

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 10, 1971

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

### PETITION: A.N.Z. BANK BUILDING

Mr. SIMMONS presented a petition signed by 158 electors stating that the building at 59 King William Street, Adelaide, known as the A.N.Z. building, was a category A building in the list of the National Trust of South Australia, it being the only building of a commercial type so listed, and that it was of such exceptional architectural, artistic and historic merit that its preservation was considered essential to the heritage of the State. It further stated that this was a potentially useful building that was threatened with destruction. The petitioners prayed that the House of Assembly would act in such ways as were possible and necessary to save and preserve the said building for posterity.

Petition received and read.

## QUESTIONS

### UNIROYAL DISPUTE

Mr. HALL: Will the Premier say on what basis he has indicated that the Worker Student Alliance, a group of university students, is responsible for continuing the strike at the Uniroyal rubber plant? The Premier and the Minister of Labour and Industry are both reported as having said that they believed that this group had prevented a return to work at that plant and that it was therefore responsible for throwing thousands of people in this State out of work. However, the State Secretary of the Miscellaneous Workers Union (Mr. Cavanagh) is reported as having scoffed at these suggestions. He said:

It is an insult to the workers to suggest that they could be manipulated by a handful of immature kids.

This matter, which is serious for many people in the State, has been raised in the House before. I have contended that, because of its unsympathetic attitude towards industry, especially towards the management of Uniroyal, the Government is responsible for the continuation of the strike.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In view of the comment the Leader saw fit to make, apparently as part of his question, I do not quite know what his question is. I notice that in assigning views to the Minister of Labour

and Industry and me he did not quote what I had said: that is his form. In fact, all that was said by the Minister and me was that we deplored the fact that the workers at Uniroyal had not accepted the advice of their elected union representatives. We said that apparently some advice had been taken from other peripheral groups. True, some pamphlets have been issued to workers at Uniroyal and to others by such organizations as the Worker Student Alliance. However, I have not said that the Worker Student Alliance is responsible for the situation at Uniroyal. The Government is not responsible for the situation at Uniroyal, either; in fact, it has constantly endeavoured to get the parties together on this issue. Its doors have been constantly open both to the Chamber of Manufactures, which is managing this dispute on behalf of Uniroyal, and to the representatives of the union and the United Trades and Labour Council. The conferences that have been held during the course of this dispute have been held at the instance of the Government. The only attitude of the Government towards the management that the Leader can talk about is that we deplored (and we were not alone in doing this) the fact that the voluntary conference held before the Commissioner was followed by the employer's failing to accept the suggestion of the Commissioner as a basis for discussion. Subsequently, when a compulsory conference was held at the instance of the Government and a "back to work" order that was made was accepted by the union representatives on the advice of the Government, the Uniroyal workers chose to reject the advice of their union representatives, and we condemned that. I did not notice the Leader assign that as a cause for the present dispute, although the Government has seen fit to say that, in certain instances, both sides have been wrong. The Government has no responsibility for the continuance of this dispute; no Government could have done more than this Government has done in endeavouring to settle it. I do not know what the Leader suggests should be done. If he proposes that, like Mr. Bjelke-Petersen did in Queensland, we should declare a state of emergency in South Australia, the answer is "No".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what outside influences have played a part in stopping the men employed at Uniroyal from going back to work? With your permission, Mr. Speaker, and the concurrence of the House, I should like to explain the question.

The SPEAKER: The question was asked of the Premier a short time ago.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, with great respect, Sir, it was not the same question. I desire to explain the question and, so as not to offend the Premier's susceptibilities, I intend to quote the Minister's comments. A newspaper report states:

Mr. McKee said today that there was no doubt that outside influences played a part in stopping the men going back to work at Uniroyal. He said he understood they offered financial help to the strikers.

Then, in direct speech, the report states:

"It is not a good thing when people like this can get 36 men into a position where they can influence the jobs of thousands of people in South Australia."

I therefore ask the Minister who are these outside influences.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The honourable member claims that this question is not similar to the one he has asked the Premier, but it clearly is. Members of a group calling itself the Worker Student Alliance have distributed pamphlets among the strikers offering them financial support and have been asking around various hotels for donations, telling people that they are collecting the money to assist strikers at Uniroyal. The group has put out a pamphlet to this effect and, doubtless, this would have played some part in encouraging the people who are on strike to continue the strike whilst they are offered financial assistance. I think that should answer the honourable member's question fully.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Premier make a stronger statement condemning the action of the strikers? The Premier, in his reply to the Leader of the Opposition, has said that he criticizes both sides, and he has urged the employees to take the advice of their elected union representatives and return to work. I have been trying to work out just what the Government has done in relation to this dispute, which I point out is tremendously serious to the whole of South Australia and the State's industrial position. The Government has said several times that the position is serious and has urged the men to go back to work now.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am relating facts.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has sought leave of the House to explain his question, but explaining is not commenting or

going into that aspect of the matter. I cannot allow him to comment.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Could I explain why it is necessary for the Premier to make a stronger statement than he has made in urging these men to go back to work? By explanation I want to point out how little the Government has yet done, and that is why I need to relate these instances. On one occasion here recently the Attorney-General refused to say whether he supported the injunction granted by the Supreme Court.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow the honourable member to continue in that strain and open up a debate on this issue. The Premier has been asked whether he will make a stronger statement on this matter. I do not know whether the Premier desires to reply to the question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has said that the situation is serious, and that the workers' decision is irresponsible in refusing the advice of union representatives that they should return to work in accordance with the order. I cannot see what stronger statement the honourable member desires me to make. If he wants me to write it in blood, I am sorry, but that is not on.

Mr. EVANS: As it has been stated that a group at a university is causing, or having some effect on, the strikes at Uniroyal at present, will the Premier use his good offices, together with those of the Minister of Education, and consult with the principals of the university to ascertain any way by which the group can be deterred from acting as it is?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, certainly not. The political views of people at universities or elsewhere, and their political actions, are, so long as they are within the law, for them alone, and the Government does not intend to use against people, who either agree or disagree with opinions expressed in this House, some kind of education control. Universities are autonomous and any person at a university has the right (as has any other person in the State) to pursue his political views and act on them, if that action is within the law. The Government intends to take no action to inhibit people from expressing their views, whether those views agree with the Government's views or not.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier support action to introduce secret ballots when decisions are taken to strike?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This is a somewhat hypothetical question, because no such proposal that I know of is before the House. I do not see how it could conceivably be worked. The honourable member may laugh, because he knows nothing about how trade unions work, but I, having been a trade union secretary, do know, and I assure the honourable member that if he has a talk with the member sitting diagonally in front of him he will learn something about how it happens. In many unions in South Australia it would be completely impossible to hold a secret ballot of workers to decide on a strike. How could it happen in the Australian Workers Union? Neither a postal ballot nor a secret ballot could be held. Members opposite know so little about the structure of trade unions that I suggest that, before asking questions like this, they do their homework and find out how unions work.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Did the Minister of Labour and Industry base his statement criticizing outside influences in the decision to continue the Uniroyal strike on the fact that members of the Worker Student Alliance had attended the meeting of press operators yesterday morning? If he did, will he discuss with the Secretary of the Miscellaneous Workers Union the question of excluding those, who have no right to be present, from the future meetings of the union? It appears that members of this group attended the meeting yesterday morning. In his earlier reply, the Minister confirmed the reports that, in his view, these people were responsible for or influenced the decision, whereas the Secretary of the union has denied this. It has also been reported that the Minister and Secretary have discussed other questions. As this question seems to be of great moment, I ask whether the Minister will act as I have suggested.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The question has already been discussed with the Secretary of the Miscellaneous Workers Union.

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister see to it that fringe groups, such as the Worker Student Alliance, which seems to be interfering with the law and order enjoyed by the work force of the State, are prevented from interfering? In an earlier reply, the Premier said that people from universities enjoyed certain autonomy, and it now appears—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Victoria is asking this question of the honourable Minister of Labour and

Industry. As the attendance at union meetings is not under the control of the honourable Minister, I cannot permit the question.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what was the outcome of the discussions that he has just said were held between the Secretary of the Miscellaneous Workers Union and him about the attendance of unauthorized people at the meeting of press operators?

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable Minister wish to reply?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: This is a question that concerns only the union and the other organizations concerned. I cannot divulge confidential information about union affairs. However I can say that a conference was held this morning, and the Secretary of the Miscellaneous Workers Union is very confident that these men will return to work tomorrow. Therefore, I think that the less that is said now the better it will be for the whole situation. It appears to me that members opposite are trying to keep the strike going by asking these questions.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I ask the Minister to withdraw the suggestion that we are trying to keep the strike going. I think that is a disgraceful statement and should be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: Order!

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! I want honourable members to realize that Standing Orders provide that, when the Speaker rises, honourable members shall resume their seats and there shall be silence. I will not tolerate this back-chatting that is part of the conduct of certain members in the Chamber. The honourable member for Alexandra has taken exception to a statement made by the honourable Minister of Labour and Industry. All I can do is ask the honourable Minister whether he desires to withdraw.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I did not mean to offend the honourable member. If what I said affects him in some way, I am prepared to withdraw it, but that is the impression that members opposite are creating.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: There was no withdrawal; it was just put in another way.

The SPEAKER: I will not ask the honourable Minister to do anything further. Out of courtesy to the Chair, honourable members should realize that questions should be framed more carefully. If honourable members were

more careful in the way they framed their questions, it would facilitate the proceedings of this House.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I would like to ask a question of you, Mr. Speaker, about the question that was put to the Minister of Labour and Industry. Simply, what was the outcome—

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not the turn of the honourable member for Alexandra to ask a question. The honourable member is being grossly unfair to other honourable members on his side of the Chamber. It causes me some concern that certain honourable members want to dominate the whole of Question Time: this is not fair to other honourable members. When the turn of the honourable member for Alexandra comes, I will give him the call; I have noted that he desires to ask another question.

#### CHARLES MARTIN

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Attorney-General ascertain whether Mr. Charles Martin, who is a Commonwealth prisoner at Cadell convicted under the National Service Act, is now eligible for parole or remission of sentence? We understand that, because Mr. Martin is a Commonwealth prisoner, it is not possible for this Government, which opposes the National Service Act, to assist him in his predicament. However, I believe that, if the full facts about whether he is eligible for parole or when he will be eligible could be made known to the public, this may considerably assist his cause.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will consult the Chief Secretary and get a reply.

#### WATER RATES

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Minister of Works investigate the current system of payment of water rates so that the payment for excess water could be spread over 12 months, as is at present the position with water rates? The present system of charging people excess water rates means that people who are in necessitous circumstances are required sometimes to pay a sum that they can ill afford. My district is in a dry area, and the use of excess water is prevalent.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I assume that the honourable member appreciates that the quantity of excess water used cannot be established until the end of the year; therefore, payment on a quarterly basis would have to be for excess water used during the previous

year. Also, where difficulty is experienced by people in paying a lump sum for excess water, arrangements can always be made for the payment to be spread over a period. However, as a result of this question I will have the matter examined and obtain a report for the honourable member.

#### HOLDEN HILL SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of August 3 concerning the sewerage of an area at Holden Hill which includes such streets as Waninga Drive?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The departmental report states that about 12 months ago the department examined a scheme to connect sewerage to eight houses on allotments 84 to 91 Waninga Drive, Holden Hill. It was found that the return from ordinary sewer rates in relation to the cost of the sewer main was very low, and all owners had not requested the facility. In August, 1970, letters were sent to the people concerned and only three answers were received. Follow-up letters were forwarded to the remaining owners but no replies resulted. In view of the lack of support from most owners, no further action was taken with investigations. If the owners of allotments 84 to 91, Waninga Drive, were to apply for sewerage, the department would be prepared to re-examine the scheme to see whether it is a feasible proposition.

#### LETTER TO UNIONISTS

Dr. EASTICK: Does the Premier intend, in his next letter to unionists, to tell them that, in future, they should obey all lawful directions of appropriate court authorities? By that, I mean in the letter that goes forward, paid for by private funds, which talks of the trimming of the tall poppies and which starts with "Dear friend" and finishes with "Yours fraternally".

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The answer is "No".

#### BLACK FOREST SCHOOL

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question regarding land near the Black Forest Demonstration School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: An irregular area about 437ft. by 240ft. near the Black Forest school was purchased some time ago for the building of a new infants school, but enrolments have declined to such a degree that the infants school has been disestablished and no new school is likely to be built on the

site. Consideration has also been given to the establishment of a school oval on the site. Because of the irregular shape, it was difficult to provide an oval of satisfactory size. An additional allotment on the southern end of the area has been purchased, and the purchase of a second additional allotment on the north-west corner of the area is with the Crown Law Department for settlement. The acquisition of the two allotments will make the establishment of a school oval possible. Normal policy for the establishment of ovals in such circumstances is for the department to carry out necessary ground formation and for the reticulation and grassing to be a subsidy matter. It will thus be necessary for discussions to be held with the school committee before progress can be made. In the meantime, the Director, Public Buildings Department, will be asked to keep the area in satisfactory order.

#### NIAGARA CYCLO-THERAPY

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health to investigate the activities of an organization styling itself Niagara Cyclo-therapy? In the local press and in letter-box pamphlets this organization has been advertising a system claiming to cure many illnesses that doctors cannot cure. As far as I can understand, until now it has operated from a caravan park at Brownhill Creek. I feel sure that the Attorney-General will agree that for the protection of people such an organization should be investigated.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to the Minister of Health and ask him to investigate it.

#### INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY ACT

Mr. PAYNE: Can the Minister of Education say whether it is likely that the foreshadowed amendments to the South Australian Institute of Technology Act will be introduced this session?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is likely that they will be introduced this session.

#### CITY MORGUE

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Works say whether the Government has any plans to build a new city morgue? Although I realize that there is little future in this matter, I ask the Minister whether he is aware of the shocking conditions existing at the morgue and of the fact that some years ago successive Governments and the Public Works Committee investigated the problems associated

with this matter. Has the present Government any plans to erect this badly-needed building?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I have no information on this matter, I will obtain a report for the honourable member and bring it down as soon as possible.

#### RURAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Lands whether it is necessary for an applicant for rural reconstruction assistance, who desires to avail himself of the retraining scheme, to fill out the document consisting of 23 pages, which is required of applicants seeking relief under this scheme?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I should hope that, in order to apply for retraining, it would not be necessary for people to complete the 23 pages of the document, but I will discuss the matter with my colleague and bring down a report for the honourable member.

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Works ask his colleague to request the Rural Reconstruction Committee to explain fully why an application is refused? One or two of my constituents have told me that, when their applications for assistance under this scheme have been refused, all they have received from the authority has been a duplicated sheet, which has merely stated that their application has been refused and has given no explanation. Like them, I believe it would be far better if a full explanation were given.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take up the matter with my colleague, but perhaps the reason for the refusal is that the Commonwealth participation in this matter has not been sufficient for the State to do what it wanted to do.

#### ABORIGINAL RELICS

Mr. BECKER: Has the Minister for Conservation a reply to my recent question about Aboriginal relics?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: In relation to the map provided by the honourable member, the northern area contains a sand quarry from which purported ancient human skeletons were reported to the Museum in mid-1970. Examination of specimens and an inspection of the site established the objects were calcified roots. These are fairly common in sandhills and are sometimes mistaken for bones. However during the on-site inspection, the immediately adjacent area was found to have been a

large Aboriginal camp site. The southern area appears to be the important and extensive Aboriginal cave-painting site on Lincoln Park Station, section 4, hundred of Jenkins, which was declared a historic reserve on July 23, 1970, under the provisions of the Aboriginal and Historic Relics Preservation Act, 1965. This site immediately adjoins land held by the Department of Army. The Museum has already established co-operation with the Army authorities at the Lincoln Gap camp. A stone arrangement discovered in 1967 first drew attention to the importance of protecting sites in the area, and a permanent instruction has been issued by the Army authorities restricting access to areas where relics are located. Knowledge of the Port Augusta region is still incomplete but a study is continuing on a long-term basis as part of the general survey of the whole State.

### MIGRATION OFFICE

Mr. HALL: Was the Premier aware of the existence of an Australian Government Migration Office in Hong Kong when he was reported as having said that the Australian Government might one day set up an office in that colony? My inquiries have revealed that the Australian Government Migration Office was established in Hong Kong on March 5, 1955. It has five Australian-based officers plus locally engaged support staff numbering more than 12. It is situated on the ninth floor of the International Building, Connaught Road, Central Hong Kong. In this same building and on the 15th and 22nd floors respectively are located the Hong Kong Migration Service and the Canadian Migration Service, so it is in fact centrally located for migration information. The Australian Migration Office handles all normal migration matters, including the issuing of passports, entry facilities into Australia for settlers, business men and visitors, and makes arrangements for Hong Kong students who wish to study in Australia under the private overseas student programme. In the light of the report published in South Australia that the Premier was advocating the setting up of an Australian Government Migration Office, I ask him whether he was aware that such an office had existed since 1955.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, and most of the people of Hong Kong were not aware of it either; and the reason for this is quite simple. I was asked whether I thought a migration office could be opened in Hong Kong, and the press was clearly unaware that such an office was there. I said in due course that I thought it would be a good idea, but the

Leader seems to omit the fact that the migration office there is little concerned with people migrating from Hong Kong to Australia. In fact, the office can process few such cases, because there are few such cases.

### PRISONERS' AID ASSOCIATION

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Minister Assisting the Premier a reply to the question I asked him on August 3 about the Prisoners' Aid Association?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I have been informed by the General Manager of the South Australian Housing Trust that the trust receives many social welfare requests each week from organizations such as the Prisoners' Aid Association and cannot comply with most of such requests without being unfair to the many ordinary applicants who are waiting for houses. In addition to this difficulty, the trust is required to let its houses to people of limited means and, therefore, can only deal with actual families; thus, even if it had accommodation available, it could not let, say, two houses directly to the Prisoners' Aid Association for its own use. The Prisoners' Aid Association has, and I presume will go on making, direct representation to the trust for specific families, and the trust will try to help wherever possible while still having in mind the many other welfare requests referred to above, the many medically supported applications and ordinary applicants who are waiting their turn.

### SALT CREEK BRIDGE

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say when work on the proposed bridge to be built over the Salt Creek on the Murray Bridge to Palmer road will commence?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I regret that, because of the noise being made by members opposite, I could not hear the honourable member's question. I hope that I can get it from *Hansard* and obtain a reply.

### WEEDS

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture what is that Minister's attitude towards councils that do not attend to the weeds in their areas? I do not think the question needs further explanation.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to obtain a reply from my colleague.

### VICTORIA SQUARE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. EVANS: Can the Premier say on what basis the Government finds it necessary to state that it will make subsidy money available for the development of a new hotel in

Victoria Square, when no public statement has been made to the effect that finance will be made available to purchase the Australian and New Zealand Bank building in King William Street? I had been approached on the matter earlier and I told the person who approached me that I would not raise the matter until a submission had been made to the Government on the feasibility of purchasing and making the property something like a viable unit. I also consider that, if the late Hon. Frank Walsh was a member of the present Government, he would exert strong influence on that Government because of his knowledge of stonemasonry and stonework generally, and of the value of preserving for all time some of the historical buildings in our community. I know that some of the late honourable member's colleagues in the present Government realize that. It is of great importance to the State to preserve the building. If it is demolished we will have two bare sites and plans for a new building in Victoria Square.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

Mr. EVANS: You have ruled that, Mr. Speaker, but, in explaining the question, I am stating what has been told to me.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The reason for the Government's proposing to require from hotel developers on the Victoria Square site no more than a peppercorn rental for the area arises from submissions that all State Governments have made to the Commonwealth Government. Ministers from all Governments, of whatever political complexion, at the Tourist Ministers' conference have decided that, in order to get first-class international hotel facilities, some assistance from Governments is necessary. In fact, the proposal by the South Australian Government is entirely in accord with the resolutions adopted by the Tourist Ministers and the proposals made by the Australian National Travel Association. If the honourable member wants more detail about this, I can show him copies of letters that the Victorian Tourist Minister and Mr. Askin have sent to the Commonwealth Government seeking special facilities and Government assistance for hotel development. The honourable member contrasts this matter with the preservation of the old A.N.Z. Bank building. The Government has gone to considerable lengths to try to find some way to solve this problem, but I point out that the problem existed before the present Government took office: the National Trust's recommendations for the classification

of this building as one for preservation were made to the previous Government and not acted upon. No regulations for preserving this historic building were promulgated by the Hall Government under the Planning and Development Act, although it was proposed to that Government that they should be. The Government allowed the building to be sold to Mainline Corporation, which now demands not only the cost of acquisition of the site but also the cost of the corporation's planning for development on the site and the provision of an alternative and equally commercial site in King William Street as the price for the corporation's sale of this property to the National Trust or some other body. The Government has tried to find some means of providing tenants for a building of this kind. We have examined every aspect of Government activity and possible use of the building by alternative tenants to try to find some viable means of using the building.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: All Ministers have been consulted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: All Ministers, as well as Public Service Board officers and officers and architects of the Public Buildings Department, have inspected the building. The proposal put to the National Trust was that, if the trust could provide a scheme under which it would take over this building, be able to service the loan necessary for its acquisition, and maintain the building, the Government would propose to Parliament that the loan moneys be guaranteed and that compulsory acquisition powers be conferred on the Government to obtain the site. Until today, however, no proposition of that kind has come forward. The proposition put to me only this morning does not, in fact, cover those qualifications that we placed on the offer. In fact, the Government is asked to make a considerable yearly subvention to meet the difference between the cost of servicing any loan and maintaining the building and the amount of revenue received from prospective tenants. The Government is considering the matter.

#### **ELECTRICITY ACCOUNTS**

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Works ensure that the Electricity Trust's current policy of requiring payment of electricity accounts in advance for some consumers, under the description of security deposits, will not cause hardship to consumers with limited incomes? I have received several complaints on this matter, which I understand is not a new issue. In many cases that I have heard of, it has

been simply a matter of a person's not paying an account within 14 days because the account has come at the beginning of the month and the normal business practice is to pay the account at the end of the month. However, I have received several complaints that do concern me. One of these was made to me at lunchtime today. One consumer, a supporting mother, has always paid her electricity account by the instalment plan, with the concurrence of the trust. She recently moved and, when the last account came, she sent her daughter to the trust with \$5, offering to pay \$5 a week off the account. This was refused and I understand that \$10 a week was demanded. When she returned to her house last Tuesday, the power was cut off and a large quantity of food that she had been keeping in the freezer for her family was completely ruined. She made representations and I understand that the power was reconnected. She depended on her income tax refund cheque at that time, and gave that as the reason for her being able to pay the account in full. This morning she posted \$8, which was all that she could afford, and, when she came home at lunchtime, she found that the power was once again disconnected. I am concerned that she will have to pay a reconnection fee of \$1 each time and I am also concerned because there is not more consistency in the trust's attitude. I should like the Minister to investigate the problem and give the House an assurance on it.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will give the honourable member no assurance that I will take steps to have the trust's policy in this matter reviewed because I consider that the trust's policy in the matter of payment of electricity accounts has been, and will continue to be, fair and reasonable. It is a policy that was adopted by the Adelaide Electric Supply Company and has been in existence since the Electricity Trust of South Australia was formed.

Dr. Tonkin: That's no excuse for this.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Whilst there may be some cases that require representations to be made to the trust it is open to any honourable member to make them and it is also open to any consumer to go to the trust. In my experience with constituents, I have never had the slightest reason to complain about the trust's treatment in certain matters. When I read that the honourable member was making appropriate noises to the press yesterday on the matter, I called for a report. It is rather

surprising to me that, although people complain, they never suggest an alternative system that will work to the satisfaction of both parties.

Mr. Jennings: What's the position with the gas company?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is a different matter: that is private enterprise and it can do what it likes. The value of electricity used by any consumer cannot be determined until after it is used and metered. It is therefore normal to allow credit for one month in the case of large consumers and three months for small consumers before preparing and rendering accounts. At present, the trust is extending such credit to 416,500 of its 433,000 consumers, and at any time the value of electricity used but not paid for is about \$9,000,000. From the remaining 16,500 consumers who may involve some credit risk the trust obtains a deposit as security against future accounts. This deposit accumulates interest at 1 per cent above current savings bank rates, and is held by the trust until the electricity supply is no longer required or the consumer demonstrates that a deposit is unnecessary—normally by regular payment of accounts over a period of two years. At present, the trust is holding deposits totalling \$544,000 from 16,500 consumers. This represents 3.3 per cent of the sales of electricity a quarter and 3.8 per cent of the total number of consumers. I trust honourable members will take into account the \$9,000,000 outstanding. Notwithstanding the care taken to ensure due payment of accounts, the trust has had to write off \$155,000 arising from bad debts during the past three years.

The trust seeks a security deposit in the following circumstances: first, from a person starting a new business and not having an appropriate credit rating with the trust; secondly, from a person renting a furnished dwelling and not having an appropriate credit rating with the trust; thirdly, where the trust has grounds for believing that a consumer may default in payment; fourthly, from a person taking over a business of a type which has a substantial risk of failure, for example, delicatessen, night-club, coffee lounge, etc. (most of the 16,500 are in the category of a small business that is rather risky); and fifthly, from a consumer with a consistently poor record of payment of trust accounts.

It is trust policy to deal sympathetically with consumers who have difficulty in paying accounts or deposits. Arrangements to pay by



reasonable instalments are readily granted and may be extended in cases of sickness, etc. Consumers with a poor record of payment are always given, in a previous quarter, a warning that a security deposit will be required if future accounts are not paid by the due date. However, it is not usual completely to defer payment for long periods because, while power remains connected, additional usage and expense is being incurred. More than 1,000 requests are received each week for extension of time to pay accounts, and at least 90 per cent of these are granted. The trust considers that the policy of lodging security deposits where necessary must be maintained (and I agree with that) as a proper means of safeguarding trust moneys, and as a means of ensuring that most of the electricity consumers are not penalized by the small number who might constitute a credit risk. Last July, I sent all members a copy of this policy. It seems to me rather amazing that it is only now that this question has been raised, and the honourable member referred to payments of accounts at the end of the month. I noticed, in this morning's newspaper, a letter to the Editor written by a Mr. Young. I do not know whether he is one of the constituents with whom the honourable member has had contact. He said in his letter that he had used electricity for 30 years and had always made his payments at the end of the month. His letter continues:

Notification of this requirement was received by mail on August 6, some days after my account had been paid, and it stated that, notwithstanding the fact that my account had been paid, the \$75 would need to reach them before August 10 to avoid instant disconnection of electricity.

I refer to details of this case in order to show members how reasonable the trust has been in this matter. Five reminder letters (and they were polite letters) have been sent to Mr. Young between November, 1967, and February, 1970. He operates on a quarterly account. In addition, final letters (that is, letters warning of disconnection unless payment is made) were sent out on May 15, 1970, September 1, 1970, November 5, 1970, and February 9, 1971, and on May 5 (more than three months ago) a letter was sent informing him that, if all future accounts were not paid by the due date, a security deposit would be required. On August 3, 1971, when his account was still unpaid, the trust requested the payment of a deposit as well as the outstanding account. The deposit was for \$75 and due date of payment was August 10.

The account was paid on August 5, but no reply has been received about the deposit. I think it can be demonstrated that Mr. Young had ample warning that a deposit would be required if he did not meet his payments on time. He was given ample time to meet them. Although he may claim some inconvenience because he paid all his other accounts at the end of the month, it seems amazing that the other 416,000 consumers in this State can meet the trust's requirements, yet Mr. Young cannot.

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Works reassure those people of limited means or those who are in financial difficulties that the Electricity Trust will receive their approaches to arrange for the payment of accounts by simple instalments? In the Minister's previous voluminous reply to my question, he gave the House to understand that he would take no steps to ensure that the trust's policy would not cause hardship to consumers of limited means. I am sure that he did not mean this in that context, and I would welcome his reassurance to those people to whom I specifically referred, who might be caused hardship and who otherwise would undoubtedly be worried.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I made the statement that the honourable member attributed to me, but rounded it off by saying that I did not believe there was any need to give the assurance, because the trust's policy already provided for this. The honourable member used the statement out of context. That is normal, because I suppose he wanted to get it into *Hansard* so that he could show someone what I said. I believe that the trust already offers a facility to anyone in hardship to spread these payments, which must be made for electricity used: the honourable member will not deny that. Those payments are spread over a period that the trust considers reasonable. I stated my personal experience with the trust concerning constituents, and I am sure that other members have had a similar experience.

Mr. Jennings: I can assure you I am one—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Ross Smith is out of order.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the honourable member, or the member for Ross Smith, has a specific case and is not satisfied with the way in which the trust has handled it, surely he has access to the Minister or to the General Manager of the trust. The instruction that went around to members was that, in

a case involving disconnection, they should contact the General Manager of the trust or, in a case of emergency, contact the Minister, and that policy applies in the case that has now been raised. In a specific case of hardship, where an honourable member can refer to an officer of the trust who is not applying what I believe to be the policy of the trust, I shall be happy to sort out the matter. I do not deny that such situations can arise in an organization as large as the trust. However, the policy of the trust is such that hardships that now occur can be adequately handled, but individual officers may apply that policy in different ways.

### WHEAT QUOTAS

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the Government plans to alter the present Wheat Delivery Quotas Act, particularly the section referring to the carry on of short-falls? I have been told by people that rumours are circulating that the Government intends to alter the present formula for the carry on of short-falls, and this suggestion is causing much concern to my constituents living in marginal areas.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I should tell the honourable member that rumours are dangerous: many rumours normally exist, but usually there is nothing in them. However, I will check with my colleague on this matter.

### INTAKES AND STORAGES

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Works details of the present water storages in metropolitan reservoirs?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have been waiting for my colleague to ask this question, and members will be pleased to know that metropolitan storages are in good order. At present the storage is 36,481,900,000 gallons and the total capacity is 41,438,000,000 gallons. At this time last year the storage was 25,539,100,000 gallons, so that the present storage is a vast improvement on the storage at this time last year. I have statistical returns showing the storages in the individual reservoirs and seek leave to have the table printed in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

### METROPOLITAN ADELAIDE WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM

Supply	Capacity million gallons	Storage last year million gallons	Storage present million gallons
Onkaparinga River—			
Mount Bold.....	10,440	8,071.7	10,440.0
Happy Valley.....	2,804	1,490.8	2,888.2
Clarendon Weir.....	72	62.6	72.0
Myponga River—Myponga.....	5,905	4,658.1	5,905.0
Torrens River—			
Millbrook.....	3,647	1,928.9	3,647.0
Kangaroo Creek.....	5,370	1,056.0	2,356.8
Hope Valley.....	765	580.0	733.0
Thorndon Park.....	142	112.5	123.1
South Para River—			
Barossa.....	993	513.2	812.5
South Para.....	11,300	7,065.3	9,504.3
Totals.....	41,438	25,539.1	36,481.9

### LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ENROLMENTS

Mr. McANANEY: I understand that the Attorney-General has a reply to my question of July 28 about the cost of Legislative Council enrolments. I congratulate the Attorney on his efficiency in obtaining a reply in a few days when I could not get a reply from the Premier for six months.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The cost involved was \$7,665.

### PARLIAMENT HOUSE STEPS

Mr. JENNINGS: My question is directed to you, Mr. Speaker. Do you remember questions asked by members of previous Speakers about the control of human trash on the steps of Parliament House? If you do, Sir, what is your attitude to a situation which is portrayed in the weekend press under the subcaption of "Member of Parliament steps into 'trash role'"? The article further explains that a film is being

produced for the Young Liberals. Do you, Sir, approve of the use of this building for a film for Party purposes to the extent of its prostitution by a member picking up his milk and a trash newspaper in his pyjamas and in his moustache?

The SPEAKER: I will consider the honourable member's question.

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

Leave granted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I acknowledge the notice given by the member for Ross Smith to the Young Liberal revue "Out of the Trash Can". I assure members that the part which I take in a film will greatly enhance the tone of the revue which, in any case, is of excellent standard. I suggest—

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable member is not availing himself of an opportunity to advertise. I want that assurance before I permit him to continue.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I give that assurance, Sir. I go on to suggest that you, Mr. Speaker, should attend before you give your considered reply to the member for Ross Smith, and I also invite that honourable member and, indeed, all members opposite to see "Out of the Trash Can". It can be seen at the Arts Theatre next Friday and Saturday evening.

Mr. Clark: Are you going to give us the price of the seats?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Tickets are available from members on this side and from John Martins.

### **WILLIAMSTOWN UNDER-PASS**

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Education say when it is intended that an under-pass from the Williamstown school to the school oval on the opposite side of the Lyndoch to Chain of Ponds Main Road No. 96 will be constructed? The roadway from Lyndoch to Chain of Ponds traverses the original grant of land obtained by the Education Department for the erection of a school at Williamstown. As a result of the danger that exists at this point, representations have been made for a long time by members in another place and by the member for Tea Tree Gully when she was member for Barossa. A considerable amount of correspondence has passed between the authorities and the school committee. On March 25, the Acting Assistant Superintendent of Primary Education wrote to the Secretary of the primary school committee, as follows:

The Public Buildings Department has been contacted concerning the progress of this project. Advice has been received that the architect and consultants have agreed on their recommendations, and these are being considered by a senior officer. The findings will be reported to the Education Department shortly, and I will advise you of them.

On May 4, the same officer wrote to the Secretary as follows:

This is to confirm information given to you by telephone on 3 May, concerning the construction of an under-pass at the Williamstown Primary School. The Public Buildings Department advises that funds for this project will be made available this week. This will enable tenders to be called and work to proceed. The department is unable to give any indication of the date of tender call or date of completion at this stage.

On July 7, I wrote to the Director, Public Buildings Department, as follows:

I would appreciate advice on the date on which tenders were called and/or closed in relation to an under-pass on the Lyndoch-Chain of Ponds Main Road No. 96 adjacent to the Williamstown school. Information relative to the schedule for commencement and completion would also be appreciated.

On August 3, the Secretary, Public Buildings Department, wrote as follows:

The matter of providing safe access to the oval for children attending the school has been given consideration by this department at the request of the Education Department. A firm of consulting engineers commissioned by this department has investigated the various proposals put forward to overcome the problem, and a report has been forwarded to the Director-General of Education on the feasibility of various schemes, and favouring, for reasons of cost, the construction of an under-pass. I am not in a position, therefore, at this stage to give an authoritative answer to your question. However, the matter of providing safe access for children of the school is under active consideration and, as soon as a decision has been reached as to the best means of achieving this, appropriate action will be taken.

I point out the variation in that correspondence. I approached the Minister, through his Secretary, so that he could reply to my question.

The SPEAKER: I draw attention to the very extensive explanation given by the honourable member. Honourable members must realize that, as I permitted the honourable member to give such an extensive explanation in relation to his question, I should appreciate their not raising objections to the Minister when he replies, because I shall have to extend the same courtesy to him if he desires it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am renowned for the brevity of my replies and I do not think there will be any need, Mr. Speaker, for you to give me such protection.

A request for the provision of an under-pass near Williamstown Primary School has been extant since 1967. Hitherto, the responsibility for bearing the cost of the construction has rested with the District Council of Barossa. That council has been unable to carry out the work because of the lack of funds. Under a new Government policy on finance relating to, amongst other things, school crossings and pedestrian over-passes and under-passes announced last Friday by the Minister of Roads and Transport, the Government will now pay two-thirds of the cost of the construction, with the remaining one-third being paid by the local council. I understand that the estimate for the under-pass at Williamstown is \$6,500 and negotiations will now take place with the District Council of Barossa in the light of the new policy. This has been a matter of considerable difficulty and of varying stories over a long time. The Education Department on this occasion is grateful for the wisdom and foresight of the Minister of Roads and Transport in adopting this policy. The new policy will require legislative sanction by Parliament before the policy of the payment of two-thirds of the cost of school crossings and pedestrian over-passes and under-passes constructed by the Highways Department can be officially introduced. I have no doubt that the honourable member will be pleased to give that legislation his support when it comes before Parliament.

#### PETRO-CHEMICAL INDUSTRY

Mr. VENNING: Will the Premier say whether he disagrees with the Western Australian Minister for Industrial Development (Mr. Graham) over a statement he made in Western Australia last week concerning Japan's interest in a petro-chemical industry for Australia? It is reported in the *Western Australian* of August 5 that Mr. Graham does not agree with Mr. Dunstan's statement that Japan is not interested in a petro-chemical industry for Australia. Mr. Graham is reported as saying, in the Western Australian Legislative Council, that only the day before he had informed Mr. Dunstan accordingly.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I remember what Mr. Graham said to me, and I do not think the honourable member's explanation is an accurate description of what he said.

Mr. Venning: It's in the paper.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, what Mr. Graham said to me did not concern Japanese interests. He simply said that

Western Australia was going to get a caustic soda plant. I saw Mr. Graham that morning after I had spoken with the Premier. The position facing us concerning Japanese interests in a petro-chemical industry is that there is considerable over-capacity in Japan at present. Japan has four plants that are working at only 50 per cent capacity and it has three more planned. The Japanese have already involved themselves in a petro-chemical development in Thailand and in an enormous investment in Iran. The figures they require for the supply of natural gas are below the 3c a therm at which we could conceivably supply natural gas in South Australia. At present, Western Australia is looking at providing a feasibility study on piping gas from Mereenie and Palm Springs and on the development of natural gas finds by Wapet. As far as I am aware, they cannot supply or assure a supply of natural gas at 3c a therm, which is the figure that the Japanese interests have quoted. That does not mean to say that other interests will not be keen to see a petro-chemicals development in Australia. However, I think I must report (because I spoke to all the major Japanese interests in this area) that the people concerned were somewhat less than enthusiastic about the developments in Australia at present. If Mr. Graham can promote the existing Japanese interests in respect of salt development in Western Australia, including a new refinery, that may well be good for Australia as a whole, but at this stage my talks in Japan do not give great cause for hope for any Australian plant receiving assistance of that kind.

#### HENLEY AND GRANGE RAILWAY

Mr. HALL: In view of the announcement that a survey will be made into the feasibility of providing a new rail link to the Henley and Grange area, will the Minister of Roads and Transport say why he so rudely ignored the local council and failed to inform it of this survey?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not aware of rudely ignoring, or even ignoring without being rude, the council which, whenever it has sought information, has been provided with that information. If the Leader is using his place of residence as an opportunity to stir up the council against the Government, that is his business, not mine. I have not ignored the council, and I defy the Leader of the Opposition to prove his wild unfounded allegation.

**PARKSIDE INTERSECTION**

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the George Street and Greenhill Road intersection?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The traffic lights being installed at the Greenhill Road and George Street intersection at Parkside do not have the "turn right" phase incorporated. I believe the volume of right-turning traffic at this intersection is not sufficiently high to warrant this third phase at present and would only cause unnecessary delays to motorists and reduce the traffic capacity at the intersection.

**MINISTERS' REPLIES**

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I ask you in what circumstances you will take the initiative to ask members to withdraw statements that are obviously untrue or insulting.

*Members interjecting:*

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I ask leave to make an explanation.

The SPEAKER: As long as the honourable member is not commenting, he may do so, but if he comments on the matter in question he will be out of order.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Ministers seem to have a new device when replying to questions whereby at the end of their reply, in the last sentence before sitting down, they make an insulting statement about either the questioner or—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting. In explanations of questions asked today, many statements have been made against the Government, although it is doubtful that the aspects of the explanation in question were necessary. I have not sought to stifle criticism of the Government during the explanation of questions. Therefore, members cannot expect the Chair to intervene and to prevent Ministers, if they so choose when replying to questions, from using the same standard of criticism as employed by the members who asked the relevant questions. What is critical is not necessarily unparliamentary. That is the procedure I intend to adopt.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: On a point of order—

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I wish to ask whether, in the statement you have just read—

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not a point of order. The honourable member is trying to ask another question.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It is a point of order.

The SPEAKER: What is it? State the point of order.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The point of order is that the question I asked was not in any way provocative or offensive to the Minister.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not a point of order; it is an explanation, and the Chair decides on balance what is parliamentary and what is unparliamentary. I have replied to the honourable member, and I will not go into further detail. I was rather tolerant when the member for Light asked a question a few moments ago, in case I was criticized, and I have explained that I allowed the same tolerance to the Minister of Education. The matter was rather drawn out and, indeed, the question should have been ruled out of order. However, I gave the Minister an equal opportunity.

**NAILSWORTH SCHOOL**

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Education say whether arrangements are in hand for the amalgamation of the Nailsworth Technical High School as a co-educational boys and girls technical high school, and can he also say what progress is being made with the design and construction of an assembly hall and a new school?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to look into the matter for the honourable member and to bring down a report.

**LIBRARIES**

Mr. MATHWIN: Regarding free libraries of municipal and district councils and their return of books to the State Library, can the Minister of Education say how many books have been returned this year, whether they are to remain unissued and, if they are, what is to become of them?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I believe that several councils have been required to return books to the State Library this year; Brighton and Mitcham councils and a country council are the main councils involved. As the member for Glenelg is a member of the Brighton council, he will be aware that the number of books that can be maintained in a subsidized library depends on the sum that the council contributes towards the cost of

those books. The Libraries Board then subsidizes that sum on a \$1 for \$1 basis. Regarding Brighton, the initial grant of books for a period of five years was made (I think that there were about 5,000 books when the library first opened), but the Brighton council has not paid a sufficient sum to continue to keep those books from the State Library in the local Brighton library.

Mr. Mathwin: They didn't receive all the books.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is for the Brighton council to sort out with the State Library what was received and what should have been received. The point in relation to those 5,000 books is that if, over the previous five years, the council had been paying \$1,500 a year or 30c a book, it would have been entitled to the complete replacement of these 5,000 books this year. Most other councils have been paying at the appropriate scale. The position now arises that the Brighton council will have to pay \$1.50 for each book immediately to get all the 5,000 books back, and that would be a payment of \$7,500 by the council to the State Library this year, with no payments necessary in addition to the normal payment that the council is already making over the next four years. However, then a payment of \$7,500 would recur in five years' time.

I am concerned about this matter because I want to see the Brighton council able to ensure that the local subsidized library is adequately stocked with books so that the appropriate service can be provided to the public. I am sure that the member for Glenelg, as a member of that council, wants to see the same thing. As Minister, I want to see that other councils that have been in difficulty on this point, such as Mitcham, are also able to meet their responsibility towards the local community. I hope that arrangements can be made which, although they will not relieve the local council of the commitments that other councils are meeting, will ease the problem of financing the immediate restoration of the full quota of books at the library. Discussions are currently proceeding with the State Librarian in order to try to achieve a proposition that is fair to all concerned. When I say "fair to all concerned", that also means fair to those councils that have paid up their full contribution and have paid at a rate sufficient to sustain an appropriate quantity of books available in the local library. That has not been the case in Brighton or in one or

two other councils to which I have referred, and it is that problem that is causing the difficulty; we need to find a way of getting out of it.

Mr. Mathwin: But they haven't got all the books.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg has asked a question and received a reply. He must not jump over other members on his side who have not had the call.

### PROSH

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Attorney-General inspected the *Prosh* magazine that was distributed last week and made any decision about prosecutions associated with that publication?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have not yet received any report from police officers who I understand questioned people who were selling the magazine. Consequently I have not yet been called on to make any decision. When the report comes to me, I will make a decision.

### WATER PUMPING

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Works explain the basis on which a licence was issued to the Murray Bridge council to pump 250 acre feet of water from the Murray River? I recall that recently the Minister told the member for Torrens that no additional licences had been issued. I know that during the term of the previous Government additional licences were not issued, and since this Government has been in office additional licences have not been issued. I hasten to add that I am delighted that a licence has been granted for the golf course, because a wonderful job has been done in developing that area. The local newspaper of last week contains a report that a licence has been granted on the basis of 250 acre feet of water, and, naturally, persons who apply for licences for horticulture, almond trees and glasshouse watering are concerned when they receive from the department the kind of reply that states:

In reply to your request for the issue of a diversion licence to take water for irrigation purposes from the River Murray, it is advised that a policy decision given by the Government has set out that only applications received prior to December 1, 1968, can be considered for a water allocation. No exceptions can be made to this.

Will the Minister explain why the licence to which I have referred was issued?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The water licence granted to the Murray Bridge council was granted not for horticultural purposes but

on an annual basis for the watering of a golf course, and it was issued to a local government body as distinct from an individual. The department and I considered that, in these circumstances, bearing in mind that it was issued on an annual basis, if there was a need to provide for the discontinuance of the licence this could be done. The difference is that a licence not issued on this basis could lead to permanent plantings. Although one could say that it could be granted to people for vegetables, etc., I point out that those persons must make a capital outlay, whether for one year or 10 years. I consider that, in all the circumstances, the granting of a licence was reasonable, on the basis that the authority concerned was a council, that the licence was not granted for permanent plantings such as vines, etc., and that it could be cancelled if need be. The licence was issued on an annual basis and was not in contravention of the policy followed in respect of individuals or people who would be required to outlay capital. If, however, the honourable member considers that the issuing of this licence will create a precedent or lead to the policy breaking down, I will examine the matter and cancel the licence.

#### **BOARDING ALLOWANCE**

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Minister of Education consider increasing the boarding allowance for secondary school students in the outback areas of South Australia? At present the boarding allowance in South Australia for secondary students is \$180 a year for the first four years and \$230 after the fourth year. In the Far North of the State last weekend, when I visited many people who live on cattle stations, my attention was drawn to the fact that the boarding allowance in the Northern Territory is higher than that in this State, and some of these people who look across the border rather enviously have said that they will have to seek employment in the Northern Territory in order to educate their family. I understand that the allowance in the Northern Territory is \$250 for all students, plus another \$120 on a means-test basis applying to persons on an income of less than \$5,166. Therefore, most managers of cattle stations would qualify under that means test, making the total amount payable for each student \$370.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The practice in relation to the boarding allowance is as the honourable member has stated. However, I do not think he has considered my recent announcement that special secondary scholar-

ships would be provided by the Education Department over and above the basic boarding allowances for all stages of secondary education, where children do not have the appropriate facilities for secondary education available locally. These scholarships will therefore be available, in addition to the boarding allowance, to all parents in the outback and to any other parents in rural areas where the appropriate facilities are not available locally, such as on the West Coast. They will also be available to the parents of Matriculation students where no Matriculation class is available in the local school. The proposal is that the additional sum to be paid should be paid on a means-test basis and up to a maximum of \$370 a year over and above the boarding allowance, so from first year to fourth year the maximum scholarship sum available would be about \$550 and for fifth year the maximum sum available would be \$600. We intend to adopt a means test similar to, but not identical with, that which the Commonwealth Government applies to determine the living allowance appropriate for Commonwealth university scholarship holders. That means test, applied in relation to these scholarships, is likely to be such that the whole \$370 would be payable, if someone gained one of these scholarships, on an adjusted family income level between \$3,000 and \$3,300 (that is, adjusted to take account of the number of children, although actual gross income may be higher than that). I would then propose that the amount of the scholarship be reduced by \$1 for every \$10 of income by which the gross income exceeded this minimum amount, so the scholarship would not cut out until the adjusted family income was about \$7,000. I hope that a significant number of these scholarships will be available for the children of outback parents. I said in the press release (of which I will make sure the honourable member receives a copy) that we would have to give special attention to those children who had attended correspondence school and, consequently, were not in the same competitive position as other children. If a significant number of scholarships can be made available to the children of outback parents, a large part of the problem the honourable member has mentioned will be covered and catered for at a standard significantly higher than that which applies in the Northern Territory.

#### **FAN STATION**

Mr. BECKER: Will the Premier ask the Minister of Works, who is temporarily absent from the Chamber, to investigate the noise

caused by the Engineering and Water Supply Department fan station at the corner of Toledo Avenue and Military Road, West Beach? Several constituents who live near the fan station have complained about the noise created during the evening.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

### **BINNUM SCHOOL**

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about closing the Binnum Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Following a meeting of parents of children attending the Binnum Primary School, the Secretary of the school committee wrote asking that Binnum school be closed at the end of 1971, and that transport be arranged to the Frances Primary School. This request has been approved, and formal notification of the approval is about to be sent to the school committee and the head teacher at Binnum, and to the head teacher at Frances. Enrolments at both schools have been declining. At Frances, where there are three teachers, numbers are such that only two teachers could be retained. At Binnum, numbers would have warranted only one teacher in 1972. With the consolidation of the two schools, there will be sufficient pupils to justify the retention of three teachers at Frances.

### **TIP-TRUCK OPERATORS**

Mr. EVANS: Is the Premier aware that tip-truck operators are being paid at rates that are so low that the operators should be referred to as a form of slave labour, and will he ensure that these operators receive at least a reasonable payment when working for Government or semi-government departments or on Government or semi-government contracts? In May, 1970, a slight increase was given to these operators, and later the same year the Prices Commissioner granted a further slight increase. Some operators, now having to pay \$8,500 for a vehicle with which to operate in this industry, are receiving about \$3.50 an hour for vehicle and labour, although the Prices Commissioner fixed the maximum rate at nearly \$5 an hour. The difference between these rates can only be referred to as a loss for labour, because the cost of operating a vehicle is the same. This difference is lost by the individual for his labour. As an individual operating on his own he has to find accident insurance (except in the case of the E. & W.S. Department, which insures private

operators who work for it); he has to find his own long service leave, annual holiday payments, public holiday payments, provision for sick leave, and also insurance in lieu of superannuation. Plumbers are being paid \$3.85 an hour for labour only. I know that representations have been made to the Premier and other Ministers in the past, but the present position has become serious. Some operators are keeping trucks on the road that could be classed as unroadworthy, but they are forced to do this because they do not have any other trade and do not receive a fair payment. Will the Premier help this industry, which is in a serious state, partly because of its own fault in not coming to an agreement and partly because Government departments do not pay anywhere near the rate that the Prices Commissioner has stated is a fair rate?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Prices Commissioner does not set a minimum rate. In relation to several services he sets a maximum rate: only one minimum price is provided in South Australia, that is, for wine grapes. I do not know exactly what course the honourable member wants me to follow, because unless there is some action by tip-truck drivers to form a union or an association, which will make representations as to a fair basis of payments, the simple aspect of supply and demand will occur. If there is a greater supply of operators than there is a demand for them, I should think that, in accordance with the philosophy of the honourable member's Party, prices will tend to be depressed for the services. I shall be pleased to inquire into payments made by the Government to tip-truck operators for work they do for the Government or for contractors with the Government. It has always been Government policy to require that contractors with the Government pay subcontractors what is not less than a fair wage for the service they offer, and subcontractors should not be forced to work for long hours for less than fair wages in order to get a return for their work. On that basis we will consider what can be done in Government departments concerning tip-truck operators, but I do not see any future possibility of the Government's prescribing minimum rates for the service of tip-truck operators generally.

### **MATRICULATION CLASSES**

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Education announced details of Matriculation classes that will apply in 1972? I asked this question on Thursday, July 29, and the Minister said he hoped to be able to announce details of



these classes. However, as I was absent from the House last week, I wonder whether the Minister has announced these details.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, I have.

### RAILWAY CROSSINGS

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport make available to members a list of the railway crossings that are to be equipped with electrical equipment during 1971-72? The Minister will recall that last week he said that at least one railway crossing in the Murray Bridge area was to be so equipped, and that this information was now available. Last year he made a similar list available to all members: will he do it now?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As the list is available, I will bring a supply down for members as soon as I can.

### POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister for Conservation investigated the Duncan McWade emission control unit and, if he has, has he any details to report? The Senate Select Committee on Air Pollution and the Traffic Engineering Branch of the University of New South Wales have tested this gadget, which showed a reduction of 52 per cent in carbon monoxide emissions, and it seems that this gadget will assist in reducing air pollution. Can the Minister say whether this unit has been tested in South Australia and, if it has not, will he institute such an investigation?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: As I understand that this matter has been considered by the Minister of Roads and Transport, I will discuss the matter with him and ascertain what information can be provided for the honourable member.

### RAILWAY STRIKE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Does the Minister of Roads and Transport support the action of the Railways Commissioner in standing down 600 workshop employees last Thursday during the national rail strike? In this morning's newspaper there is a report of a no-confidence motion in the Railways Commissioner as a result of this action; the report concludes with the following sentence: "Mr. Virgo declined to comment." As I understand the position, the Minister of Roads and Transport is the Minister responsible in the Government; I therefore ask him, as a matter of very great public interest, whether he supports his Railways Commissioner or whether he supports the resolution passed?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I take it, Mr. Speaker, that you would like me to reply to the first question and to ignore the second one. The first question concerns whether I support the Railways Commissioner in his action in standing down 600 men last Thursday. I think I should point out that the decision on standing down the men was taken by the Commissioner. It is not a question of whether I support or whether I oppose. What the honourable member lacks is any basic knowledge of how the worker feels. What he also lacks is any appreciation that throughout the Railways Department there are about 9,000 employees, all of whom serve this State very faithfully and all of whom have a very high regard for their own ability—and with justification. If one looks at the products turned out by the Islington workshops one will find that they are second to none in the world. I have complete confidence in the ability of those employed there and in their integrity and devotion to duty. It was this factor that prompted them yesterday to conduct a meeting and carry resolutions.

What the Railways Commissioner did last Thursday he did in the interests of the State of South Australia. At that stage he did not know whether the railway stoppage would continue for another two hours, another two days, or another two weeks. Accordingly, he took the action that he considered was right and proper, and it was not necessary to seek my approval, as Minister, to do so. I had discussions with him at various stages. The men on the job resented the fact that they were given notice very late in the day, but it was explained that notice was deliberately withheld until then because, if there had been any breakthrough in the strike negotiations, the notice would not have been given. It is not a question of whether I support the Railways Commissioner in his stand. The Commissioner has received support and, furthermore, the Commissioner supports this Government. So, it is a rather foolish question; a person of the calibre of the honourable member has no appreciation whatsoever of the trade union movement or of members of trade unions, and he is merely using this situation to dig the knife a little bit further into the back of the trade unionists in the Islington workshops, and I will not wear that.

### TORRENS LAKE

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What was the bacterial count of the tests conducted in March, 1971, on water from the Torrens Lake, and what organisms were detected?

2. Have further investigations been made, and will microbiological examinations be on a regular and more frequent basis in future?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. The results of bacteriological testing of water from the Torrens Lake on March 8, 1971, were as follows:

Sample Number	Location of Collection Site	Examinations per 100 ml. Coli-forms	E.Coli 1
1	Centre of weir . .	1,600	170
2	Morphett Street bridge (south side).....	550	70
3	University foot-bridge (south side).....	9,000	1,750
4	City bridge (north side).....	3,500	900

2. Future testing will be carried out periodically as a normal function of the Adelaide Local Board of Health. Because any body of water receiving storm water from roads and inhabited areas will inevitably be contaminated, it is the policy of the Public Health Department to advise the people that fresh water swimming should be confined to pools which are filtered and chlorinated, and not overcrowded.

### HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT LAND

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Of how much land in the metropolitan area is the Commissioner of Highways the registered proprietor and what is its total estimated value?

2. How much other land has the Commissioner contracted to buy and what is its total estimated value?

3. Where is all this land?

4. For what purposes is it being held?

5. When will it be used for such purposes?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. The Commissioner of Highways is the registered owner of about 1,250 parcels of land within the metropolitan area, and the purchase price of this land was about \$15,000,000. This includes the land held for building and depot purposes, as well as for roads.

2. About 30 parcels of land are currently in the process of being transferred to the Commissioner of Highways, the estimated value of these being \$500,000.

3. It is not practicable to provide a list showing the location of all 1,280 parcels referred to in replies 1 and 2.

4. This land is being held for future road works, departmental building and depot purposes, abandoned projects or are surplus to completed road works.

5. As and when required.

### REFERENDUM VOTING

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How many persons have been prosecuted for not voting at the referendum on September 19, 1970?

2. How many of these complaints have been heard?

3. How many are awaiting hearing and when will they be heard?

4. How many of those prosecuted have been convicted?

5. What reasons for not voting at this referendum were accepted as valid and sufficient by the Returning Officer for the State?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. No person has yet been prosecuted for not voting at the referendum on September 19, 1970.

2. No complaints have yet been heard.

3. A total of 197 cases have been prepared and complaints are in the process of being served.

4. No convictions have yet been recorded.

5. The reasons varied from elector to elector. The Returning Officer for the State decided each case on its merits.

### GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. MATHWIN (on notice):

1. Are any further contracts for the building of schools to be given to the New South Wales firm of Civil and Civic Proprietary Limited?

2. What is the cost of construction of the Para Vista and Para Hills schools, respectively?

3. What is the percentage profit that Civil and Civic Proprietary Limited will receive on these package deals?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson, for the Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. There is no current proposal to use the services of Civil and Civic Proprietary Limited on any project other than those to which the honourable member's question refers.

2. The sum of \$1,525,000 for each school.

3. The percentage profit is not known.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: GAS**

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I ask leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am happy to inform the House that the Tirrawarra No. 2 well has produced 1,500 barrels of oil a day from a depth of 9,798ft. to 9,848ft.. and has also produced 3,500,000 cub. ft. of gas a day with the oil. This is the second oil well on the structure and, following the success of the Tirrawarra No. 1 well 12 months ago, which flowed 600 barrels a day, it proves that the Tirrawarra structure is a significant oil pool and that further development will justify a pipeline.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION: SALARIES**

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. McANANEY: It has been reported in the press that either Mr. McRae, M.P., or Mr. Potter, M.L.C., is representing me before the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal. This is not correct. Some Liberal and Country Party members, as individuals, will give evidence before the tribunal, but no official case is being presented on behalf of the Liberal and Country Party, of which I am Chairman.

**GLADSTONE HIGH SCHOOL**

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Gladstone High School (Replacement).

Ordered that report be printed.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL**

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Audit Act, 1921-1970; the Police Regulation Act, 1952-1970; and the Public Service Act, 1967-1971, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It seeks to increase the salaries of the Auditor-General, the Commissioner of Police, the Commissioner nominated Chairman of the Public Service Board and the two other Commissioners of that board. In the past, these salaries have been adjusted concurrently with adjustments to the salaries of permanent heads of the Public Service in this State in order to

preserve accepted relativities. Therefore, it is now appropriate that, first, the 1970 national wage award of 6 per cent and, secondly, the increases made to salaries of permanent heads and other senior Public Service officers in April of this year should be reflected in the salaries now in question.

I shall now deal with the clauses of the Bill. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 sets out the arrangement of the Bill. Clause 3 is formal. Clause 4 contains the relevant amendment to the Audit Act. The salary of the Auditor-General, which now stands at \$16,995 is raised to \$18,015 as from January 4, 1971, thus incorporating the national wage award increase, and is further raised to \$20,200 as from April 12, 1971, which is the operative date for the other Public Service increases I have referred to earlier. Clause 5 is formal. Clause 6 amends the Police Regulation Act by increasing the salary of the Commissioner of Police from the present \$15,656 to \$16,595 as from January 4, 1971, and then to \$18,600 as from April 12, 1971. Clause 7 is formal.

Clause 8 amends the Public Service Act with respect to the salaries of the Commissioner nominated Chairman of the Public Service Board and the two other Commissioners. The Chairman's salary is raised from the present \$16,995 to \$18,015 as from January 4, 1971, and then to \$20,200 as from April 12, 1971. The salary of each other Commissioner is raised from the present \$14,420 to \$15,285 as from January 4, 1971, and then to \$17,100 as from April 12, 1971.

Mr. Jennings: Do you think that this, too, will make the front page of the *Advertiser*?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know, but it is in accordance with the general movement of Public Service and other salaries that has already taken place. These are salaries that need to be fixed by Statute, and this is the earliest possible opportunity for me to introduce the necessary amendments in accordance with the amendments that have already been made administratively in other areas.

Mr. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

**LOAN ESTIMATES**

In Committee.

(Continued from August 4. Page 578.)

Grand total, \$142,940,000.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): One hesitates, almost, to speak to a Government measure nowadays, so touchy and prickly are the Ministers about the slightest criticism

of their administration; but there are items within the Loan Estimates that deserve criticism. All I can say is that Ministers will have to get used to having their ideas and the quality of their administration tested if they are to continue to perform the effective function of Government; and, what is more, they will have to start taking notice of some of the criticism made of their administration if they are to govern for long in South Australia. The Government is now moving, as all relatively new Governments do, slowly into an area of its own responsibility. Still, of course, it boasts of work carried out by the previous Government of a different nature and still we have the Treasurer referring to the long list of new buildings being constructed in South Australia for industrial concerns, nearly all of which were arranged under the previous Liberal and Country League Government. Yet, despite this reference to the flow-on effect from the previous Government, this Government is now beginning to stand with its own programme outlined to the public of the State; and this programme, as it moves into its own Labor administered area, will, of course, be subject to further testing from this side of the Chamber and from the public of the State.

These Loan Estimates are, therefore, the most important document (I suppose it is fair to say) of the Government's own programming that has yet come before us since May, 1970. What of the quality of the management after one year in office, this being the second Loan Estimates that the Treasurer has brought in since his success at the State elections in 1970? Certainly one thing that stands out clearly, namely, the see-saw type of budgeting that has gone on in relation to the Loan Account. It is interesting to refer to the Loan Estimates for 1970-71. We find that the Government came into office with \$13,032,000 in credit in the Loan Account. I ask members to cast their minds back to the criticism that emanated from the Labor Party, when in Opposition, about our Government's maintaining a relatively high balance in the Loan Account. I remember the Treasurer being critical, and other members of the Labor Party being extremely critical, of our continuing to administer the Loan Fund with an average credit balance of about \$13,000,000.

It was stated that this was a sum of money that we were holding. Incidentally, in the first year we had \$8,000,000 of deficit finance that we had been left by the previous Labor Government and, when we went out of office,

we had reduced it to \$4,500,000. Nevertheless, it was said that this large sum of money was wrongly held and that it should have been applied to the construction of facilities urgently required by the public. What, therefore, have this Government and this Treasurer done with the \$13,000,000 credit balance? Has this money been expended on behalf of the people of this State? That is a major question in relation to this year's Loan Estimates because, after all, much of the sum total of the Loan Estimates will be spent in a way that is traditional each year. Little remains for the Government by way of variation in departmental allocations. In fact, it is unusual to find new allocations: they generally follow the same pattern year after year.

So what did the Government do with the \$13,000,000 balance of which it was so critical? In the first year the Government said, "We have \$4,500,000 deficit still remaining, and we have \$13,000,000 with which to cover it; we will reduce this during the year by using \$4,300,000 of the \$13,032,000 in our year's loan programme." If one follows this through, one finds that the Government intended, therefore, to have left at June 30, 1971, \$8,732,000 in the Loan Account, which would have been a reasonably healthy situation, it having, of course, \$4,500,000 to cover the debt of the previous Labor Government. But what in fact happened? Did this Government reduce the surplus in the account from \$13,000,000 to £8,700,000? No, it did not. The accounts the Treasurer has presented show that the Government has increased the sum held by over \$1,500,000 and, instead of having a balance of \$8,700,000, it has a balance of \$14,800,000. This means that on its own calculations the Government has underspent by \$6,000,000. What would \$6,000,000 have accomplished in the way of establishing proper services and modern facilities in this State? Have we all the school buildings we need? Is that what the Government is saying?

Mr. Millhouse: The crisis apparently ended last year.

Mr. HALL: The Treasurer himself said that the crisis ended last year, implying that it ended when the Labor Government was elected in 1970. Is that why the Treasurer holds such a large sum in credit and will not spend it? He did not explain this in the document he presented; in fact, he said he would maintain the figure at \$14,800,000. The Treasurer said:

In all the circumstances, the Government considers that it should hold in reserve as much as practicable of the balance of Loan

funds held at the end of 1970-71. We have come to the decision that it would not be reasonable or prudent to draw on those funds this year to the extent of more than about \$1,500,000 towards financing capital works. The total appropriation of \$142,940,000 included in the Loan Estimates is based on that decision. It envisages the use, if necessary, of \$1,540,000 of funds in hand . . .

It will use that sum "if necessary", so it seems that the Government will be content if at the end of this financial year it again has \$14,800,000 in hand on account of Loan funds. What on earth is the Government doing with the State's finances? Last year it was able to increase its budgetary expenditure by about 15 per cent. It introduced a substantial range of new taxation last year, the full effect of which will be evident after it has applied for the whole of this financial year, and it may well have further taxation planned. The Government is apparently considering the possibility of going into deficit to the extent of about \$10,000,000. I remind members that the Government is holding nearly \$14,800,000 to cover an existing deficit of about \$4,500,000. What does \$10,000,000 cost each year? What is the long-term bond rate? We are apparently to pay out \$600,000 worth of interest a year on unused money, because the Government is unable to make up its mind about its budgetary procedure.

Not only, therefore, are we not obtaining the advantage of this \$10,000,000 worth of spare money out of the \$14,800,000: we are to pay a useless and unproductive \$500,000 or so in interest each year, and this is equivalent to the cost of a good school of medium size. The Government is doing this while dithering in its general financial programme. This is obviously the most glaring fault and the worst example of lack of planning in relation to the Loan Estimates, and it invites criticism of smaller yet important issues.

I refer here to the astounding statement made in this Chamber today by the Treasurer. We on this side have listened with interest and with some alarm to the replies to questions asked last week about the possibility of establishing a hotel in Victoria Square. I remind members that the previous Government had purchased the land in question (in Victoria Square) for the future erection of a new Government administration building. Indeed, it is evident that, if South Australia is to maintain proper standards in relation to the Public Service, a new building will have to be erected fairly soon, and there can be no better site for it than the Victoria Square site, across the square from the existing administration building. One

can concede that a Government must have the right to implement its own policies. If the Government decides to use a site for a certain purpose, one can criticize that decision but one must admit that the Government has the right to use the site for Government purposes, although unfortunately in this case the site will be made available for private use.

I am astounded today to find that the Treasurer has indicated that that site will be made available at a peppercorn rental. As I understand the remarks made by the Treasurer's Deputy, the term of the lease will be 99 years, and this will be at a peppercorn rental. A gift is being made of this land apparently to entice a combination of overseas and Australian investors to come to South Australia to erect an international-class hotel. The value of this land which is the public's land is about \$600,000, bearing in mind the interest accrued since its purchase. If the Treasurer can get someone to agree to the scheme, he will present this land to those entrepreneurs who would come to South Australia to make rather good profits (profits which Government members, including the member for Florey, so readily deplore in connection with certain successful Australian-owned industrial enterprises).

The Treasurer is not only enticing overseas interests to take part in a South Australian enterprise: he is giving them a packet to come here. What will the member for Florey then say about the profits of this venture? Will he criticize them? I suppose those profits will be exempt, because they will not have been made by Australians! The member for Florey can criticize the Australian-owned Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, making that his chief target, yet he can agree to giving \$600,000 in public money to smart entrepreneurs from overseas. He would agree to put hotels before schools. He would not only provide the block of land: he would give \$600,000, which could be used to build a school, to an overseas entrepreneur. There is no other way of describing the situation.

Government members, during long years in Opposition, prated about the lack of expenditure on school buildings, yet the Treasurer talks about making this land available for a 99-year term at a peppercorn rental, and it will obviously be an extended period. He will give away the public's asset. Already a large new hotel is planned on the site of the South Australian Hotel, which will be emptied of its contents at an auction next week. It is a misuse of public funds, and it is a misdirected use of the land.

The Treasurer shirks his responsibility to the public by presenting this land to an entrepreneur. The Treasurer has said that subsidies are often given to industry, but I invite him to be more specific about the handing of public resources to private industry. Apparently he gives subsidies more readily than he should. When we came to office in 1968, we were confronted with the indenture which the Treasurer had signed with the developers of West Lakes and which almost completely disregarded the public interest in that huge and valuable piece of land.

Mr. Millhouse: Quite reckless.

Mr. HALL: Yes. We know the stories that have circulated that the document was drawn up in extreme haste just before the last State election. It took Sir Glen Pearson months to renegotiate that document with the company, which co-operated fully and adequately, and to preserve and even increase the public interest in that development. It is nonsensical for the Treasurer to say that this land was presented on subsidy to that company. He knows full well that the company is obliged to undertake public works in the midst of that development which are worth many millions and which will become publicly owned. That is the basis of the agreement between the previous Government and the developer. How much the company will make and how much value will reside in the public sector from this development is a matter for conjecture, but at least a fair balance was struck at that time; it was certainly not envisaged by my Government that that land represented any gift to that company. The company took a risk, which it must now be considering carefully in view of the present industrial conditions in this State. If its planning is good and the project is well developed and of high quality, the company will make a profit (and I hope it does), but the land did not represent a gift or subsidy to the company.

Similar circumstances apply to Government provided lease-back factories. As the Treasurer knows, with lease-back factories the Government recovers the money outlaid and the public is not involved in a yearly or capital subsidy. When in office, I always resisted the payment of a subsidy to industry on a continuing or capital basis, because an industry that must be sustained by subsidy is usually one that will provide a long-term problem for the State and for the Government that supports that industry. I have the case clearly in mind of a Managing Director of one

industry who asked me for a continuing subsidy. I refused that application, and that industry is now one of the very successful country industries in the State. I can say little more about this matter now, for the Treasurer has been less than forthcoming; he has presented us with almost no detail of what he intends to do with the public asset in Victoria Square, except that he will put that project before schools in his assessment of the course development in the State should take. Will honourable members choose a school, or will they support the interests of an overseas entrepreneur? Members opposite should carefully consider their choice, especially if their districts need facilities. If they support the Treasurer, they deny their districts the facilities they need.

Another reference about which almost no worthwhile information is given is in relation to the allocation towards the festival theatre. The Treasurer has rightly provided for a further payment to cover the Government's involvement in the festival theatre. I am pleased to see work proceeding, and I look forward to its completion with much satisfaction because of my own involvement in choosing the site and in renegotiating arrangements with the City Council. However, what is interesting in regard to the festival theatre allocation is the reference to additional cultural facilities. The Treasurer said:

In addition to the normal annual appropriation of \$900,000 towards the theatre, a contribution of \$800,000 is appropriated in the Loan Estimates as a first instalment towards a cultural complex associated with the theatre, and which is presently under discussion with the City Council.

What sort of budgeting is this? What sort of provision of capital funds is the provision of \$800,000 for a project that is presently being discussed? I draw the attention of honourable members to the statement that this is a first instalment towards a cultural complex. Therefore, if we approve this, are we voting for something that will eventually cost \$2,000,000 or \$5,000,000? What is the Treasurer talking about when he refers to a cultural complex still under discussion with the City Council? This is most irresponsible financing. I know that the Treasurer will come back at me and say that I do not favour cultural activities, but that is utterly disproved by my personal involvement in the festival theatre, by the increased allocation that we arranged for it, and by my Government's constant support for the project in co-operation with the City Council. However, I would be

an irresponsible Leader of the Opposition if I approved without protest \$800,000 for a project that is as yet unplanned and unapproved.

Does the member for Stuart approve this payment? I should like to hear him say in his district that he has approved, in addition to the allocation for the festival theatre in Adelaide, another allocation towards a project the total expense of which he does not know and the plans for which he has never seen, and that he has done this while his own district goes short of capital facilities. Will he do that? No, he would be ashamed to do it. This is the most irresponsible line in the Loan Estimates. I do not oppose the eventual construction of some cultural facilities in addition to the festival theatre, but this provision is well before its time, as the festival theatre will not be completed for another 18 months; it will probably be another three or four years before the plaza development is added to the theatre. It is futuristic nonsense to allocate money to a scheme that is not even agreed to when we have insufficient money available to carry out the State's capital programme.

Therefore. I have shown two instances where the Government has put its own fancy planning before the needs of the people. I believe these are cases of the Treasurer's personal intervention in the Loan programme. I think members of his Party are being led by the nose and dragooned into supporting something for which they have very little enthusiasm. It would be interesting to know whether members opposite support the giving to Japanese interests of land in Victoria Square worth \$600,000 and the spending as a first instalment of \$800,000 on an unplanned project in regard to the festival theatre. We will see whether they will support taking this \$1,400,000 out of the public purse and putting it into what at the moment certainly are unproductive uses that take from our school, hospital, and social welfare programmes. It will be indeed interesting to see whether members opposite, with all their electoral needs, will support the Government in that plan. I have said that I consider that allocation the most irresponsible but, on looking at my list, I am not so sure.

I think another allocation deserves extreme censure, if only because of the arrogant way in which it is presented in these Loan Estimates. It is typical of course, of the Minister of Roads and Transport, as he has said this afternoon, to defy people. He defies

not only members on this side but all of South Australia and he continues to get away with it, first, because he is No. 1 strong-man in the Labor Party in this State and, secondly, because he has the numbers in this House.

How would one normally feel after reading, in three and a half lines, that the Government will spend \$500,000 of capital money (and I remind the House that it is capital money) on transport research? I remind the House that this expenditure will cost \$30,000 a year in interest for the next 53 years, in terms of the financial agreement, and we are doing that so that the Minister of Roads and Transport can spend capital in research into his wild-eyed ideas of air-cushioned vehicles running to Marino. This provision vies with the other line for irresponsibility in allocating resources.

Over the years this State has jealously guarded its capital funds and, wherever possible, has put them into productive works. As the need for education buildings has increased, and as water and sewerage works in this State have become a subsidy situation, obviously the point has been reached where one cannot always look for returns, and I think the dead weight on investment today is more than 50 per cent. However, this is no reason for the Minister's recklessly indulging in allocating, for the running expenses of the State capital funds that should come from the Budget or, at least, should be met from Highways Department income from licensing and from Commonwealth funds.

However, we are told that \$500,000 will be spent, and no detail is given for us to approve. We can only imagine that the Minister will continue his disregard and spend money in a fragmented way that will yield nothing for the people of South Australia. I remind honourable members of the replies to questions that the Minister of Roads and Transport gave in this House last week. They illustrate the contradictions and confusion in his mind about where we are going with the \$500,000,000 plan for Adelaide transportation. The reply given by the Minister last Thursday is relevant to the provision for research in these Loan Estimates. The Minister stated:

The Government will not implement the decisions made by the previous Government to construct the freeways and expressways, proposed in the M.A.T.S. plan which are within the built-up areas and where substantial demolition of private property is involved.

I think all honourable members remember the Minister's emphatic statements in the last few

months that M.A.T.S. is dead, that it is finished, and we remember his continual re-emphasis that the M.A.T.S. plan will not be proceeded with. The Minister re-emphasized his statement again last Thursday. Mr. Virgo, in reply to Mr. Millhouse, Deputy Leader of the Opposition—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Honourable members must not be referred to by their name.

Mr. HALL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I apologize for using the Deputy Leader's name. He is such a worthy person that I gave him more notice than I should have given. The Minister said:

I have no reason to doubt the veracity of the Commissioner of Highways, in whom I have complete confidence.

That was in relation to the question whether the Commissioner was correct in telling the Salisbury Council that a freeway would be built to the Regency Road area of the old sewage farm. In reply to Mr. Brookman—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HALL: In reply to the member for Alexandra, the Minister said that he had made the matter clear and had stated the Government's policy. He made the following statement on policy:

The first question asked by the honourable member, before he started his explanation, was whether I would make a clear statement on the Government's policy, and that is the question I intend to answer. I think I have made this matter clear, and I think that anyone who has listened to what I have said will understand it as a clear and simple—

Then honourable members interjected, after which the Minister stated:

I am sorry if members opposite do not have the ability to understand the Queen's English expressed in single-syllable words. I have stated the policy of the Government, and we are pursuing that policy. The statement read to the House by the Leader as allegedly having been made by the Commissioner of Highways, is not inconsistent.

In reply to the member for Light, the Minister stated:

It is possible that some roads that are being constructed could be part of the freeway system.

So, in the series of replies the Minister began to re-emphasize that the Government would not build freeways in Adelaide. He went on to say that the Commissioner of Highways was correct in telling the Salisbury council that the freeway would be built to Regency Road, and then he told the member for Light that it was possible that some of the roads now being built would be part of the M.A.T.S. plan.

Mr. Payne: That's not what he said: he said "part of the freeway system".

Mr. HALL: All right. One could ask several questions. First, is the Minister simple? I do not think he is. Is he trying to conceal something? I think there lies the answer. Obviously, the Minister intends to proceed with the M.A.T.S. plan, yet he will not call it the M.A.T.S. plan, and he will not describe free-ways by that name. As I understand it, the Minister will find it very difficult to try to coin a new name for a type of road universally known at present throughout the world. However, whatever it may be called, the Minister is busily implementing M.A.T.S.

I was interested to read a statement in the *Advertiser* about a week ago by a wellknown journalist who stated that the Minister was busily implementing M.A.T.S. The Minister insults members on this side who accuse him of doing that, yet he makes these admissions when it comes to giving details of the M.A.T.S. plan. One wonders about this type of Minister who charges on, defying, as he admits, members opposite him, defying the public, and refusing to make any clear statement of the Government's policy on transport. He continues quietly, behind all this blunster, to implement M.A.T.S. The emphasis that was needed on this matter was given a few months ago when the *Financial Review* carried an article concerning an alleged alternative to the M.A.T.S. plan: a rapid transit rail system. Upon examination, it was found that the alternative just happened to be the identical plans regarding rail transport that were included in the M.A.T.S. report. It appears, therefore, that the Minister of Roads and Transport and the Government will go to almost any lengths to avoid being labelled as the builders of the M.A.T.S. plan when, secretly, they not only advocate it but also continue to build it.

Reference is made in the Loan Estimates to the Housing Trust, which brings to mind this State's long building record and the fact that, if there is any one reason for South Australia's success in this respect, it could be attributed to the extremely successful programme carried out by the trust over many years, during which South Australia was able to take a tremendous proportion of Australia's migrants and, indeed, provide for them a happy environment and the industry in which they could be employed. The continuation of the housing programme is therefore absolutely essential if this State is again to start to develop in the manner to which we became accustomed in the early 1960's.

The fact that the trust has been referred to raises for full discussion the Government's



plans for the building industry. It is important that rental accommodation be provided at the lowest possible rates. The occupants of trust houses form basically that part of the community which is unable to purchase a home for itself. There may be many reasons for this. These people may be in an industry or a vocation that does not enable them to purchase a house and then to shift within a few years, or they may be unable to acquire the required capital. As honourable members know, there may be many reasons why a housing trust home is required by a family. The families availing themselves of this type of accommodation need to obtain it at the lowest possible rental. It is, therefore, rather sobering to know that single-unit individual houses, comprising five rooms, some with three bedrooms, in the Christies Beach area range in rent from \$13.50 to \$15.50 a week. Therefore, the rental in proportion to a family's total income is indeed significant, even in the lowest-cost rental housing that the State can provide, as it does through the trust.

It therefore behoves the Government to do all it can to ensure that housing construction costs do not increase, as to raise these costs by a small percentage would place an almost intolerable burden on those persons in the work force who live in Housing Trust houses and who rely on the lower rental therefor. Over the years the trust has built houses which are of a consistently good quality and which are as much as, or in many cases more than, one could expect from the expenditure involved. One reason why it has been able to do this for many years has possibly been the large contracts it has undertaken. In this respect members have in the past read of many houses that have been constructed in one contract.

Those involved with trust management will tell persons who inquire that the great success of low-priced housing in this State has been achieved because of the subcontracting activities within the building industry, and that the availability of low-cost homes is based on the competitiveness and the productivity emanating from those subcontracting activities. In this area the Government bears a heavy responsibility, as it is trying to destroy these subcontracting activities with its builders licensing legislation. For that reason I inform the House that I have on the Notice Paper a motion to disallow regulations made under that legislation. They are the most iniquitous regulations that have been introduced by this

Government in relation to this State's cost structure.

Reference is also made to the trust's role in providing industrial and commercial buildings. Last year, \$2,830,000 was spent on land, site development and the lease-back building programme, which was almost entirely arranged by the previous Government led by me. Much of this year's expenditure will be incurred in relation to the programme arranged by my Government. I commend this project, although I am worried that it has lost its impetus: since this Government came to office, few, if any, large industries have announced that they will set up in South Australia. The Housing Trust is therefore a tremendously important part of South Australia's industrial development structure, as it provides not only houses but also land and factories.

What is the Government doing to match this greatest development agency that South Australia has? It is the type of newspaper headline to which I am about to refer that is at present tending to destroy South Australia's industrial attractiveness. I know many people, particularly this Government's Ministers, have said, when they have been under the severe strain of questioning from the Opposition benches, that members should not inflame the situation obtaining or that their remarks were not helping to solve South Australia's industrial problems.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Hear, hear!

Mr. HALL: I am the first to admit that confidence is self-generating, and it is confidence, above all else, in the Government's ability to attract industry and to provide a viable profit-making area for industry that will attract it to this State. However, there comes a time when members of Parliament representing the State must speak clearly about what they see, and when they can no longer tolerate the hypocritical attitude of the Government which, on the one hand, talks of attracting industry to this State and sends its Treasurer abroad to attract it here but which, on the other hand, destroys at home the confidence that has been so carefully built up over many years.

It is not pleasing to read in the local press headlines such as "Employers attacked". Of course, the present Government does not like successful business. Indeed, the Labor Party has made this very clear over the years, and one does not have to sit opposite members of that Party for 12 years, as I have done, to

know that they dislike successful business enterprises. No members opposite would deny that. The member for Florey made his position quite clear. In almost every case members opposite have been critical of successful primary or secondary industry businesses. However, surely that is no reason for the Treasurer to be responsible for headlines, such as that to which I have referred in our local press, at one of the most critical times in this State's industrial development.

I say "critical" because factors exist within the Australian community that members of the Government do not even seem to recognize. The centre of gravity of the Australian population is more than ever shifting to the Eastern States, and South Australia has at least to maintain the advantages it has in costs, infrastructure, and confidence to keep its industries here, to develop them further, and to attract new ones. This will not be accomplished with the type of treatment employers have been receiving in this House in the last few weeks. I know that my statement will be easily misconstrued by my opponents, but I repeat that I am not an anti-unionist. In fact, I believe the action that is being irresponsibly taken by some unions today is greatly harming the union movement in Australia. Therefore, it is interesting to see that this is a view put forward by some of the more right-wing union members in Australia who are bringing motions before the A.C.T.U. Congress on this matter. I applaud this move, which is an attempt to keep union activities confined to actions on behalf of the members and to refrain from trying to govern from a union position when that union has no right to govern. Having said that, I regret the Government's continual one-sided advocacy in relation to industrial disruption. Many times in this House the Minister of Labour and Industry and the Treasurer have attacked employers, who have obeyed to the letter the awards under which they operate, who have broken no law, and who are willing to negotiate through the arbitration machinery. Yet this Government tends to adopt consistently the ploy that is being noticed by industry (and I warn the Government about this) that any attack on an award or any strike for any reason should result in some gift by the employer. No matter how recent the award or how long the agreement has to run (particularly in relation to B.H.A.S. at Port Pirie) and no matter what the legal consequences or the position of the company or the employer, the Government at Ministerial

level has consistently said that the company or employer should immediately give something. This is an open invitation to industrial anarchy.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Leader must link his remarks to the Loan Estimates. He cannot turn this into a debate on trade unions.

Mr. HALL: That is why I relate them to the Housing Trust, because \$26,500,000 is involved in supporting industry in South Australia. You, Sir, would be aware that tens of millions of dollars has been spent by the trust at Whyalla. I think \$100,000,000 has been spent at Whyalla, and I specifically draw your attention to the \$2,830,000 that has been allocated to the promotional work of providing land and industrial buildings. That is why I want to ensure that the money is wisely invested and is of promotional advantage to the State. I am not attacking unions in any way, but I am attacking Ministers for their one-sided advocacy. When dealing with the merits of a case, why should the Government immediately take sides? This situation would be fun if we were having a political battle, or if Government members considered that they were for unions and we were against unions, or if we were the "goodies" and they were the "baddies", but the situation is that industrialists are watching the Government, which does not seem to know or care.

The first reaction of some industrialists is that they should take their industry out of the State, but the Deputy Premier has suggested that these companies were going to expand to another State anyway or that it was only a minor part of the industry that was to be shifted. However, industry is watching and reading the Government. What new industries has the Government announced would be introduced into this State this year? It will be interesting in the next 18 months of this Government's administration to see how industry reacts to what the member for Florey said. He is an influential back-bencher: he has had a meteoric rise from the back-bench to the middle bench over several of his colleagues. Obviously, he is making for the front bench, and I hope he gets there soon, because anything would be an improvement. I urge the Government to promote him soon. The member for Florey speaks influentially of how Government members detest industry and profit-making: they suggest that industry must not come to South Australia if it wishes to make a healthy profit, because that would be wrong. The Treasurer and the Minister of

Labour and Industry have adopted an anti-company attitude in relation to their advocacy or their representation of industrial disputes.

I ask members what does this add up to. I believe it adds up to a return to the situation that applied in 1965-68. I would not have believed that the Government could again get itself into this sort of situation so soon. I should have thought that the 1965-68 experience would give the Treasurer (and some of his Ministers who were here at that time) the wisdom to avoid the obvious pitfalls in industrial development, yet we read, after the Government supported the strikers last week in this House, the editorial under the heading, "Industrial Matters". It is not a question (as members opposite would know in their innermost hearts) of who wins the debate, who makes the loudest noise, and who makes the best points. We debate matters and tell our people what we think, and we hope the public will hear our case, but the Government will win the vote. It is the public who should listen and look and, concerning industrial development, it is industrialists (considered by Government members as nasty people) who look and see what this Government is doing and will do to South Australia,

I assume that we hope to increase employment, that we believe unemployment figures are too high and should be reduced, that we want to provide as many jobs as we can for our young people (and additional jobs are required by those who are leaving country areas now), and that we want to increase our living standards, but to do all these things we must have a highly productive industrial base. However, Government members are denying the development of this highly productive industrial base by the policies they are advocating now. I believe that the Government has had the chance to rephrase its attitude: after all, it has been more than a year in office and has had the chance to rethink and at least take a neutral viewpoint about the situation. For everyone's sake, I hope it does. School buildings have been the subject of much representation in this Chamber for many years, and I take members back to the last year of Labor in 1967-68.

Mr. Jennings: That won't be the last year. I assure you.

Mr. HALL: I stand corrected, as always, by the member for Ross Smith. In the last year of the Walsh-Dunstan disaster of 1967-68, the Labor Government spent \$8,679,000 on school buildings. We came to office in 1968-69

and increased that amount by \$4,591,000: in other words, we increased it by more than 50 per cent in one year, to \$13,270,000. In our second year, we increased it by another \$2,200,000. So, we increased the amount from \$8,600,000 to \$15,500,000, an increase of more than 70 per cent in two years. We set a tremendously high target for this Government to follow, and it has not yet been able to match the increases that we achieved. Last year, in its first year of office, the Government spent \$17,885,000 and this year it plans to spend \$19,300,000.

All members appreciate the tremendous need to up-grade educational buildings; that does not mean that we do not have very fine buildings now, because there are some tremendously efficient, well designed and comfortable buildings in our education system. When one inspects them one's appetite is whetted to get more of them. They certainly increase the enthusiasm of the students who use them. I believe that all schools should have a good spine of solid-construction buildings so that at least the senior classes can use them in the more difficult years of education.

In conclusion, I point out that the Government, whilst increasing the amount spent on school buildings, is not increasing it at the rate at which the previous Government increased it. This is happening at a time when the Government has underspent by \$6,000,000 in connection with last year's Loan programme and it has a surplus of nearly \$15,000,000 in the Loan funds, which it intends to keep surplus. In the meantime the Government continues to experiment by giving public assets to private companies. This is reprehensible and is a misallocation of Government funds. I can only say that this year we see in full view the Government's policy—Labor Party policies. I support the Loan Estimates knowing that the capital programme of this State must proceed. I support them with regret, however, in connection with those areas that represent a waste of public assets.

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): I have examined the Government's proposals for financing the capital works programme in South Australia for 1971-72. These Loan Estimates are the second to be introduced by the present Government. When the Leader of the Opposition speaks in debates he usually shouts and raves, but he did not do so in the speech that he has just concluded: he usually makes outrageous statements, mainly for the purpose of being reported by the news media. Usually,

copies of what will be said have already been given to the press and, of course, we expect to see headlines in the press on the following day—and that happens. However, on this occasion the Leader spoke more quietly, but without conviction, mainly because he could not find many matters on which to criticize or censure the Government. He referred to the festival hall, transport research, housing, the Housing Trust's involvement in industrial buildings, industrial problems and school buildings. Most of these matters have already been the subject of questions in this place, so it is obvious that the Leader is not satisfied with the replies given by Ministers; of course, he does not have to be satisfied. As Leader of the Opposition, he has the job of continuing to pursue these matters to his satisfaction, although I am sure that he will never be satisfied. However, I believe that the replies given should have satisfied him.

He said that Ministers must get used to criticism; I am sure that Ministers accept criticism, so long as it is constructive. He said that the present Government was boasting of some items in the Loan Estimates for which the previous Government was responsible. That is true to some degree, but I point out to the Leader that that kind of situation must occur whenever there is a change of Government. The Leader at the same time also referred to some of the projects that were commenced when the previous Government was in office.

The total appropriation of \$142,940,000 involves the use, if necessary, of \$1,540,000, which was the balance in hand from last year's funds, and \$89,140,000, which has been allocated through the Loan Council as new funds by way of loan, subject to payment of interest and sinking fund. Of our allocation, \$28,760,000 is a grant, free of interest and repayment. A total of \$117,900,000 has come through the Loan Council—an increase of \$5,480,000, or 5 per cent. In his statement on the Loan Estimates the Treasurer said:

At the meeting of Loan Council in June last the Commonwealth agreed to support a total programme of \$860,000,000 for all State works and housing purposes. This figure is an increase of \$37,000,000, only 4½ per cent above the 1970-71 total of \$823,000,000, which included a special \$3,000,000 for Western Australia.

South Australia's share of the allocation is \$117,900,000, which, of course, could be larger. The Treasurer continued:

In our conferences and discussions between February and June, 1971, all State Governments were seriously concerned about the 1970-

71 trends, but they were even more concerned about 1971-72 and the longer term future.

Therefore, we cannot possibly escape the common problem. Members on both sides should view the Treasurer's statement with concern, because the problem affects not only this Government but other State Governments, irrespective of their political persuasion. As well as the sum that I have already referred to, semi-government borrowing approved by the Australian Loan Council is \$425,000,000, South Australia's share being \$21,450,000. This is to be allocated as follows: \$9,500,000 to the Electricity Trust, \$6,850,000 to the Housing Trust, and \$5,100,000 to the larger local government borrowers. We would like this amount to be bigger.

Turning to the District of Tea Tree Gully, I notice there is a direct reference, under the heading "Government Buildings", to the Modbury Hospital, \$4,500,000 being allocated for the continuation of that project. The Treasurer states:

The sum of \$4,500,000 is provided to continue work on the first stage of the new hospital at Modbury. \$2,497,000 was spent last year on the main hospital building comprising the ward block, surgical and casualty suites, outpatients department and the pharmacy. Work was also carried out on a new nurses home designed to accommodate 225 nursing staff. This work will continue in 1971-72 and it is proposed also to commence work on accommodation for resident medical staff and the hospital workshops. The estimated total cost of the first stage is \$11,900,000, and \$3,334,000 had been spent to the end of June last.

As the member for that district, naturally I am interested to read those remarks and I am anxious to see the project come to fruition. However, if the previous Government had still been in power, as much progress as has been made would not have been made. In view of the little money that was allocated to that project during the previous Government's term of office, it is obvious that the present Opposition was never really in favour of it.

I come now to schools, particularly school buildings. I see that \$237,000 was the final cost for the erection of the Modbury West Primary School, completed in 1970-71, and that \$255,000 has been allocated for the Highbury Primary School, at present in progress. Also, \$60,000 is allocated for major additions to the Holden Hill Primary School, of Samcon construction, to be commenced during 1971-72. Then \$355,000 is allocated for major additions to the Tea Tree Gully Primary School, to be commenced during 1971-72. This building is eagerly awaited by the staff and the schoolchildren, and by the

parents of children interested in this school. Also, Modbury Primary School is mentioned under the heading "Major works for which planning and design is proposed during 1971-72". I query this name. Perhaps it should be the Modbury South Primary School. When we deal with that line, I intend to ask a question on that. The Ridgehaven Infants School and the Tea Tree Gully High School are also mentioned as major works for which planning and design is proposed during 1971-72.

Other matters which are indirectly referred to in these Loan Estimates and which interest the people of Tea Tree Gully include the provision of sewerage facilities in new areas, \$1,790,000 being allocated for this purpose, and the continuation of the construction of waterworks under "Extensions, services and minor works", \$3,286,000 being allocated for that purpose. "Subsidies towards swimming pools, canteens, recreation halls, etc." attracts an allocation of \$400,000. On that line, I query whether included in the allocation for subsidies for canteens is an amount for the Modbury High School. Although this high school was erected six years ago and is overcrowded, nevertheless it still has no canteen. I support the first line.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I should like to be able to begin by saying that I listened with interest to the speech of the member for Tea Tree Gully and by congratulating her upon it but, unfortunately, I cannot because I found it difficult to hear everything she said. Unfortunately, those bits of her speech that I did hear seemed to me to be merely a regurgitation of the Treasurer's speech and not to take the argument very much further. I can, however, assure members of the Committee that I did hear the speech so well delivered by the Leader of the Opposition and I can congratulate him on what he said. He covered the field and left very little unsaid which should be said in this debate on the first line of the Loan Estimates. Therefore, I shall not take up much time, but there are one or two points in elucidation and support of what he said that I should like to make.

First, if one reads, as I am sure every honourable member has read, the speech delivered by the Treasurer, one is struck by the support that is given in line after line by the Commonwealth Government to our Loan programme (not only to South Australia as a member of the Loan Council but also in all sorts of ways), yet we know the policy of this Government is to kick the Commonwealth

Government at every conceivable opportunity, to blame it for all the State Government's own shortcomings and never to acknowledge that the Commonwealth does any good thing for the States. Yet, even in a document such as this (let's face it, a pretty dull sort of document) it is impossible not to see the subventions of the Commonwealth coming through.

Mr. Keneally: But do they do enough?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: So far as these figures show, the answer to that is "Yes, they do enough", because we are not spending even what we have. If we were overspent on Loan Account, it would be possible to argue that the Commonwealth was not doing enough—and I know the honourable member would like to do that because that is in line with the policy of his Government; but the Leader has pointed out that the balance left in the Loan Account is a big one. He has said how much it costs us to keep this money idle and he gives the direct answer to what the member for Stuart has said.

But let us look at some of the ways in which the Commonwealth helps us. First, there was the assistance granted in April, and that is referred to on page 1; on page 2 there are references to the transfer of payroll tax to the States and help to South Australia through the Grants Commission, and so on. Right throughout the document, one notes the help given us by the Commonwealth Government.

As I have often said, I am not happy about the financial relationship between the Commonwealth and the States; I think it is absolutely and utterly wrong that the States should be financially dependent on the Commonwealth, because if we are financially dependent we are dependent in every other way. I cannot see any way out of the dependence, short of substantial and significant changes to the Commonwealth Constitution. I know that in this matter the Labor Party speaks with two voices: its official policy is the abolition of the States and the creation of semi-autonomous regions; but, on the other hand, when it can and when it suits it, the Labor Party kicks the Commonwealth as hard as it can and tries to screw everything possible out of it.

Mr. Burdon: You were using both boots two years ago.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know about that.

Mr. Burdon: Things are different when they are not the same.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: One can say that of the opinions of the Government in this matter. The Leader has already made the point that we were kicked pretty hard between 1968 and 1970 for not spending the Loan moneys available for husbanding the resources of the State against the revenue deficits, but now this crowd in office is doing the same thing, and even more so. Therefore, the first point I make is that the Commonwealth subventions are significant and should at least be acknowledged, even though I do not like them. In dealing with that matter, I have referred to the second point that I intend to raise; that is, the large credit balance which has been left in the Loan Account and which it is estimated will be left there. This shows that we are not spending as much as we should or could be spending; we are leaving unused resources for which we must pay and which are bringing in no return. This is largely a matter of priorities, and the Leader has dealt with this as well. We on this side do not agree with the priorities that we see set out in these documents. The two matters to which I refer especially (again, following the Leader) are the proposals concerning the hotel in Victoria Square and the \$800,000 that we are being asked to vote, without knowing anything about its use at all, for the cultural complex, which I think is the term used. The Government prefers to use moneys for these purposes rather than for what we would call the more bread-and-butter purposes, such as schools and hospitals.

Mr. Coumbe: And teachers colleges.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and so on. This shows pretty clearly again the duplicity of the Government. It says it is a Government that stands for the people, yet it does not spend as much as it could or should spend on the basic facilities that are required for the community. I do not know whether a hotel in Victoria Square is justified but, as has been said, there is to be a new hotel opposite Parliament House. The old South Australian Hotel is to come down and a new monster hotel is to go up there. I do not know whether anyone has worked out how much hotel accommodation we need in this State, but yesterday I had the pleasure of meeting an American entrepreneur, a man who promotes conventions, and so on, all over the world, and I discussed these questions with him. As he pointed out (and this is common sense), we must have not only accommodation: if we are going to hold conventions, and so on, we must have large halls in which to hold them and we must have something

to attract people both to the location and to surrounding areas where they can relax and see something new.

It is all very well to go ahead and to have a new hotel built in Victoria Square in addition to the new accommodation that is being provided, but if we do that and do not also develop in the other ways to which I have referred (facilities for people to meet together, etc.), and if we are to have conventions here, our development will be lopsided and ineffective. Concerning the Government's proposal apparently to give away the site in Victoria Square for 99 years, the Leader has said enough, and I adopt his views on that.

We have had much trouble and controversy in South Australia about the building of a festival hall. It was the Leader when he was Premier who finally settled the problem of the site, and we noticed that when the present Party in power came back into office it was only too happy to adopt the work that had been done and to accept the site that had been chosen.

Mr. Hopgood: It was too late to change it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was not too late. Will the member for Mawson say which of the two sites he personally prefers?

Mr. Hopgood: I wasn't in Parliament at the time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I see; he will not answer the question. He is learning quickly from the front bench how to avoid answering a direct question. He will not give a straight-out answer to the question, because in all honesty he would have to say that he preferred the present site to the other site.

Mr. Hopgood: Rubbish!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Why does he not say so?

Mr. Hopgood: How do you know that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Because the member for Mawson would give the answer if he had any other answer to give.

Mr. Hopgood: Nonsense!

Mr. Langley: What happened when you were Minister; did you answer all the questions off the cuff?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and I think I did as well as any other Minister has ever done. However, this line on the Loan Estimates of \$800,000 breaches the conventions of Parliament. Traditionally, Parliament is told for what purpose money is to be used before it is asked to vote, yet here we are told virtually nothing about the use to which this money will be put. All we find in the speech is the following:

In addition to the normal annual appropriation of \$900,000 towards the theatre, a contribution of \$800,000 is appropriated in the Lean Estimates as a first instalment towards a cultural complex associated with the theatre, and which is presently under discussion with the City Council.

Nothing has yet even been agreed about this project: we do not know where it is, what form it will take, what the ultimate cost will be, who will use it, who will staff it, who will build it, or anything else. However, Parliament is asked to vote this money (to give a complete blank cheque to the Government), and I protest at it strongly. On the other hand, we find that less money (in net figures, anyway) is to be spent on school buildings than has been spent in previous years. The figures are set out in the Loan Estimates under the heading "Public buildings", and we find that the estimated payments in 1970-71 were \$16,500,000, the actual payments last year being \$17,885,409.

The proposed payments this year amount to \$19,300,000; that looks pretty good, but if we look at the proposed net payments we find that the figure is down to \$16,100,000, because of a subvention of \$3,200,000 from the Commonwealth Government. Therefore, the Government plans to spend less out of its own pocket on education and school buildings this year than it spent last year. In about the middle of June, in company with other members of Parliament, I attended a meeting in the Norwood Town Hall, at which education was discussed and at which were present the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science and our own friend opposite, the State Minister of Education. At the conclusion of the addresses all of the parties were handed, by representatives of schools in our districts, requests for memoranda setting out the improvements in facilities required at those schools.

I guess that several other members did what I did and read the request carefully, transmitting it to the Minister of Education, who was responsible, and asking him what he was going to do about it. As I did not get a reply for a while, I followed it up, as I have had to follow up other matters with Ministers, and asked for a reply. The gist of the reply I got was that the Minister was too busy to give replies at that stage and that he was preparing a general policy statement to be issued (as far as I know it has not been issued yet). He said that in his own good time there would be answers to specific matters but that, in the meantime, his

departmental officers were too busy to deal with them. That is a strange attitude for the Minister to take, in view of the things he said when in Opposition about the departmental expenditures and what they should be. He has much less enthusiasm now that he is in office than he had before he came to office. In spite of all these things that have been put up (and no doubt many more are known to the department which, after all, has a broad view of the picture), we find that a lower net amount is to be spent on school buildings this year than was spent before. How the Government can reconcile its attitude on education (it says that the crisis is over, and so on), with this lack of expenditure, I do not know.

Several other matters referred to in the lines can be more easily dealt with during discussion on the individual lines. I support the adoption of the first line because it is traditional to do so, but there is nothing in these Loan Estimates that need give the Government any pride or comfort; they are a lack-lustre set of Loan Estimates and have a number of deficiencies. They ask Parliament for authority to spend money in ways of which we are ignorant, and this should not be the case. I hope that when we deal with the lines both the matters to which I have referred and many other matters will be raised with the Government and that, for once, we will get some sort of answer from the Treasurer and the other Ministers.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I, too, support the adoption of the first line, and I intend to speak only briefly. It is pleasing to see that from last February's proposed deficit of \$11,500,000 we have now come to a nominal revenue surplus of \$21,000. It would have been far more pleasing if credit had been given where credit was due. I support the member for Mitcham in giving credit to the Commonwealth Government in this regard. It is a very different story when this Government is trying to find excuses for its inaction; it then blames the Commonwealth Government. However, it gives the Commonwealth no credit whatever when that Government comes to the party and provides the funds that the State needs. I believe that the holding of a "modest reserve of funds" is not desirable, no matter how much the Treasurer may say that it is. For one thing, as the Leader has said, a substantial sum is involved in interest. In addition, this money is so badly needed for so many other things. The Treasurer states:

The continuing pressures to provide more extensive and higher standards of services in education, health and social welfare are such

that there will be great difficulties in all States' finding in areas under their own control the additional revenue resources to meet them.

That is fine, except that we also have here \$10,000,000 which is not being used and on which we are paying interest. That money could be used for many other things. At random, I choose the matter raised in the Chamber some time ago relating to the replacement of deep drainage and sewerage facilities in some of the older suburbs, as we find that sewage from these systems is polluting the Torrens Lake in times of flood following flash rains. It will do the Minister of Works no good to say that it is weak effluent. He says that these mains must be replaced, so I am disappointed to see no provision made for the replacement of these essential services. Although it is necessary to provide sewerage services in new areas, it is just as essential to replace old sewerage systems which are no longer efficient and which present a danger to public health.

The Leader and Deputy Leader referred to the need for schools. I believe that this sum could well be spent on facilities to train teachers, as I think the lack of such facilities is one of our major problems. I am talking about one of my hobby horses when I say that I believe we may have schools enough and that the important need is for teachers. If we can train more teachers, perhaps we can make better use of the existing capital works represented in our schools. Although I am prepared to believe that it is necessary to construct more schools in some areas, I should very much like to know whether a cost analysis study has been made of the possibility of using existing facilities with more staff. For example, I referred recently to the proposal for a new high school at Rostrevor. Instead of building that school, perhaps some modification could be made to the facilities of the Kensington and Norwood Girls Technical High school when vacated and transport services used to bring people there from the Rostrevor area. I should like to know how the cost of this balances up against the continual repayment of interest on the sums of money being held in reserve. We must get value for money, and the need to get that value is more and more critical.

The heading in the Loan Estimates of "Transport Research" is delightfully vague; it states very little and summarizes the attitude of the present Minister of Roads and Transport. The word "research" explains everything! We see little attention given to direct and positive measures of reducing the road toll. We hear that an air-cushion vehicle is to be investigated

to provide a linear motor link in our suburban rail transport service. Unless there is some remarkable new development in linear motors, I think this is one area in which they are not feasible or efficient. As it takes a long time to propel an air-cushion vehicle to its maximum speed, it would be only by the time the train had reached Marino that it might be getting somewhere near its operating speed.

I must approve of the proposal to spend money on further construction at the Home for Incurables. Not only is this an important facility but it is also situated in one of the finest districts in the State. I believe the Leader and Deputy Leader have already dealt very well with the festival theatre and the associated facilities. Once again we are writing an open cheque, with no definite plans being available. If it suits the Treasurer to tell us, we will be told later about this; that is not a satisfactory way of running any business or budget.

Finally, I wish to say that I am most disappointed that no reference at all is made to the building of the hospital part of Flinders Medical School. I hope I may see this provided for in the next session: I sincerely hope so. I know that plans for the medical centre are being drawn, but it will be a happy day when someone moves in with a bulldozer and starts building the foundations. I support the first line.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I join the Leader in criticizing the maintenance of Loan funds at such a large amount. In the month of July the figure has increased by \$300,000 and I consider that this money should be used for the purpose for which it was borrowed, namely, the creation of solid assets that will bring back some return to the State in increased services or better education facilities. The Treasurer has said in this House several times that he believes in the Keynes theory on the use of money, but he has not put that theory into practice since he has been Treasurer. At present we have the second highest unemployment figure in Australia and vacancies are becoming fewer, so this is a time when the Government should be spending money to create jobs and activity in our industry and manufactures.

The policy being adopted at this stage is wrong, and it is entirely wrong to say that money must be retained to meet future Budget deficits. The States must learn to trim their expenditure according to the money available. During last year this State had the



biggest increase in revenue return from the Commonwealth Government and also had an increase of 24 per cent in money made available to it to spend in the State, and it is impossible for a State to continue spending at this rate. The gross national product is not increasing at anywhere near this rate, so the States are spending far too big a percentage and, to maintain that, taxes must be kept at an ever-increasing amount.

During the last financial year the Commonwealth Government provided in taxation reimbursement \$1,000,000 more than the increased amount that this State spends on education, hospitals, and social amelioration. The State cannot continue to spend at this rate. Although we know that we need these services, members of this Committee, particularly those who are members of the Public Works Committee, know what activities are being carried out and at times we see the lack of planning. Considerable saving in expenditure can be made and the same result achieved. The Government should employ outside efficiency experts to examine every avenue of spending.

Mr. Keneally: Would you be available?

Mr. McANANEY: The member for Stuart is always making facetious remarks. This requires experts in the particular field and, although I am an expert in several fields, I am not in this one. We need some organization like J. P. Young and Associates to make a value analysis. Such an analysis, to include an examination of our Public Service, which has been carrying on in the same way for many years, would be of tremendous value. For instance, there is a lack of co-operation between the Public Buildings Department and the Education Department. Every honourable member knows what goes on in that relationship.

Value analysis experts usually work as part of a team, which includes people from the client company as well as from the consulting firm. They select particular functions to be analysed then proceed to look at every aspect, for the purpose of identifying and eliminating every unnecessary cost, costs which provide neither quality, nor use, nor life, nor appearance, nor customer features. When value analysis techniques are applied to a function they concentrate on getting required performance at lower cost. I think this is definitely lacking in our administration.

When I say this I have the greatest admiration for the many sincere and honest people who work in the Public Service but, on the

whole, I am most critical of the administrative set-up. I think it requires new viewpoints and outlooks, so that money may be saved. I criticize the Government for not using money that is available to it. As the Leader has said, this money is costing interest and, if Government members were business people, they would have the money out on short-term loans so that the cost to the State would not be as much as it is. However, I doubt that the Government would do that.

The greatest Treasurer that South Australia ever had, Sir Thomas Playford, used to borrow money at extremely low interest rates from the Commonwealth Government, as he was entitled to do, to carry on the finance of the State and he let the money out on the short-term market and made a considerable profit from it. However, I cannot imagine an impractical Treasurer such as we have now doing something like that. He is a great man with words but, when it comes to facts and figures, he is the most visionary man that I have encountered in my short lifetime.

We must give credit to the Commonwealth Government for the amount of money it has made available to South Australia. We do not read of this in the *Advertiser* or in any other newspaper of the local press. That press criticizes everything that the Commonwealth Government does for this State, but the Australian press is not parochial in outlook. One section of the Australian press stated:

McMahon preaches gloom but practices charity.

Mr. McMahon may have run second to Mr. Gorton, the former Prime Minister, who broke the record and made the biggest increase in the amount of taxation reimbursements and loans granted to the States. Mr. McMahon saw the tremendous handout that Mr. Gorton had given to the States. I am pleased that \$500,000 will be spent in the provision for the River Murray Commission, or at least that the provision is made. I do not know that the Government will tell us what will be done with the money or whether the Government is optimistic enough to think that the other States may proceed with the necessary dam at Dartmouth. I think there is little chance that that dam will be proceeded with, and what a crying shame that is for the people of South Australia! If we have a run of three dry years, Adelaide will be without water: the Government is running a tremendous risk in not proceeding with the construction of the Dartmouth dam. In a

year like this, with much water in the river system, if the Dartmouth dam had been completed in May, 1970, the Dartmouth agreement would have come into operation last April, and South Australia would be receiving the increase of 250,000 acre feet. No-one, not even Tom Stott, has claimed that we would obtain this extra quantity of water from the Chowilla dam. Sir Thomas Playford did not claim that: he said we had to have Chowilla in order to obtain what we had been promised before. No-one has claimed that we would receive more water if Chowilla dam were constructed. We do not need a computer to work out what a tremendous advantage the Dartmouth dam would be to South Australia.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has to link his remarks with the Loan Estimates.

Mr. McANANEY: I refer to \$500,000 allocated to the River Murray Commission, and this is connected with works on the Murray River. My remarks are tightly linked with the Estimates. As one who lives on the lakes, I realize what a tragedy it would be for the lower river areas if the dam were constructed at Chowilla. Water would evaporate at the rate of 1,000,000 acre feet a year, and probably, because of the westerly winds, would produce more rain in New Zealand. This water would not be available to flush the lower regions of the Murray River and the lakes. With water being pumped from Murray Bridge, extra water would have to be pumped into the reservoirs in the spring so that fresh water would be available for Adelaide later in the year.

Mr. Curren: How much evaporates and goes to waste out of the lakes? Have you those figures?

Mr. McANANEY: I think it is about 600,000 acre feet, but we are not relying on that in our calculations.

Mr. Curren: That is an estimate?

Mr. McANANEY: This gives an example of how much evaporation is caused by a shallow lake. Chowilla dam is shallow, so that the honourable member has proved my argument conclusively, and I thank him. I agree with the member for Bragg about the Bedford Park Hospital; it is time that this hospital was being constructed. We know the Government's record about hospitals: it was to have built one at Modbury many years ago. Railway workers have come to me in the last

week and said that they were told the night before that they had to go on strike, and that they did not have a say about the strike.

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

Mr. McANANEY: Before the adjournment I had emphasized that there was extreme dissatisfaction at the retention of so much Loan money that should be spent in solving the unemployment problem in this State. I have heard the Treasurer say in this place that he believes in the Keynesian theory of the use of money and credit. The unemployment position in this State is the second worst of any State in Australia, and job vacancies are decreasing, yet the Treasurer is hoarding money for some future deficit in the budgetary accounts.

Mr. Langley: How is the building trade in this State?

Mr. McANANEY: This policy is most unsound and is to be deplored. The member for Unley has mentioned the building trade. As a result of its poor administration, the Government is not able to spend the Loan money, and possibly this is why there is so much money in the Loan Account.

Mr. Langley: We haven't got the tradesmen.

Mr. McANANEY: We have not got them back since they departed from this State between 1965 and 1968. With the increasing demand now, many of those people have come back, but it has taken them all this time to regain confidence in South Australia.

Mr. Langley: We are providing that confidence for them.

Mr. McANANEY: I know that much money is being allocated to the railways, which are an ever-increasing problem in South Australia. Despite the claim that the railways revenue increased by \$1,000,000 last year, a Treasury report at the end of June showed that this revenue had decreased by \$1,000,000. I know that we will be given the explanation that these are only cash figures and that the Railways Department is owed money. That was said 12 months ago when I asked the same question. Surely it cannot be claimed that the Railways Department's revenue has increased. Expenditure has increased by so much in the past year that there is now a loss on running expenses of well over \$5,000,000, and this is something that has to be faced.

The suburban passenger services lose a good deal of money. Either some expert has to decide on some alternative way of transporting passengers from the suburbs to the city or the railway lines have to be up-dated. I

believe that this is essentially part of the M.A.T.S. plan. The Minister of Roads and Transport now disowns that plan but at the same time takes every step as fast as he possibly can to see that it comes into being. In other words, he denies the birth of the baby that he is helping to nourish.

Improved railway services for Adelaide were featured in the M.A.T.S. plan. Apparently, the revenue from the Highways Department was insufficient to have financed the improvement in railway services over the years in which the plan was being introduced, and there was to have been enough money from road users to pay for the necessary roadworks. However, no-one knew where the money was to come from to improve the rail services that were to be updated under the plan.

The city of London has an underground railway system with many lines, but a relatively small proportion of people is carried by rail; 60 per cent are taken into the centre of the city by road. The Government must make an effort to bring our antiquated rail system up to date, and money must be spent on it, rather than on those country lines that are losing much money already. Cheaper alternative services are available in the country. The Government seems to think that, if people cannot be attracted to do something, they must be compelled to do it. The Railways Commissioner has suggested that people should be compelled to use the railways, despite the fact that in some cases a cheaper alternative service is providing the money to provide the roads.

For a long time we have heard that we will have a Director-General of Transportation. The process of appointing committees has now reached the stage where committees are inquiring into reports of committees, which in turn had inquired into reports of other committees. This has happened because committees have failed to adopt a commonsense approach to problems that could have been solved in the first place if they had been dealt with by committees that represented a wide cross-section of opinions and qualifications. The Matriculation class at the Oakbank Area School could have come up with a more practical approach to our transportation problems than Dr. Breuning did. Anyone can say that we should defer the matter for 10 years and hope for the best, but in the intervening 10 years there will be more congestion, more costs and more pollution. Something must be done soon.

If the Minister of Roads and Transport were honest, he would agree that he is really continuing with the M.A.T.S. plan; the sooner he owns up to that, the better it will be for South Australia. These Loan Estimates are commonplace; they lack an imaginative approach and they do not solve South Australia's problems. There is a negative attitude in connection with retaining Loan funds to meet a possible deficit in the Budget Account; that policy is highly deplorable. The Budget Account should be entirely separate from the Loan funds, which should be spent on productive items. By "productive" I do not eliminate school buildings, because in them we are educating children so that they can be more productive when they leave school. Loan money should be used for something of lasting value to the State rather than for making good a deficit in a Budget of an irresponsible Government that does not try to spend its money wisely in order to get the best benefit from it. It should employ experts to make its administration more efficient, because there could be many savings within the administration.

Mr. Langley: Tell us some of them.

Mr. McANANEY: If the member for Unley was a member of the Public Works Committee, travelled around, saw the various projects going on, visited the schools in his area and saw the duplication of effort and the waste of money going on, he would probably change his mind about these things. For instance, a changing room is built for a swimming pool and a year later it is discovered that the swimming pool is not operating because it will take four months to draw up the plans for the pool and then invite tenders.

Mr. Langley: Which school was that?

Mr. McANANEY: There are so many glaring examples. That was at the Oakbank Area School. Projects have been put before the Public Works Committee for the removal of wooden buildings that are as good as any school building that I have seen in America. These buildings are to be knocked down and replaced. I agree, of course, that many wooden buildings should be knocked down. For instance, I could show the honourable member a room at that school where the wooden floor is 1ft. higher on one side than on the other. I suggest that that type of thing should be eliminated. Anybody who works 15 hours a day could make some headway, but a man who works short hours (say, a

union leader) could not. I am not against unions. Increased production means better living conditions for the people of Australia.

There is a sequel these days to what happened before this Government came into power. The member for Edwardstown in the last Parliament used to scream, "Look at the seat-warmers on the other side!" There are about 10 seat-warmers on the Government side now who make no contribution to the welfare of South Australia. For instance, the member for Mawson makes no useful contribution to this House. He has come into this House at too early an age, and he has had no practical experience, but there is so much to be done. People in the Premier's Department will not attract one more industry. The Minister in charge of the rural reconstruction scheme gets applications of 23 pages and replies to them in three or four lines, saying "Your application has been refused." There are no public relations; there is no humanity in this crude reply to people who are being forced off their land. People working in the Public Service get a good pay cheque and have no worries, but the man on the land gets no sympathy.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Can the member for Heysen link up his remarks with the Loan Estimates?

Mr. McANANEY: Yes; there is a heading "Loans to producers". I think that covers it. Anyway, I think I have shown that people are disillusioned with this Government, and that the Treasurer's approach to finance is deplorable. Someone who claims to have a knowledge of financing Government projects but who fails to carry out his programme is more guilty than someone who does not claim to have that knowledge and who fails to carry out satisfactory financing. What is the reason for the Treasurer's attitude? Is it because he is flitting around the world telling other people what they should do? That is one of the problems experienced today: people are telling others what they should do but cannot run their own country.

On the matter of apartheid, perhaps we should examine our own situation: I believe that we are ashamed of the way we have treated our natives. We spend more money on our natives possibly than any other country in the world spends on its native population but we have not given the natives as many opportunities to advance as natives in South Africa may have received.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must draw the attention of the member for Heysen to the fact that we are dealing with the Loan Estimates, and he must link his remarks to this debate.

Mr. McANANEY: Mr. Chairman, I agree with you entirely. I think I have made the various points that I wished to make. I hope that the Treasurer will stay in South Australia long enough to consider these matters and adopt a sensible approach to financing, and that he will not blame the Commonwealth Government at every opportunity. Indeed, the Commonwealth Government has provided a 24 per cent increase in taxation reimbursement, but increases cannot continue at this rate, because this will reduce the total production. The Commonwealth Government has given this State reasonable treatment, but this Government will have to increase its efficiency in order to give the people the same degree of service that they have received in the past. The Government will have to get down to a more common-sense approach to financing, rather than continue to adopt the airy-fairy approach that we have seen over the last year.

Mr. HOPGOOD (Mawson): One, in a sense, has to sympathize with members of the Opposition when they speak to the Loan Estimates, because it is almost impossible to evaluate a Government's financial intentions without looking at both the Loan Estimates and the Budget; and, of course, members opposite at present do not have the Budget before them.

Mr. Coumbe: Do you?

Mr. HOPGOOD: Therefore, of course, we have been treated to a series of circumlocutions this afternoon. I think the Leader of the Opposition would have had to halve the length of his speech if there had been no reference to a hotel in Victoria Square. The member for Mitcham, his Deputy, was so scratching for material that he tried to get something out of an interjection I made, and I will deal with that in good time. Of course, we are an extremely thick-skinned group on this side. I am sure that, if some of the remarks just made by the member for Heysen had been made by someone on this side, his colleague the member for Alexandra would have taken at least six points of order within 20 minutes.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: He was very offensive.

Mr. HOPGOOD: From anyone else it would have been extremely offensive. He implied that former trade unionists should not have any

place in the Legislative Assembly. That is the best construction that one can place on his words. He implied that at the hoary old age of 32 I should not be in here because I am too young, even though his colleague the member for Eyre is, I believe, four years younger than I am. In fact, I am so old that I believe I qualify for a seat in the Legislative Council, and not everyone who has ever occupied a seat in a Legislature would be able to say that. What we would like to know from the Opposition (and I realize that it is somewhat handicapped because it is not fully aware of our intentions with regard to the Budget) is its attitude towards expenditure. Does it believe that we should be spending more or does it go along with the Commonwealth Government's belief that we should be spending less?

Last year, when this Government announced that it would not cut down expenditure on what it regarded as the essential services of education, social welfare and health, I got the distinct impression that we were under considerable attack from members opposite because we did not fall in with the wishes of the Commonwealth Government; there was all this talk of inflation and so on. Now today we hear statements, such as has emanated from the member for Heysen who, on the one hand, continues to abuse us for over-spending on certain things which he is careful not to specify and, on the other hand, criticizes us for holding back money. The honourable member cannot have it both ways. We await with interest further offerings from members opposite to try to clear up what seems to be a confusion in their minds. I realize that there is a difference in expenditure from Budget and from Loan, but there is still this basic contradiction. To give honourable members opposite their due, it may well be that they are trying to criticize the intention of the Government, based on a document that sets out only a portion of that intention, but it seems to me that certain criticisms have been made that might well have awaited presentation of the Budget so that comments made could be much more informed. We still await an indication from the Opposition whether or not we should be expanding these services.

Although we have received individual requests from members to provide these services nonetheless, when it comes to looking at the total programme of the Government, generally they abuse us for not falling in line with the announced intention of the Commonwealth Government to tighten the belt,

although what that Government has done about this seems to be rather meagre. Before dealing with matters affecting my district, I want to refer briefly to the small exchange that occurred between the member for Mitcham and me when he was discussing the festival theatre. I made the point by way of interjection—

Mr. Mathwin: Interjections are completely out of order.

Mr. HOPGOOD: Yes. I said that, when it came into office, it was too late for this Government to change the site of the theatre. The member for Mitcham, also completely out of order, then asked me whether I thought the site chosen was the best site. I declined to take him up then, because the answer I wanted to give was by no means as simple as the difference between black and white. Although I could be accused of wasting time, I now wish to expound briefly on this matter. As a person outside Parliament at the time, I was not all that struck by either site but on balance I would have chosen the Government House site. The other point I make (and I make it very strongly) is that it was not possible, without much inconvenience to everyone concerned, for the Government, on attaining office, to change the site of the festival theatre. Before the election there was a photograph in a newspaper showing the then Premier driving a bulldozer around the site of the festival hall. I simply make the point; was this just a pre-election gimmick? Was the Premier sitting on a piece of machinery on virgin soil for electoral effect, or were these serious earthworks? If they were serious earthworks (and I am willing to give the then Premier the benefit of the doubt, because I really do not think he would want to mislead the electors on something like that), what could possibly be done once the earth was turned over? However, if people will not be as charitable as I am in interpreting what the then Premier was doing, I leave that to their judgment, and I also leave the honourable gentleman to their judgment.

There is reference in the Loan Estimates to the provision of low-cost housing. I think that I spend probably as much of my time trying to assist people on housing matters as I spend on all other matters referred to me. Therefore, I am pleased that the programme will continue and I am pleased that portion of my district, namely, Christie Downs, will continue, with Ingle Farm and Elizabeth, to be one of the three major Housing Trust building sites in the metropolitan area. I know that

the trust has vast tracts of land in the south, extending to the Onkaparinga River and beyond, that will be developed in future, and we all look to the orderly development of these areas by the trust.

If I may just say something here on a matter that people in my district feel keenly about, I mention the feeling that at Elizabeth the trust built a city and built it very well and that in the south they put up some houses. In one sense, that comment is rather unfair. I know that far more planning and thought have gone into the matter than simply building houses, but I consider that the time must soon be coming for the trust to take up seriously the provision of facilities in the south for the people in the trust's houses similar to the facilities provided at Elizabeth.

I shall now deal with the matter of metropolitan sewerage, for which \$6,374,000 is provided. Probably half of my district is still unsewered and I listened with envy when the member for Bragg said that in some old-established areas sewer pipes should be replaced. The people in the south only wish that there were some sewers in their area that needed replacement. In fact, those people face years of having to put up with septic tanks. The Engineering and Water Supply Department has a rule of thumb (and it is something that any Government Department must adopt) that 70 per cent or 75 per cent of an area must be built on before sewerage facilities can be provided.

I realize that this, as a general rule of thumb, is only fair and equitable, and one can imagine all sorts of other ways of deciding whether an area should be seweraged that would not be as fair. However, I wish to mention the health aspect of the matter and the constitution of the soil, which in some cases must be considered in deciding whether an area should be provided with these services. The Christies Beach and Port Noarlunga part of my district has an entirely different type of soil from that in the Morphet Vale and Hackham area. The Port Noarlunga area has had some septic tanks in the ground for 12 years, but people at Morphet Vale fear for the health aspect in their area because of the continual pumping that has to be done as a consequence of the poor soil. I am pleased to see that \$223,000 is to be provided to complete the work at the Christies Beach Sewage Treatment Works. During the construction of this facility, I think any fair-minded person would have to

say that it was rather unsightly, but I am aware that the Engineering and Water Supply Department has considerable plans to beautify this area, and we look forward to these plans being carried out.

Turning now to education, I am pleased to see that provision of schools in the south is proceeding. In the appendices to the Treasurer's statement, under the heading "Major works to be commenced during 1971-72", I note that the Hackham East Primary School is to be provided with a Samcon school at an estimated cost of \$220,000, and that there will be further additions at Christies East Primary School (Stage 2 to cost \$478,000) and at Port Noarlunga Primary School at an estimated cost of \$128,000. The latter school is on a bad site, and the problem is not having enough room to reconstruct what is a very old and inadequate school. Under the heading "Major works for which planning and design is proposed during 1971-72" is included the Morphet Vale East Primary School. I think that this work is at a more advanced stage than this bald pronouncement would suggest, because the Public Works Committee inspected this site in the last two or three weeks.

Additions are also planned for the O'Sullivan Beach Primary School and the Seacliff Primary School, and there will be a new high school at Morphet Vale which, I understand, will be near the Stanvac Primary School. I particularly applaud the provision of this facility, because there has been some rather ill-informed criticism arising out of the provision of the comprehensive school on Beach Road at Christie Downs. Members may be aware that, originally, a high school was built on this site, then a technical high school was planned and built on it, but the two were amalgamated into a comprehensive high school. Instead of having, in a sense, two secondary schools of moderate enrolments, we now have in the south a large secondary school with a large enrolment, and this has been criticized by some people. The new high school at Morphet Vale will obviate the need for children to travel from the Reynella and Morphet Vale area, and will go a long way towards meeting some of the criticism of the large school at Christie Downs. Also, I hope that the department will continue its policy of providing comprehensive schools, and that the new Morphet Vale High School will be a comprehensive high school.

I now refer to two other matters: first, the reference to \$500,000 for research into new modes of transport. It has been interesting to hear criticism from Opposition members about this matter: I would not have thought that it was in the best interests of everyone to include much detail in the Treasurer's statement. If Opposition members require more information I am sure that the Minister of Roads and Transport will provide it when the lines are being considered. I regard it as rather spurious criticism to criticize this line because there is not much more explanation about it than is shown. The member for Heysen told us that our rail system should be updated. Well, what better way of doing this than by looking at some of the new means of urban transport that are available to us?

There has been talk, as we know, that the Government will legislate to extend the Lonsdale spur line to Christie Downs. I believe there is tremendous potential here, not only for goods traffic associated with the industries in the Lonsdale area but also with the burgeoning residential development in Christie Downs that I was talking about earlier. I make the point that this line will not get patronage unless there is rapid transit to the city, which is what is needed. Of course, the reason for the failure of the old Willunga line to provide this facility to the expanding areas that it passed through at Morphet Vale and Hackham was the speed limits that were applied on that line because of the grades, the curvatures, and the substandard nature of the railway line, which was first put down soon after the First World War. So if the new Christie Downs line is to be a success in terms of urban transport (and I sincerely hope it will be), it has to provide a fast transit system to the city.

I have not given up all hope for the land that the Railways Department still has in the old Willunga line. I believe that this line should be retained for a possible rapid transit system in the future. Such a service could possibly pass north from Reynella through the Happy Valley and Flagstaff Hill areas and so link up with other transit systems through to the south of the city. I am rather attracted by the concept of a busway on its own right of way, separate from other forms of motor transport.

Mr. Mathwin: A dial-a-bus system?

Mr. HOPGOOD: No, not at all. This would be simply an express bus having its own separate right of way. It would be a train running on pneumatic tyres. This is

something that is becoming fairly popular in other parts of the world, because the capital installation cost is no-where near as high as it is for the very heavy types of transport vehicle that we are using on rail at present, and it is something that I know the Minister of Roads and Transport is presently looking at fairly closely. A high capital cost is involved in putting on rail much heavier vehicles than are really needed for the transport of passengers.

The other point I want to raise concerns the provision of \$250,000 for foreshore protection. We believe that in the south we have the best beaches on this gulf, possibly in the State. The member for Mitcham may be prepared to back me up on that statement. We play host to him at the better times of the year, and I think he would probably agree that his choice of that part of the coast for disporting himself in the warmer months is by no means accidental. I have always been a great believer that what we should do with our beaches and foreshores is leave them alone. A beach has certain natural protective devices which, in a sense, have a sort of inbuilt conservation aspect. For example, sandhills act as a reservoir of sand. They collect windblown particles that the sea breezes blow off the beach, and at certain times return this sandy material to the beach.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the cliff at Port Noarlunga?

Mr. HOPGOOD: Perhaps I will come to that presently. Once the sandhills are removed, the natural reservoir of the beach is removed too. Then, there is the phenomenon of onshore drift, which arises from the fact that the prevailing winds approach our coast from the south-west. So, there is a net force driving sand northwards along the coast. Any barrier across the beach, such as that at Glenelg, will build up sand on the windward side of the barrier and deplete the quantity of sand on the other side. The onshore drift will continue to carry sand particles away from the lee side of the barrier, but there will be no consequent recharging of sand, because the sand is being built up on the windward side. So, the unnatural barrier has a deleterious effect on the coast.

The problem is that the beaches have not been left alone. In many places the sandhills have been removed and sea walls, which have this devastating scouring effect, have been installed. Moreover, we have groynes at some places along the coast. I therefore view with

much pleasure the report received last session. I believe that the driving mind behind that report was that of Mr. Robert Culver of the engineering department of the Adelaide University. The report said simply that sand must be carted from those areas where there is an unnatural build-up and dumped on to those areas from which it had been removed. All of that requires money. In some cases aspects of foreshore protection involve land acquisition and so on. Stockpiling of sand is necessary, and it is also necessary to cart sand from A to B or from A to C. The Government expects that an authority will be set up in conjunction with the councils concerned. This project will involve enabling legislation, which I hope will be brought down fairly early this session.

I join with the member for Bragg in hoping that it will not be very long before the south-western districts hospital and its associated medical school at the Flinders University really get under way. Like the honourable member, I am a member of the Flinders University Council, and we have therefore been privy to some of the discussions that have gone on with regard to this matter. We particularly look forward to a provision of this sort because it will provide much needed outpatient services for the people in the southern part of the metropolitan area. In the Mawson District and farther south there is a dearth of doctors. I realize that we are by no means unique in this respect. It is well known that, because some country towns have no doctors, the cadetship system is being expanded by the present Government. However, the fact that others are in the same position does not help us very much. In the Noarlunga area there is a serious need for a second medical practice to take some of the strain off the present Onkaparinga clinic and to enable doctors to make more home visits.

The next best thing we can hope for is expanded outpatient services, and I look forward to that with the coming of the new hospital at Bedford Park. I hope that, under a Commonwealth Labor Government, outpatient services will be provided free of charge and that we will come much closer to providing the sort of medical services in Australia that most civilized countries already have. I wish to announce that I am taking up a collection for the member for Heysen, because it is obviously a long time since he inspected the development at the site of the Modbury Hospital. It is high time he inspected that development. As there is no railway there, the honourable member cannot use his gold

pass. It would be unfair for him to have to pay his own fare, so we will toss a little into the hat to pay for it.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): The Committee this evening is being asked to agree to Loan funds amounting to \$119,440,000 after repayments of \$23,500,000, the gross figure being \$142,940,000. That compares with last year's estimate of \$113,220,000 and actual payments of \$110,665,922. This, together with the estimated surplus of almost \$15,000,000 in Loan funds, is a considerable sum. The Opposition's duty in this Committee is to see that the Government spends this money to the best advantage of everyone in South Australia. Is the Government doing just that? I will develop that point in a moment.

The member for Mawson concluded his speech with an invitation to my colleague the member for Heysen to visit Modbury, but I wonder how long it is since the honourable member himself looked at the facilities at Modbury. I was there yesterday, so I know what is going on. The honourable member said that the Opposition was under a handicap because we did not know the Government's intentions and plans for the Budget, which comes into this Chamber next month. It is true that we do not know; we should not know. The only inference I can draw from that is that the honourable member is privy to the Government's plans for the Budget. If that is so, both he and the Government are acting improperly because, as every member who has been in this Chamber for some time should know, Budget details are private to the Ministry. I can only be charitable to the honourable member, who has been here for only a short time, and say that he was speaking in an inexperienced manner and without a knowledge of the facts. It is possible that he has been told of some broad details of the Government's intentions about its Budget programme. If that is so, members on this side certainly do not know them and nothing that has been given us in answer to our questions, asked in vain, trying to get information brings us nearer to knowing the Government's intentions than we knew before we asked the questions.

This year's Loan Estimates (Parliamentary Paper 11A) is similar to last year's. It begins by saying that the Government budgeted for a deficit and finished up with a modest surplus in revenue. How has that come about? The Treasurer's statement tells us how. I am the first to admit that revenue-deficit problems



are faced by every Government but the Treasurer said that he was expecting to have a considerable deficit when he introduced the Budget last year. The Revenue Budget presented last September indicated a 1970-71 deficit of \$4,896,000. However, he finished up with a nominal revenue surplus of \$21,000. Why? The Treasurer said, first, that some of the taxation measures introduced last February by his own Government had been implemented and that they would bring in \$6,000,000 in a full year, or \$700,000 in the financial year just concluded (details of this were at page 3491 of *Hansard*). The Treasurer then referred to "an offer of special assistance by the Commonwealth Government in April, supplemented by a much greater than expected increase in general financial assistance grants", and this enabled the State to finish with a surplus of \$21,000 in Revenue Account.

We on this side are getting a little tired of hearing Government members on every possible occasion blaming the Commonwealth Government for every ill. But here, the Treasurer is being forced to admit in his printed statement that, because of the exceptionally high financial assistance grants made by the Commonwealth Government, he can finish up with a modest surplus of \$21,000 instead of a deficit. Later, the Treasurer said:

The largest variation was an increase of almost \$1,300,000 for the loans to producers activity, as the Commonwealth made a special contribution as its half-share with the State in reducing the outstanding debt of canneries adversely affected by oversea marketing problems.

Although we do not normally refer to revenue items in Loan discussions, I am merely using the Treasurer's own words. The Treasurer referred to the net effect of repayments and savings and other measures which resulted at June 30, 1971, in a Loan surplus of nearly \$15,000,000. Well, good luck to the Government, but it is rather ironical that members of the present Government, when in Opposition, chided us because we had, under the good housekeeping of Sir Glen Pearson (the then Treasurer), reached a figure of about \$12,000,000. What sum has been given to the State this year? South Australia's share of the total is \$117,900,000, and that is \$5,480,000 above the allocation of last year, an increase of almost 5½ per cent. This is according to what the Treasurer said, yet I refer to another example of muddled thinking, namely, the Treasurer's remarks at page 3491 of *Hansard*, of February 23 last.

At the time, the Treasurer was introducing his special taxation revenue measures to bring in about \$6,000,000 in a full year, although this was before he introduced the entertainment tax and then took it off virtually the next day. I do not know what the additional entertainment tax was going to bring in, but the Treasurer removed the tax.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Don't you think he should have?

Mr. COUNBE: I agree that he should have; I said so at the time. I cite here an example of the Treasurer's muddled thinking, when in February last, referring to Loan Account, he said:

The indications from the Commonwealth at the conference three weeks ago were that we could not expect support of Loan programmes at all significantly greater in 1971-72 than in 1970-71, and there is undoubtedly some serious risk of the Commonwealth seeking to impose a reduction.

Far from imposing a reduction, the Commonwealth got to work and has given South Australia an increase of about 5½ per cent or \$5,480,000. I believe the Commonwealth is right in doing that. I have read out the reasons given by the State Treasurer for thinking that the Commonwealth would seek to impose a reduction.

Mr. Simmons: Are you talking about the present Treasurer?

Mr. COUNBE: Yes. I am sure that all members support the increased housing allocation. The total allocation to South Australia consists of \$28,760,000 by way of grant (free of interest and repayment) and \$89,140,000 by way of loan, subject as in the past to payment of interest and sinking fund. The Treasurer has often referred to his difficulties with regard to Revenue Account. I recall that an agreement was reached on payroll tax whereby the Commonwealth would vacate the field, and this tax would go to the States. This is a boat type of tax—one that goes up year by year as a country's standard of living rises. I asked questions in this place to obtain information as to the effect this would have on State finances.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot allow discussion on taxation during a debate on the Loan Estimates.

Mr. COUNBE: The Treasurer has referred to payroll tax arrangements. I think it is germane to this Committee to look at the effect of that.

The CHAIRMAN: Not for the purpose of debating the question.

Mr. COUNBE: I will just say what the effect is, if you will allow me, Sir. The revenue from this tax to the State would be about \$2,150,000 this year. If the tax is increased by 1 per cent, as suggested, this could raise the sum collected for the remainder of the year to \$6,750,000 and up to possibly \$9,000,000 in a full year. Also, I point out that the Commonwealth Grants Commission last year recommended a grant of \$5,000,000 for South Australia. The Treasurer has said he expects that the grant for the coming year will be considerably more than \$5,000,000. Although I have looked through these documents fairly carefully, I cannot see where the effect of this extra grant will be felt. To pick out this item, I will have to wait until the Revenue Estimates are introduced.

In the Loan Estimates, in the provision for Highways and Local Government, we see that last year \$1,000,000 was provided for roads and bridges, whereas this year nothing has been provided. This staggered me. Traditionally, the item in the Loan Estimates is for the construction of bridges and I should have thought that, because of the large number of roads that must be built in the State, some bridges would have been built somewhere or other. I should like to be told later why we are not building bridges or why there is no allocation provided for roads and bridges.

The next item I mention is the provision for Marine and Harbors. When I was Minister of Marine, I was able to get the provision for harbors accommodation increased each year but, unfortunately, the provision is now going down. Last year \$5,306,751 was spent on extremely essential work, some of which had been started when the Hall Government was in office and completed recently. Now there is a drop to a proposed expenditure of only \$3,250,000, a drop of about \$2,000,000 in one departmental line. I looked at the accompanying document for an explanation but I found only a few bald statements about what would be done. I regret that the provision for this department has been cut in this way, because there is a definite need for harbour development throughout the South Australian seaboard, whether in the gulf, on the West Coast, or on the South-East coast. If we do not have harbours with proper facilities, we cannot expect vessels to trade with the State.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Have you read the first paragraph on page 7 of the Treasurer's Financial Statement, about the over-spending in 1970-71?

Mr. COUNBE: Yes, I am perfectly aware that there was over-spending. The estimated expenditure on this item was \$4,500,000. The Minister is hedging as usual and trying to cover up, as I remember he covered up an item and spent only about \$8,000,000 on schools in one year. I am disappointed that the provision for Marine and Harbors has been reduced. You, Mr. Chairman, as a member representing an important port in this State, will agree with me on that.

I shall now deal with the provision for Public Buildings. The Government has many times expressed the normal sentiments about wanting more hospitals, nurses and doctors and about the need to look after the health of the people of the State. I hoped to see a large increase in the amount to be spent on hospital buildings. However, in 1969-70 the amount for hospital buildings was \$11,073,000; last year the amount actually spent was \$10,668,000; and the net amount this year is \$11,450,000.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The figures you are quoting were net, not gross: you are being inaccurate.

Mr. COUNBE: I am quoting from the Auditor-General's Report: does the Minister say that that report is inaccurate?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The first lot of figures you quoted were gross and the second lot were net. You are comparing gross and net figures. You should make the correct comparison between the figures.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. COUNBE: As the Minister is so pernickety, I will quote the figures from the Auditor-General's Report. In 1969-70 the figure for hospital buildings was \$11,073,714; in 1970-71 the estimated payments for hospital buildings were \$11,100,000.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That is gross.

Mr. COUNBE: Of course it is: the actual payment was \$10,668,988. The proposed amount for this year is \$11,950,000, estimated repayments \$500,000, with net payment of \$11,450,000. What is the Minister cavilling about? In the first instance I used the same comparison for the three items.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You did not quote the repayment figure in the first place.

Mr. COUNBE: I used the same comparison. However, I suggest that the Minister has the privilege (as has every member) to get up on his legs if he is game to and speak to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You should quote the figures accurately.

Mr. COUMBE: I always try to do that. The Minister was talking about school buildings a short time ago, and he is proposing to spend this year a record figure of \$19,300,000 gross. Last year the estimated payments were \$16,500,000 and the actual payments were \$17,885,409. This year he is to receive a recoup from the Commonwealth Government of \$3,200,000, whereas the recoup last year was \$2,300,000 so that the amount received from the Commonwealth has increased. Spending on other Government buildings has been reduced. This is unfortunate, but we finish up with a net figure, after recoups, of \$32,710,000 for public buildings, and the actual payments last year—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What was the net payment last year?

Mr. COUMBE: The net payment was \$35,086,938.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That is a gross payment.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, I am perfectly aware of that. With regard to school buildings, I had a close look at the Treasurer's statement. It is rather difficult, unless one goes through every project that has been referred to the Public Works Committee, to see exactly how the sum total is arrived at. Certainly, there is an annexure at the back of the statement. This shows that work is to be completed on 46 projects that were started last year. Of the total of \$15,600,000, the completion is to take care of some \$7,618,000. The new projects to commence total 43 and they have a total value of \$12,941,000, so obviously with fewer projects and a slightly lower value there must be some different type of structure in some of these schools. The amount to be allowed for this year is \$3,950,000. As I said, it is most difficult for a member to see what these are and what the exact amounts are without going through the annexure at the back and going through every project referred to the Public Works Committee.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Even the annexure is not accurate.

Mr. COUMBE: Is the Minister saying that the Treasurer's statement is inaccurate?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: No; there are some projects which have not yet been approved by the Public Works Committee but which

will be started before the end of the year. These are not yet included in the annexure because they have not yet been approved.

Mr. COUMBE: I thank the Minister for that comment. When I was a member of the Public Works Committee I always understood it was a principle that nothing went on the Loan Estimates until it had been approved by the committee.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That is exactly right.

Mr. COUMBE: Am I to understand that the Government has included in these Loan Estimates items which have not yet been approved by the Public Works Committee?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: No.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Gladstone High School will start before the end of this financial year.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. COUMBE: The notation I am speaking of commences with the words "The commencement in 1971-72 of 43 buildings". I am not referring to the other works that are in progress.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Gladstone is not on the list but it will be started.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There can be only one speech at a time. Interjections are out of order. The member for Torrens is addressing the Committee.

Mr. COUMBE: Thank you, Sir. The other items on school buildings were touched on earlier today by my colleague, and I will not weary the Committee by going over those again. We have to look at how the Government is spending the Loan money. It has now accumulated a surplus in the Loan Account of some \$15,000,000, and this is something about which the Minister of Education, when he was the member for Glenelg sitting on this side of the Chamber, was so vociferously vituperative in his criticism of the then Government. The Minister, who has been so persistently interjecting, was critical of the then Government for hoarding, as he said, a nest egg of \$12,000,000. His cry then was, "Why can't we spend this on new schools?"

The Government now has about \$15,000,000 on hand. Did I hear the Minister protesting that this surplus should be reduced and more school buildings erected? He may have protested in Cabinet, but of course he is only one of ten. The principle of responsible Government is that the Cabinet collectively agrees or else it resigns.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It didn't happen in Canberra.

Mr. CUMBE: In connection with the school-building programme, the Minister for once would agree with me that there comes a time when there is a limit to the physical resources available, quite apart from the funds available, for increasing the school-building programme. I am not talking now about amenities and other desirable facilities. There comes a time when there is only a limited number of tradesmen to do the work; when there is only a limited number of architects (whether they be Public Buildings Department architects or architects in private practice) to draw plans; and when there is only a limited quantity of materials available. These factors have to be balanced against what the Government wishes to do in a year.

Today the Leader referred to the rate of increase in expenditure over recent years. Members will see from the Auditor-General's Report how expenditure has consistently risen from an all-time low in recent times of \$8,600,000 in 1967-68. The Minister has claimed that there is an increase this year, and so there is. However, there will come a time when the rate of increase will be most difficult to maintain. If the present Minister is still in office next year, I doubt whether he will be able to maintain that rate of growth, but let me make it plain that that does not mean that we do not want more schools.

Mr. Hall: It depends on whether he disgorges the \$15,000,000.

Mr. CUMBE: The Treasurer has said that he may possibly use \$1,500,000 of it, but he would rather not do so; he would be very reluctant to break into the nest egg to the extent of \$1,500,000. At present \$15,000,000 is attracting interest, because it must be serviced. I imagine that the Treasurer is worried about his revenue deficit, but he has already said that he will have a modest surplus this year because of the increased grants handed out by the Commonwealth Government. We will see what happens to the \$15,000,000, but I hope the Minister sleeps easily tonight when he remembers how he criticized us when we put aside \$12,000,000.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: But that was in a year when you had proposed to increase expenditure on school buildings.

Mr. Hall: Rubbish!

Mr. CUMBE: The Auditor-General's Report states that expenditure was increased from \$8,600,000 to \$13,200,000 and then to \$15,500,000.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That is actual expenditure.

Mr. CUMBE: I am talking about achieved results: that is what counts in this world. It is traditional to support the Loan Estimates, and I support them. However, I reiterate that it is the important duty of an Opposition to scrutinize documents and figures of this kind, especially as we are asked this evening to approve a record sum, including this \$15,000,000. When the Revenue Budget comes into the Chamber and is considered in Committee, we shall be looking at that item even more closely. I formally indicate my approval of the Loan Estimates.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I, too, support the Loan Estimates, and the remarks of the previous speaker, because he highlighted certain features of the Loan Estimates that needed to be emphasized to the Government. The Treasurer's explanation of these Estimates states:

At the beginning of 1970-1971 Revenue Account had recorded accumulated deficits of \$4,579,000. The Revenue Budget presented last September indicated a 1970-1971 deficit of \$4,896,000, but this figure took no account of likely substantial increases in expenditures as new wage and salary awards became operative.

In the last financial year the Government finally recorded a small surplus of \$21,000. We now find that it intends to spend on capital works \$119,440,000, an increase of \$6,220,000 (or just over 5 per cent) over last year's estimated payments of \$113,220,000. This has been provided for by grants from the Commonwealth Government, but one thing that is not clearly indicated in this statement is that this State was awarded only \$117,900,000 as its share, whereas the Government intends spending \$119,440,000. Therefore, we find later in the statement that the Government intends to use \$1,540,000 held in the credit balance of the Loan Fund, so the Loan Fund of \$14,811,000 will be depleted by \$1,540,000. This is not spelt out clearly in the report; it is hidden in a mass of words from one page to another. It is about time the Treasurer took positive steps to present a clearer statement of what is going on to Parliament and to the people of South Australia. He is in the fortunate position of having a surplus of \$14,811,000 in the Loan Fund so that, if he is in difficulty, he can call on that money to prop up the forthcoming Budget. He is also lucky because the Commonwealth Government has now handed over the collection of the payroll tax to the States, and this State will immediately increase it by 1 per cent, which

represents an overall increase of 30 per cent. So the Government is in a good position to obtain revenue in the next financial year.

The sum of \$1,500,000 is provided for work on the south-western suburbs drainage scheme. As I said last year, this scheme was commenced on a budget of about \$3,000,000. However, already \$8,365,000 has been spent, and it is estimated that a total of \$11,000,000 will be required to complete the scheme. Many of the councils concerned have had to increase their rates, and in Glenelg the council rates have risen this year by as much as 50 per cent. These increases have been necessary in order to meet the loan repayments under this scheme, even though the money has been borrowed on a 53-year term.

In Glenelg, the great problem is one of preventing rubbish from entering the Patawalonga Lake from the cemented section of the Sturt River. When the works are completed, all sorts of other work will be required in Glenelg. One thing that has been kept quiet from the people in the area is the demolition of the Anderson Avenue bridge, a small wooden bridge that carries one lane of traffic at a time. This bridge, which was condemned some years ago as being unsafe, is still in use and, when it is demolished, thousands of people, particularly from the migrant hostel, Novar Gardens and Glenelg North will be denied access to the beach. The council does not want to do anything about this matter; nor, apparently, do the authorities. Of course, there will be a new bridge across the basin, but this situation is a farce, because the Highways Department is not too sure about what will happen in the area; nor is the Department of Civil Aviation; and no-one seems to know what is going on.

The south-western suburbs drainage scheme has not been a good scheme, and it has created a problem concerning the huge volume of water from the Sturt River which is channelled into the Patawalonga Basin and out through the locks. It is difficult to understand why a drain was not cut directly from the Sturt River through the Patawalonga Basin and out to sea; although the sewage treatment works are in the way, a system could have been devised, even if pipes had to be taken around the treatment works. Large volumes of water cannot be made to take a sharp turn (in this case, to the left). The silting up of the Patawalonga Basin is a great problem and efforts to solve it will add to the cost. The major financial burden is being carried by most of the councils in the area.

There is a problem also in relation to the drainage scheme and cementing of the Sturt Creek. After heavy rains in the winter, many houses in the Novar Gardens and Glenelg North area have been flooded. The drains were built many years ago, and are now under the level of the water that remains in the Sturt Creek. As water cannot run up hill, flooding has resulted. Thousands of dollars worth of damage has been caused by flooding in this area, and most insurance companies refuse to accept claims for the damage. This has all come about because of a scheme which I believe should never have got off the ground.

In the Loan Estimates, another \$982,000 is provided to continue work on major extensions at the Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works, the estimated total cost of which is \$2,930,000. The proposed extensions will increase the capacity of the plant by about 40 per cent. A sum of \$127,000 is also provided to complete extensions to the effluent utilization works at the Glenelg treatment works to permit maximum use of reclaimed water by the surrounding recreation areas and the Adelaide airport. Nothing is said about whether anything will be spent on checking the effluent that is being pumped into the sea. My constituents tell me that effluent from the works pumped into the sea has killed marine growth and is contributing to the drifting of sand from the area. Professional fishermen claim that there has been a loss of seaweed in a semi-circle from the sewage pipe outlets and that sand is now drifting into the gulf. We can have all the theories and tests we like, but the only way to check beach erosion is to live in the area and witness what happens each day through the year. The people who really know about this are those who have lived there for 30 or 40 years. I have seen the whole pattern change at the foreshores of Glenelg and West Beach.

A sum of \$250,000 is provided for beach and foreshore protection, but the \$64,000,000 question is where the money will be spent and how. The member for Mawson referred to the Culver report, suggesting that the sand should be carted and dumped on the beach, but we have to find graded sand of the type that will be suitable to the beach. This suggestion will not solve the problem, because the wave action at our beaches will only wash the sand out into the gulf again. Beaches near the treatment works at Glenelg North are suffering from the disappearance of marine growth, and there is nothing to stop the sand drifting away. Obviously the Minister

will not accept the fact that the treatment works has contributed to the loss of marine growth. The Minister for Conservation has been very quiet about what is contained in the final report of the beaches and foreshores committee. I asked him some time ago whether I could look at the report, but he is sitting on it; I hope he will release it soon, as we must know what is happening. We must develop some practical method of preserving and reclaiming our beaches and foreshores. Several methods can be used. The groyne at the Patawalonga has been controversial but it was well constructed and has stood up to what it has had to face. Sand has built up on the southern side. The only thing to do is construct a series of groynes along the coast. I think that is the solution, instead of depositing sand. Of course, we could use the oversea method of portable groynes, but I do not suppose the Minister has heard about that. Dumping sand on the beach will not solve the problem, because the sand will wash up along the beach in future years.

Mr. Mathwin: That method is used in America.

Mr. BECKER: It may be all right there but our gulf structure is entirely different from the West Coast of the United States. We must rely on information given by persons who have lived near our beaches for many years and who can remember shacks being built in front of the sand and cars being driven on to the beach at Glenelg or West Beach. That cannot be done today, because over the years from 6ft. or 10ft. of sand has been lost.

It is pleasing that the Government, with Commonwealth assistance, has increased the provision for housing. Last year there was an allocation of \$11,750,000 for the Housing Trust, \$13,250,000 for the State Bank and \$1,900,000 for the building societies. This year the amount is increased but, of the housing allocation, building societies will receive an estimated \$100,000 extra. The State Bank and the Housing Trust will be the main lending authorities for housing, in terms of these Loan Estimates. The building societies are being given a poor deal. If the Government wants to help private enterprise and the building industry, it should contribute more money to the building societies by doubling or trebling the present allocation. Building societies do a worthwhile job in helping young people but the State

Government is starving them of funds, and this action affects the building industry. Tendering for the Housing Trust is extremely competitive and has seriously affected the operation of many builders in South Australia.

Mr. Simmons: Don't you believe in competitive tendering?

Mr. BECKER: I do, but I do not believe in sending builders bankrupt in the process. I have known many builders to go bankrupt, and the trust would also know of that. The money can do more for the State if it is channelled through the building societies. We have heard much about education in this Chamber and the Minister has been able to whip up enthusiasm. It is interesting to note that, major works were in progress at 31 primary schools on June 30, but only five of these schools were in Liberal districts. Of the three high schools at which major additions were in progress, one was in a Liberal district. Of the eight library buildings to be provided, only one was in a Liberal district, although it is pleasing to note that that was at the Plympton High School. No major works are to be commenced at schools in Liberal districts in the next financial year and major additions will be carried out in only five schools in Liberal districts, whereas major additions will be undertaken at a total of 31 schools. Major additions will be carried out at two high schools, none of which is in a Liberal district.

I shall deal now with major works for which planning and design is proposed for 1971-72. We see that 10 primary and infants schools out of 38 are in Liberal districts; for high schools, four out of 11; and there is a great improvement in area schools, because four out of four are in Liberal districts. These figures prove that Opposition members are not getting a fair go. I should like to know how much money the Government has allocated for capital works in the district of the Minister for Conservation in the last 12 months. It is trying to buy that district for him, and he knows it. It is even talking about something as airy-fairy as a train line from Henley Beach. I support the first line.

Mr. WELLS (Florey): I congratulate the Treasurer on an extremely businesslike and comprehensive review of the expected expenditure for the State for the next 12 months. However, I should like to comment about some of the statements made by speakers in this debate. The Leader had much to say about providing a \$600,000 block of land in Victoria Square to a firm that would be

required to build upon it a modern first-class international standard hotel. The Leader said that I would object because this was a capitalist firm (or words to that effect) and that it would be profit-making. He said I objected to big business. I correct that very erroneous impression: I am not opposed to business at all. I firmly believe that any business is entitled to return a reasonable profit according to its capital outlay, but I object to profiteering.

Mr. Venning: What percentage would you suggest?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. WELLS: I maintain that, if such a firm came to South Australia, it would be in line with the decision made by all Ministers of Tourism, including the Commonwealth Minister, who agreed that it was essential that such hotels be provided throughout Australia, particularly in capital cities. Those Ministers also agreed unanimously that it was essential to provide incentives to these people to build this type of hotel. I believe it would be a good venture, but I assure the Leader that, if this hotel eventuates and I think that profiteering and exploitation of workers are taking place, I will raise my voice in this place and make my opinions known. I believe that big business is entitled to a reasonable return for its capital outlay, but I also believe that the enormous profits that have been indicated by the balance sheets of particular combines that I spoke about in a recent debate show that they are doing either one of two things: they are either overcharging or cheating the consumer or they are depriving the workers that develop and produce the wealth for them of a just portion of the profits made from the products or activities of the firm.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Have you worked out the profits as a percentage on the capital outlay?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. WELLS: The Leader knows that no fresh expenditure has been incurred with respect to this block of land. The Government possesses it and is paying about \$30,000 a year in interest on it. It is used as parking space for a few cars. If the Treasurer and the Government can use that block to the great advantage of the State they should be applauded, not castigated, by Opposition members.

Mr. Hall: Should we applaud you for giving it away to overseas interests?

Mr. WELLS: We are not doing that. If a hotel is built on the block, others will be

attracted to share in the wealth of this State that is engendered by the Labor Government. The Leader also claimed that the Treasurer had attacked the employers of this State, but that is not correct. What the Treasurer said was that he deplored the employers' attitude in connection with the Uniroyal strike, and I do, too. The employers refused point blank to go to conciliation and arbitration, which they have always said should be the basis for settling claims.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot allow the debate to proceed on a matter that has no relation to the Loan Estimates.

Mr. WELLS: I wish to link my remarks to the Loan Estimates by saying that a tourist hotel is to be built on the block of land under discussion, and the trade union movement of this State will be responsible for building that hotel. It is therefore essential that we have a contented work force in this State.

Mr. Rodda: Are the workers of this State discontented at present?

Mr. WELLS: They are still recovering from 20 years of disgraceful Liberal Government during which time South Australia was a low-wage State. Never let me hear the honourable member bemoan the fate of primary producers; their situation in respect of subsidies has never been better. In connection with the Leader's claim that the Treasurer had attacked employers, I point out that the Treasurer said that he deplored the action of some of the unionists in this matter.

Mr. Hall: When?

Mr. WELLS: He said that today. It was only last night or today that we were aware that the unionists had decided that they would ignore a recommendation—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot and will not allow the debate to proceed in connection with a statement that is outside the scope of the Loan Estimates.

Mr. WELLS: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman. I shall refer now to the construction of harbours and wharves. Certain figures were given and I have no doubt that they are accurate. I am pleased to know that progress is still being made in this area, because \$450,000 has now been allocated for the completion of the passenger terminal; and \$500,000 is being provided for a new roll-on-roll-off berth at Port Adelaide. This essential provision must bring great benefits to the State. Also, \$450,000 has been allocated to commence the building of a high capacity bulk loading installation to cost \$7,050,000 on

completion. This in itself should attract the greatest possible praise from the Opposition, particularly the rural representatives in this Chamber.

Proposed expenditure on school buildings is \$19,300,000, an increase of almost \$3,000,000 on last year. Again, that is a great achievement, and the Government should be applauded for its activities in that respect. I have heard nothing from members opposite about the people of Kangaroo Island, who have been suffering great difficulties and strain because of their transport problems, but once again this Government is facing up to the problem and providing a solution, because \$900,000 is allocated for the provision of a ferry to alleviate the conditions suffered by the people on Kangaroo Island under the Liberal Party, which made no attempt to assist them with their transport problems. The Government has done an excellent job over the past year, but even more kudos and praise will be accorded it over the next 12 months when we relate these Loan Estimates to the work that will proceed from them. The people of this State will recognize the value of this Government—what it has done over the past 12 months and what it will do in the next 12 months and, in fact, in the next 20 years. I support the first line.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the first line, because I realize that we cannot change it and the Government must spend its Loan money. We must have progress in different directions. However, I object to certain aspects of the Loan Estimates. I take up the point raised by the member for Florey, namely, that the worker should not be exploited and that people should be given a fair return for their capital outlay. I refer to a group of people employed on Government contracts where money is being spent by the department of the Minister of Roads and Transport on the development of the road safety instruction centre, and by the Engineering and Water Supply Department on the extension of sewerage services within the metropolitan area. I refer to the tip-truck operators. The Treasurer has asked for a suggested system whereby the Government can help this group of people regarding their payment by Government departments and by contractors who tender with Government departments on a certain project. At this stage, I am referring particularly to those whose work is affected by allocations made in the Loan Estimates to both the Highways and Engineering and Water Supply Departments. The present position can be

remedied if the Government, when calling tenders for materials to be supplied, obtains two quotes, one relating to the cartage rate and the other relating to the materials required for a project. It may be of interest to the Minister for Conservation, who is present at the moment, to be reminded of what he said in reply to a question I asked on this matter. The Minister said:

Other members have raised this matter with me privately, and I am at present considering calling a conference to examine it. I will take it up with the Premier later to determine what can be done about having discussions on it. Once that has been done, I will consider whether the honourable member can be invited to attend, and I will inform him accordingly.

I have heard nothing since. The work carried out by the group of people concerned involves a 7-ton vehicle, costing about \$8,500, but these people are paid by the Government departments concerned at the rate of \$3.50 an hour, this payment supposedly being sufficient for the use of the vehicle and for the labour involved. In respect of people using a similar vehicle, the Prices Commissioner sets a rate close to \$5, so there is a \$1.50 difference. I believe that this matter must continue to be raised until the Government accepts the responsibility to see that the people concerned receive fair payment for the capital outlay and labour involved. I know that the member for Unley and possibly others would agree that an electrician is paid a fair sum for his labour, and I think we agree that a plumbing contractor who receives \$3.85 an hour for labour only is receiving a fair payment; but I am referring to a group of people who are being paid \$3.50 an hour, even though an outlay of \$8,500 is involved, plus their own skill as drivers, faced with the road hazards that exist in the metropolitan area, where there are restrictive laws applying to speed and weight limits.

These people are being paid by Government departments for work in respect of which money is being allocated in these Loan Estimates. I do not believe that any Government member could justify such a lousy payment. In respect of cartage rates paid by quarry masters, the Prices Commissioner sets a rate of 16c a ton-mile for the first mile, 8.8c a ton-mile for the next five miles, and 8c a ton-mile for every mile thereafter; yet the tip-truck operators in question are being paid less than 5c a ton mile to cart goods under contracts which are allocated by the Government and which are the subject of these Loan Estimates. How can any member defend such



a situation? This is not a fair return for the capital outlay involved or for the work undertaken. It is exploitation of workers, because if ever a group of people work it is this group. I ask the Minister for Conservation to raise this matter with the Treasurer in the strongest possible terms, to gain the support of his colleagues in this regard, and to ensure that the people involved are assisted. These people must allow for their own sick and accident insurance, long service leave, four weeks' annual leave, nine days a year public holidays, sick leave, and some form of insurance in lieu of superannuation all on a lousy \$3.50 an hour or, alternatively, on the ton-mile cartage rates.

This point needs to be considered at the earliest possible moment. I can tell the Minister that the Minister of Education, the Minister of Roads and Transport, Senator Don Cameron, and Mr. Clyde Cameron, M.H.R., who with me attended the deputation of tip-truck operators in 1969, will help if any help is needed in this cause. Other aspects need to be referred to. Regarding Government tenders, one method now used by the Government on contracts is to call tenders for a small quantity of material (say 500 tons) and receive a reasonable tender. Then all the other contractors in the field know roughly what the contract price is, as they have failed to obtain the contract by tendering too high. The Government department then calls tenders for say 100,000 tons, all the quarry contractors sharpen their pencils and cut prices, and the cartage rate is cut at the same time. I believe that the only way to protect these people is to have two prices—one for cartage and one for the material.

Mr. Langley: That is what happens with subcontracting.

Mr. EVANS: I think that the member for Unley will be aware that many reputable painting contractors will not even bother to tender for Housing Trust work, because the rates for painting have been cut so low that for the price paid it is impossible to carry out work of a high standard using good quality paint. The Prices Commissioner states that the maximum rate shall be \$2.90 an hour. In many cases the people who tender for this work are quoting far below that price, and that is one of the reasons why we end up with painting of poor quality in some trust houses. It is also the reason why many subcontractors find themselves becoming insolvent. If the member for Unley does not agree with the member for Heysen's reason for the shortage of building tradesmen in the State (that it is the result

of the previous Labor Government in 1965-68), he would agree that the reason is the builders' licensing regulations. That is why we have a surplus in the Loan Account of \$15,000,000 that we cannot spend on building in this State to alleviate the shortage of houses. Tradesmen are not prepared to stop here and disclose all their personal assets and belongings to some board so that they can get a licence.

Mr. Langley: Subcontracting has killed the building trade, and you know it.

Mr. EVANS: That is a ridiculous statement. I remind the honourable member that of all the States South Australia has the best standard of housing at the lowest price and of the highest quality. If the honourable member says that the subcontractors have ruined the building industry in this State, I believe he is a hypocrite.

Mr. Langley: You ought to know better than to talk like that.

Mr. EVANS: I now refer to a matter that has been discussed during this debate. I refer to the piece of land owned by the Government in Victoria Square and to the Government's intention (an Australian Labor Party Government that is supposed to be in office for the benefit of the workers) to tell some international business enterprise that it can have the land at a peppercorn rental to build a hotel complex of international standard on it. That is what the Treasurer has said. If the block of land was offered for sale, people would be interested in paying a fair price for it and building a hotel without subsidy from the Government. That piece of land was purchased to provide good office accommodation for the workers in State Government departments, the people whom the A.L.P. claims to represent. The member for Florey has said that he would object if the workers were exploited, but what workers could afford to pay the charges that would be asked at a hotel of international standard?

Mr. Harrison: Do you think we have hotels of international standard now?

Mr. Hall: Listen to the representative of the workers!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Fisher.

Mr. EVANS: We all know that certain organizations are interested in building hotels and I understand that one will be built opposite this building to replace a hotel that was of some significance in our community. I do not know whether the new hotel will be of international standard but I know that the

organization interested in the project will not build a substandard hotel and that the Adelaide City Council would not allow such a hotel to be built.

Mr. Langley: Not many substandard hotels are being built at present, are they?

Mr. EVANS: I thank the member for Unley for that interjection, because there is no need to give a piece of land to an organization at a peppercorn rental. We have in King William Street the A.N.Z. Bank building, in relation to which the member for Peake presented a petition today. I give that honourable member credit for the work that he has done.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. EVANS: I will link this up, Mr. Chairman. I give the honourable member credit for his work regarding preservation of that building. There are two ways in which the Government could assist, through the Loan Estimates. The second of these is the easier way to help. In these Loan Estimates \$800,000 is allocated for part of the festival theatre complex. In his statement the Treasurer said:

In addition to the normal annual appropriation of \$900,000 towards the theatre a contribution of \$800,000 is appropriated in the Loan Estimates as a first instalment toward a cultural complex associated with the theatre, and which is presently under discussion with the city council. It is anticipated that this matter will be the subject of enabling legislation in due course.

The cultural complex to which the Treasurer refers is the festival hall. The petition presented by the member for Peake asked for \$750,000 to preserve the A.N.Z. Bank in King William Street, and I ask the member for Peake and all other Government back-bench members to bring pressure to bear on their Cabinet colleagues to allocate the \$800,000 to preserve that building. A submission made by the A.N.Z. Building Preservation Trust states that it will cost between \$18,000 and \$20,000, but I would allow \$30,000 a year to maintain this project. However, we are to lease a piece of land in Victoria Square worth \$600,000 at a peppercorn rent, which means we will be throwing down the drain possibly more than \$30,000 a year before many years have passed because of the increase in the value of land in that area. If we are to acquire and to save the A.N.Z. Bank building, we must also consider that the land on which it is built will increase in value and be a greater asset in future.

The member for Florey suggested that it is essential, to promote tourism, to build a new hotel in Victoria Square. What better tourist attraction would we want than the heritage of this State shown in one of our old buildings which indicates all the skills of the stonemason and which should be preserved for all time. The building has been inspected by architects, engineers, and members of Cabinet. What better way would there be of showing tourists that we have a city worth visiting than by preserving this building? If a previous Leader of the Labor Party, a hard worker in his time and a mason by trade (the late Frank Walsh) were on the front bench now, I would say that that \$800,000 would not be allocated for some cultural complex (a future complex that we are not sure we will see or not), but it would be allocated to preserve the A.N.Z. Bank building. The Premier, Cabinet Ministers, and Government members know this, so I ask the Minister of Labour and Industry to inform the Treasurer of this request and to let him know that there is a solution to the problem of preserving this building. This decision would be applauded by many people in the community and, in future, the Government would have to its credit the fact that it could say it had preserved the building. The opportunity is there now and the money is available, and that is all that needs to be said on the subject.

I should like to support what the member for Mawson said about sewer extensions in some areas that are not developed completely. His comments about soil types and the prevailing conditions in particular areas should be considered in relation to the extension of sewerage services. I know of the area that concerns the member for Mawson, and I fully support his request to Cabinet to supply the services needed in that area. Similar circumstances exist in my district, particularly around Sun Valley, Glenalta, Belair, Blackwood, parts of Bellevue Heights, and the other area that has been so prominent in the press recently, the Stirling-Crafers area.

I ask the Government to do all in its power to extend the sewerage system in the Blackwood-Belair general area, because the stage has been reached where it is unhealthy for small children to play at the side of the houses and even for people to sit outside the houses on hot summer nights, because of the putrid stench. We know that sewer extensions are going ahead rather slowly at present because of the rocky terrain in the area. I realize

that the department faces problems in connection with blasting and digging trenches when houses already exist, but it is important that the extensions be completed as early as possible—and I would say that they should be completed earlier than the time originally planned. Because the western end of Gloucester Avenue and the streets nearby are not included in the plan, I sincerely ask the Government to reconsider that area. If we have to wait for nine or 10 years for extensions there, we will have a regrettable outbreak of disease.

Concern has been expressed about the Stirling District Council's proposition in relation to town planning. Practically all the small towns in the district and larger centres like Stirling, Crafers, Bridgewater and Aldgate are in the water catchment area. Consequently, they must be sewered as soon as possible if we are to protect the water that is collected in the Mount Bold reservoir and if we are to protect the water that is to be pumped into the Mount Bold reservoir from the main from Murray Bridge to Hahndorf. Unless we take protective measures, the effluent from septic tanks in the area will undoubtedly end up in the reservoir. Some local people are concerned that the Engineering and Water Supply Department intends to treat sewage from the area and run the effluent from its plant into the stream and then into the reservoir. If that happens it will be hard to justify a ruling that more houses cannot be built in the district. I hope the department will change its plan (if that is its plan) and that it will pump the treated water out of the catchment area into the Sturt Creek or one of the other streams that flow away from the locality.

In connection with the allocation for national reserves, it is planned to develop a 1,600-acre regional park between Dorset Vale, the top of Mount Bold hill and Cherry Gardens. When that is done the District Councils of Meadows and Stirling will lose 1,600 acres of ratable property. Members who have been here for at least three years will know that I have raised annually the question of the land in the Adelaide Hills that is acquired for water catchment preservation purposes, for recreation for city people, and for the Woods and Forests Department. I have argued that some sort of grant should be made to the councils to help to compensate them for the loss of ratable land.

I assure all members that, if the Liberal Party wins Government in 1973 (and I think there is every chance of that), there will be

strong demands from people in the area about this matter, because otherwise their rates will become so high that it will be impossible for the average man to live in the Hills. Surely we do not want rates in that district to become so high that only rich people will be able to live there, but that is what is happening. This year the Stirling council faces a rate increase of between 12 per cent and 15 per cent. Every year the council has to consider this loss of ratable property. There is an increase in the loss of area each year because of Government acquisition. It is a serious matter that I hope the Government will consider. The Government should make an allocation to help those councils.

I conclude by answering a comment made by the member for Florey about South Australia, in the past, being a low-wage State. I agree that it was, but I assure members opposite that the wages we received in those days had a greater purchasing power than those received by people in similar occupations in other States. It is not the amount of money we receive that counts: it is how much we can buy with it. That is the fallacy we have fallen for here. I support the first line.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I, too, support the first line. I start by referring to harbour accommodation. It is pleasing to note that the Government intends to spend \$800,000 on the Thevenard harbour complex, but the present problem is that the programme of the Marine and Harbours Department, as designed, will interfere with the shipping programme at Thevenard at the most vital time. Last week I asked the Minister of Marine whether he could have that work reprogrammed to avoid causing problems at Thevenard, but he was not prepared to do so. He said that he was not aware that barley was being shipped through Thevenard. True, this will be the first time that we have been able to ship barley through Thevenard, and the growers in the bulk handling division at Thevenard will be able to get the same benefit as growers in other parts of South Australia.

Mr. Venning: The bulk handling co-operative has done a good job.

Mr. GUNN: Yes, and we know that the honourable member has played his part together with other people connected with the scheme. The farmers, too, have paid for the scheme through their contributions. The Marine and Harbours Department needs to be told to programme its works so as not to interfere with the shipping programme in

Thevenard. However, we are told that the department will close down the loading facilities from November 12 to December 10, for nearly a month, right at the busiest period. As Thevenard is an "early" area, this will be the time when we shall want to get boats to come to Thevenard to ship the early barley. There is only enough storage at Thevenard for 500,000 bushels and that will fill up rapidly. I have been reliably informed that, if a boat cannot come into Thevenard in November, the growers in that area will have to wait probably until the end of February. This is a serious situation, because it is the first time that growers in this area have had the opportunity to take advantage of a cheaper freight differential. In the past, they have had to freight their barley right to Port Lincoln, and in some years they have been lucky to make anything on the first payment.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: How much barley have you grown this year?

Mr. GUNN: All the Minister can do is make vicious personal accusations against members on this side.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Interjections are out of order. The member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was referring to the advantages that growers in my district would receive. I have been informed by officers of the Marine and Harbors Department that it cannot alter its work programme, which involves 80 men, but it has failed to consider the 800 farmers who will be affected by this decision.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Will you be one of them?

Mr. GUNN: Members on this side come into this place to try to do what they can for the benefit of all their constituents, unlike the Minister who thinks only of himself.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You're a farmer, aren't you?

Mr. GUNN: I am speaking on behalf of my constituents in the area concerned. For the information of the Minister, I think most of my barley will go to Port Lincoln this year.

Mr. Payne: You don't want the freight differential?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Interjections are out of order. The member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: Wheat shipments will also be affected. I have received representations from members of the United Farmers and Graziers in the area who have expressed concern about this matter, and no doubt the bulk handling

co-operative will also be concerned. I have not received representations from people connected with the gypsum and salt industries, but no doubt these two important industries at Thevenard would be affected. The cartage of gypsum to Thevenard has been one of the most profitable railway undertakings in South Australia. I hope the Minister will seriously consider this matter and try to see whether the work can either be brought forward or delayed at least until March, so that the growers concerned will not be detrimentally affected.

I was pleased to receive from the Minister today a copy of a press release stating that work on the Tod replacement main to Ceduna would be completed before the scheduled date in 1978, namely, by mid-1975. Not only will this project provide an adequate water supply to constituents in my district: it will also provide work for many rural producers who are in a difficult situation. The condition of the Tod trunk main was completely unsatisfactory, and any money spent on further maintenance was money down the drain. I was also pleased to see that the Government intended to spend \$859,000 on the Poldakimba main. Unfortunately, only 20 people are working on the main, and only 11 miles will be completed this year, even though trains and road tankers are carting water to Kimba.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: How long has this been going on?

Mr. GUNN: The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford organized a programme to commence the Poldakimba main but, because of the actions of the Minister's Party, work on the project was stopped for three years. It was not until the Government headed by the present Leader came to office that the Kimba main was started. The Government has wasted money in other ways. For instance, there was the useless shopping hours referendum, and the Moratorium Royal Commission set up simply to humiliate the Police Commissioner. This money would have been better spent on the Kimba main or the Eyre Highway. Money was also wasted on that nonsense report, the Breuning report, and now \$800,000 is going down the drain in another useless way, and no-one knows where it is going, certainly not the Government. We know that this is the brainchild of the Treasurer. When anything to do with the arts comes up, he throws his head in the air and puts his hands in the pockets of the Treasury. If the Government wanted to do what was in the best interests of all the

people in the State, it would allocate much of its Loan funds to the Kimba main, because in the long run this would be the cheapest thing to do. This would avoid paying out money for the carrying of water and for other redundant work.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: It won't do them any good. Aren't they all going broke?

Mr. GUNN: The Minister cannot even look after his own district; I understand men will go on strike in Port Pirie again tomorrow. I have referred before to the Public Buildings Department. I have spoken of an occasion on which the department insulated a school building that had been closed for six months. When the contractor pointed out to the department that the school was not open, he was told that this did not matter and that the work must be carried out. He did not mind; he had travelled 140 miles to do it, so he went ahead with it. Wherever I go in my district, I receive complaints about failures of the department. With regard to the Streaky Bay school, an article in the *West Coast Sentinel* points out that, for the last 10 years, every time it has rained children have had to walk through puddles of water. They have had to take seats out of the school shelter to enable them to avoid walking through pools of water. This is one of the many cases of the inefficiency of the department. If the Government will not employ contractors, it should at least set up in Port Lincoln an architect who has authority to spend funds.

I do not know whether officers in the department do not wish to co-operate but at present they seem unable to co-operate with headmasters and school committees who request that work be done. The officers make promises but in most cases fail to honour them. I wish to refer to a problem that is causing concern at the Cook Primary School, which was built about 50 years ago and which has never had anything done to its playing area. The school committee has made many requests to me for work to be done. In the last 18 months, the Public Buildings Department has made promises, but to date nothing has been done. All that the committee requests is that an area 100ft. by 150ft. be surfaced, so that at least that area is free of bulldust. I hope that the Minister of Works releases the report that my colleague initiated when he was Minister so that members will know what is the Government's thinking. I also hope that the present Minister will rectify the serious situation in the department and thus save much money. Under the present stop-go attitude of the Public Buildings Department, one or two workmen are sent to a building for a couple of days and then they have to return to Port Lincoln. On the other hand, long-term planning would benefit all people.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 10.8 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 11, at 2 p.m.