

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, June 28, 1967.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I ask leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: From the point of view of the future economy of the State, the completion of the standard gauge link between Broken Hill and Port Pirie is of very great importance. Will the Minister of Transport explain to the Council what part the Silverton Tramway Company's line plays in respect of this project and state the present position concerning the negotiations that are proceeding with this company?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I agree with the honourable member that it is important to know what stage negotiations have reached regarding the link between Cockburn and Broken Hill and the standardization of the line between Broken Hill and Port Pirie. The South Australian section has been progressing according to plan and the work is up to schedule. I have expressed concern regarding the section between Broken Hill and Cockburn and, because this matter affects the Governments of New South Wales and the Commonwealth to a great extent and because the area is outside of South Australia, it would be necessary, whatever was done in regard to this section of line, for legislation to be introduced by the Commonwealth Government and by the Governments of New South Wales and South Australia if the South Australian Government was to take over any section of the line outside of this State. I have been concerned that no finality has been reached in the negotiations, and I have repeatedly impressed upon the other Governments the necessity to finalize them. A month or two ago I was successful in getting representatives of the three Governments together, and this was a step towards reaching finality. Negotiations have to take place with regard to standardizing the private sidings of the mining companies, and a plan has been prepared that will take the negotiations further forward. I am very hopeful at present that finality will be reached very shortly between representatives of the three Governments regarding standardization of this section of the

line. If finality is not reached in this matter, there will be delay in the completion of standardization between Sydney and Western Australia. The longer it goes on, the less likelihood there is of completion by the scheduled date, which is January, 1969, or, at least, December, 1968. I am just as much concerned about this matter as are other honourable members and I am pressing for finalization. I cannot at this stage give further information to the Council about the final result of the negotiations, but they are progressing towards finalization.

SWIMMING INSTRUCTORS.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I ask these questions of the Minister representing the Minister of Education. In view of the importance of having every South Australian child taught swimming and the need to retain the services of competent instructors, and in view of the reply I received yesterday to my previous question concerning the long delay in paying the women employed as swimming instructors by the Education Department, I ask the following questions: (1) How does the Minister then explain the fact that four of these swimming instructors lodged their claims on March 29 of this year but were not paid until the second week of June, a delay of 2½ months; and also that four other swimming instructors who lodged their claims, respectively, on March 29, March 29, April 7 and an unspecified date in April have not yet been paid—that is, up to a late hour last night? (2) Can the Minister tell me how much longer these women who have not yet been paid for work commencing in February and finishing in March and whose claims have been lodged up to three months ago will have to wait for their payment? (3) Will the Minister take action to see that a more efficient system for the rapid handling of these entitlements is introduced?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The honourable member has asked a series of questions. I will convey them to the Minister of Education. However, I think he answered the honourable member's final question yesterday when he said that these matters would be handled by computer next season, which would eliminate some delay.

MURRAY RIVER SALINITY.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked on June 21 about salinity in the Murray River?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Minister of Works has informed me that the committee entitled the Murray Basin Irrigation Areas Drainage Committee was set up under his authority, and first met in February. Four meetings have been held and a detailed programme of research is being established. The work sponsored through the committee will involve some drilling and other field investigation and it is unlikely that any specific results or recommendations will be available for a long time. The drilling programme envisaged will take one or two years.

On a wider field, the Engineering and Water Supply Department is co-operating with the River Murray Commission in considering the whole salinity problem of the Murray Valley. The department is collecting information for the commission's subcommittee on salinity data collection. In addition, the River Murray Commission is considering the appointment of a competent consulting engineering group with experience in soils and river salinity problems to advise it on control measures necessary to maintain the Murray River in its best possible condition as a fresh water stream.

COOBER PEDY WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I ask leave to make a short explanation before asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Works.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: During the summer months the solar still at Coober Pedy produces between 3,000 and 4,000 gallons of fresh water a day. At that time the opal field is virtually unoccupied and much of this water is not used. No provision has yet been made to store the water, and during last summer it was put back through the still; in other words, the water was not put to any use. Can the Minister of Labour and Industry ask the Minister of Works what plans are in hand to have this excess water stored during the summer months so that another crisis like that which is now occurring at Coober Pedy, where there is an acute water shortage, can be averted? Also, can the Minister say what is the present weekly water ration for each person at Coober Pedy?

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question relates to the activities of the Local Government Act Revision Committee which, as honourable members know, has been meeting for a considerable time and which has taken evidence in several States as well as in this State in connection with re-writing the Local Government Act. Can the Minister say whether a final date has yet been set for the submission of evidence, when he expects to receive the committee's report, and when the task of re-writing the Act will commence?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The committee has not set a final date for receiving evidence; it is still open to any organization or person wishing to do so to place evidence before it. It is difficult to give a definite answer to the other two questions raised by the honourable member. I hope that the committee's report will be available to me later this year and that the committee will then be able to commence re-writing the Act. This will depend upon the Parliamentary Draftsman's office, because it will be necessary for a draftsman to be available to the committee to assist in drafting the legislation when this stage is reached. That is all I can say at present.

NORTHERN WATER SUPPLIES.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Has the Minister of Transport obtained a reply from the Minister of Works to my question of June 20 regarding the security of water supplies in the North of the State?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Minister of Works reports:

The present combined storage of Beetaloo, Baroota and Bundaleer is 729,000,000 gallons, which amount compares with 703,000,000 gallons at this time last year. Total intake last year was limited to 171,000,000 gallons in Baroota, which occurred during December. The overall position of supply to the areas in question is kept under constant review by the department and sufficient capacity is available from the Morgan-Whyalla main to supplement supply from all three reservoirs in the coming year on the assumption that no natural intakes are received. The supply of Murray River water to Bundaleer reservoir has been in operation for the past year; the rate is adjusted to meet expected requirements and will continue until natural intake makes this action unnecessary. No serious problems of supply are foreseen in the 1967-68 summer.

CHOWILLA DAM.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: In view of what I think is the woolly and confused thinking which exists in a number of quarters about the Chowilla dam, both in the lay mind and in the trained mind, not only in this State but in other States, I offer a suggestion to the Government. It is that a tour and an "open day" be conducted at the dam site, so that certain selected delegates from the signatory States and from this State may be given the opportunity of catching up completely on the present position, the experiments that have been carried out, and the authoritative statements made on behalf of the constructing authority (the South Australian Engineering and Water Supply Department), with the object that these people could be given lectures and inspect the site. I consider that this would have a very great effect upon dampening down some of the apprehension that exists at present in the minds of many people. In my opinion, this would be of very great benefit to South Australia and to the rest of the Murray River system. Can the Minister offer an opinion on the suggestion I have made?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am not qualified to give opinions, never having had any legal training, but I think the honourable member's suggestion may be a very good one. My colleagues, the Premier and the Minister of Works, are at present in Canberra, and are no doubt discussing this matter. I shall be happy to place the honourable member's suggestion before the Premier and the Minister of Works on their return.

SNOWTOWN POLICE STATION.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Some time ago, because of the poor condition of the Snowtown police station, the Government decided that this station should be closed until finances were available to have it rebuilt. In the meantime, the police work at the Snowtown station has been looked after by police officers from the Brinkworth and Bute stations and, no doubt, this extra work has entailed increased hours of duty for those officers. Can the Chief Secretary inform me whether this extra work has necessitated officers at Brinkworth and Bute

stations working longer hours and, if so, have they been fully reimbursed for the extra hours of duty worked?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am not in a position to say what the situation is. I sincerely hope, if there has been added work, that the officers involved have been reimbursed for it. I shall refer the question to the Police Commissioner. I never interfere with the running of the Police Department, and I have complete faith in the Commissioner, who does a remarkable job.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Can the Chief Secretary give any indication as to when the Snowtown police station will be rebuilt?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I think I gave a reply to that question earlier this year. The matter was taken up with the Police Commissioner (I am speaking from memory, but I think I am right). It is a question of priorities, and this matter would be put in its order of priority, which I understand was fairly high for the 1967-68 Estimates. Honourable members well know that sometimes a bit of a battle goes on over the allocation of funds. I have asked the Police Commissioner to give me a report on his urgent requirements for police stations, courthouses, etc., so that I may know where I am going. I understand that the erection of Snowtown police station is relatively high in the order of priorities but I do not know what amount of money can be allocated from Treasury funds for the department.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Giles Point Bulk Loading Facilities
(Report No. 2),

Murray Bridge to Hahndorf Pipeline.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from June 27. Page 134.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I rise to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and I join with the mover and the seconder in thanking the Governor's Deputy for the manner in which he opened the proceedings of Parliament for this session. It will be appreciated that Sir Mellis Napier has performed this duty on a number of occasions and he has a record of

service to South Australia of outstanding merit that is greatly appreciated by every loyal citizen of this State.

We are sorry to learn of the indisposition of His Excellency the Governor, Sir Edric Bastyan, and I join with the mover and seconder in extending to His Excellency best wishes for a speedy recovery. I think all members of this Council are sorry that His Excellency's term of office is shortly to conclude and I know that we all greatly appreciate the services that he and Lady Bastyan have given during that term. Their dedication to the people of this State is well known and no matter where one moves in South Australia His Excellency and Lady Bastyan occupy almost a revered position. This is the result of their fine service to South Australia. Through His Excellency we extend our loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen.

In the opening address reference was made in paragraph 3 to the death of two former members of Parliament and one sitting member during the last session. I have already made reference to the passing of the Hon. R. S. Richards, a Premier of this State for a short time. I would also like to comment further on the reference to a former member of this Council, the late Dudley Octoman. While serving here the late Mr. Octoman endeared himself to all members of Parliament in South Australia. He had a long record of service to the State that culminated with an all-too-brief period of service in this Council.

In paragraph 2 of the opening address mention was made of the resignation of the Premier, the Hon. Frank Walsh. As far as I am concerned, the Hon. Mr. Walsh has made an important place for himself in the political history of South Australia because it was he who led the Labor Party to the Treasury benches after that Party had been in the wilderness for 32 years. I place on record in this Chamber an appreciation of the political life of the Hon. Frank Walsh. Of course, Mr. Walsh follows a different political philosophy from that which I follow, and indeed a different political philosophy from the majority of members in this Chamber. However, despite this difference in political thinking, I think there was in South Australia a feeling of mutual understanding and trust between members of both Parties, and that this feeling has existed for some considerable time. In the interests of the State, I hope it will continue in the future. Indeed, I will

go so far as to say that I think this feeling does not exist to the same extent in any other Parliament in Australia.

I consider that this mutual understanding and trust has been largely due to the standard of leadership that we have enjoyed in both political Parties in South Australia. In my own memory we have had Sir Thomas Playford and you, Mr. President, as the Leaders of the two Houses for many years, and leading the Labor Party we have had the late Michael O'Halloran, Mr. Frank Walsh and, in this Chamber, the present Chief Secretary. I consider that it is from this standard of leadership in both Parties that this feeling of mutual understanding, respect and trust has emanated. I think I express the views of the majority of members in this Council when I say that we were somewhat disappointed that upon the retirement of Mr. Frank Walsh as Premier and Treasurer of this State he was given a very minor portfolio. Mr. Walsh's political career finally led the Labor Party in this State to the Treasury benches after being in Opposition for some 32 years, and I do not think his present very minor portfolio is a very high note on which to finish his career. I do not think his present portfolio of Minister of Social Welfare is a fitting one on which to complete his political life.

Over a period of some years the Labor Party has advocated that the Ministry of Housing should be a separate portfolio. If one reads *Hansard* one will see that this claim has been made on a number of occasions. It seems to me somewhat illogical to allow the Hon. Frank Walsh to perform only the duties of Minister of Social Welfare when he could have retained a Ministry as important as housing. The Labor Party itself has insisted that this portfolio is an important one and that it should be separate and in the hands of one Minister. Mr. Walsh has spent most of his life in the building industry and has a particular knowledge of the industry, and I am quite certain he could have carried this housing portfolio with some distinction. As I say, it seems rather illogical that he should have had to relinquish this post, and I do not think this action of the present Government in the closing months of the honourable gentleman's political career reflects a great deal of credit on the Labor Party.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Perhaps he will be knighted!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Perhaps this rearrangement of portfolios happened because the present Premier was advised by his personal

publicity officer to hang on to housing and to shed the portfolios of Aboriginal Welfare and town planning as all the publicity in those two matters had been drained dry. Perhaps the publicity officer would look at the fact that probably there is more future publicity in relation to housing than there is in those other two portfolios. I feel somewhat sorry for the Ministers who have taken over those two portfolios, because the only thing left in them at present, now that legislation in respect of them has passed through both Houses of Parliament, is the problem of administration. I consider that the future difficulties have now been placed in the lap of other Ministers.

In relation to this question of the mutual understanding and respect that existed between members of Parliament in this State, I think it is unfortunate that the new Premier, in my opinion, is starting slightly behind scratch. If one is prepared to study many of the statements he has made in his career as a private member, as the Attorney-General, and now as the Premier, Treasurer, Attorney-General and Minister of Housing, one will see time and time again statements that in my opinion have been designed to discredit. I think they have been designed to discredit, first, Sir Thomas Playford, secondly, this honourable Chamber, and thirdly (and quite recently), the attitude of the Commonwealth Government towards South Australia. Both the mover and the seconder of this motion attempted to substantiate some of the recent inaccurate allegations that have been made, particularly against the former Premier and Treasurer, Sir Thomas Playford. I think all of us have seen those press statements, and I have no hesitation in saying that those statements, to which I shall refer presently, do not present the truth of the situation. I am sure that the present Premier, up to now, anyhow, has seen politics as a game to be played, and that before he can assume a position of control over the political mind of South Australia he must first destroy the image of Sir Thomas Playford. I do not think there is any doubt about this. As one moves around the State at present one sees a very great appreciation of the work of Sir Thomas Playford.

In substantiating the case I intend making, I wish to point out that as far as I am concerned there is no personal rancour whatsoever. I believe that the present Premier considers it imperative that the image of Sir Thomas Playford must be destroyed. In 1965 the Hon. Mr. Story quoted from an article that appeared in the university newspaper *On Dit*, and I think

at this stage it would be quite relevant if this was re-quoted. The article, under the heading "Pied Playford", stated:

Mr. Dunstan went a long way to grounding a myth before it ever got under way when he carefully debunked the image of Sir Thomas as having been the Pied Piper in attracting industry to South Australia.

The words used here are "debunked the image"; I have used the word "discredit". I do not think there is much difference. The report continues:

South Australia has been lagging in rates of industrial development behind the other States, including Tasmania, for years and currently ranked only fourth. He called in evidence the submissions of the employers' advocate at a recent wages hearing who claimed that South Australia was so far behind, it needed lower wages to attract investment capital. "Where Western Australia has a staff of 40 professional and technical experts on the job to attract investment our development department would seem to consist of Sir Thomas and two typists."

It is interesting to reflect on the rather amazing job done by Sir Thomas and two typists when we consider the staff engaged on this work at present and the results that have been achieved.

The point I make here is that there was an attempt to debunk or discredit the image of Sir Thomas Playford. Many other examples could be given—this is not an isolated example—but I intend coming to the present time. At present more than ever before, in the light of the inability of the Government to handle the financial affairs of this State, this image must be destroyed. The financial integrity and the achievements of the previous Treasurer, Sir Thomas Playford, must be attacked to divert attention from the inability of this Government to handle satisfactorily the financial affairs of this State. In a recent telecast the present Premier made the following statement:

Sir Thomas Playford ran down the cash balances of South Australia by spending capital funds and funds carried over from earlier years to pay for current State services.

I direct this question to this Council: is this the truth? Did Sir Thomas Playford run down the cash balances of this State? Did he spend capital funds and moneys carried over from earlier years to pay for current State services? I hope I shall prove it is not the truth. It is the image of Sir Thomas Playford that this is designed to attack and destroy. Here we have this new Treasurer, after a few days in office with a wealth of Government financial experience behind him, attempting to cast a slur on the Treasurer who conducted the

Treasury of South Australia for 27 years and after 27 years finished with a surplus in the Treasury of \$1,160,000, with all the trust funds in order and accounted for to the last cent. It is a very fair question to ask the Government members in this Chamber to answer: what was the state of the trust funds when the Walsh Government took over? Were they depleted? Of course not, and it is recorded in *Hansard* in a statement from the Under Treasurer that the trust funds were in order. Was there a deficit in the Loan Account and in the Consolidated Revenue Account? The answer of course is "No". Again, we come back to the only logical conclusion to which we can come when hearing these statements: the image of Sir Thomas Playford as Treasurer must be destroyed because the present Treasurer cannot compete.

Let us examine further this statement that Sir Thomas Playford ran down the cash balances of South Australia by spending capital funds and funds carried over from earlier years to pay for current State services. I have no doubt that here the present Treasurer was referring to the moneys that came from the winding up of the Radium Hill project. In this regard, it is necessary to examine that project and see how it was originally financed. The position is that \$13,725,000 was supplied from Loan funds and \$1,535,000 was supplied from the Consolidated Revenue Account of this State to finance the Radium Hill project. It is most important to realize that over \$1,500,000 of the moneys to finance that project came originally from the Consolidated Revenue Account. Was it not proper business practice, when this project was wound up and finally completed and Loan funds repaid, that any profit from the venture should be paid back into the Consolidated Revenue Account? Has anyone else any other suggestions in this matter? If honourable members want further information, I refer them to the 1962 report of the Radium Hill project, where these matters can be fully understood. Admittedly, there was a small profit (I cannot think of the exact figure for the moment) but the \$1,500,000 was originally supplied from the Consolidated Revenue Account.

Not only has the present Treasurer embarked on a programme designed to discredit Sir Thomas Playford (although I think this is something that all his eloquence and all his publicity officers will not be able to sell to the people of South Australia) but he has also embarked on a crusade to discredit (or debunk

the image, if you like) this honourable Council. I should like to quote from the 1965-66 *Hansard*, which shows that an attack, as reported in the university paper *On Dit*, was made in statements to university students. Again, it is interesting to reflect on this matter at this stage. The passage reads:

The rest of the seats are filled by men who seem to answer only to God, and that God, it would appear, is a nineteenth century Tory. But since this little group consistently knocked back Sir Thomas Playford's Bills, we can rest assured they will do everything they can to humiliate the Labor Government and stifle any effective programme.

I can quote from memory figures in this regard. They were used by the Hon. Mr. Banfield yesterday in his speech, when he compared the second session of the Playford Government in 1963-64 with the second session of this Government. In the second session of the last Playford Government 80 Bills came before this Council, including two that did not pass here and three that did not pass in another place. In the second session of this Government 87 Bills came before this Council, three of which did not pass here. So our record is consistent in our attitude towards legislation. It can be substantiated easily that this Chamber has never been obstructive to the will of the people expressed at an election; nor has it ever openly set out to be obstructive to the will of another place. We may well remember the allegations made by the present Treasurer when by regulation the Government increased harbour dues considerably in this State. Here again a statement was made to the university students. I think every member of this Council will remember it clearly: it was that the present Premier claimed that a deal was made to allow the Legislative Council members to go to Melbourne and play bowls provided that they allowed the regulations to pass. Once again I ask this Council: was this the truth?

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: It was completely untrue.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I think anyone who looks at this matter honestly will come to the conclusion indicated by the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan. The statement was designed to discredit this Council in the eyes of the people. I turn now to a press statement reported in the *Advertiser* of November 18, 1966; this was at the end of the sittings before the Christmas break. The present Premier made the following statement:

Events of the past week had shown what kind of a block to progress and the will of the people the Legislative Council majority was.

Then he went on to deal with three matters, the first of which was the Planning and Development Bill. The following is a direct quote from the *Advertiser* of November 18:

The Bill, introduced to the Assembly in February, was explained and allowed to lie on the table so that all interested could examine it, make submissions and discuss with the Government and the Opposition any amendments they thought should be made. Members of the Legislative Council were in the same position as other members of Parliament and the public informed themselves fully on the measure before it reached them. Given three weeks to deal with it, they had adamantly refused to debate it and to complete the measure this year.

Once again I ask the question: was this the truth? The answer once again must be "No". The Bill was introduced in this Council on November 8, 1966. At this stage the Government had decided that Parliament would rise on November 17, leaving five sitting days to deal with a very full Notice Paper and this new legislation—a very large and complex measure.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: And one that was not printed.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I shall come to that shortly. The Bill was introduced in the House of Assembly and, at a rough count that I did, over 200 amendments were carried in the other place. The Bill arrived here on November 8 and the Hon. C. M. Hill began speaking to it on November 9; at that stage no reprint of the Bill was available. This left only three days for consideration to be given to a very complex measure, and yet in the *Advertiser* of November 18 the present Premier made the statement that we were given three weeks to deal with it and that we had adamantly refused to debate it. Nothing is further from the truth! Indeed, the Government did not bring this matter on for debate in this Council. Further, over 60 amendments were introduced here. In a statement the present Premier claimed that this was the finest legislation of its type in Australia, and yet it went out of this Chamber with 60 amendments made to it! In the same statement to the press on November 18, dealing with the Aboriginal Lands Trust Bill, he said that, although the House of Assembly approached the Legislative Council in a spirit of compromise, the Council majority was not willing to give the Aborigines the same mineral rights as many members of the Council enjoyed on their own properties. Once again I ask: is this the truth? Did the members of this Council deny the Aborigines the same mineral rights that many members of

this Council enjoyed on their own properties? The answer, of course, is "No". This allegation was taken up in an article by Max Harris in the *Australian* in February this year. The article stated:

But easily the most manifest example of deep-seated guilt turning to aggression occurred during the bitter 1966 confrontation between Dunstan and the Legislative Council. Dunstan's efforts to secure land ownership for Aboriginal co-operatives were frustrated when the Council referred the appropriate Bill to a Select Committee, thus shelving it for a time, and also refusing to allow the Aborigines mineral rights over the land to be allocated to them. The cynicism in this situation derived from the fact that over half the Legislative Councillors who rejected the concept of mineral rights for Aborigines possessed themselves identical rights over rich lands acquired way back in the grand old squattocratic days of the State.

Here is a statement amplified in Australia's only national newspaper. I again issue the challenge: is this true? The answer is, "No; it is not". The statement was made to discredit this Council in the eyes of the people.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Methinks the honourable member protests too much.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I think the Minister should substantiate something when he makes that sort of interjection.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am placing this on record because this criticism has been made over the years, and when somebody bit back recently against these allegations the present Premier stated in the press, "They are trying to discredit me," when he himself for so many years has embarked upon a programme to discredit not only Sir Thomas Playford but also this honourable Chamber. Recently he has also tried to discredit the attitude of the Commonwealth, and I shall come to that matter in a moment.

I now come to the last statement of this type that I want to deal with; I have only dealt with very few such statements. The Minister interjected and said that I protested too much. I assure him that I could continue with factual examples for some time. Last financial year there was a total rundown of the resources available in the Consolidated Revenue Account of this State of \$9,250,000. The Walsh Government started the financial year with a credit left by the previous Treasurer of \$1,160,000. After the first financial year the then Treasurer, the Hon. Frank Walsh, with all honesty admitted a deficit and balanced his Budget by using the trust funds of this State to the tune of about \$8,000,000. The important thing that I emphasize is that he balanced his Budget because,

as every honourable member knows, the Budget must be balanced every year. The important thing to understand is how the Budget is balanced. As the monthly statements have been coming from the Treasury this financial year we have seen a similar pattern, and every member has been expecting a rundown in the Consolidated Revenue Account this year of about \$7,000,000. However, within a week of assuming office this new Treasurer made the blank statement that this year the Government would balance its Budget and, of course, this is true. However, instead of taking trust funds to balance his Budget he is using Loan funds for this purpose. In other words, he is transferring to the Loan Account certain items that were originally committed to the Consolidated Revenue Account of the State. I do not think there is anything illegal in this practice. Section 5 of the Appropriation Act every year gives the legal right for this to be done, but the interesting thing to note is that the Treasurer said that certain items—the building of non-Government hospitals and things of that nature—had been transferred to the Loan Account. This opens up a very interesting prospect. I am not an expert on Treasury affairs, but it is remarkable how, within the last month, items that had been committed originally to the Budget (I think there were 12 Governor's Warrants for the whole financial year) have suddenly been transferred to the Loan Account.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: A "remarkable achievement"!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Quite a remarkable achievement. As far as I can find out, there is nothing illegal in this, but I should like some explanation of how certain items in a Budget account passed by Parliament at the beginning of the year, and after the 12 Governor's Warrants had been issued during the year, suddenly find themselves in a different account.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Does it happen in other States?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I do not care what happens in other States; it does not worry me whatsoever.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You were worried when you went to other States!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I agree, and that is why we went there. Since coming into office the Labor Government has overspent on items committed to its Consolidated Revenue Account by a total of \$16,000,000; the Government cannot deny it.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Sir Henry Bolte said in his Budget speech last September that he had overspent \$8,000,000.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I would not doubt that, but what the honourable member must realize is that Victoria's population is about three times as great as ours, so that its Budget will be four times as large, and by comparison this State's \$9,250,000 is astronomical.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We have that many less to collect taxation from.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The statement that the Budget is balanced is correct, but the State cannot do other than balance its Budget. But was this statement that we had a balanced Budget designed to give the people of South Australia a true appreciation of the facts about the Treasury at present? Every honourable member knows the financial consequences of using trust funds to balance a Budget. Money must eventually be found to replace the money used from the trust funds. There has already been a loss to South Australia of about \$400,000 in interest alone on the money taken from the trust funds of the State. Honourable members all know the financial consequences of using Loan funds to bolster a deficit in the Consolidated Revenue Account—the consequences are somewhat similar in both cases, but what has happened is that a hole in the Revenue Account of the State has been plugged up by funds from another source, and the Government cannot deny this.

Honourable members all know that the amount of money provided to the State by the Loan Council depends on a formula worked out on the net Loan expenditure of the State for the previous five years, and this does not include Loan funds used to finance a deficit Budget. This State, due to the very careful husbanding of its financial resources by Sir Thomas Playford, has already benefited under this formula when other States have decided to finance a budgetary deficit from Loan funds. The present Treasurer must think in terms of living within his income. It is very important to the State that money provided for developmental purposes should be used for those purposes. During the two years that the Labor Government has been in office, this Chamber has constantly drawn the attention of the Government to the fact that the developmental activities of the State cannot be neglected. If they are, then there will be a drain upon our financial resources.

An examination of the Supplementary Estimates that have come before us on two occasions since the Government has been in office shows that overspending by the Government is occurring not in the developmental side but in the non-developmental side of the State's economy. I have referred to the attack upon the image of Sir Thomas Playford and the image of this honourable Chamber, but the Commonwealth has also come in for its share of the blame. How can the Treasurer or the Government justify a claim to the Commonwealth that we have insufficient Loan funds when the Government is prepared to use \$7,000,000 of such funds to balance a deficit Budget? I am rather at a disadvantage, because I did not have the opportunity to study the speeches of the mover and seconder at any length, although I did undertake to give the Hon. Mr. Banfield the benefit of some corrected figures on matters he raised yesterday. His statement was only an amplification of what the Premier had said on a previous occasion—that the Liberal Government had made no forward planning for capital works: that it had let contracts committing the expenditure of \$5,000,000 in 1964-65; \$8,800,000 in 1965-66; and \$11,200,000 this financial year. Surely one cannot have it both ways. The charge was made that the previous Government did no forward planning. In the first place, the Budget account is a year-to-year thing; the only forward planning that can take place is in relation to the Loan Account. The charge was made that the previous Government did no forward planning. A further charge was made that commitments were made for the future.

Surely these two statements are completely opposed to one another. Regarding large bridge works and big buildings, surely some forward planning in relation to Loan funds must be made. There must be some forward commitments. It is obvious that when a new school worth \$500,000 is being erected, there may be a payment of \$50,000 within the last financial year of a Government's life. There must be a forward commitment of \$450,000 in the next financial year; and this forward planning did go on, but the interest now is in the total forward planning which by my calculations amounts to \$25,000,000. I refer to the 1966-67 Loan Estimates and a statement by the Treasurer on Parliamentary Paper No. 11A, and I quote:

At the June meeting of the Australian Loan Council the aggregate borrowing programme of the States for 1966-67 increased by \$40,000,000

to \$645,000,000 and, of this, South Australia's share increased by \$5,481,000 to \$88,430,000. That was South Australia's Loan allocation in 1966-67. It could be taken that the second year might be an average and, therefore, multiply 88 by three and the result is \$260,000,000, which would be South Australia's share over the three-year period from the Loan Council.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I do not think it works quite like that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Well, I would be prepared to call it \$250,000,000.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: What I meant was that multiplying by three would not give the correct figure.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The previous year it was \$5,000,000 less and it could be expected that this year it would be \$5,000,000 more. However, supposing that the figure is \$250,000,000; this would mean a total of Loan funds available of \$250,000,000 for the three years, and yet the forward commitment—which is quite logical, and which should exist—amounts to \$24,000,000. What is all this beefing about the previous Government committing this Government to massive works that it could not meet? Speaking of forward planning, I admit that some poor forward planning did take place in, say, the Taillem Bend to Keith pipeline. That was supposed to be completed by 1967, and Loan funds were available to complete that pipeline, which was a matter of some concern and consideration as far as the development of this State's economy was concerned. I must admit that this Government is doing a much better job in forward planning than the Playford Government because it has now put forward the completion date of this pipeline to 1972 and because of that I must congratulate the Government on the manner in which it is handling the question of forward planning. The fact remains that the charge that the previous Government committed this Government to works that it could not meet falls to the ground because there must be forward planning on large works, and the total amount of forward planning, according to the Premier's own words, amounted to \$24,000,000 from the Loan Account.

I will now attempt to answer some matters that I told the Hon. Mr. Banfield I would answer, and I deal first with portion of his speech in which he said:

I wonder where the ethics were when he was a party to a Government that was prepared to hold office when it received only 46 per cent of the votes election after election? I should be glad if an honourable member would show me the ethics in that.

I then interjected:

Who supplied those figures?

The Hon. Mr. Banfield replied:

The honourable member may go to the statistician in the same way as anybody else may go. He cannot deny that repeatedly in the last 30 years the Labor Party obtained more votes than the Liberal Party, with that one exception, yet that Party clung to office despite those figures and the wishes of the electors of South Australia.

In that statement the Hon. Mr. Banfield claimed that only once in the last 30 years had the Liberal Party a right to govern in South Australia because the Labor Party received more votes than the Liberal Party. I quote from the *Australian Quarterly* which contains an accurate survey of elections throughout Australia and it deals only with the period from 1938 to 1956. However, it is in the period of 30 years mentioned by the Hon. Mr. Banfield, and I quote first some of the material before presenting the table:

This should be borne in mind when examining the figures set out below. The figures have been compiled by using the results obtained at the Federal election nearest in time to the State election concerned in the uncontested districts and in those where one of the major Parties did not stand, e.g., where an A.L.P. and a Communist were the only candidates.

I think that is the only way that a factual appreciation of the position can be obtained. Ever since I have been in this Chamber allegations have been made along the lines mentioned by the Hon. Mr. Banfield yesterday, but what must be realized is that many districts are uncontested and many districts during this period have been contested only by an A.L.P. candidate and a Communist candidate. Of course, with compulsory voting, a totally distorted voting figure is obtained if every vote is counted. The only way a correct figure can be obtained is to use the Commonwealth figures in those uncontested districts where neither—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But Commonwealth figures do not elect this Parliament.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The point I am making is that the figures the honourable member is constantly quoting are misleading because, first, in many districts no contest is held at all and, secondly, in many districts one major Party is not opposed by the other. For example, in Port Adelaide there may be an A.L.P. candidate and a Communist candidate and in such a case how would a Liberal person vote?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: At least the Labor Party got that percentage of votes. I

point out that I gave factual figures because I quoted State figures and the honourable member can check those figures for himself.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Let me put it in a different way and I will make it a bit simpler so that the Hon. Mr. Banfield will understand it.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You are arguing on Commonwealth figures and not on the State figures that I quoted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: They are State figures with the exception of a district where there was no contest or where there was not a candidate from either the A.L.P. or the L.C.L. fighting in a district; in those cases Commonwealth figures have been taken.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Apparently the honourable member believes that Liberal voters and Labor voters vote the same in State elections as in Commonwealth elections?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. DeGaris.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: If honourable members have difficulty in following what I am saying I hope that they will read *Hansard* tomorrow. I am giving State figures with the exception of those districts where there was no election—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I know that the Leader quoted from a paper, but who is the writer of that paper?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The person concerned is from the Department of History at the University of Adelaide.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It could have been Brother Reid.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I now present the table to which I referred earlier:

AGGREGATE PARTY VOTE.

Year.	L.C.L.	A.L.P.	Others.
1938 . . .	83,413	76,093	65,780
1941 . . .	81,116	70,244	57,742
1944 . . .	144,317	157,115	57,383
1947 . . .	180,595	159,421	61,419
1950 . . .	193,962	162,318	55,470
1953 . . .	182,279	181,447	59,843
1956 . . .	185,502	188,730	32,712

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Will the Leader inform the Council how many times in the last 30 years the L.C.L. has won the odd seat in a Senate election, which I consider to be a fair dinkum election?

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: The Minister just said that it was not.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You can use figures any way you want to.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Honourable members must not converse across the Chamber. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I agree that figures can be twisted whichever way one wishes to twist them. What I am saying is that the Hon. Mr. Banfield yesterday made this statement to which I have referred, and I am putting up a factual account of the actual voting figures in South Australia.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You left out Port Adelaide and Hindmarsh. Don't they count?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I explained when I opened this argument how these figures were arrived at, and the gentleman who wrote this article said that this was the only way they could be computed properly. I agree with him entirely. If honourable members want to put their point of view that over the last 30 years the L.C.L. has had a majority only once, then I ask them to go back and do their homework again.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I said, "in this State", and I did not use Commonwealth figures.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I agree that the honourable member used State figures. However, he did not include the big Liberal vote in districts where there was no election. He counted fully the A.L.P. vote in districts like Port Adelaide when there was no Liberal candidate standing at all. I gave the corrections that have been made.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You should use the Senate figures. You would not be prepared to do it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I agree that the State Government has always shown a slightly better vote than the Commonwealth Government, particularly in the years 1938 to 1956.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You are not doing too well; you had better get off that topic, because you are talking against yourself.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am quite prepared to continue the argument with the Chief Secretary.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The only way to get true comparisons is when both Parties have candidates and everybody votes.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is exactly what has been corrected in the figures I gave.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The Senate figures don't suit your purpose.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: If the Hon. Mr. DeGaris was fair dinkum, the Senate figures are what he would use.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I assure the honourable member I am always fair dinkum. If the Chief Secretary likes to challenge these figures—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I don't accept them, because I do not know the authority for them and in any case they are probably slanted.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask honourable members to observe the decorum of the Chamber and not to indulge in argument across the Chamber.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I shall now move on to the figures given by the Hon. Mr. Banfield in relation to the allegation that the Commonwealth Government is not doing the right thing by South Australia in its capital expenditure in this State. One could put up a very nice argument, as the honourable member did, in presenting these figures. I shall not quote the figures, because they are in *Hansard* and any honourable member can read them there. The honourable member did not give the complete picture. I think we all appreciate that over the last 10 years there has been a very great capital expenditure by the Commonwealth Government on the Weapons Research Establishment. The table I wish to present deals with this matter and also deals with the capital expenditure on other than the W.R.E. I think every honourable member appreciates that in developments like the W.R.E. this very large capital expenditure occurs in occasional years. In 1956-57 defence expenditure in South Australia on other than the W.R.E. amounted to \$283,000, whereas the expenditure at the W.R.E. amounted to \$3,998,000. The figure for other than defence expenditure was \$1,105,000. Gradually through the 10-year period from 1956-57 to 1966-67 the expenditure on defence other than the W.R.E. has increased from \$283,000 to \$797,000. From 1956-57 to 1966-67 expenditure on the W.R.E. increased from \$3,998,000 to \$10,225,000 in 1959-60 and decreased to \$1,500,000 in 1966-67.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You will agree that I said the figures I gave yesterday included defence?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes, I do. The interesting thing in this is that in 1956-57 the capital expenditure in South Australia on other than defence was \$1,105,000, whereas in 1966-67 it was \$2,263,000. In other words, the expenditure on other than defence has increased over 100 per cent in South Australia from 1956-57 to 1966-67. It is quite impossible to expect the Commonwealth to continue expanding projects like the W.R.E. in any one State. It is completely impractical in the

defence concept of this nation to expect to see very heavy defence expenditures taking place in South Australia.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: How does this percentage compare with what has been spent in other States?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am merely answering the question posed by the Hon. Mr. Banfield in his speech yesterday. I can say that capital expenditure on other than W.R.E. has gone from about \$1,400,000 to about \$3,100,000 in 10 years, whereas the total capital expenditure of the Commonwealth over the whole of Australia in that same 10-year period has gone up three times. The expenditure in

South Australia on other than W.R.E. has increased about 2½ times, whereas the total Commonwealth expenditure over the whole of the Commonwealth has gone up by three times. There is a slight down-turn for South Australia in the 10-year period in expenditure on other than W.R.E., but not one in which the figures given by the Hon. Mr. Banfield give a clear indication of the actual position. Mr. President, I have a table showing expenditure over a 10-year period on defence other than W.R.E. and on W.R.E., and other capital expenditures, which I ask leave to have included in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

CIVIL AND DEFENCE CAPITAL WORKS EXPENDITURE.

Financial Year.	Defence other than W.R.E.	W.R.E.	Other.	Total.	Total Commonwealth Expenditure.
	\$M	\$M	\$M	\$M	\$M
56-57	.283	3.998	1.105	5.386	39.269
57-58	.105	3.262	1.363	4.730	40.288
58-59	.319	5.455	1.825	7.599	49.271
59-60	.292	10.225	1.366	11.883	52.645
60-61	.290	5.987	1.469	7.746	51.089
61-62	.527	4.895	1.671	7.093	55.349
62-63	.373	4.482	1.609	6.464	57.009
63-64	.569	2.909	2.103	5.581	59.060
64-65	.628	1.941	2.396	4.965	76.710
65-66	1.535	2.202	1.651	5.388	107.284
66-67 (est)	.797	1.5	2.263	4.560	123.060

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: There are one or two other matters I should like to mention only briefly because I know there are other speakers who are probably more associated with these matters than I am. One statement by the Minister of Local Government was quite interesting. He said that there were limited Loan funds available. That is quite a remarkable statement when we realize that \$7,000,000 of our Loan funds has been transferred to balance a deficit in the Consolidated Revenue Account. But there has been a very definite change in the financial policy being followed by the Highways and Local Government Department. What has happened, on the Minister's own admission, is that Loan moneys which previously were used for, shall we say, permanent constructions (constructions in concrete, as far as the Highways Department is concerned) are now to be paid for out of the Highways Fund.

This means that Loan moneys are being released because Highways Fund money is being used for this purpose. In point of fact, it means that the road user in South Australia

is being used as a means of financing a deficit Budget in this State. I object to this manoeuvre; it is not justified. The policy of the Playford Government was that money collected from the road users should be spent on the roads. It is reasonable to expect permanent structures in concrete that will serve the State for 50 years or more to be built from Loan funds. I am rather sorry for the Minister of Roads. I felt that even in moving this motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply he lacked his usual fire and enthusiasm. If we look at what is happening in his department and observe the inroads made by an extravagant Treasurer, we can understand the possible reason why his speech was dressed in widow's weeds.

The simple fact of the matter is that this Government has not come to grips with its problems. The State's expenditure in the last two years has increased by 8 per cent or 9 per cent annually whilst the gross national product increase in South Australia has been only 4 per cent. The Commonwealth figures present a much rosier picture. As far as the gross

national product of Australia is concerned, they show a growth rate of 13 per cent in the last quarter of this year. Until the Government of the day comes to grips with this problem—and His Excellency's Speech in opening this session of Parliament is no indication that the Government intends to come to grips with this problem—

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: It doesn't even know what it is.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is probably quite so.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: There is too much forward planning for the Loan Account.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes; the forward planning for the Loan Account is going further ahead while the forward planning for the Consolidated Revenue Account is getting shorter and shorter. As I was saying, until the Government comes to grips with this problem, we shall continue to have this downturn in the economic activity of this State. Whatever happens at the next general election, whichever Government occupies the Treasury benches, it will have a difficult meal on its plate.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: You are not as confident as you used to be.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am quite confident; there may be another political Party altogether running the State.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: I have heard talk in this Chamber at various times of the Labor Government lasting for 28 days, 28 weeks and 28 months, but now the honourable member says "whichever Government comes in next time".

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes, fair enough. I am perfectly happy with that statement, that, whatever Government comes in after the next election, it will have a difficult meal on its plate. It will need the understanding of the people of South Australia while it digests the problems passed on to it by this Administration. There are further matters that I could speak to, but other honourable members are probably more fitted than I to deal with them.

However, I should like to deal with one matter that I consider has contributed greatly to the loss of confidence in the economy of this State by people both inside and outside South Australia. As soon as this Government took office, it put into operation one of its main socialistic planks—the refusal to allow people to freehold leasehold land. We all know that the fundamental policy of the Australian Labor Party is socialistic. One of its basic policies concerns the tenure of land.

If there is one way to destroy confidence, it is to tamper with tenure of land. Anyone can see what has happened in the other States in this regard. Where there is security of tenure of land there will be confidence in people to develop and go on to the land.

This policy of being difficult about the tenure of land has inhibited capital investment in other States of the Commonwealth; it has also inhibited capital investment in the rural areas of South Australia. In all earnestness, I urge the Government to give this matter serious consideration. I appreciate it is difficult for the Government to alter its course at this time but I can assure it there will be no criticism or loss of face at the forthcoming general election if at this stage it decides that, in the interest of a return of confidence in this State, it will take this one step of allowing people the right of freehold tenure of the land they hold.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Do you think the Trades Hall will allow the Government to do that?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I do not mind how it is done. When the Government came to office, one of its first administrative acts was to put a brake on the freehold tenure of land, and that has contributed to the lack of capital investment in South Australia. This has occurred in other States which disastrously followed this sort of policy.

Finally, I call on the Government to bear its share of responsibility for the economic welfare of this State. It must learn to live within its means. I ask that in the coming session the Government treat with some care the emotional and non-developmental items of its legislation. If it can in its dying days show a standard of responsibility in tackling these economic problems at their core instead of skating around their perimeter, we shall owe it some debt of gratitude that it has at last realized there is a problem in this State; that there is a centre to this problem and that it can be tackled. The Government cannot get around it by insisting on emotional and extravagant legislation.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: There is not much hope for this, having regard to His Excellency's Speech.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I agree entirely. What I referred to previously, this tenure of land, was but a very small step. The Government must at this stage show some responsibility for the economic life of this State. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): Mr. President, in rising to speak to this motion, I, too, express my regret at the recent indisposition of His Excellency the Governor and the fact that he was not able to open Parliament this year, as planned. I also join with other honourable members in congratulating the Lieutenant-Governor, Sir Mellis Napier, on opening this session and his continued excellent service in the welfare of this State. I join other honourable members in offering condolences to the relatives of those past members of Parliament who have died since the last opening of Parliament—Robert Stanley Richards and Rufus Sanders Goldney, two former members who were known to me only by repute but who had an excellent record of service in this State.

I refer particularly to Charles Caleb Dudley Octoman, known to all of us in this Chamber as "Dudley" for he was not only a colleague but also a close personal friend. Although he was a member for only a short time, he contributed much to this Council and to the State. He had much experience and good, sound judgment. I regret his loss. I take this opportunity of publicly offering sympathy to his relatives. We are, of course, fortunate in having as his successor the Hon. Mr. Whyte, who is already making his mark in this Chamber.

I wish also to refer briefly to the retirement of the Hon. L. H. Densley, who was President of this Council until recently. I recall with gratitude the help and encouragement that he gave to many of us when we were new to this Chamber. I am sure that we all join in wishing him a very happy retirement. As this is the first time that I have spoken during this session, I take the opportunity to add my words of welcome to the Hon. V. G. Springett on his election to this Council. I hope that he will have a very happy and rewarding term of office.

I also wish to refer to the speeches made yesterday by the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply; I do not wish to go into them in detail but I shall refer to one or two points. Both the Hon. Mr. Bevan and the Hon. Mr. Banfield spoke in rather glowing terms of the new Premier. Since then we have heard the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, who has just resumed his seat, give a true picture of the background of the present Premier. The contrast between the two assessments is so great that my only

comment at this stage need be that I believe that the mover and the seconder gilded the lily to some extent.

It was unfortunate that Mr. Banfield, in referring to the new Premier, by comparison cast a slur on the election of the Leader of the Opposition in another place. I refer to Mr. Hall, who has all the promise of making a first-class Premier and leader of this State.

Mr. Banfield implied that, by comparison with the present Premier, Mr. Hall was somewhat inexperienced. This is an unjust accusation, because I believe that one of the things from which the present Government suffers is that it has no member with a background of business administration, and this is where many of this State's present troubles have started. On the other hand, Mr. Hall has had to make his own way in life and he has many members with business and administrative experience from whom to choose to form a Cabinet. At times I have envied the trade union background of members of the Government, especially when there is a need to speak with authority on industrial matters. However, although this background is of great benefit when industrial matters are under discussion it has been gained through obtaining benefits for trade unionists, and the cost and administration of these benefits have always been the worry of someone else. This is one of the great handicaps that any Australian Labor Party Administration must overcome if it is to handle the administration and finances of this State. The Government would be much better off if it had some members with business and administrative experience.

I turn now to His Excellency's Speech, which is, of course, written by the Government of the day to outline the legislative programme for the session. I shall commence with paragraph 4, which refers to the Premier's Department and industrial promotion. The Government would do well to look at the proposal put forward by the Leader of the Opposition in another place that a special effort should be made in this direction and that a proper authority should be set up under the control of a Minister. The Premier's Department since its formation has been very conspicuous for its lack of success in attracting industry to South Australia. I believe that this is one of the tragedies that has befallen this State. We have, of course, seen some expansion of industry; for example, the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited at Whyalla has a long-term commitment that is likely to go on, even if not at the same rate, irrespective of

what Government is in office. We also have the motor car industry in South Australia. That industry is also committed to very large capital expenditure here, and therefore it cannot afford to neglect further expansion. A recent announcement that has gained much prominence is that the Chrysler company is extending its works and spending more money, but this is in the established motor car industry, which must bring its Australian-made content to a higher percentage if it is to enjoy Commonwealth tariff concessions.

I turn now to paragraph 5 of His Excellency's Speech, which refers to the near-record crops that we have enjoyed in the last season. Frankly, I cannot understand what this has to do with the Government or with the legislation contemplated for this session.⁵ This near-record wheat crop is, of course, due to the efforts of the primary producers who grew the crops and to the favourable season that we enjoyed in most of the State, although one or two parts of the State were not so fortunate.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I hope that you will still be of the opinion that it has nothing to do with the Government if we have a drought.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I do not think anyone is blaming the present Government for the drought. However, since the Government took office two years ago it has heavily increased charges to people on the land. Harbour charges have been increased by up to 71 per cent; freight charges by up to 33 per cent; and water rebate charges and land tax have been increased. I could go on for some time.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You have nearly run out!

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Land tax is only the ordinary quinquennial assessment.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I differ with the Minister quite strongly: there was a conference on the increased rates.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: What action did you take?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Our action was to agree to the new rate until the new assessment came forward.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It was nothing of the sort! You tossed it out until the new assessment came out.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: The Minister has not done his homework, as he is not familiar with the legislation that was passed in this Chamber. The increase was accepted by a conference between the two Houses for one year, because it was known that a new quinquennial assessment was coming out, which

would affect the following year's revenue. In reply to the Chief Secretary's interjection about the present Government and the drought and the steep increase in charges, I point out that every time the people on the land have to meet these charges in a dry year, when income is practically nil, they will be very forcibly reminded that, although the Government did not cause the drought, it certainly added considerably to their financial troubles.

Regarding the near record wheat crop, it is interesting to note that Eyre Peninsula grew 24,000,000 bushels of this crop. Unfortunately, because of the large crop and the rapid expansion that has taken place in that area, the final grain deliveries did not take place until the end of March, 1967. Late deliveries are a worry to the farmers concerned not only because of the risk of weather damage to their year's earnings but because they do not receive any payment for their crops while the grain remains on their properties. For the final grain deliveries at the end of March, 1967, this payment probably will not take place until at least some time in April—12 months or more after incurring quite a bit of the expenditure in growing the crop. This means that the farmers have to carry a full 12 months' expenditure before expecting any return, and they probably had started on preparations for the coming crop.

The Government should appreciate this, because it has been repeatedly shown that it is in financial difficulties in trying to balance its Budget with money it has already received; but how much more difficult must it be for a person to pay his way when the money is not forthcoming? Therefore, I request the Government to do everything possible to speed up the construction of extra facilities at Thevenard and the investigations into a deep sea port on the eastern coastline of Eyre Peninsula. I know that the Government is not responsible for the silo space at Thevenard, but any addition by the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Company to those silos can be made only when that company is assured that there will be a suitable channel at the port for larger ships to come in and load. The whole programme of terminal port storage facilities depends upon the action of the Government in speeding up these works.

The steep increase in harbour charges made during the term of this Government (and the Harbours Board was already showing a profit of up to \$700,000 a year) must mean that the harbours authority is showing a very large profit on a year's operations, so there should

be no financial embarrassment in putting some of this money to work on harbour facilities to speed the development of the rural and secondary industries of the State. I thought the Hon. Mr. Banfield came up with a unique suggestion yesterday regarding the promotion of the interests of the State when he suggested that the Commonwealth Government ought to build a new terminal at the Adelaide Airport. The projects I have mentioned should be within the capacity of the Government because of the revenues received. They will help in the development of the State; they are not just a matter of spending money.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: What about trying to get assistance from the Commonwealth to carry out work at ports?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I cannot see where the Commonwealth Government comes into the question of port facilities. Apparently, there is a surplus of Loan funds of about \$7,000,000 that can be used to finance a deficit, whereas the Marine and Harbors Department is a very profitable enterprise that could quite easily handle the interest and capital repayments. I cannot see that it should be a Commonwealth responsibility.

Reference is made to some expansion of research at Northfield and at the Nuriootpa Viticultural Station. It seems to me that this is little enough when the great part that primary industry plays in the economy of the State is considered. Further, I think it is unfortunate that the reference to some little increase in research was given prominence in the Governor's Deputy's Speech yet we find that a restriction is placed on field officers, who could be passing on this knowledge to growers. Those district officers play a vital part in the agricultural industry, and the restriction on the use of their vehicles in relation to the mileage allowance is most unfortunate. That, to a large degree, offsets the advantages of the research programme. Unless departmental officers are permitted to move around and do their work, much of the information gained is lost.

Paragraph 9 refers to minerals, and I have little comment to make on this subject except that I have been concerned with reports made to me, and I hope the Minister will be able to reassure me. It has been said that there has been a reduction in exploratory drilling in the latter part of this year and, if that is so, I think it should be viewed with concern. I believe that the Mines Department performs a great service to this State with such developmental work because it can help with the

expansion of our economy. I hope the Minister will be able to give an assurance that there has been and will be no such restriction on drilling exploration, particularly if it should be the result of a diversion of finances to other projects of a non-developmental nature merely to suit some sections of the community.

Paragraph 11 refers to Aboriginal welfare. I shall have little to say on this matter because I believe it is such a big question that it would take more time than is available to me this afternoon. However, I wish the new Minister, Mr. Loveday, well in his appointment. I hope that now he has been appointed to this portfolio he will conduct a complete reassessment of the results of the change in conditions over the last two years. He may find after a full investigation that there could be some beneficial change in policy in the handling of a difficult and complex question. He also has the portfolio of Minister of Education, which is probably one of the most difficult to administer. I have no criticism of the Minister but I would like one matter of policy examined. I refer to the appointment of inexperienced staff to smaller country high schools. It has often been claimed that it is an advantage to have our education system centralized in Adelaide because that ensures that all schools receive equal treatment.

I believe that the policy of sending as many teachers as possible to the country at some time during their career is essential if we are to keep our country high schools properly staffed. What concerns me is the undoubted fact that the ratio of inexperienced to experienced staff in many country high schools is much higher than it is in the larger and, perhaps, prestige high schools in Adelaide, such as those at Unley and Adelaide. I am not reflecting on the young people sent to country high schools, because I believe them to be of high standard who will be assets to education in South Australia, but unfortunately they must first get experience. A check of a large number of country high schools has shown that the proportion of inexperienced teachers sent to them, particularly to the smaller schools, is greater than in the metropolitan area. This means not only that these young people are inexperienced but also that the senior staff have to bear a far greater load in administering that high school. I know that the Minister is aware of this problem and in the interests of uniform education throughout the State I hope that he will give it his closest consideration and perhaps use his influence to obtain a change in policy.

I am concerned that many high school teachers consider that a move to the city is a reward for merit. It also concerns me to find that many teaching students have the impression that their examination results could decide the distance that they will be appointed from the metropolitan area. I think in the appointment of teachers to high schools we should give particular consideration to schools where the staff is comparatively small and where it is harder to absorb inexperienced but otherwise very suitable teachers.

Paragraph 15 refers to capital expenditure. In reading this I was very concerned to see that large amounts of money are being committed to works close to the metropolitan area. Coupled with the loss of Loan moneys through these moneys being diverted to offset the deficit, this appears to indicate that the country areas could suffer a very lean period. We know that some works are urgently required in the country. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris this afternoon mentioned the Keith pipeline, and the Hon. Mr. Whyte, one of my colleagues in the Northern District, has been fighting hard for a water supply for Kimba, which will be on the brink of disaster if rain does not come soon.

We have repeatedly heard that these and other projects cannot be proceeded with because of lack of funds. It concerns me to see these large amounts being committed to the future on projects so close to the metropolitan area and so little being made available for these other important projects, which are directly coupled with development and expansion and which will ultimately affect the employment position and prosperity in this State. Mr. DeGaris referred to the road programme and the use of revenue moneys for projects that were previously financed from Loan funds.

When the Minister of Roads spoke about this matter yesterday he put up a case for not using Loan funds for this work. However, I would point out, in support of what Mr. DeGaris has said, that our road finance comes largely from sources of revenue which are ear-marked for that purpose and which cannot be diverted to any other purpose, although the Treasurer has the right to call on these funds, with the permission of the Minister of Roads.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: For what purpose?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Whatever purpose he wants it for.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: That is not right.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: This protection is always provided. We give the Treasurer certain authority each year in a Bill. The

point I was making is that these moneys are earmarked for road expenditure, and they cannot in normal circumstances be diverted to other purposes. However, we now see that a way around this has been found and that works that were formerly financed by Loan moneys are now going to be financed out of revenue, which in turn releases Loan funds to meet deficits in other departments. I am not casting any reflection on the Minister of Roads regarding this method of finance, but I say that the overall method of finance in this State is giving concern to everyone. Mr. DeGaris covered this matter very fully.

The Hon. Mr. Potter asked a question today on railways, and we shall await the answer with much interest. The honourable member questioned the future of the Silverton Tramway Company, which is an important link in our rail standardization programme. I wish to make one comment to the Minister of Transport in relation to railway policy with regard to compensation. I have brought this matter up in this Council before in the form of a question. I am concerned to find that the South Australian Railways Department takes such little responsibility for loss or damage to goods consigned to its care unless those goods are covered either directly by insurance or by the payment of an added charge, which is virtually the same thing. Even in the case of derailments, we find that under the Act the Railways Commissioner is not liable for damage to goods consigned under the normal owner's risk conditions. We find also that unless an extra charge is paid in respect of the carriage of parcels there is a compensation limitation of \$20.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: That is the policy in transportation wherever you go.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: This \$20 limit is certainly the result of an agreement between the various railway systems, but it is not any part of an agreement where road transport is involved. I am not quarrelling with the Minister on this point, but I do emphasize that in this day and age \$20 does not represent much value; many parcels could have \$50, \$100 or \$200 of value in them. I have had complaints on this score from more than one source. I have also inquired into the policy of some of the road transport firms, which accept far more responsibility than does the Railways Department in this matter of loss or breakage, particularly in the case of an accident where there is total loss, for they are covered by insurance in those circumstances.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: There is a lot more risk on the road than there is on the railways.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I question that statement. I consider that if the administration of the railways had any confidence at all in its own system it should be prepared to accept greater responsibility in the matter of compensation.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: We have been generous in that we have met some of the cost when people have not paid the extra charge.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I know that in one instance the railways met 50 per cent of the cost. However, that was in the case of a derailment, which I think is a very unusual circumstance, for that goes beyond the normal risk that anyone would expect when consigning goods on the railways. I bring up this matter because we heard something about transport in the last session. We have seen an attempt to co-ordinate or control transport. There have been various references to it in speeches in this Chamber. I hope the Minister will examine this point about compensation to make the railways more competitive, as many people are concerned about these limitations. I know for a fact that people have turned to road transport because of this very point. If the administration of the railways has confidence in its own system, surely it must take more responsibility in this matter.

On the other side, I was pleased to hear recently that the South Australian Railways, at least in one country town, has supported a co-ordinated system by using its own vehicles to cart wool to the railhead, giving a true service from woolshed to the wool store. I must commend the Railways Department for this. It is a point emphasized by members on this side of the Council when transport control was debated, that this is co-ordination as distinct from transport control.

I have already mentioned water supplies with reference to Kimba and Keith. Again, when contemplating the delay in starting these projects because of financial difficulty, we must surely remember the work that has taken place in the past. If this Government is finding difficulty in handling these comparatively small projects, it is all the more creditable that the Playford Government achieved so much during its term of office, when we think of the network of pipelines throughout the State and the development of Leigh Creek, which has been so valuable to industry in South Australia. We could go on naming tremendous projects in South Australia that have been achieved with no financial difficulty or embarrassment.

By comparison, the present situation must give every thinking South Australian room for concern. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris mentioned forward planning, which is getting farther forward. We have heard much about planning in these last two years. Surely it is time we saw some action and realized that planning alone was not sufficient to generate the confidence we must have in this State. We must see more action in public works and more encouragement to private people if we are ever to regain the economic climate that we enjoyed until two years ago. Following a question I asked in this Council and the answer I received yesterday about the Housing Trust, I hope that when the Minister gets up to speak he will give me a further answer. I asked the Minister representing the Minister of Housing whether he could let me have the number of Housing Trust houses under construction at June 15 and the number of completed Housing Trust houses that were unoccupied at that date. The answer I received to the first question was 2,186, and to the second question 517. Paragraph 19 of His Excellency's Speech states:

The South Australian Housing Trust expects to complete about 3,200 houses and flats during the current financial year, a number almost equal to last year when 3,250 were completed.

I find it difficult to reconcile these figures. The figure of 3,200 works out roughly at 266 houses a month, yet we find in the answers to the questions I asked yesterday that in the current month 2,186 houses were under construction. Even allowing for the fact that a house may take some time to build, I cannot reconcile these two figures. So either a mistake has been made or the number of unoccupied houses is considerably more than the 517 stated. I know that people connected with the building trade and who follow these things closely believe that this number may be considerably more. If this is so, even on the given figure of 517 unoccupied completed houses, it should give rise to some concern when money is being allocated for housing.

More money should be channelled into the private building field. If we have reached saturation point with the type of house built or projects undertaken by the Housing Trust, we should make more money available to encourage private builders to build, for it is in this sector of the industry that there is serious unemployment. Every honourable member here has had someone say to him that he would build if he could get the money but he did not want to move into a Housing Trust area; or perhaps he did not want a Housing

Trust house. So I urge the Government to seriously consider the allocation of money for housing. I do not intend to go through His Excellency's Speech in detail, but I refer now to paragraph 32, which states:

A Bill to amend the Succession Duties Act to provide relief for members of the military forces operating in Vietnam and to include certain uncontroversial matters in the Bill that failed to pass during the last session will be laid before you.

I would be foolish to comment at any length on a Bill of this description until it was before this Chamber, but what are "uncontroversial matters" in relation to succession duties? The only one I could imagine to be in this category would be a Bill to reduce charges.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We attempted to do that before.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: If you listen to the Hon. Mr. Banfield, you will hear that they have been trying to do that for the last two years.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: But the Hon. Mr. Banfield did not complete the statement. It was an ambiguous statement that it was the Government's intention to reduce succession duties whereas, in fact, the Bill was designed to bring in much more revenue.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It was stated that 70 per cent of the people of the State would benefit from it.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Yes, but, as the Hon. Mr. DeGaris pointed out very forcibly this afternoon, many things have been said that will not bear close scrutiny.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I could not agree more.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I am glad that we have some agreement although, perhaps, for entirely different reasons. Although I remarked that I did not intend to go through His Excellency's Speech paragraph by paragraph, I should like to comment generally on the legislative programme for this session. I am disappointed that we have before us another unimpressive legislative programme without any positive plan to encourage development and employment. In fact, much of the proposed legislation will further discourage the establishment of new industries and will contribute to increased economic problems and increased unemployment. This is a matter that concerns all of us. This is the third year in which we have seen this type of legislation outlined before us, without any constructive or developmental thought.

Further, because of the grave financial position of the Government and the depressed state of the economy in South Australia, I ask the Government to defer those items of legislation that will further add to these problems at least until the annual report of the Auditor-General is received, and the true financial position is known. It would be quite unfair to members of Parliament if some of the items that are listed for consideration in this session were placed before them prior to their having had a chance to examine fully an authorized statement on the State's financial position.

I join with the Hon. Mr. DeGaris in deploring some of the statements that have been made recently by the new Premier; it is unfortunate that they have been made in this Parliament. I have always been proud to say that the South Australian Parliament is conducted in a dignified and fitting manner and that we have never seen any attempt at a smear campaign. However, it appears that we are entering an unfortunate era, because we see these attempts to smear the name of Sir Thomas Playford who has perhaps given the most outstanding service to this State of any South Australian. Perhaps we can gain some consolation from the fact that these allegations are not believed by the general public. In fact, I have found that many members of the public, including those who are of another political persuasion—

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Don't warn them of their mistakes.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: These people are most concerned about this attack on Sir Thomas Playford. As the Hon. Mr. DeGaris pointed out, these allegations are untrue, and they represent an attempt to hoodwink the community regarding the State's financial position. Such an attempt is, if not dishonest, certainly unethical.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Your bubble has been busted: that is the trouble.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Far from the bubble being busted, as the Minister puts it, I believe that this outburst has highlighted the performance of Sir Thomas Playford, and the State's present financial position has been brought out into the open and people are starting to ask questions.

At this stage I apologize if I am repeating anything said by previous speakers: When the Walsh Government took office \$38,000,000 was in the Reserve Bank, and after it had been in office for five months (at the first balance at the end of June) there was a credit of \$1,222,000 in the Revenue Account and a deficit

of \$60,000 in the Loan Account, which resulted in an overall credit of \$1,162,000. These are the figures of the then Treasurer, the Hon. Frank Walsh: these have not been cooked up by anybody.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You didn't leave \$38,000,000 in kitty.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: There was that amount in trust funds. No-one has ever questioned the accuracy of the statement of the previous Treasurer, the Hon. Frank Walsh, and these are his own figures. Yesterday the Hon. Mr. Bevan spoke about the troubles that the Walsh Government found itself in because some Loan funds had been committed when that Government came into office. This is a normal process in connection with State expenditure.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: This was forward planning.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: This was forward planning—and not only forward planning but work which was proceeding.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: We had to pay for it, though.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Now we are seeing forward planning that is getting further and further forward, but we do not see any action.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: In the policy speech of the Hon. Frank Walsh, didn't he say that this was all taken into account?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Yes. The Labor Party said it would carry out all the promises of the then Government and add its extra projects to them. The point is that there is something wrong with the complaints made by the Minister and other members of the Government that the Loan funds were over-committed when they came into office, because in this year they have \$7,000,000 left over that they can use to fund the Budget deficit. So, which statement is wrong? Is the \$7,000,000

there, or is it over-committed? They cannot have it both ways. I think this subject has been fully covered but I did want to make the point that the Walsh Government started in office with a completely sound financial structure. We went through a period of about 26 years (I am not sure of the exact length) under Sir Thomas Playford during which all charges were met, and he finished his term with all trust funds intact—and with a credit. During that time we lived in the golden age of South Australia when we saw probably the greatest amount of expansion that this State has ever seen.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: All done with two typistes!

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Yes. Honourable members have only to look around to see the lasting monument to this work. A vast network of pipelines was constructed, and people took it for granted that the money was there. It was not until the Government got into the present situation that we heard the continual cry, "There is not enough money to do this or that," that we saw the continuing rise in taxation to meet over-spending and that we heard the continual cry that the Commonwealth Government should do something about it. It was not until this type of situation occurred that the average honourable member in this Chamber really got down to finding out in detail how the finances of the State worked. I think every honourable member has recently had an object lesson in what not to do when in Government. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.53 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, June 29, at 2.15 p.m.