding the matter.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I think the answer just given to the Hon. Mr. Story with reference to water disposal misses the point worrying many people along the river.

The PRESIDENT: Does the honourable member seek leave to make a statement?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I am sorry, Sir: I do.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: The request was for the disposal of water away from the river

rather than underground to be investigated. The physical position is that any water put underground must displace water already occupying the beds, as there is very little chance of a person's putting down a bore to any great depth without finding water. There is, however, every opportunity of pumping salt effluent away from the river to a place from which it cannot physically find its way back to the river. Salt effluents are now being placed in swamp areas along the river, where they are destroying the vegetation, and inevitably at times of high water they find their way back to the river again. The investigation requested is one into the practicability of taking salt effluent well away from the river and allowing it to evaporate and dry, or if necessary fossilize, in areas from which it cannot possibly find its way into the irrigation system again. Will the Minister of Labour and Industry ask the Minister of Irrigation whether this investigation can be put in hand?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I shall be pleased to convey the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a report as soon as possible.

FREIGHT TRAIN LIGHTS.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Recently my attention has been directed to some near accidents as a result of motorists coming to railway crossings when very long goods trains with unlit trucks have been passing over them. These trains are sometimes half a mile long and there is no light between the engine at the front and the brake van at the rear. It has also been brought to my attention that road trains (semi-trailers and the like) must have a series of amber coloured warning lights on the sides. I am aware that this matter has been discussed previously, but in view of the danger to and the value of human lives (which every member appreciates) will the Minister of Transport further consider the placing of scotch tape or other reflectorized material at regular intervals on the sides of the trucks so that accidents may be averted?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: This matter has been investigated over a long period. The placing of lamps along the sides of trains was investigated, but these lamps created considerable difficulties in the station yards and elsewhere to railway employees, who would be exposed to considerable danger because of the

different types of lights suggested. The matter was investigated by the Railways Commissioner, who proposed that trains be painted a different colour (I believe light grey) so as to be easily discernible in the conditions mentioned by the honourable member, and I believe this has been done. However, I shall have the matter further considered and bring back a report later.

DOCTOR SHORTAGE.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I ask leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Recently in the press many references have been made to the dissatisfaction of doctors in the United Kingdom with their lot in that country. Can the Chief Secretary say whether consideration has been given to trying to encourage doctors in the United Kingdom to come to this State to try to alleviate this ever-present problem of the shortage of doctors?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The question has already been acted upon. I understand that the Premier has taken up this question with the Agent-General of South Australia and has received steady advice from him. Importation of the medical fraternity from overseas has not met with our complete satisfaction.

CARAVANS.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I ask leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Roads. On Sunday last, I encountered a number of—

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Mr. President, on a point of order, did the honourable member get leave? He asked for it. Did we grant him leave or not before he proceeded with his question?

The PRESIDENT: I think the honourable member was anxious to get on with his question. Is it the pleasure of the Council that the honourable member have leave?

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: On Sunday last I encountered a number of caravans, in excess of 100, on the road between Crafers and Keith. Near Stirling I caught up with an obstruction that in the distance resembled an oversized hippopotamus. At some stage further along the road I ascertained that this was a type of caravan being drawn by what would be described as a mini-car, about 3ft. 6in. wide. It was quite obvious that it was impossible for the driver of this vehicle to have

any knowledge of the person immediately behind the caravan or to see anybody endeavouring to overtake him. I point out to the Minister that it occurred at a spot that I have often drawn to the notice of this Council, where the opportunity has, apparently, been given to pass but so far there are still no appropriate signs erected on that part of the road. Will the Minister, because of the ever-increasing numbers of these valuable assets to family travel, take up with the Road Traffic Board the matter of an inquiry as provided under the Road Traffic Act to see what can be done to overcome this problem?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I shall be happy to take up the question with the Road Traffic Board.

CRIME.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I ask leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: In this morning's *Advertiser* appears an article headed "C.I.B. Proposal to Cut Crime". It states:

Crime prevention squads to inform the public of the best ways to guard against specific types of crime were advocated at the first day of the five-day biennial conference of Australasian C.I.B. chiefs in Adelaide yesterday. A spokesman said that it had been found that specific types of crime had been reduced in New Zealand, New South Wales and Tasmania where crime prevention squads were used.

Does the Chief Secretary, who is a very conscientious Minister, believe that the Police Force in South Australia has adequate facilities to put into operation the proposals that have been brought forward in this conference? If not, does he feel that our Police Force should be equipped with these facilities?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: As a result of any decisions reached at this conference of the C.I.B. chiefs of the various States of Australia and New Zealand I shall no doubt get a request or report from the Commissioner of Police (Brig. McKinna). It has always been my personal desire, and that of the Government, to assist the police in the detection of crime in any manner possible. In case the question may be misunderstood by the press and the public (and in this I know that the Commissioner of Police agrees with me) let me say that the standards of equipment and the quality of our C.I.B. are equal to anything in Australia. At the opening of the conference yesterday I paid a compliment to the police because of one particular case called the Trig Beach murder case, because of information I

had received before the case had received any publicity. I paid a compliment to the police for the magnificent job they did in that case. I do not want to go into details now, but within 24 hours of finding the body on the beach the South Australian police knew for whom they were looking and took that person to trial and got a conviction. I am proud to be associated with the police of South Australia. Any request they make to the Government to enable them to maintain their very high standards of operation will receive every encouragement from the Government.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST BILL.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I ask leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: During the adjournment since last Thursday, my attention has been drawn to some statements made by the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs about the conduct and activities of this Council. The latest that I read this morning was that the Opposition was attempting to kill the Bill by moving for the setting up of a Select Committee to inquire into it. We have had a number of Select Committees already this session. Does the Chief Secretary concur in the expression of public opinion made by the Minister? If so, on what basis does he support his concurrence?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I think the question is "very leading", as they would say in the courts, and I am not desirous of giving an answer at this stage.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT TRANSACTIONS.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I recently attended a local government conference and have had brought to my notice the considerable number of transactions that has to be entered into by many local government bodies or semi-government authorities, and the fact that all of these accounts have to be paid by cheque. It was put to me yesterday that, as the Government has seen fit to exempt subsidized and community hospitals from the payment of stamp duty, the Treasurer might seriously consider exempting from stamp duty semi-government bodies such as district councils, which are, after all is said and done, doing a particular semi-government work.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The question involves policy. It is quite different from the case of hospitals, and I point out that I am not attempting to write down local government. However, I think the honourable member will be satisfied if I reply by saying that I will call my colleague's attention to this matter and bring back a reply in due course.

PARKING BAYS.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: A number of main highways in this State have parking bays, areas in which heavy vehicles may pull off the main highway to effect repairs or the drivers may even require a rest. However, on the Port Wakefield Road for at least a distance of 30 miles from Adelaide no such facilities exist; in fact, the road in the locality concerned does not lend itself to vehicles pulling off to the side so as not to be a hazard to the motoring public. Many truck drivers proceeding to Adelaide arrive in the early hours of the morning and have to put in some time before proceeding to their destination and therefore they require some facilities for parking. I have often seen such vehicles parked along main highways on the very edge of the road, but with their parking lights on. As I have said, this represents a hazard to the travelling public. Will the Minister or officers of his department give consideration to providing parking bays on all main arteries in the vicinity of Adelaide?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: As far as main roads are concerned, it is the policy of the Highways Department to provide, as far as practicable, such parking bays. Apparently it is the suggestion of the honourable member that parking bays be provided on every main road in the vicinity of the metropolitan area merely because people rise in the early hours and may need them, but I do not think such action is the prerogative of the Highways Department and I believe other facilities exist for such needs. If the honourable member wants consideration given to constructing parking bays for near-metropolitan parking I will take the matter up with the department and reply as soon as possible.

WEEDS ON ROADS.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: On route 83, which I refer to as the Main North Road, between Laura and Clare the area surrounding the white posts and the roadside mileposts has been sprayed with a weedicide. Is such action to become accepted practice, and is it intended that the sides or shoulders of the roads be sprayed in similar manner in future years?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I will obtain a report from the Highways Department for the honourable member.

RAIL CHARGES.

The Hon. C. C. D. OCTOMAN (on notice):

1. What are the reasons for the steeper increases in rail charges for long distance hauls?

2. Is the Minister aware that these new rates will impose an additional freight cost of 4.25 pence a bushel of wheat transported from Kimba to Port Lincoln?

3. Has allowance been made for increased use of road transport in estimating an additional revenue of \$630,000 from such increased charges? If so, to what extent?

4. Is it the intention of the Government to raise rail charges on other commodities?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The replies are:

1. To provide a rate structure more in conformity with the traditional pattern.

2. The new rates represent an increase of 3.47 cents a bushel between Kimba and Port Lincoln, and not 3.54 cents (the equivalent of 4.25 pence).

3. Yes—approximately 2½ per cent.

4. This is a matter which will receive the consideration of the Government at the appropriate time.

ENFIELD GENERAL CEMETERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government) moved:

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee be extended to Tuesday, September 27, 1966.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 25. Page 1338.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): In speaking to this Bill I consider that the Loan Estimates in this State are vitally important to the whole of the State's well-being. We

are obliged to the Treasurer for a most fulsome report on the manner in which the Loan Estimates are being disbursed this year. I want to get down to fundamentals and not waste the time of this Council on frivolous matters. I am a little perturbed at the position in which the State finds itself at present because at the end of the first complete financial year (June 30, 1966) since this Government took office the State recorded deficits in the Loan Account and the Consolidated Revenue Account. This is well outside the budgeting of the Government when it brought these measures before us a little over 12 months ago.

The year commenced with a minor deficit in the Loan Account of \$59,000. New borrowings amounted to \$61,892,000 and recoveries amounted to \$10,869,000. The total expenditure was \$75,167,000 and accordingly the deficit on Loan Account increased as a result of the year's operations by \$2,406,000 as at June 30, 1966, and that total amounted to \$2,465,000. At the same time the deficit on the Consolidated Revenue Account for the year 1965-66 was \$6,834,000, so that, after bringing into account the \$1,220,000 brought forward from earlier years, the net deficit on revenue at June 30 was \$5,612,000. Therefore, on the combined accounts the aggregate rundown during 1965-66 was \$9,240,000, and an aggregate deficit at the end of the year of \$8,077,000. It appears to me that something has gone very wrong. The Treasurer mentioned four factors that contributed to the aggregate deficit but, having looked at the four factors fairly carefully, I think there must be a fifth (and perhaps a sixth) factor as well which has not been mentioned. The first of the four factors he mentioned was the particularly bad season. In addition, he blamed the wretched Legislative Council for certain actions that it took.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: What did he say?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: He blamed the wretched Legislative Council. That means all of us.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I just wanted to be sure.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: What the Legislative Council did really amounts to peanuts, because it represents less than \$1,000,000 of the £70,000,000 involved. Nobody has been able to obtain the exact figure and perhaps the Chief Secretary, who represents the Treasurer, may like to give that figure. I must mention the paragraph dealing with the position in regard to trust funds, in which the Treasurer said:

The occurrence of a deficit on Loan Account concurrently with one on Consolidated Revenue Account has meant, of course, that it was not possible for the Revenue deficit or any part of it to be funded out of borrowings.

This in itself is a bad way of looking after one's house. The Treasurer continued:

The combined deficit of \$8,077,000 at the end of 1965-66 has as a consequence been met temporarily out of other funds in the hands of the Treasury, representing trust accounts, deposit accounts and other appropriations held for particular purposes. Of an aggregate of \$27,322,000 of trust and deposit accounts held by the Treasury at June 30, 1966, \$18,000,000 was held in fixed deposit at the Reserve and State Banks, and the remainder was used either to finance temporarily the deficits I have mentioned or held in current form at bank and in minor cash balances.

One might be pardoned for asking what has happened to the other trust funds, because in the Auditor-General's Report last year there was mention of an amount of \$27,332,000 that is not mentioned here. Has someone got on the inside running and removed trust funds to some other place? No-one has told us where this rundown has occurred since the last report by the Auditor-General. It seems to me that we are down a considerable number of dollars in the trust accounts and in other deposit accounts that were mentioned in the report.

The funds deposited with the Treasury as trust funds include the Government Insurance Fund at \$187,000, the Marginal Lands Improvement Account at \$130,000, the Debt Adjustment Fund at \$402,000, and such things as the Legacy Club of South Australia, the Poppy Day Appeal, the Returned Servicemen's League, swine compensation, the Phylloxera Board, Rhinitis and various other funds. It is possible that many of these funds may be called upon at short notice.

If a call is made on a bank at short notice when one is caught short, that is just too bad, as some of my banker friends, and I as a borrower, know. The banks do not like that. Banking institutions in this State would not dare to get to the point where, if there was a run on the banks, they were not able to meet their obligations to their depositors. However, we are dipping into these funds, and apparently we have confidence that no-one will want this money for the time being. That is not good practice. Everyone knows what happens to the accountant or solicitor who backs a magnificent horse on a Saturday with the intention of putting the money back on the Monday morning. Unfortunately, the person concerned does not know as much as the horse or the jockey.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: It is robbing the piggy bank.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes. My children have done that to me.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: What did you do?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I tanned their hides, and I am in the process of doing something similar to the Government on the same principle, because money cannot be taken out of reserves, particularly trust reserves, without permission. The Government has taken that money out. It will be interesting to see who has to go short so that the money can be put back, because it has to go back to the reserves. Although this document does not tell us much, it seems that there has been a nice balance at about \$9,000,000, which amount is the difference between the aggregate of \$27,000,000 and the figure of \$18,000,000. I am interested in the position regarding the balance because, according to the Auditor-General's report for the year ended June 30, 1965, we had \$12,000,000 and, regarding the other items mentioned here, there are the appropriations.

This is like using X, because one does not know what X means until one finds out the rest of the sum. I do not think we have had the full story about this matter. The other item concerns trust fund accounts and securities held by the Treasury at that time. They comprise various funds, such as the Highways Fund. I should like clarification from the Chief Secretary about that, because it is disturbing to me. The Treasurer also said in his explanation:

For many years it has been the practice in this State to charge against Revenue Account those grants to institutions for tertiary education and to non-Government hospitals which are for buildings. Comparable expenditures for buildings for departmental schools, for Government hospitals, and for other departmental purposes, however, have regularly been charged to Loan Account.

Then we come to what is almost the theme song of this Government: we must always put ourselves in the melting pot with other Australian States.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: We didn't do so with the Prices Act Amendment Bill!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No, we did not. The Treasurer continued:

The other Australian States adopt the general practice of charging such appropriations for building against Loan Account, whether they be by way of grants to institutions for tertiary education or non-Government hospitals, or direct expenditures for Government buildings. There can be no dispute that, if it can be afforded, the practice of charging

building grants against Revenue Account rather than Loan Account is desirable. However, it would be foolhardy to continue this practice whilst the effect of charging them against Revenue Account is to put that account further into deficit.

In the first place, this is hire-purchase finance, and nothing else. This is not money that the Government is working with: it is mortgaging the future and hoping that it will get out of it. That is typical hire-purchase psychology, and it is the psychology that we heard in this Council from members opposite when they were in Opposition. I shall not weary members or embarrass some of my honourable friends who now sit on the front benches by reiterating what they have said about this, but there is plenty of evidence in their speeches that we should get out and spend the money and the future will look after itself. It does not, however; it catches up with us, and it has done so now.

We have been making grants to tertiary education organizations and non-Government hospitals and, as they come out of revenue, there is no worry over interest. What we are now doing is giving them grants or subsidies (let us call them subsidies) out of the Loan Fund. The subsidy is a direct gift that is matched by the organization receiving it, but who pays the interest? The Government pays it for the full term of the sinking fund arrangement whereas, when the subsidy comes from revenue, it has come from taxation and there is no interest borne by the Government.

It is frightening to realize from a perusal of last years' Auditor-General's Report the amount of interest that is accruing on our Loan funds. This went on in the previous Government's day, and it is still going on. It is all right to utilize Loan funds to develop the State but, when the Government departs from an established principle and, in order to keep face and keep the pot boiling, it starts to dip into Loan funds to finance items that should be financed out of the yearly maintenance money, so to speak, it is going to run down further and further. Although it may balance its books better and make things look better for the next year, the future of the 17-year-olds and 18-year-olds is being mortgaged for 53 years hence by this change of financial policy, and this is not a good thing.

I agree with the Government that it is foolhardy to continue this practice while the effect of charging it against Revenue Account is to put that account further into deficit, but it is nobody's fault but the Government's that the Revenue Account is going further into deficit.

It is only through some manipulations that have gone on and some new ideas some people have had that the Government has had to fund the Revenue Account out of Loan moneys, and that is a dangerous thing. As the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford has pointed out to the Government, it is dangerous to use Loan funds to fund revenue deficits, because when the Treasurer goes to Canberra for the carving up of the national cake once a year he immediately gets into difficulties. I do not agree with this principle, which is completely inconsistent with what the Government allows councils and hospitals to do. The Government will not subsidize country hospitals from Loan moneys, and that is a wise thing, but the Government should remember that, if a hospital borrows \$100,000 to build a hospital worth \$300,000, the \$100,000 has to be repaid. The Government insists that it will not subsidize such a loan.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: It is a big drain on the Treasury.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It is. However, there is a big reversal of form, and the Government is doing what it will not allow councils, hospitals and tertiary organizations to do. I believe this should be closely examined by the Treasury and the Auditor-General. I do not have to teach the Auditor-General his job. We usually do not have his report in time to discuss this Bill.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I understand you will have it tomorrow.

The C. R. STORY: As always, I was born too early! We have always been slow to get the Auditor-General's Report. I could criticize the Government on many other things, but the points I mentioned were those I was keen to discuss. I shall leave it to some other honourable member to discuss the allocation of \$700,000 as advances for homes, as I cannot work it out. Last year \$700,000 was allotted and spent. This year \$700,000 is allotted, repayments will amount to \$1,700,000, and there will be \$1,700,000 of new money. I cannot work this out, so I shall leave it to some of my friends who deal with housing.

One thing that I do know something about is loans to producers. Loans to producers amount to \$1,050,000. I will read what the report accompanying the Loan Estimates says:

The sum of \$1,359,000 was advanced by the bank under the Loans to Producers Act in 1965-66. This amount was made up of \$826,000 advanced to distilleries, fruit canneries, fruit packing houses, cool stores and other processors of fruit, \$443,000 to fish handling co-operatives, \$73,000 to processors of dairy products, and \$17,000 to assist in financing co-operative

irrigation projects. The sum of \$1,200,000 of the total was provided from State Loan funds and \$159,000 from semi-government borrowings. Of the \$200,000 borrowed as semi-government loans in 1965-66, \$41,000 remained unspent at June 30 last, and is thus available to meet payments in 1966-67 on account of commitments already made.

So really that \$41,000 is not for this year: it is merely being carried over to pay for various loans made, where the people concerned could not complete their works in time to avail themselves of that \$41,000. The statement continues:

It is proposed that approximately \$1,290,000 will be available in 1966-67 to enable the bank to continue to assist in financing co-operative enterprises of this nature. A sum of \$41,000 has been carried forward from last year, \$1,050,000 is to be provided from Loan Account and \$200,000 will be raised by way of new semi-government loans.

We are down in the amount of money available under Loans to Producers by some \$750,000. We have had two inquiries set up by this Government (the citrus industry and the wine industry inquiries), and both those reports were submitted to Parliament, both recommending that the co-operatives in respect of the Loans to Producers Fund should take up more of the surpluses available than they had done in the past. I have heard Government members say what a magnificent job these inquiry committees did. I agree with that, but it is little use setting up costly committees, which submit reports, when we do not provide the sinews of war for the recommendations to be carried into effect. We have to get more money into these particular items; otherwise, we shall start to run backwards in the primary producing section of our development. It is bad enough that secondary industry at present is running into difficulty through various taxation increases and because of the resistance of the Eastern States to some of our goods—for instance, motor cars and other made-up goods—but, when our primary industry starts to run into difficulties because of lack of funds, we shall really be in queer street. There are moves at present afoot. We know that we are faced with a heavier vintage than last year's in the wine industry and that in previous years when we had this sort of vintage we experienced difficulty in placing our commodities. We know that various co-operatives are prepared to develop considerably their storages, along with the private wineries, but the money has to be made available. This can be done in one of two ways—either by a guarantee by the Government to private banks

to enable them to work with this sort of finance, which involves large amounts of money; or by the money coming direct out of the Loans to Producers Fund through the State Bank. I have been waiting for some little while to get an amendment into the Industrial and Provident Societies Act but so far I have not succeeded. I hope it will come about.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I have a report on that.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: In that case, I retract what I say. I understand that the Chief Secretary has a report for me but I am still in as big a quandary as ever, because I do not know whether it is a good or a bad report. However, we must have an amendment to the Industrial and Provident Societies Act, which enables the companies to retain more money in regard to profit. This was mentioned in the Auditor-General's report last year. We have slipped back in this matter. We were getting much more money a few years ago into the Loans to Producers Fund than we are getting now; yet the production of citrus fruit alone is doubling every three years in this State, and we have to find a home for it.

I was intrigued a few days ago that a member of the Party opposite, a friend of mine, had much to say about this wonderful socialistic thing called "co-operatives". If I could ever say anything, I would say that the co-operative movement set up under the Industrial and Provident Societies Act was the complete answer to Socialism because, as I understand the position, with Socialism we all share and share alike irrespective of what we put in; we are all good fellows, work just as hard as each other and get similar rewards. That is the theory of Socialism. But, in the co-operative movement, co-operation is simply that: it enables individuals to do collectively what they cannot afford to do as individuals. They are paid for what they put into a factory. If they put in a poor quality article, they get a poor price; if they submit a good quality article, they get a good price. It means simply that this is private enterprise, only we have to get together to do it because everybody cannot afford to have a processing plant of his own.

These industries are running fairly close to the bread-line all the time. This production can be done collectively but not individually. I have never heard so much nonsense as when listening to talk about the co-operative movement in South Australia being socialistic. I get almost out of control when I hear such

stuff as this put over. The amount of money provided under Loans to Producers is not adequate.

If we look at another facet of what is happening in our financial world today, it would be interesting for honourable members and for some members of the public to find out a few things. In the last year or two there have been many references to the Public Works Committee upon which the committee has reported favourably. I mention a few that I have taken out. I have done some homework, even though we have been accused in the press today of not doing our homework. One of the terrible things about this Council is that it usually does its homework too well and thus gets into strife.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Can we do it too well?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I do not think we can; I think we do it adequately, though. I should like to raise two points. Total references approved by the Public Works Standing Committee in the last 12 months amounted to \$26,684,512. I have searched the Loan Estimates and I cannot find anything like that amount in connection with items that have been mentioned. I went back a further year in doing my homework and I found a number of references that did not get on to the previous one; in fact, I can go back nearly three years and find this state of affairs.

It must be disappointing for the people of Renmark and Karoonda to find that, although their schools were referred to the Public Works Committee and reported upon early in the financial year, neither received a guernsey in the Loan Estimates this year; they were not mentioned. The two schools were estimated to cost \$330,000 and \$340,000 respectively, and they appear to have missed out altogether. Many other matters do not appear to figure in the draw. In the south-western suburbs sewerage scheme, Blackwood, Eden Hills and Flagstaff Hill, representing an outlay of \$2,600,000, do not seem to be mentioned. The Swan Reach to Stockwell main estimated to cost \$8,000,000 has an amount of \$1,360,000 allotted for the first year. We were told in evidence before the Public Works Committee that it was imperative for this main to be completed in 2½ years, yet only this comparatively small amount has been allotted.

Extensions to the Forbes Primary School do not seem to be on the list, yet this is in one of the fast-growing areas and a school with

about 1,700 students. The estimated cost was \$3,800,000, but no provision has been made for it. Expenditure on Kingscote water supply was estimated to cost \$1,582,000 and an amount of \$760,000 is provided. The Port Adelaide Girls Technical School receives its full amount of \$320,000. Next is the Roseworthy Agricultural College with the provision of a science block and a new engineering workshop at an estimated cost of \$670,000. Much publicity was given this project on television and it was something that the Government had entered into in a big way, yet \$630,000 will be provided by the Commonwealth Government as a grant to the State.

An amount of \$300,000 represented the estimated cost of an Engineering and Water Supply Department depot at Elizabeth, but that is not shown on the Estimates; nor is the LeFevre Peninsula water supply at an estimated cost of \$240,000. With regard to the Ingle Farm water and sewerage project, most of the money is provided by the Housing Trust, and it is one of the projects that keeps Government employees in a job. When the Housing Trust undertakes a new subdivision it is responsible during the first year for providing a large proportion of water and sewerage costs. Tea Tree Gully sewerage is mentioned in the Loan Estimates, as also is the Whyalla Scott Street Primary School. A tremendous need for education exists in Whyalla as it is a fast-growing area and many schools have been erected there in recent times—high schools, a technical school and so on.

The Port Lincoln tuna berth was estimated to cost \$510,000, but I do not see any mention of it in the Loan Estimates for this year. The Department of Chemistry and Medico-Legal Building situated next to the Public Library in Kintore Avenue will be a most expensive project and is estimated to cost \$2,200,000, but I do not see a line to cover that expenditure. The building will include the new city morgue. An amount of \$248,000 is provided for the Agincourt Bore Area School. As far as I can ascertain, this is the first time that we have departed from normal practice of building schools in one of two forms. In the fast-growing areas in Para Hills and Elizabeth we have at odd times erected a number of temporary buildings in such a manner as to form a school. Later, when we could afford it, the temporary buildings would be removed and permanent buildings provided. That is one method; the other method is to erect a solid construction type of building

in the form of masonry or the new Samecon type of construction.

Two schools in my electorate, situated in two of the hottest places in the State in fairly inhospitable country, both subject to northerly winds in summer and cold southerlies in winter, have been fobbed off with permanent timber buildings. That surprises me, and I do not think any other school has had one of those permanent buildings erected for a long time. I understand that the reason for erecting permanent timber buildings is that manpower was available in the department at the time, together with certain materials, and rather than let the contract to a contractor who would build a school of solid construction the money was utilized to keep people in employment. I have no objection to this, but I am sorry that it is happening in one of the hottest and most inhospitable parts of the country. At the seaside where cool breezes prevail such buildings would be satisfactory, but in such places Mount Gambier stone has been brought up to build a school.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: There would not be much economy in that practice.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: There would be none at all, because with timber frames being cut on the spot it is a most expensive method. I think that from the point of view of the Government this was a matter of necessity, but I register a protest and ask that if such buildings are to be erected more suitable places should be found in which to erect them. If the Government is short of money and materials, let it look to other places where the type of building I have mentioned is to be erected and not erect it in the arid, hot parts of the State. Air-conditioning and electricity are not available there, and they must also use bore water as they are not even on the mains. These people put up with enough hardship without inflicting permanent wooden buildings on them. Other matters dealt with by the Public Works Committee include Elanora Hospital, which is a training hospital at O'Halloran Hill, and the committee reported on that project 12 months ago. The estimated cost was \$6,372,000. Strathmont hospital, in the Hillcrest area, for the intellectually-retarded, which is also to be a training hospital, has been estimated to cost \$5,702,000. The estimated cost of the two hospitals was about \$12,000,000. However, they were not provided for on the Estimates last year and they are not provided for this year. I know that the Chief Secretary is aware that he has either

to use his powers of persuasive eloquence to get the Commonwealth to extend the time during which it will make subsidy available in 1967 or get on with the job.

I do not think the Northfield wards, which have been estimated to cost \$2,000,000, are to be commenced. The building for the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science is estimated to cost \$1,852,000 and we have not got very far with it yet. All those works total \$26,684,512. We shall not spend that amount, and I have dealt with those that we are not going to start. I was questioned closely the other night about the new Tea Tree Gully hospital in my district and about when it would be built. I said that I did not know and that the Minister had said that a different site had been chosen. The former Government was going to provide a smaller hospital that was big enough for the population at that time. However, the new Government has acquired land that I understand is satisfactory to the people in the area.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is at Modbury.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That site is in the Midland District.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is in the planning stages, in preparation for reference to the Public Works Committee.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I have mentioned many things that have not been accomplished, and these projects must be just as important to the people concerned as is the Tea Tree Gully hospital. We have just completed a reference regarding 226 additional beds at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital at an estimated cost of \$8,608,000. The people at Tea Tree Gully have been promised a hospital of 500 beds and so, on the basis of the cost of additional beds at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Tea Tree Gully hospital could not be built for less than about \$16,000,000. The proposal for the Port Augusta Hospital is before the Public Works Committee at present, at an estimated cost of \$3,580,000.

The cost of works on hospitals at Strathmont, Elanora, Port Augusta and Queen Elizabeth means that our hospital plate will be fairly full for a long time. I think the people of Port Augusta will be toey if they do not get their hospital before something is done at other places. There may be other projects, because I have not gone into the matter fully, but I have mentioned sufficient to show that at present projects that have not a chance of getting off the ground are being put forward to Parliament. This is particularly so because about \$9,000,000 will have to be put back into the trust funds before we can start to spend.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: That only balances for last year.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes. Courts of law require that restitution be made and I shall be interested to hear the representative of the Treasurer explain how we are going to do this. What has been said so far does not tell us. I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): I consider that the most outstanding feature of this debate and of its repercussions outside is that it is causing alarm among the general public. This alarm has been caused by the Government's handling of the finances of the State and it is spreading throughout the State, through all sections of the community. The man in the street is now talking about it, and the employer has been concerned about it for a long time already. I consider that the Government deserves severe censure, and I shall give reasons for this criticism. From a position of sound management, growth, prosperity and full employment, the economy was entrusted to this new Government in March, 1965. The Government had gone to the people with a policy speech that included the following famous words:

Ours is not a policy of extravagance. It is one of accuracy in budgeting.

The people who simply wanted a change thought that they could rely on and trust a Party that included such words in its policy speech. However, now, with the biggest deficit in the history of this State after its first full year of Government, with unemployment the worst on a percentage basis of any State in Australia, with less money appropriated for this current year from Loan Account than was spent in the last year for school buildings, with less money appropriated this year than was spent last year on State hospitals, with less money going towards water and sewerage works, with less money spent on the south-western suburbs drainage scheme, with the State Bank having its usual \$1,000,000 for ordinary trading purposes completely cut out, with the expenditure on police and courthouse buildings reduced this year compared with what it was last year, with less money appropriated for Government buildings under the heading of "Other Government Buildings", with the Mines Department being cut down this year on the amount it was given to spend last year, with the Produce Department's allocation being reduced, with about one-third of the State's Treasury funds and deposit moneys drawn against in an endeavour to get the Government out of its embarrassment, and with these trust funds being used in this way for the first

time since the last Labor Government did this prior to 1933, it is little wonder that alarm is spreading.

I, along with other South Australians who are talking about this shocking mismanagement, strongly criticize the Government for the mess it has laid at this State's door after only 18 months in office. What was the general position of the State before the last election? Loan money right up to the hilt and some revenue money was channelled into some form of development and increased production. We built up such a programme that the Commonwealth Government's grant formula rose to 13.7 per cent of the total Australian allocation when our population was under 10 per cent of the Australian total.

This was in marked contrast with the position in Victoria and New South Wales, whose allocation of grants was less than their percentage of population to the Australian total. We enticed new industry here because of our approach to the need for development and keeping costs down. High employment was our accomplished goal, and overtime was enjoyed by the workers of this State. This added, of course, to the high level of business activity. We did not tap trust funds or deposits at the Treasury: the Playford Government never ran out of money. We financed hospitals other than Government hospitals.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: There were deficits when the previous Government was in office.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: We had deficits, but we did not tap trust funds and look around for money.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You had 11 in the last 19 years.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: We balanced our Budgets.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You had 11 deficits in the last 19 years. Look at the Auditor-General's report.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: And we balanced those against our surpluses. We financed other than Government hospitals out of revenue, and grants for tertiary education buildings also came from revenue. We were the envy of the other States, and all this was ploughed into this State with the emphasis on development. As this came from revenue, other Loan money was used for further developmental purposes. What is the position now as revealed in the Chief Secretary's speech and the Estimates before us?

First, it must be emphasized that we are receiving an increased Loan allocation this

year, that coming, of course, from the Commonwealth Government. The increase, as stated in the Chief Secretary's explanation, is \$5,481,000. The Chief Secretary also mentioned that a further \$6,500,000 was expected from the Commonwealth Government for revenue purposes. I do not think any share of the blame can be palmed off on the Commonwealth Government, because we have received a grant higher than last year's. The deficit has been met temporarily (this deficit was mentioned by the Chief Secretary as being \$8,077,000) by using funds at the Treasury, representing trust accounts, deposit funds, and other appropriations held by the Government. Under this general heading the Chief Secretary said there was a total sum of \$27,322,000, \$18,000,000 of which was set aside on fixed deposit and the balance being held apparently as bank balances.

This trust money, as the name surely implies, was held on trust for various institutions, semi-Government bodies and other organizations, the names of which were not disclosed. I think they should be disclosed, because we and they ought to know whose money is being applied to bolster the tottering finances of the State. As this money is being used temporarily (this is the word the Chief Secretary used) what are the plans to repay it? Does the Government expect to repay it in the current year, and how is it planning to do this? This question must surely be answered at this time of urgent inquiry into the State's finances, and at this time when this Bill is being debated.

I shall go a little deeper into the question of whose trust money is being used. I noticed that the Hon. Mr. Story read the names of some institutions and semi-government bodies from what I believed was the last Auditor-General's Report, which was for the year ended June 30, 1965. I ask the Chief Secretary whether he will disclose the names of the owners of these various accounts, because surely it is the Government's responsibility to make their names known. I would think (but I do not know, as the names have not been disclosed) that the South Australian Superannuation Fund was in this category. If this is so, the funds this body lends for housing finance will not be available, or will not be available to the same extent as previously, because they have been taken and used by this Government.

This source of housing finance is a great boon to public servants, who are given priority when they want to secure long-term low-interest loans for houses for purchase. These public servants, who contribute their own money to

the fund in addition to the Government contribution, should not be placed in a position of disadvantage of this kind, if they are being so placed. If these people are to be forced into a long queue to obtain temporary finance at high interest rates, this fact must surely be ventilated.

As I was looking through the Auditor-General's Report I noticed some figures relating to money that the Housing Trust had at the Treasury. For the last year about which the Auditor-General's Report deals, the figure was \$722,280, and in the previous year it was \$1,700,386, which was cash in hand or at the Treasury. It may well be that this Government, in effect, is absorbing money held at the Treasury on behalf of the Housing Trust simply to balance its books from last year, and I ask the Chief Secretary whether this is so—whether, in the figure of about \$9,000,000 that is being taken against these trust funds, money is included as security that belongs to the Housing Trust.

I thought I would obtain from the Auditor-General's Report the names of the people who had trust money at the Treasury, but I was so startled at the first case I looked at that I did not take it any further, because the first page that I opened dealt with the Department of Aboriginal Affairs. From this Auditor-General's Report I see that trust funds are held at the Treasury on account of this department. There is some explanation of these trust funds under the heading "Trust Funds". I quote a few lines from page 45 of the Auditor-General's Report:

At June 30, 1965, the amount of trust moneys held for pensioners was £18,500. Child endowment, maternity allowances and other moneys are also received and disbursed on behalf of Aborigines. Moneys held from these sources at the end of the year amounted to £15,800.

So it seems that trust moneys held by this Government—moneys used for the purposes of child endowment, maternity allowances and pensions to Aboriginal people—are being used as security by this present Government in its endeavour to balance its books of account.

The changed procedure of financing hospitals other than Government hospitals, and buildings for tertiary education, from Revenue to Loan means that that net \$4,500,000 to be spent on these items this year will come from Loan, whereas under the previous Government's policy it came from Revenue. Loan money that would and could have been allocated for other purposes if this Government had managed its affairs properly is not now available for such other purposes, and

apparently \$4,500,000 is swallowed up in the everyday running expenses of the State.

I now mention some of the details in the reduced allocations this year, and emphasize the further running down of the State's economy, which must result as less money is being appropriated than was spent last year. How the Labor Government is endeavouring to tackle the serious unemployment position when reduced expenditure on works is announced I just do not know, and those who are alarmed at this unemployment problem will gain no consolation from these figures.

First, I deal with Government hospital buildings. We find in the Loan Estimates with which we have been supplied that in the year 1965-66 the actual payments on hospital buildings (that is, Government hospital buildings in this State) were \$7,314,120, but the appropriation this year is a smaller sum than that—\$7,280,000. Then a repayment is to be received, estimated at \$260,000, and a proposed net payment of \$7,020,000 will then result. It may be argued that it is not a particularly large reduction but, nevertheless, in times like these it is a great shame that there is to be a reduction in hospital construction. Here again, going back to the policy speech made on behalf of this Government before it took office, dealing with hospitals it states:

The Playford Government has been most neglectful in its duty to the people of this State concerning the provision of hospital treatment and has failed to provide a co-ordinated plan for the future. You, of course, realize that it is entirely wrong to expect sick people to be moved from such places as Modbury and Tea Tree Gully to the Royal Adelaide Hospital or from such other parts as Christies Beach and beyond, and it is only reasonable to expect that a decentralized plan for general hospitals would have been implemented.

The Hon. Mr. Story dwelt upon this and I have looked carefully in the Loan Estimates for the current year, which take us to June 30, 1967, and a hospital at Modbury does not so far appear. There is another part of the policy speech with which I continue:

Labor's proposals provide for a general hospital at Tea Tree Gully of 500 beds and a teaching hospital for the south-western districts of 800 beds—this must be at or near the university area at Bedford Park—and to provide for sufficient doctors this teaching hospital must be erected without delay.

The only public hospitals mentioned in this report as receiving building attention in this current year are the Royal Adelaide, the Queen Elizabeth, Parkside, Enfield, and Palm Lodge.

So people are asking whether all this talk of hospitals at Tea Tree Gully and Modbury, with more and more money to be spent on hospitals, was only propaganda for election purposes.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No, it was not, and it will be proved to the contrary in a very short space of time.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It will be proved in the next year in which there will be an election.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No; it is only because of time. One cannot plan and get a hospital ready in 12 months.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I know.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You can play politics as much as you like.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: There is no denying that this was an extravagant policy speech. In case Government members are getting upset about it—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We are not getting upset but you are only playing politics, and doing a bad job.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Let us move along to "school buildings".

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Now we might get somewhere!

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You are the one who is upset, because promises are being put into operation.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If that is so, I am waiting for the Tea Tree Gully hospital to be built. There was a very small allocation for the Parkside Mental Hospital. We find in the Loan Estimates before us that in the year 1965-66 a sum of \$11,758,894 was spent on school buildings; the allocation for the current year is \$10,640,000. There is to be a repayment of \$80,000, there being a net expenditure, therefore, of \$10,560,000.

Here again, from the State's point of view as regards the employment of labour on the construction of school buildings and from the point of view of the younger married people who want to see their children placed in first-class modern school accommodation, it is a great pity that the allocation for expenditure on school buildings this year is less than what was spent last year. Of course, a paradoxical situation will arise this year, because money will be taken to be spent on free school books, and parents will be asking whether there has been a cut-down on construction costs of school buildings to provide some of this money for free school books for our children.

We now turn to the Engineering and Water Supply Department, which of course, from the point of view of water conservation throughout the State and water schemes and sewerage schemes in the metropolitan area in particular, is a most important department. When considering the figures and the reduced allocations we would be in agreement that the amount of actual work being done for every dollar allocated this year will be less than that completed for every dollar spent last year because costs of labour and materials tend to rise all the time. That is an important influence that must be borne in mind when considering these figures.

The amount of money spent last year by the Engineering and Water Supply Department (and again I quote figures from the Loan Estimates) was \$27,415,368 and the amount appropriated this year is \$26,800,000. Then the department is to receive repayments of \$2,600,000, so that it will require a net amount of \$24,200,000. Therefore, it does not matter whether we take the net or the gross figure; there is less money appropriated in the current financial year in these Estimates than was spent last year.

Then there is the relatively small item of the south-western suburbs drainage scheme, and I refer to the Bill that was passed as an urgent measure last session in connection with Drain No. 10. Of course, little has been done about it in the meantime, but at long last the money is to become available and the sum of \$420,000 has been appropriated. The amount of money spent on the drainage scheme last year was more—\$525,935—and the complete scheme, according to the report and Estimate in 1960-61 (which can be said to be a conservative figure compared with the actual costs that will be incurred) is \$4,400,000. So we are not getting far with it and on the other hand we are allocating less money to that scheme this year than was spent on it last year.

So one could go down the list item by item. I refer to the line "Police and Courthouse Buildings"; last year an amount of \$908,651 was spent and this year an amount of \$790,000 is allocated. Under the general heading of "Other Government Buildings" the figures for 1965-66 show \$3,965,172 expended whereas an amount of \$3,600,000 is provided this year in the Estimates. Under this heading one item is of particular interest to people in the metropolitan area, and that is the new office block for public servants in Victoria Square.

As I read the figures given to us, the estimated cost of the building is \$6,392,000. The

amount spent last year was \$1,486,000, leaving a balance owing on the construction (and we know it is under construction at present because I counted the storeys of the steel framework this morning and it is up to the tenth floor) of nearly \$4,000,000. This building will provide much-needed accommodation for public servants, and they deserve that accommodation. It is a serious state of affairs that at present the State has not the amount of money in hand for completing that building, or at least some of that money. I would like to have an assurance from the Chief Secretary that an arrangement can be made this year so that work on this building will not be restricted.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Your Government was responsible for the position over the years.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The scheduled finishing time for the building is December, 1967, and I am assured it will be completed then.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If it is to be completed then, and paid for when it has been completed, a sum of \$4,000,000 will have to be found in the year following this current one.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: There are a lot of other works that are being completed that will not need the money next year. They are getting it this year.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: I don't think the Minister can follow the honourable member; the Minister is not versed in finance.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I think I am as good as the honourable member.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am hopeful that next year will see some increase in these items so that the unemployment position can be attended to. I will not prolong the agony—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You are doing a good job for the Government; keep going!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Department of Mines in this State deals with the exploration and development of mineral resources; and again the figure drops, from \$303,714 to an estimated allocation of \$250,000. The Produce Department has also been cut back. As I mentioned earlier, \$1,000,000 was granted to the State Bank for ordinary trading purposes and that has been completely cut from the Estimates this year. One would have thought that the Government would be generous with the State Bank, and here I refer to the point raised by the Hon. Mr. Story when he said \$700,000 had been allocated under Advances for Homes. It is money that the State Bank lends to people for housing purposes and it is an allocation entirely apart from money that

comes from the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement.

The sum of \$700,000 is allocated again this year, but in the repayments from the State Bank to the Government is a figure of \$1,700,000, and that leaves a credit of \$1,000,000 in that line. In view of the fact that the Government is going to score \$1,000,000 it is a pity that the bank's trading section could not have been given that same opportunity to expand and develop and help business people throughout the State, as has been done in past years. The bank was given \$1,000,000 last year and nothing this year.

I move now to matters concerning housing. In the first instance I mention the operation of the South Australian Housing Trust. I compliment the trust on making every possible endeavour within its limits and resources to proceed with building. However, one or two small facets of its operations should be examined because they disturb me. First, it is estimated that 3,250 houses will be completed this current year, and I take that to be houses and housing units because they seem to be grouped with various accommodation under the general category of housing. Last year the same number of houses were completed, and as at June 30, 1966, 2,661 houses were under construction.

There must be some explanation for this figure of 2,661 and I ask the Chief Secretary whether he could give it because I believe the Council should be told. It appears that the Housing Trust completes houses within 12 or 13 weeks, and it would seem that if on July 1 this year 2,661 houses were under construction they would probably be finished during the month of October. From what we have been told it seems that the trust expects to complete only another 600 houses after that in the whole of this year. There must be some explanation that has not yet been given.

It may be that many houses are awaiting the provision of services, or it may be that the trust believes in this stop-go principle of having many houses partly finished before the end of the financial year so that, if we have a bad year in the following year, it can complete a large number in that bad year. If it is building on a stop-go principle, that is not good for the building industry or for obtaining an even flow. A steady flow is in the best interests of the building trade.

Secondly, I refer to the \$1,000,000 set aside by the trust for shops and industrial premises. The comment is made that industrial development is progressing satisfactorily, but I am

concerned that the Housing Trust is proceeding to establish shops and industrial premises when the private sector of the building industry is in a bad way and when there is serious unemployment in the industry. This is an appropriate time to give an opportunity to private enterprise to build these shops and premises. If that were done, it would allow the trust to spend that \$1,000,000 to help young people and others needing houses. Going right back to the offices of architects who specialize in commercial construction, the whole position is bad, and private enterprise—

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Are you suggesting that private enterprise is falling down as far as building is concerned?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It has not fallen down. It is tending at bedrock figures, as I am sure the Minister knows, just to keep staff and organization together. Staff and sub-contractors who have been working with the same firms for years are drifting away from reputable builders, including members of the Master Builders Association. When these people want business and when the position is so bad, I question why the Housing Trust should set aside \$1,000,000 for shops and industrial premises.

I question the figures given by the Chief Secretary regarding the amount available for housing under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. He says that there is a supplementary amount of \$1,100,000 available for lending. I am not saying that the Chief Secretary has erred intentionally: in fact, I may be wrong. However, I should like an explanation, because the figures are misleading.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Can you give the paragraph so that we can check it?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We don't want to hide anything.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: You have too much to hide.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We have nothing to hide.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The paragraph reads:

The \$20,750,000 of housing moneys will be supplemented by recoveries of earlier advances to the extent of some \$1,100,000, so that a total of \$21,850,000 is expected to be available for distribution for housing purposes.

The Auditor-General's Report for the year ended June 30, 1965, shows that the extra money available for investment stood at \$845,850, but it was then invested by way of mortgages with the State Bank, the Co-operative Building Society and the Hindmarsh Building Society,

and the bank balance was a debit of \$2,508. This balance, which is invested and is an additional amount for financing purposes, is an increasing balance each year, and it has increased to about \$1,100,000. I am submitting that the major part of it was invested, anyway, in housing finance. If that is so, it is not available this year, and I ask the Chief Secretary to clarify the position. If I am right and the information that has been given by the Chief Secretary is wrong, the position ought to be clarified.

The year 1964-65 started with an aggregate surplus of \$1,163,000 and ended with an aggregate debit of \$8,077,000. The reasons given by the Treasurer for the deficit were, first, that the rate of expenditure in 1964-65 was unusually high, and that the carry-over, therefore, forced heavy expenditure, and, secondly, that there was an increase of only 1.2 per cent in the allocations for 1965-66.

It is not good enough to bring those excuses forward as the first and second reasons in importance for the deficit, because at the beginning of every financial year every Treasurer is faced with problems and challenges and he has to use his skill to work out the best way in which those forthcoming problems and challenges can be met. The same principle applies to a person balancing his own family budget.

The basis on which one controls one's financial affairs are fundamental. The same problems are there, and the Governments that give high priority to their responsibilities in the finance sector should be able to make out. This Government has not made out and I do not accept the two excuses that have been brought forward. The third excuse is now the hackneyed one that financial Bills were obstructed in this Chamber.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Weren't a couple of financial Bills thrown out?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes, and I shall give the amount involved.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Then you are the only one that can give it, because the other members have not been able to do it.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Another honourable member gave the figures but he was being very kind to you, because he said we had obstructed to the extent of \$1,000,000. That is not so: the figure is only \$500,000. I have listed the amounts that we caused the Government not to receive. They are \$300,000 under the succession duties legislation, \$100,000 under the stamp duties legislation—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No, \$150,000. That is a fact.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I listened with great interest to the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill when he tore to pieces the argument put up in another place about irresponsible characters in this Chamber (whoever they may be) who blocked legislation.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The Treasury estimated \$150,000.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Very well; I will agree to add \$50,000. Of the \$8,077,000 aggregate deficit, we were the cause of the Government's losing \$550,000, which is about one-sixteenth.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Are you sure it is that much?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am being generous.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: You can afford to be!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Although I have accepted the extra \$50,000, I have great respect for the manner in which the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill dissected this matter and went through it item by item. His figure came to just under \$500,000, and the biggest item of the four was \$300,000 on succession duties, and that was the Minister's own estimate. The fourth and last reason given by the Treasurer for this history-making deficit was the general slowing down of economic activity. I know the Government does not agree, but I consider that it is most definitely the general lack of confidence in this Government that is contributing to the slowing down of employment.

This Bill gives cause for an extremely close look by the people of this State into the Labor Government's handling of the financial affairs of this State. It is apparent that there will be a further running down of the economy, and higher taxes and charges must follow. Our prominent and buoyant place within the nation has been lost, and we must simply await a re-awakening by the Government to the urgent need to produce, to develop and to employ.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): I support the Bill, which provides for a total expenditure of \$77,459,000. Being a realist and knowing that only a limited amount of money is available, I congratulate the Government on the way it intends to distribute the money. It is easy for the Opposition to say that certain things have been left out of this programme and that the Government should have done this and that, but not

one member opposite has indicated any project on which he would cut down. Members opposite know that only a certain sum of money is available from the Commonwealth Government and that this Government is spending all that plus other money. Members opposite have not indicated any project on which they would cut down so as to bring forward their favourite projects.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: You have cut down on all of them now!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Opposition's criticism is destructive rather than constructive. If members opposite have an alternative they should bring it forward, but they have not. They know they could not do better than the present Government has done in the circumstances. Like other members, I am concerned about the unemployment in this State. It is regrettable that a country such as ours, which is crying out for development, should have any unemployed people. However, this is not to be blamed on the Government of this or any other State where there is unemployment.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: What is your solution?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: To change the Government now in office in Canberra, whose policy is one of tightening up. That Government has put into operation the stop-go policy. The Commonwealth Government holds the purse strings, and it has drawn them tight, so it must accept the blame for today's conditions.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: Why are figures worse in South Australia?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: This Government is tackling the unemployment position in the best way it can with the money available. Loan money will be spent throughout a large area of this State, and the whole State will benefit. I am pleased to see that the Government has set aside money for the purchase of land for a suitable site for a new Government Printing Department building. All honourable members are well aware of the obsolete and totally inadequate building at present occupied by the Government Printer. The previous Government made an announcement in October, 1961, about the type of building it proposed to erect for the Government Printer but, like many other announcements, the Government never got around to doing anything about it.

The Hon. C. R. Story: At least it had a plan.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes, and this Government has the property, and plans will be put into operation.

The Hon. C. R. Story: We had the property, too.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes, and you had plans for many other projects that were not brought forward. I compliment the Hon. Mr. Story on his speech, which was very much in line with speeches once made by the late Mr. Frank Condon, who often condemned the last Government for not proceeding with projects recommended by the Public Works Committee. The honourable member did exactly the same this afternoon. The Auditor-General's Report for the year ended June 30, 1965—three months after we took office—states at page 1:

I estimate that at the present time major works in progress, approved for commencement and others recommended by the Public Works Standing Committee total more than \$160,000,000. At the present rate of availability of Loan funds for major works, this is equivalent to more than three years' expenditure.

Members opposite can bring up Strathmont and other projects they have in mind, over which I offer them my sympathy, but the fact remains that this Government is not the only Government that has not put into operation projects recommended by the Public Works Committee. At the time of taking office, this Government was \$160,000,000 behind. So much for the speech made by the Hon. Mr. Story.

The Hon. C. R. Story: But you said you would implement the lot. You said that in the policy speech.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: This Government intends to proceed with a new building for the Government Printer.

The Hon. C. R. Story: When?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: As quickly as possible. The building at present occupied by the Government Printer was constructed in 1865, and the last addition was made in 1916. It is no wonder that the conditions are deplorable and that the present Government is so far behind because it has to do things that the previous Government did not do anything about except to announce them, when apparently it had no intention of putting them into operation.

The Hon. C. R. Story: That is what you are doing now. There is nothing on the Estimates.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: There is something on the Estimates.

The Hon. C. R. Story: There is nothing on the Public Works Committee's file.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Let us have another look at the previous Government's actions. During this session certain questions have been asked by Opposition members about who will pay for additions at the Roseworthy Agricultural College. True, this money is coming from the Commonwealth Government through these Loan funds. However, the fact remains that it is this Government that has taken an interest in the welfare of the primary producer. Members opposite by way of question have elicited the fact that the Commonwealth Government will pay for the additions, but the important thing is that these additions are being done by this Government, something that should have been done 25 years ago.

Roseworthy Agricultural College plays a very important part in providing technological training in horticulture, animal husbandry, farm management and agricultural engineering, as they apply to South Australia. It provides technological training for those wishing to enter professions relating to the Australian wine industry. The college also conducts agriculture research programmes in keeping with the special interests of the college staff. They are designed to increase the productivity of South Australian farms. It conducts a plant breeding programme to maintain supplies of pure seed for distribution to South Australian farms.

I recently had the opportunity of being shown over the college grounds. In view of the often expressed concern for the primary producer in this State by the Opposition, I was astounded to see the present run-down state of the facilities at Roseworthy. The present facilities and equipment at the college are completely outmoded and inadequate. I may say at this stage that those conditions existed long before the advent of this Government. Nobody can deny that this Government is providing the remedy.

The main workshop at the college comprises a shed that was originally a blacksmith's shop, and this type of building is certainly not in keeping with present-day requirements. The sheet metal shop was erected in 1890 (76 years ago) and has had no improvements made to it since then. In fact, it is understood that it was originally designed for use as a cowshed. Now it is used by staff and students in the teaching and learning of sheet metal work. Shame on the previous Government!

The Hon. C. R. Story: Are you suggesting that the House of Assembly should be abolished, too, because it was built in the same year?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It has not had so much use as has the Roseworthy Agricultural College: consequently, it has not been knocked about so much. The Legislative Council has not been used to its full extent, either. The money could have been better spent on Roseworthy Agricultural College in 1939 than on adding this Chamber to this building. The present science laboratories are too small and quite inadequate for the jobs of teaching and research. The Plant Breeding Centre is unsuitable for its purpose. These are the conditions that the previous Government allowed to continue at the college. The fact that Roseworthy has continued to operate so well in these difficult circumstances is a tremendous tribute to the spirit and ingenuity of the Principal, the staff and the students. I think that emphasis should be placed on the ingenuity of all at the college because, without it, the college would have ceased to exist about 25 years ago. The proposed additions include an agricultural engineering centre, a science block and a plant breeding centre. With these new facilities South Australia will again lead the country in agricultural education. Listening to honourable members opposite, one would think that primary production was their prime concern. How could they let this college run down like this?

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Will the other buildings that you criticized be modernized at the same time—for example, the sheet metal shop?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Those other facilities will be provided to make this college the most modern of its kind in Australia.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: But the sheet metal shop?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It cannot be disputed that the new modern Roseworthy will be of great value to the important primary industries of this State. We have to have the primary industries; we rely upon them. They cannot develop properly without proper facilities for teaching and training students.

Much has been said lately about "Heartless Harry" the tree-chopper, but it is interesting to know that the Highways Department has undertaken a tree-planting project and planted 1,500 eucalyptus trees last year; it contemplates planting 5,000 more during the current

year, with a stepped-up programme in the years to come. This surely nails the lie to any statement implying that the Minister and his department have no concern for the beauty of trees.

In supporting the second reading of this Bill, I assure honourable members opposite that the Government backbenchers in this Council are unanimous in their desire to congratulate the Government on the way in which it has drawn up these Loan Estimates.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): After such an interesting discussion by the Hon. Mr. Banfield, I feel most humble in trying, when talking to the lines of Parliamentary Paper No. 11, to put forward some constructive criticism. I refer first to the item "Student Hostels, \$200,000". It is stated:

Advances by the bank under the Student Hostels (Advances) Act amounted to \$222,000 last year and \$200,000 is proposed in 1966-67. The loans are designed to assist in the financing of accommodation at various schools and institutions principally for country students, and are made upon a long term basis and upon interest and other terms comparable with loans for housing purposes.

On the eve of the last State election, promises were made by members of the then Opposition that a student hostel would be built at Leigh Creek forthwith for the benefit of the children and their parents living in the north of the State in station country. The idea of this hostel was that the children would be able to come down from station country into Leigh Creek, board there and enjoy the advantages of the area or high school in the town, thereby bettering the education that they had been able to get by correspondence. This was a firm promise. When the Government by some fluke got into power, it then made an assessment of its stocks and said, "Yes; we did promise you a hostel at Leigh Creek but we shall not do it yet."

There is nothing in these lines to indicate whether Leigh Creek will get a hostel in this current financial year, but I remind the Government of the urgent need for such a set of buildings in that town. The whole project has merit and is worthy of consideration today because, no matter how we try to educate our children, it is much easier for those of us who live in the inside country, in towns or in cities, to send our children to the nearest school; but it is an infinitely more difficult proposition for those who live in the areas of the State where transport and communications, in spite of this technological age, are still a great problem. So, with that small point, I urge the Government to consider this seriously.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Did you get a guarantee that the parents would send their children there?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Because of the firm promise given by an individual, but not by the Government, about these Leigh Creek hostel projects, names were collected from all those parents who would be interested in sending their children there to school. The parents were assured that this hostel would start and that it would be ready by the second term of 1965. They took this advice at its face value and did not re-hire governesses for the second term of last year because they believed their children would be going to Leigh Creek. That did not happen; I could get names for the honourable member, as a list was made. I think the Minister asked whether there was any guarantee that the children would attend the hostel, but I am not able to furnish such a guarantee, but it was the genuine intention of the parents to make use of it.

Turning to harbours accommodation, the sum of \$2,050,000 has been allocated for this year, and of that amount \$129,000 is required (and I quote) "to reclaim an area for the establishment of an oversea container depot at the eastern side of Port Adelaide and for the construction of associated road and drainage works". The problem of container cargoes for export or import is of intense interest to me, and has been for some time. I am mindful of the history of Port Stanvac and the fact that because we wanted a refinery in this State it was necessary to supply a port with the necessary harbour facilities deep enough and good enough for big tankers to enter and discharge cargo. It would not have been worth while for oil companies to spend much capital on a small project, and by hard work and careful observation Port Stanvac became a reality. Now tankers enter and offload part of their cargo—sufficient to enable them to enter Port Phillip Bay later and discharge to refineries in Melbourne.

The whole method of container cargoes is the modern conception of a ship which, instead of taking three weeks to unload in an average Australian port, is able to unload a similar quantity of cargo in two or three days. Not only is this the streamlining of the unloading of ships but it is the streamlining of the movement of goods into and out of Australia, thus reducing costs. Plans are under way to spend \$16,000,000 in Port Phillip to establish eight container berths—that is an estimated cost of \$2,000,000 for each berth. Our estimate of

expenditure on this line is \$129,000. Against that figure also, Sydney is planning two container cargo berths at a total cost of \$10,000,000. If we were able to establish Port Stanvac and allow big tankers to berth successfully, why can't we plan now for this container cargo revolution, because this type of transport is becoming world wide? It is confidently predicted that the system will be in full operation by 1968-69.

I understand that American experience shows that for the new container ships our ports will have to provide for ships 800ft. long and 90ft. wide, with a draught of 30ft. In company with other honourable members I witnessed the christening and launching of the *Bogong* at Whyalla recently. Her length is 740ft. (the Americans plan to build ships of 800ft.) her width is 104ft. (they plan 100ft.) and her draught is designed at 38ft. According to the *Year Book of South Australia* for 1965, at the wharves of Outer Harbour the depth of water is 35ft. while the depth at Port Adelaide is 32ft. and the depth of the channel into Port Adelaide 27ft. The ships that America envisages will have a dead weight of some 55,000 tons, and we have just about all the facilities we need as far as expensive outlay on deepening harbours is concerned. If the *Bogong* is going to lie 38ft. in the water, fully loaded, we have at the Outer Harbour a depth of 35ft. and because of that it would not be a major work to enable a big ship to get into the Outer Harbour.

If the main export container trade goes from Melbourne to the ports of the world (and at this stage the Victorian Government does not charge duty on export goods going across its wharves) this State will lose a lot of money just by procrastinating and not planning for this container cargo revolution.

Last year of the total exports from South Australia primary industry accounted for 8,219,000 tons, or 21 per cent, of the total tonnage. The mining industry provided 36 per cent of the total tonnage, while secondary industry represented 30 per cent of goods that went over the wharves. We have two problems. The first is that the Victorian Harbors Board is spending \$16,000,000 in Melbourne to make the harbour fit to handle these big ships. The second is that from Broken Hill, and swiftly advancing, is the standardization of the railways. Responsible members of the Commonwealth Railways have said that before long they will be able to take goods by train from Sydney to Fremantle in about 60 hours,

and it has also been freely stated that Fremantle will be a container cargo port.

Would it be foolhardy to think that imports could be landed at Fremantle and taken across this massive steel network of railway lines to Sydney in a matter of two or three days? Would it be impossible for people who are exporting washing machines and other items of secondary industry, when the whole network of railway lines is completed, to rail those goods to Port Pirie for onward movement to Sydney? Does this mean that our ports will virtually wither on the limb and die? The explanation says that \$129,000 is required to reclaim an area for the establishment of an oversea container depot at the eastern side of Port Adelaide and for the construction of associated road and drainage works. I know that it is easy to be critical of the Government at any stage. If it rains, whom do we blame? If it does not rain, whom do we blame? We are always able to say that it is the fault of the other fellow, and I tender my remarks not as criticism but as a request that this matter be again examined.

There is provision of \$40,000 for fishing havens, of which \$20,000 is to commence additions to the jetty at Kingston and \$20,000 for minor works. This State has a marvellous coastline and, in the days of the ketch trade, many small jetties were dotted around the coast so that goods could be taken to and from people inland. These jetties served a wonderful purpose in opening up the State but, as time has moved on, the ketch traders have ceased to operate, other means of communication now serve those communities and the State, and the jetties are falling into disrepair. I can recall many jetties on the West Coast and on St. Vincent Gulf that do not serve any constructive purpose as far as the prosperity of the State is concerned but, if they are going to rot and go to ruin, assets will be written off the books. The jetties will then have no earthly use at all.

Would it not be better to have a constructive policy of, first, looking into the problem of these small seaside jetties and allocating money each year for their maintenance, not in an effort to put them in the best order overnight but to go around the coastline progressively and maintain them? This would give enjoyment to the people who live nearby and would attract tourists to many of the towns. People would be likely to stay at a town if there was a beach where children could play and a jetty nearby. It is regrettable that many of our jetties are being whittled

away by the sands of time and will eventually disappear. Then, there will be a resurrection: someone will have to build them again.

I am intrigued at the provision of \$60,000 for the purchase of spare parts for the recently-completed bucket dredger. I suppose that this is a legitimate line, but it seems strange that we now have to provide that amount for spare parts to keep in operation a bucket dredger that has just been completed. Would it not have been better to get the spare parts when we got the dredger? Regarding that marvellous organization, the Electricity Trust, the Treasurer said:

During 1966-67 the trust proposes to spend \$35,000,000 on capital works. The sum of \$6,700,000 is to be provided from State Loan funds, \$7,214,000 to be raised by the trust from financial institutions and the public, with the balance of \$21,086,000 to be met from the trust's internal funds derived from depreciation provisions, recoveries, surpluses and cash held against commitments made. The total programme of \$35,000,000 is by far the highest programme ever undertaken by the trust in one year. It reflects the rapidly increasing rate of construction of the Torrens Island power station and the large programme of distribution works required to keep pace with the growing demands for electricity.

Those are fine words. It is easy to worry about the unemployment problem, or about the slowing down of the finances of the State or of Australia, if there is a slowing down—or, is there a levelling off? It is pleasing to see one organization with a record spending budgeted for and aware of the growing demands for electricity. Whether it is the fault of the Commonwealth Government or of the State Government that something was not done, a trust that raises most of its money from revenue sources is moving forward. An amount of \$1,200,000 is provided for rural extension, and here we have the result of the vision of those who planned the trust over the years to provide electricity for the people of the State.

I am aware of the remarks made by the Hon. Mr. Banfield that the State needs more primary production. The State also needs farmers and it needs people to go back and regenerate many towns. The expenditure of the amount proposed on rural extension augurs well for those whose shoulders feed and clothe the people of this State and whose money meets many of their financial obligations. I support the second reading.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I support the Bill, although not with any great enthusiasm. I realize that the Loan Estimates must be passed and that the Government has to carry on the work of Government and of the

Public Service, and the extension of Government enterprise. I cannot show any great enthusiasm for the Loan Estimates, as presented, when we have this deficit of \$8,000,000 in a short period of less than 18 months of this Government's term of office. I note that most of the provisions have been reduced compared with the allocations last year. This is not good. Also, many matters are not provided for in the Bill, probably because of the Government's bad financial position. It may also be because of a lack of detailed appreciation of the need.

I record my disquiet at the present financial position of the State. I do not intend to deal with it in any detail, because it has been covered fully already by the Leader of the Opposition and my colleagues who have followed him and supported his remarks. I shall proceed to make some observations on the various allocations. As I have said, unfortunately, most of these Estimates show a reduction on last year's allocations. I consider it unfortunate that reductions in most cases, if not in all cases, must reduce activity and the ability to expand. This should concern us, whether we belong to the Government or to the Opposition.

I listened with much interest to the Hon. Mr. Banfield in his spirited session, but I wondered how much he really wanted to congratulate the Government while it realizes the position that it is in, and I think something has been said by the Government itself about the Government's being foolhardy to continue unwise financial practices. I consider that this is very true and that the Government will have to watch its step very carefully indeed.

In turning to some of the individual items listed, I notice that \$1,050,000 is provided under the Loans to Producers Act and that \$1,359,000 was provided last year, so there is a reduction there of \$309,000. Also, \$200,000 will be raised by way of new semi-government loans. This reduction is an unfortunate step, because working under this Act are many of the co-operative societies, which are actually the basis of operations of many of our smaller primary producers. These societies are continually trying to advance and expand, and they are always in need of some funds. I express my disquiet at the reduction in this provision, and also at the reduction of \$16,000 under the Advances to Settlers Act through the State Bank.

As many other honourable members have already spoken, I do not intend to deal with all matters contained in the Loan Estimates,

but I wish to deal with a provision of \$400,000 for irrigation and reclamation of swamp lands which will be a reduction of \$37,000 on last year's allocation. I notice with some gratification that the work on the electrification and reconstruction of the pumping station at Waikerie has been completed. I notice also that the Government has provided \$24,000 to complete a drainage scheme at Cadell, and that funds are provided for preliminary work on the replacement of pumping plant at Cadell, and for various channels, pipelines, buildings, plant and minor works. I am sure all members are aware of the importance of continuing work in the irrigation areas.

I pass now to the provision for harbours accommodation, for which \$2,050,000 is provided. This is over \$500,000 less than last year's provision. Of this sum, \$700,000 is provided for further work on the major scheme of widening and deepening the Port River, and lesser amounts are provided for some of the country ports, including a provision for widening the Wallaroo jetty. I do not see any reference to the Outer Harbour terminal, which was first suggested in this Council two or three years ago and was mooted by the previous Government. Although Outer Harbour is not in my district, I believe a terminal must be provided as soon as possible, because honourable members who have seen the facilities provided at Fremantle and have compared them with the front door entrance, as it were, to this State for people coming here by ship will realize that some adequate and modern passenger terminal is most necessary.

I note that \$40,000 is provided for fishing havens, and this provision is slightly less than last year's. I am glad to know that the Edithburgh fishing jetty has been completed, although I understand that it is not completely adequate and is not serving its purpose as well as it might.

The provision of \$26,000,000 for waterworks and sewers is over \$750,000 less than last year's allocation. I notice that amongst other things sewer works completed for the year included the Para Hills and Modbury scheme at a cost of \$880,000. I was sorry to be told that some parts of the Tea Tree Gully area, which I understand is to be sewerred, will not be sewerred for another four years. I am glad to know that the hospital in that area about which there has been so much talk has at last reached the planning stage but, having regard to the remarks by

other honourable members this afternoon, I think its construction must perforce be a long way off yet.

For the Adelaide water district, \$6,425,000 is provided. Provision is made for work to be continued in the Elizabeth, Modbury and Salisbury districts: \$200,000 is required to continue work at Elizabeth, and provision is also made for work to be carried out at Salisbury and other places. For the Barossa water district, \$96,000 is provided. Of this, \$40,000 is required to complete the duplication of portion of the existing Barossa trunk main between Sandy Creek and Gawler. As all honourable members know, this work is the first stage in the scheme to improve supplies in the Two Wells and Virginia area, and it will also increase the flow to the Elizabeth-Salisbury area. The Hon. Mr. Hart has brought this matter before the Council on more than one occasion previously, and I can only underline the fact that in the Two Wells and Virginia area the mains are very old and should be replaced, and that the provision of a better flow of water by a duplication of the trunk main will ensure a more adequate supply of water. The Barossa reservoir is old: it was constructed about 1898. Honourable members will know that there is a whispering wall there that has properties which are not unlike the whispering gallery at St. Paul's Cathedral. The reservoir, which has a capacity of 993,000,000,000 gallons, is now little more than an outlet for the South Para reservoir and all the water delivered from South Para goes through the outlets of the Barossa reservoir.

For the Warren water district, \$161,000 is provided, of which small sums are allocated to complete improvements to the Angaston and Hansborough water supply. It has been suggested already that the capacity of the Warren reservoir could well be increased considerably by raising the height of the main wall. It would mean also that a new road would have to be constructed around or along one side of that reservoir, which would probably be a good thing in any case because the present road there is both narrow and dangerous. I understand, however, that the present wall at the Warren reservoir was constructed by contract and could well have been better constructed; and that it might be necessary to strengthen that wall considerably if there were to be an increase in its height, thereby increasing the capacity of the reservoir very considerably. Probably the suggested main to which I will now direct my attention is the better solution.

For country water districts a sum of nearly \$3,000,000 is provided, of which an amount of \$1,360,000 is proposed to commence work on the new main from the Murray River at Swan Reach to Stockwell. The chief function of this main is ultimately to relieve the Mannum-Adelaide main of the task of supplying considerable quantities of water to the Warren reservoir. This main will increase considerably the efficiency and general capacity of the Warren water scheme. The expenditure this year includes the establishment of a headquarters camp at Sedan, the laying of about nine miles of main and the commencement of the construction of a pumping station at Swan Reach.

Recently, I was present with my colleagues, the Hon. Mr. Story and the Hon. Mr. Teusner, in the Sedan area, and we saw some activity there. This camp at Sedan will probably give that small township an injection of activity for some two or three years to come. However, I urge that consideration be given to action being taken to supply the areas of Sedan and Cambrai on the Murray plains with water when this main goes through. Its construction has been delayed by at least 12 months: it should have been on the Loan Estimates at least 12 months earlier, so that the scheme could well have been under way at present. I understand that at the moment, while provision has been made for future supplies to the Murray lands areas near Sedan and Cambrai, there is no intention of making this available at the time when the main goes through, and it may be postponed until some time in the future. If this is the case, it is wrong that people who have been working in those areas and paying taxes there under great difficulties for many years should not be considered. When this main goes through, provision should be made for reticulation in the Murray lands areas to those towns and their surrounds.

I come now to the item "Adelaide sewers", in respect of which \$9,029,000 is provided. Of this, a considerable proportion is provided to continue work on the Bolivar sewage treatment works. In company with most other honourable members, I had the privilege of going to the opening of those works. This is a great advance in the treatment of sewage and the disposal of effluent, and has been needed for some time. I believe the Government would be ready and willing to concede that these treatment works which it is in the process of completing were in fact started by the previous Government, and great credit must go to the

previous Minister of Works, the Hon. Glen Pearson. The Bolivar treatment works will be a great asset to the State. Like the Leader of the Opposition and other honourable members both here and in another place, I have observed that at present there is a considerable unsatisfactory odour in that area. I hope it will be eliminated as the works are completed, because we have older sewage treatment works where it has been successfully eliminated.

While on this subject, I remind honourable members that some suggestions have been made by some of my colleagues and myself about the use of the effluent. I hope the Government will keep in mind that, even if a 5,000-acre property is to be developed for irrigation purposes at a later stage, at least in the first place consideration should be given to the reticulation of some of this effluent to the people who most need it at present in the Virginia area. I note, too, that the construction of additional sewerage works will be undertaken in 1966-67. Part of the money for those works is to complete the reorganization of the existing system to improve facilities for General Motors-Holden's. I presume that this will be in the Elizabeth area, where General Motors-Holden's is expanding considerably, rather than in the older plant at Woodville.

Let me say a word or two about the provision of sewerage facilities for Gawler. The town has been without sewerage facilities all through. Much of the building in the town is in a hollow, and it is impracticable to dispose of sewage effluent from septic tanks, so it is desirable that this town be sewered as soon as possible. I know there are plans, but I appeal to the Government, as I have previously, to see that this work is speeded up. In fairness, I know that the member for Gawler in another place (Mr. Clark) has made this appeal on many occasions.

I come now to the item "River Murray weirs, dams, locks, etc., \$800,000". Most of this will be used for the estimated expenditure on the Chowilla dam. We are all, I think, seized with the vital necessity to South Australia of the construction of this large dam. We realize, and have realized all through, the disadvantages of constructing such a large dam with so great a surface area and no great depth: that anything up to 25 per cent evaporation can be expected. However, I think that honourable members and the Engineering and Water Supply Department consider that saving 75 per cent of the water that might otherwise run out to sea at times of plenty is better than letting it all go. Even

if we have to lose 25 per cent of that water, at the moment in times of high river we are losing 100 per cent. This dam may be the means of South Australia's continuing to expand, as we hope it will.

Other members have commented on hospital buildings, for which an amount of over \$7,000,000 is provided. I stated earlier that I could not see how it would be possible to proceed with new hospitals for some time because of commitments on existing hospitals. I was able to attend the opening of the new group laundry at Islington at the end of last year and I believe this is a splendid set-up. The Chief Secretary is to be congratulated on the completion of this establishment, although I believe he would be the first to concede that much credit for this enterprise is due to the previous Chief Secretary, the Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin.

I have noted with concern that the allocation for school buildings this year is \$10,640,000, a reduction of over \$1,000,000 on the previous year. I believe this is a serious reduction as we know how the Education Department is straining at the leash, as it were, in its endeavours to cope with the population explosion. This position must be arrested. The Government cannot continue to allocate a lesser amount than for any previous year. I have seen some of the construction that has taken place over the last year or two; it is a credit to the Public Buildings Department or to the contractors. In the appendix, amongst the completed buildings for the previous year, is listed the Gawler Adult Education Centre. The first estimate of \$340,000 for that centre was obtained in 1963 (after considerable work by members of both Parties) although the final cost has exceeded that figure by over \$100,000. One realizes that these school buildings may exist for a period of 50, 60 or 70 years, and possibly by that time they will seem as out of date as the buildings now being vacated, but one may question the necessity for the elaborate construction. I appreciate the facilities provided at such schools and I realize just how good they are. However, it makes one wonder whether the elaborate facilities provided do not delay other enterprises listed for building.

On the other hand I agree with the Hon. Mr. Story that the provision of a school at Agincourt Bore of timber construction with a solid spine (which was also adopted for the Paruna school) perhaps shows that the other extreme may have been reached in some cases.

Those buildings are not good enough for permanent schools, particularly in the Mallee area where it is either very, very hot and dusty or very cold. I think there could well be a middle course between elaborate provision (such as at the Gawler Adult Education Centre and some other schools) and the buildings called permanent schools but which are more of a temporary nature.

I also said that I had seen the Samecon schools that have been erected at Mount Barker, Sandy Creek and other places. Although those schools may not impress people from the outside, when one enters them one cannot but be impressed by the facilities provided. I do not know whether all such schools are air-conditioned, but the ones I have visited have been. I understand some problems are associated with Samecon schools and perhaps they are not as economic to operate or construct as they should be, but provided those problems can be overcome I think that, if it is not possible to erect a solid construction school within reasonable time, the Samecon construction would be by far the next best thing and much better than the weatherboard buildings of previous years.

An amount of \$790,000 is provided for police and courthouse buildings and this again is a considerable reduction on the previous year's allocation of \$909,000. Portion of the amount provided is to continue work on the construction of the first stage of the new and improved accommodation at Fort Largs, and in this I wholeheartedly concur. Amongst the smaller items is one of \$43,000 to complete the construction of a new police station and courthouse at Tanunda. I believe that in strategic country areas and in a number of suitable towns the provision of adequate police stations and properly furnished courthouses is necessary. In recent years in my home town of Gawler a new police station has been erected and the old courthouse, which was of solid construction, was renovated and made suitable for present-day requirements. I wholeheartedly agree with such action.

Under the heading of "Other Government Buildings" an amount of \$3,600,000 has been provided and one item is the provision of \$200,000 for the Agricultural College Department, which is the department at present administering the only agricultural college in South Australia—that is, Roseworthy. We have been told many times that the total estimated cost of the work at Roseworthy is \$670,000. We also know, even though in publicity the Government gave the impression to the contrary, that the bulk of the money

has been supplied by the Commonwealth Government. In my opinion, Roseworthy College has always been in the forefront of agricultural colleges in Australia.

The Hon. Mr. Banfield said that after this money was spent South Australia would once again become the leading State as far as agricultural education was concerned. I doubt whether we have ever lost that position, because this State was the first to provide such a college and my late father was one of the first students to attend that college in 1883. It is time that we did more about agricultural education, in the same way as we have been trying to do more about secondary education. I consider that the standards at Roseworthy Agricultural College will be upgraded to, probably, the equivalent of a university diploma for those who graduate. If this is so, we shall have to provide additional accommodation for the other students who are capable of doing a more practical course leading to a certificate rather than to a degree or diploma, or else we shall have to provide other colleges, as have been provided in some other States, for people not so academically inclined.

I repeat that anybody who is left by the wayside with a course half completed at one of these institutions is not being properly treated by our education system. It is far better that persons who cannot do degree or diploma courses be channelled into a certificate course which they can complete and which will fit them for the vocations in which they intend to spend their lives. Advance consideration is now being given to the eventual provision of a horticultural college, possibly in the Upper Murray, and possibly one or two other agricultural colleges, which will provide, first, for the student who is not desirous or able to do a degree or diploma course but who, after doing a certificate course, will not be deprived of the opportunity of going on to advanced study, if he is sufficiently successful.

I approve of the work that is going on at Roseworthy college. I do not endorse the rather extravagant criticisms made by the Hon. Mr. Banfield because, even though some of the facilities at the college have become somewhat out of date, this will happen in all institutions. By and large, the college has done a splendid job over the years.

I support the allocation of \$900,000 for the Libraries Department. We all recognize the value of libraries and must encourage their use. It is unfortunate that, in these days of pressure, the public generally speaking are reading less, and probably less of value, and

we must support the continuation of education by providing valuable reading matter in libraries.

Only \$1,000,000 is provided for further work on the new office block in Victoria Square. I hope that the Chief Secretary was right when he said this afternoon that the scheduled date for completion was December 31, 1967, and that many of our public servants will be able to go into the new building at that time. It will still require a further allocation of nearly \$4,000,000 before that time. I do not intend to say much about the Housing Trust, except to pay a tribute to it, and particularly to the late Chairman, Mr. Cartledge. I compliment the Government (as I always do when I have the opportunity) on the appointment of Mr. Dridan as the new Chairman of the trust, and I pay a tribute to the General Manager and his staff.

I notice that 844 houses or flats have been provided for rental. For many months I have received repeated representations about the provision of more rental houses in country towns. I know that this matter presents problems, but I bring it forward for what it is worth and suggest that the Government give it attention when making further allocations and programming work. The Hon. Mr. Geddes referred to the Electricity Trust, to the record spending and to the progress being made with the construction of the Torrens Island power station.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Be careful. We helped you to get that.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Yes, I accept that. I thought I would be bound to get that interjection. However, I suggest that the Opposition at that time only helped. It could not have done it on its own.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You wouldn't have got it without us.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The Torrens Island power station is progressing very well. I did not hear any criticism about that by the Chief Secretary. When he was Leader of the Opposition we were all told that it should be at Wallaroo, or somewhere else. However, I notice that it is going well, and I compliment the trust.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: We might help them to get a gas pipeline.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Yes. Regarding the Festival Hall, I was one of the country members who stuck their necks out and supported it, because I believed that it was just as much the concern of country people as, for example, the town hall at Jamestown

is the concern of the people of Caltowie. I notice that \$30,000 is provided for it. I am in favour of the provision of a Festival Hall, but I was concerned when I saw the covered waggon type of design depicted on the front page of a newspaper. When I supported the proposal, I thought the building would be dignified, such as this Chamber always appears to be. I do not know anything about architecture, but I do not like modern art or modern architecture. The only thing missing from the covered waggon was the horse.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Do you know where the horse has gone?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Someone may have pinched it.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Do you think we ought to pinch the \$30,000?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: No, I am fully in favour of the Festival Hall, but I do not appreciate the design. I was impressed by the extensions to the Lyell McEwin hospital, which the Chief Secretary opened. All that concerns me is that one has to walk about half a mile to get from one side to the other, and I wondered whether the hospital should have been built straight up in the air.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We think likewise.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: If the Government thinks that, the Tea Tree Gully hospital could have been built upon the land originally purchased for it. Perhaps that matter can be considered in regard to future hospitals. I compliment the Government on the extensions made at the Lyell McEwin hospital. The Chief Secretary will be the first to concede that much of the credit for the hospital must go to the previous Chief Secretary (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) and to other people, including the local residents, who took an interest in the hospital.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I have always expressed that view. No hospital could continue without the continued support of the local identities.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I completely agree with the Chief Secretary on that matter. The large deficit that concerns the Government concerns me, too. As I said only last week in a country town, there is no airy fairy way of Government finance any more than there is any airy fairy way to finance a property. I was then at a public meeting where some gentlemen were being persuaded that there was an easy way out of this and that it was possible to finance something for nothing, and all that sort of nonsense, but in Government as in anything

else one has to pay one's debts. Therefore, we are in the position that we have had all these reductions because we have overspent and must pay our debts. With some reluctance, I support the Estimates given effect to by this Bill. I support them because I realize the Government has to carry on. I do not agree with its methods, because it has increased, and will have to increase further, taxes on all sides to pay for its extravagance since it has been in power.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I do not relish rising to speak to this Bill at this hour of the day. I am never at my best on an empty stomach, but probably the state of my stomach is like the position in the State Treasury now.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: The State Treasury is a lot emptier!

The Hon. L. R. HART: I join with other members in voicing my disapproval of the action of the Government in trying to force this Bill through in two days this week. However, I know that the state of the Treasury could be one reason why this is necessary. We have been told by the Chief Secretary that this rush is necessary because the Royal Show will be opening on Thursday. However, it was known 12 months ago that the Show would be commencing this week, so there was plenty of warning. The Government should have introduced this legislation earlier if it wanted to get it through before the Show.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: I wonder if the Government knows when the Show will be held next year.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You can sit next week if you want to.

The Hon. L. R. HART: There may be different people in charge next year. I believe the real reason why the Government wants to get this legislation through is that it is rather sensitive of the criticism being levelled against it because of the financial position of the Treasury, and the sooner it gets this Bill through the sooner this criticism will die down.

It is rather interesting to investigate the views some members of this Government put forward when in Opposition in previous years. Before 1954 this was a mendicant State, but from that year it has been a non-mendicant State, and the present Government was very critical about this when it was in Opposition. In 1964, when Leader of the Opposition, the present Chief Secretary said:

When the Government, and particularly the Premier, were proud to announce that this State was no longer a mendicant State, I said

that the people might live to regret this, and I think that now the chickens are coming home to roost.

No doubt the chickens are coming home to roost now, and I would think they were not laying very many eggs, either. He thought the State should remain a mendicant State because greater assistance could be obtained from the Commonwealth Government out of the pool of taxes paid by the South Australian people. He continued:

It is our duty to remain a mendicant State and to get a much better return from the Commonwealth. There are other States in a better financial position than we are that are still mendicant States.

As this was the view of the Chief Secretary as recently as 1964, I assume he still holds it. In view of the experience this Government has had in relation to financial matters, I think this view would have been cemented and that it would be his desire that this State again become a mendicant State. I wonder if this State can look forward in the near future to again being a mendicant State dependent on the Commonwealth Grants Commission for its finance. This may be a very good thing because, when the State was under the Grants Commission, that Commission gave some direction on how the economy should be controlled and on how the money should and should not be spent. This State may be served very well indeed if this Government again places itself under the Grants Commission.

Other members have dealt very well with the financial position of the State, and I wish only to deal with one or two matters. One omission from the Loan Estimates this year is in relation to advances to the State Bank. There may be a reason for this, although I have not found it. In the previous two years advances totalling \$1,000,000 were made. I am concerned because provision was made in this way for advances under the Rural Advances Guarantee Act, which was introduced by the previous Government under the leadership of Sir Thomas Playford. This Act has been of great benefit to many settlers in South Australia who have wanted to obtain properties. I trust that the State Bank will have sufficient finance for this legislation to continue successfully, so I should like to hear from the Minister why there has been this omission. I cannot imagine that the bank's financial position would be such that it did not require an advance this year. I have no doubt, however, that in due course the Minister will advise us on this matter.

Another matter I should like to mention is afforestation and timber milling. I have had something to say about this matter previously, and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris has spoken at length about it. Unless there are considerably more plantings in this State in the next few years (unless there is a crash programme of reafforestation), by the year 2000 we shall have to import many of our softwood requirements. New South Wales is setting out to produce softwoods in large quantities. In fact, it is setting out to develop 75,000 acres a year over the next few years to avoid this crisis, but what do we see in South Australia? I know that this State produces about 10 per cent of the softwoods of Australia from less than 1 per cent of the forests, but New South Wales has planted 75,000 acres this year whereas South Australia has bought a miserable 4,000 acres. As has been pointed out in this Council previously, the only way to overcome the shortage of softwoods is to encourage private enterprise to enter into its production. This Government is doing nothing in this direction. Admittedly, previous Governments have not done anything, either, but previous Governments have been responsible for the huge Government plantations that we now have; but, as we are fast reaching a stage where suitable land in large areas is not available, it is necessary that we look to some other means of increasing our softwood plantations. It is only by the encouragement of private plantings that we shall attain that goal.

The next item I mention is the allocations made for railways. I note that \$1,540,000 is being provided to meet the cost of sundry works such as track re-laying, bridges and culverts, signalling and safety devices, minor buildings, and improvements to yards, as they

are required. The interesting thing here is that it is double the amount of money provided in the previous year. I should be pleased to hear from the Minister what particular works will have double the amount of money spent on them in the coming year. The interesting item is "signalling and safety devices". We have heard much about the need for signalling and safety devices at railway crossings, and I hope that this is one direction in which these increased sums will be used. Of course, some of it may be spent on items that are now somewhat obsolete. I recently mentioned the cattle trucking yards at Virginia, where cattle has not been trucked for three years. I have ascertained that over a period of five years there have been only two cattle trucked: yet the Government spent \$593.50 on rebuilding those yards. The same thing happened in the rebuilding of some of the goods platforms.

The platform at Two Wells was built two years ago—a big, heavy, concrete structure, a magnificent job; but the amount of goods unloaded from the railways at the Two Wells trucking yard at present does not warrant this expenditure. At present the Virginia goods platform is being rebuilt—another concrete structure that will cost much money. This, too, is not warranted, because these areas are not using the railways: they are using road transport. I believe they will continue to do so even if we have another Road Transport Bill before us. I seek leave to conclude my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.59 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, August 31, at 2.15 p.m.