

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 17, 1971

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

QUESTIONS**STEEL PRICE**

Mr. HALL: In view of the previous intention of steel suppliers to place a surcharge of \$7.50 on small orders, and in view of the subsequent arrangements after discussions with the Prices Commissioner to reduce that charge substantially, I ask the Premier whether he will outline to the House the details of the new arrangements, so that users of small quantities of steel who want to obtain their supplies from wholesalers will know in somewhat exact terms just what the additional charge will be.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As I think that it would be better if I obtained a detailed reply from the Prices Commissioner, I will give the information to the Leader tomorrow.

REFERENDUM VOTING

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Attorney-General give me information additional to that which he gave me last week regarding those who failed to vote at the shopping hours referendum? Last week, both on notice and without notice, I asked a series of questions about this matter, and the Attorney told me, in reply to a question on Thursday, that he had not given me all the information available in answer to my Question on Notice. I understand that he now has that information available.

The Hon. L. J. KING: On Tuesday last I gave a prepared reply to a Question on Notice by the member for Mitcham in which he sought information on what action had been taken in relation to persons who had not voted at the shopping hours referendum. Last Wednesday, the honourable member asked a question, without notice, about the same topic, and that question raised in my mind the possibility that the prepared reply given to the Question on Notice might not have provided all the information that was available on the topic. I caused certain inquiries to be made, as a result of which I informed the honourable member privately that I believed that the prepared reply was incomplete. I informed him that I would obtain a full report and would give a further reply setting out the information in full. On Thursday last the honourable member sought this reply, and I informed him that the report

had not yet come to hand but that I would be able to give the reply today. I now have the information, which I will now give.

An examination of the rolls following the referendum indicated that the total number of persons who appeared not to have voted was 50,181. The Returning Officer for the State then eliminated those who had died or who appeared on the face of the matter to be likely to have a valid and sufficient reason for not voting. On November 25, 1970, the Returning Officer for the State dispatched 23,240 notices requesting an explanation of the failure to vote. The actual timing of the dispatch of these notices was determined by the posting of over 300,000 Legislative Council enrolment cards at the same time. The bulk postage involved enabled a saving of about \$500 in postage. These notices required an answer by December 16, 1970. On January 13, 1971, 3,022 notices were sent to persons who had not complied with the first notice. These notices required an answer by February 3, 1971. This was in accordance with the normal practice in elections. On February 11, 1971, in accordance with the normal electoral practice, 1,460 notices were sent to persons who had not answered the first or second notices. The third notices were accompanied by a postal acknowledgment of receipt form in order to obtain evidence of the receipt of the notice as a foundation for a prosecution. These notices required an answer by March 4, 1971.

In 187 cases the elector's signature was not obtained on the acknowledgment of receipt form and instructions were thereupon sent to the Crown Solicitor to prosecute these electors for failing to vote at the referendum. These instructions were sent to the Crown Solicitor on March 16, 1971. As the referendum was held on September 19, 1970, a complaint for failure to vote was required to be made, under the provisions of the Justices Act, not later than March 18. Unfortunately, the Electoral Department did not bring to the attention of the Crown Law Office the urgency of the matter and the file did not receive the attention of a Crown Law officer until the time for prosecution had already expired. It was therefore impossible to proceed with prosecutions in respect of these electors. Previous experience indicates that in any event it is unlikely that it would have been possible to serve the summonses in view of the high degree of likelihood that the electors had left the address.

Instructions for the prosecution of 197 electors, who signed for the third notice but

did not reply, were forwarded to the Crown Solicitor on March 16, 1971. The complaints have been laid in these cases for the offence of failing to reply to the notice. I am informed that the summonses are in the course of being served at the present time. In the case of 158 electors who replied to the notices, the Returning Officer for the State was not satisfied with the explanation given and gave the appropriate notice to an elector whose reason for failing to vote is held not to be valid and sufficient. This notice requires payment of the sum of \$2 by way of penalty, and 117 electors paid this penalty in answer to the notice. In the case of the 41 electors who were sent this notice but did not pay the penalty, instructions were sent by the Returning Officer for the State to the Crown Solicitor for prosecution for failing to vote. These instructions were also sent on March 16, 1971, and the time for the making of the complaint expired before the prosecutions were commenced.

It is impossible to be satisfied with the fact that the time for prosecution was allowed to expire. In defence of the Electoral Department, it must be said that it was undergoing considerable problems at this time. It had in hand the major task of the Legislative Council canvass. It was still coping with the aftermath, including prosecutions, of the general election in May, 1970. It had to produce jury lists just prior to Christmas, 1970, under a new computer programme. The Assistant Returning Officer for the State was engaged on the Royal Commission into the Moratorium. Moreover, the department was experiencing general problems of staffing and special problems resulting from a direction by the Public Service Board as to the taking of accumulated recreation leave. The department carried out its mammoth task under very great difficulties. Nevertheless the events which occurred have exposed a weakness in the system by which three notices are customarily sent before prosecutions are launched, but the prosecutions must nevertheless be launched within six months. The problem was accentuated by the fact that the number of prosecutions authorized in the case of the referendum far exceeded the number authorized in any general election in this State both as to absolute numbers and as a proportion of those who failed to vote. In a general election it is rare to have more than 20 or 30 actual prosecutions, as distinct from those who pay a penalty in answer to a notice. The Electoral Department authorized 111 prosecutions in

respect of the general election in May, 1970. In the result, there will be 197 prosecutions, as indicated in the prepared answer to the Question on Notice, and 117 persons have paid their penalty in response to a notice; 228 persons who should have been prosecuted have escaped because the complaints were not laid within the time prescribed by the Justices Act.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Attorney-General say what was the total cost of the work entailed in ascertaining who did not vote and in sending out notices to those persons, and will he say whether he will consider exonerating the 197 persons who were unfortunate enough not to have had the notices sent to them made invalid? Surely the moral for everybody in this extraordinary story that the Attorney-General has given is that the Electoral Department would be much better employed in conducting elections that were not compulsory and that much of the work of the department seems to have been involved in checking on about 50,000 persons who did not vote.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is starting to comment.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I want to know the cost of that activity. I notice that the Attorney has said that some cost was saved because the work was done in conjunction with the sending out of notices about enrolment for the Legislative Council, which is another activity which is dear to the heart of the Attorney and for which the taxpayers must pay a large sum. I think the Attorney may tell me what those costs are and also comment on the apparent injustices of prosecuting 197 persons whilst 228 persons, through what can be described only as inefficiency, anyway, have escaped.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Well, the Attorney-General will support that statement. Although 228 persons have got away without any action being taken, 197 persons will be prosecuted.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The honourable member has suggested that the Electoral Department would be better employed conducting elections of a voluntary kind. I can only comment that I can think of no work on which the department is better employed than in conducting elections under a system that ensures that the result is in accordance with the general consensus of opinion and verdict of the people of the State, and I think that for the department to be occupied on anything else

would be most unfortunate. When listening to the question, I was struck once again by the extraordinary effect on Liberal Party policy that the defeat in May, 1970, has had. I do not know the cost of performing the work to which the honourable member has referred. I do not even know whether it is possible to obtain a figure for it, because it would be done in the course of the ordinary activities of the Electoral Department. I shall inquire whether it is possible to obtain a figure and, if it is, I shall give it to the honourable member.

As to the second part of the question, I am astonished at the logic of the suggestion that, merely because the time for making a complaint has expired in certain cases, other offenders should not be proceeded against. If one applied that logic one would have to say, as every complaint under the Justices Act must be laid within six months and occasionally some have got out of time, that we could never proceed against anyone. If one argues that, because an offender escapes justice because the time for making the complaint has expired, no-one else should be brought to justice in this area, then that argument should apply in every other area. I cannot see the force of this, and it seems to me that, in this case, as about 430 people were found by the Returning Officer for the State to have committed this offence and did not expiate the offence, all these people should have been proceeded against, although in some cases the time had expired before the complaints were laid. For the life of me I cannot understand how that provides any justification for the action of the others who broke the law in these circumstances. The reply to the second part of the question is "No".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Attorney-General say what is the general nature of the reasons given by those electors from whom an explanation was sought for not voting at the referendum? I am indebted to the Attorney, particularly for the information that he has given today about the debacle following the referendum. However, so far, the Attorney has not given any information concerning the persons (about 49,000) who failed to vote but against whom no prosecution is intended. I gather from his reply today that about 23,000 of these persons were asked to explain their reason for not voting and that most of them submitted an explanation. It seems only reasonable to expect that some common threads would run through the explanations which were given and which the Returning Officer for the

State accepted, such as that people were sick, had a conscientious objection to being forced to vote, did not like referenda, thought it was an absurd question to ask, or something of that kind.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Because this is a matter of great public interest on which members of this House ought to be able to get some information—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Do you speak for all members?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, I am not the only member in this House, I remind the Minister of Roads and Transport.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You seem to be the only one who isn't satisfied.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot permit cross-fire in the Chamber. If the honourable member does not want to explain his question, I will call on the Attorney to reply.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Because of this interest and importance, I ask the Attorney whether he will supply the information in reply to my question.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Two things must be said about this. First, I have already answered the honourable member by saying that I have been told that the replies vary from elector to elector and that the Returning Officer for the State has exercised his judgment. I do not think the reply either can be or should be taken any further than that. I would doubt, on grounds of general policy, whether it would be appropriate to make public the explanations or the sorts of explanation that have been accepted. I see considerable public mischief to enforcing any law resulting from telling the public at large what sorts of explanation have been accepted, because there is always the danger in subsequent cases that some people will think that an explanation accepted in respect of a referendum in 1970 should be accepted in respect of, say, an election in 1971 or 1972. I would think that, on general grounds, it is inadvisable to state these explanations. I will consult the Returning Officer for the State, but I am reasonably confident that no further reply than that given to the Question on Notice can be given.

DOOR TO DOOR SALES BILL

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Attorney-General make public the fact that the Door to Door Sales Bill, 1971, has not yet passed into law, and will he give such statement as wide a circulation as possible? It has been brought

to my notice that certain door to door sales operators are assuring people that this Bill has already passed into law and that people are entering into contracts on the mistaken impression that a protection actually exists.

The Hon. L. J. KING: It is certainly true, as the honourable member has said, that the Bill relating to door to door sales has not passed into law. It has been introduced in this House and is now on the Notice Paper. In view of the matter that has been raised by the honourable member, the press may see fit to publish the reply that I am now giving, namely, that the Door to Door Sales Bill has been introduced and is on the Notice Paper, that it will be proceeded with as soon as Parliamentary time is available, but that it is not law at present.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS COUNCIL

Mr. WELLS: As the South Australian Industrial Relations Advisory Council, consisting of representatives of the Government, trade unions, and employer organizations, has now held its initial meeting, can the Minister of Labour and Industry comment on the results of this meeting and on the attitude of the parties concerning the future activities of the council?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I am pleased to announce the establishment of the South Australian Industrial Relations Advisory Council, with me as Chairman. The council comprises Mr. L. B. Bowes (Secretary for Labour and Industry); representatives of the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia. Mr. A. R. Griffiths (Secretary, Australasian Society of Engineers, South Australian Branch). Mr. F. J. Kelly (Secretary, Operative Painters and Decorators Union of Australia, South Australian Branch), Mr. J. E. Shannon (Secretary, United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia), and Mr. R. M. Tremethick (Secretary, Police Association of South Australia); representatives of employer organizations, for the Master Builders Association of South Australia, Mr. R. J. Emmett (Managing Director, Emmett Contractors Proprietary Limited), for the Metal Industries Association of South Australia, Mr. J. D. A. Howie (Manager, Metters Limited), for the South Australian Chamber of Manufacturers, Mr. R. T. Patterson (General Manager, F. H. Faulding & Company Limited), and for the South Australian Employers Federation, Mr. G. E. Pryke (Executive Director, South Australian Employers' Federation).

The council has been formed so that there may be an established body on which the

Government, employers, and trade unions can confer on matters of mutual interest in the field of industrial relations and associated matters with the object of having a better understanding between the Government, the major employer organizations, and the trade unions. The objects of the council will be to enable the Government, employer organizations, and trade unions to confer concerning industrial relations, industrial safety, industrial training, and associated matters and, through the Minister, to advise the Government and the Department of Labour and Industry in relation to those matters.

I appreciate the willing response from the United Trades and Labour Council and employer organizations to the proposal that this council be formed. Although its formation had been under consideration for some time, it is opportune that it should now commence to operate in the present industrial relations climate. An initial meeting of the council has already been held for the purpose of agreeing on the scope of the council's activities and the general operating procedures that would be adopted. Matters within the council's scope will include methods of improving industrial relations, the safety, health and welfare of persons employed in industry and commerce, rehabilitation of injured workers, the development of industrial training, technological change and automation, and measures to achieve increased productivity.

BUILDING CONTROLS

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Local Government say what the Government intends to do about the Building Act, which was passed last session? Several councils have told me that they wish to have the protection of the old Act, which is superseded by the amending Act, until such time as the new regulations under the new amending Act have been prepared; in other words, that the new Act and regulations should come into force together.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Because of the seriousness of this question, I should like the honourable member to take what I am saying now as an interim report only, and I will obtain a detailed report, including times. The Government's intention in introducing the new Bill, which eventually was passed by Parliament, was that it would not operate until the regulations made under it had been drafted and laid on the table of this House. The Building Act Advisory Committee is currently working on the regulations which, I believe,

are well on the way. I understand that the committee had a series of consultations with its counterparts in other States because, as I said when the legislation was introduced, it was the Government's desire to have as near as practicable a uniform building code throughout Australia. I understand that the regulations will be available later this year. This matter is of grave concern not only to local government bodies but to all those involved in the building industry generally. In the meantime, the old legislation still operates, together with the regulations made under it, and these will operate until the new Act has been proclaimed.

Mr. CUMBE: Is the Minister aware of a discussion that took place in the Adelaide City Council yesterday in relation to which a motion was moved and seconded by two constituents of mine who are members of that council? The motion referred to building controls, including building bulk and plot ratios that are used in determining sizes of buildings and the number that shall be erected in a certain area. The council passed a certain resolution on this matter, which it would investigate. People are concerned to know whether this matter involves the Building Act or the Planning and Development Act and also whether it will mean driving away from Adelaide or not attracting to Adelaide many developers who would be concerned with activities either in the city square mile or in North Adelaide. Will the Minister examine this matter and bring down a report? I point out that it is essential to attract to Adelaide (indeed, South Australia as a whole) developers, who bring much business to those engaged in our building industry.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I saw in the press a report on this matter but, if the honourable member now desires further information on it. I shall be only too happy to try to obtain it. Although I think, from memory, that the problem referred to is taken care of under the new Building Act, I will obtain full details on the matter.

WATER RATES

Mr. KENEALLY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of August 10 about excess water rates?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is desirable from the viewpoint of proper funding of Government finances that revenue accruing in a financial year should be collected in that year. The proposal would not achieve this.

However, the honourable member can rest assured that all representations from pensioners and other people in necessitous circumstances are dealt with sympathetically by the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

BURNSIDE RUBBISH DUMP

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to my question of July 29 about pollution at the Burnside rubbish dump?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I have received the following report from the Corporation of the City of Burnside:

The question is difficult to interpret as the council does not have a rubbish dump for burnable rubbish. During last summer, on January 20, a fire occurred in a council property in Chambers Gully where tree and shrub prunings and other garden growth were deposited but where general rubbish is prohibited. Police inquiries were made and it was indicated that the fire had been caused by an intruder using a portable welder to remove old quarry working steel railing. This fire was reported on by the the Burnside Emergency Fire Service. For the past several years the council has been burning street tree prunings only about three times a year in an excavated quarry on the property of the Gilburn Brick Company at Wyatt Road, Burnside. The council has now purchased a chipper machine to process this material instead of burning it.

Regarding noxious weeds in national parks around the eastern foothills, I am informed by the Director of National Parks that the National Parks Commission continually seeks to undertake control measures in connection with both noxious weeds and other introduced plants. In general, such control measures are proving to be reasonably effective, particularly in country areas. Within several near city parks, however, the problems of weed infestations have assumed serious proportions. In particular, the difficulties associated with the adequate control of South African daisy in the Belair, Cleland and Horsnell Gully National Parks in the eastern foothills of the Mount Lofty Range would appear to be almost insurmountable. The infestations have increased greatly both in extent and numbers as the result of bush fires, and spraying with weedicide or any form of cultivation as methods of general control is impracticable because of the steep nature of the country and the density of the native vegetation. Some control work has been carried out in the past by the Agriculture Department using back-pack spray units in localized areas of thick infestation, and by hand pulling using prison labour from the Adelaide Gaol. The commission,

which views this matter with extreme concern, will endeavour to make every effort to control the problem.

TRANSPORTABLE SCHOOLS

Mr. SLATER: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about transportable units in use at primary schools?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: At present the Primary Division of the Education Department has 62 transportable classrooms in use. In addition, 27 new rooms have been ordered but these are required to meet the needs of all divisions of the Education Department. The enrolments at the East Marden school have continued to increase. At present, 660 children are enrolled, and all classrooms are occupied. In addition, classes are held in the activity room and library and this is unsatisfactory. To meet these difficulties, four additional classrooms in Samcon are currently being erected at the East Marden Primary School and should be available for occupation in February, 1972. To give relief until the Samcon rooms become available, two transportable rooms were requested. It was expected that rooms would have become available before now, but the wet weather has delayed the opening of some new schools and buildings that would have released transportable rooms. In addition, the commencement of a replacement school at Thebarton has meant that seven transportable rooms are required to house classes displaced by the building. The earliest date that it appears transportable rooms will become available will be late October. Since East Marden's requirements will be met in 1972 by the Samcon rooms at present under construction, it is not considered that the expense of placing rooms there for a few weeks is warranted.

MOUNT GAMBIER HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. BURDON: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on July 21 about the air-heating system at the Mount Gambier High School?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Problems have been experienced with the heating plant at the Mount Gambier High School, and repairs were carried out by the contractor up to the expiry of the maintenance period in December, 1970. Following the receipt of complaints in May, 1971, specialist personnel from the Netley workshops of the Public Buildings Department were called in and have been working on the plant, which is now performing satisfactorily. It is intended to overhaul the system during

the coming summer months, at which time any design problems will be eliminated. The equipment is now included in regular maintenance schedules and both routine and break-down work will be carried out by personnel from the Netley workshops.

SCHOOL WATER COOLERS

Mr. BECKER: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I recently asked about refrigerated water coolers in schools?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The present Education Department policy does not provide for the supply of refrigerated water coolers to primary and infants schools, but they may be purchased on a subsidy basis. The department meets the annual costs of electric power used, but not maintenance costs. However, as from the 1972 school year, schools will be able to purchase these units using grant funds if they so desire.

GOVERNMENT PRODUCE DEPARTMENT

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Works obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about the committee examining the operations of the Government Produce Department?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The committee has recently inspected the Port Lincoln freezing works, and a detailed investigation of these operations is proceeding. The committee expects to receive evidence from interested parties. This inquiry is quite a complex task, and it will take some time to investigate the whole of the operations of the Government Produce Department, which includes the Port Lincoln freezing works. Nevertheless the committee hopes to be able to provide at least a preliminary report by the end of September and to complete its full investigation before the end of the year.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked last Thursday about the "financial management and sickness plan"?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have obtained a preliminary report from the Senior Companies Inspector regarding literature which has been distributed in the suburbs seeking money for a scheme called "Planned Financial Management's Investment/Sickness Plan". The organization distributing these pamphlets is Planned Financial Management, of 183 Macquarie Street, Sydney, and the New South Wales authorities have been asked to advise

on the *bona fides* and financial standing of that organization. In South Australia a business name "Planned Financial Management" has been registered. The person (Mr. Jan Keys of 181 Fletcher Road, Largs Bay) who is the proprietor of this business name is alleged to have stated that he is merely distributing the pamphlets for and on behalf of Planned Financial Management of Sydney. This person (Mr. Keys) is absent from the State and it has not been possible to interview him as yet. In these circumstances, I issue a strong warning to people who may receive this literature that it would be most unwise to contribute money to this scheme on the information at present available. If further information comes to hand, I shall make a further statement.

HOLDEN HILL POLICE STATION

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on July 27 about the Holden Hill police station?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Considerable investigation has been undertaken by the Public Buildings Department and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization in an effort to determine and remedy the cause of cracking to the police station and adjoining residence at Holden Hill and, because of the necessity for long-term observations of soil movement, a final report and recommendation has not yet been received from C.S.I.R.O. However, it can be stated that the cracks do not constitute a danger to occupants of the buildings. Investigations have shown that considerable seasonal movement takes place in the highly expansive clay on which the building is erected, and it is believed that this movement is more pronounced than that of soil in the immediate vicinity. As the evidence to hand is still inconclusive, it is not possible to indicate at this stage what action will be taken to provide a permanent solution to the problem.

COCKATOOS

Mr. EVANS: I ask the Minister of Works whether he has with him the reply to my recent question about Major Mitchell cockatoos, as he informed me last week that he had the reply available.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: During the four years 1967 to 1971, seven permits for a total of 11 Major Mitchell cockatoos were issued by the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department. Of the birds eight were for export on a zoo-to-zoo basis and three were family pets of former residents permanently leaving Australia. Final approval of

export is the prerogative of the Commonwealth Department of Customs and Excise, but the countries for which these birds were destined (subject to customs clearance) were as follows: United Kingdom, 2; New Zealand, 2; Sudan, 4; Singapore, 2; and Yugoslavia, 1.

GAME RESERVES

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to my question of August 5 about fences around fauna and flora reserves in my district?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: A considerable amount of fencing of the boundaries in national parks has been undertaken by the National Parks Commission since the adoption in July, 1964, of a policy of reimbursement to landholders for the materials used in erection of fences. Almost two-thirds of both Hincks and Hambidge National Parks has been fenced already and the areas that remain unfenced are mainly areas which have gazetted, but unmade, roadways adjacent to the boundary of the park where it is not possible for the commission to give assistance to the adjoining landholder.

BRIGHTON ROAD

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to a question I asked recently about Brighton Road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Subject to endorsement by the Public Works Committee and subsequent approvals, the Engineering and Water Supply Department will construct a large water main from Darlington to the north of Grange. The proposed main will involve a 57in. pipe being laid from the vicinity of the Don Avenue and Brighton Road intersection northward. Brighton Road provides the obvious route for this main, but a final decision cannot be made before further studies of the use of alternative streets have been completed. The section of this projected main north of Don Avenue is expected to be laid commencing late in 1972. As a result of this scheme the Highways Department proposes to defer further reconstruction of Brighton Road to follow as closely as possible behind the Engineering and Water Supply Department work.

BLACKFORD DRAIN

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Works obtain for me a report on the level of salinity in the Blackford Drain and, if it is as high as stated in the figures that have been publicly quoted, will he find out whether that is the result of high tides backing up the

creek? Also, will he ascertain whether or not Blackford Drain has had its bank breached to enable the water to go northwards along the old Reedy Creek Drain and, if it has, whether the matter has been followed up, because I believe this would establish that this water could be diverted into the Coorong without difficulty?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I take it that the honourable member has covered all the points on which he wants a report. He knows that figures which have been released show a salinity level of 21,000 parts a million. This figure has been checked and verified, and the level is not subject to tidal influence. Although the level seems extremely high and may sound ridiculous, I can tell the honourable member that the figure is accurate. When I saw the figure for Blackford Drain I was just as alarmed as the honourable member, and I was also alarmed at figures for other drains: even the level in Eight Mile Creek was much higher than I would have expected. I will obtain from the South-Eastern Drainage Board the information requested by the honourable member about the breaching of the bank; to my knowledge it has not been breached.

RAMSAY REPORT

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he intends to make public the Ramsay report on agricultural education in South Australia, or will he release it to members to peruse? Work on this matter was commenced during the time of the Walsh Government. Although the Minister of Education indicated on March 17 that the report would be released, it is still not available. At page 4120 of *Hansard*, the Minister of Education indicated that the report had been published; he then altered that statement, saying that it had not been published but that it was to be published. Therefore, will the Minister of Works or the Minister of Education say when we can expect the release of the report?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have consulted the Minister of Agriculture about the matter, which affects both the Agriculture Department and the Education Department. The report will be issued late next week.

NORTHFIELD SCHOOL

Mr. WELLS: Will the Minister of Works investigate the reason for the delay in constructing four tennis courts at the Northfield Primary School and seek to have work on

them, as a separate entity, proceed urgently? Over 12 months ago, this school received permission to have the four tennis courts constructed. The Parents and Friends Association at the school has raised its share of the cost of the tennis courts and has invested this money in short-term bonds. However, confusion seems to have arisen and the school authorities have been told now that this work will be done when other work is carried out in and around the school: I understand that the total cost of this work will be about \$20,000. The Parents and Friends Association is alarmed at the position, because it does not want to wait while this other work is in progress: it wants to have the tennis courts provided.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to take the matter up for the honourable member and do what I can about it.

COUNCIL BY-LAWS

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Local Government remind metropolitan councils of their obligation under the Local Government Act to supply copies of by-laws and resolutions thereon, upon payment of the prescribed fee? During the last two weeks both the West Torrens and Prospect councils have refused one of my constituents copies of resolutions passed pursuant to a by-law in which he is interested.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will examine the matter.

WATER RATING INQUIRY

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Minister of Works say whether the Government intends to release the report of the committee appointed by the previous Government to inquire into water rating systems? If the Government does not intend to do this, will the Minister give the reason for its refusal and say why the report has not been released already, as I understand that the Government has had it for more than six months?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have said previously in reply to questions in this House that the Government received the report last November, that the report is complex, voluminous and of great moment, and that it is being evaluated by a working committee in the Engineering and Water Supply Department. It is expected that that evaluation will take between 12 and 15 months.

Mr. Millhouse: That's longer than the report took to prepare!

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: What's the secret about it?

The SPEAKER: Order! There can be only one question at a time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The member for Alexandra asks what is the secret about it. The previous Government asked for the report, and the Minister of Works in that Government asked for it for his purposes. The department is at present evaluating the report. When that evaluation has been completed, recommendations will be made to the Government on the report, and when the Government has considered those recommendations, and only then, will I decide whether the report will be released.

Mr. Millhouse: But why?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Because the department is at present making an evaluation and the report is for my use and the Government's use, not for the use of anyone else.

BOTANIC ROAD

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Local Government say whether he knows of the proposal to widen Botanic Road within the city of Adelaide? Whilst I realize that the city of Adelaide does not come within certain provisions of the Highways Act, I ask whether the Engineering and Water Supply Department, in respect of the department's depot at Kent Town, and the Botanic Garden Department are involved in this proposed widening, the plan for which I understand the Adelaide City Council deferred at a meeting yesterday, the estimated cost of the work being about \$85,000. I ask the Minister whether these two Government departments have been consulted on the matter and, if they have been, I ask him what is the Government's reaction to the proposal. If the Minister has not this information readily at hand, will he ask his colleagues what their reaction is and report to me?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am aware of the proposal to widen this road, which the honourable member now calls Botanic Road, although I thought it was part of North Terrace. Regarding consultation with the departments involved, the negotiations have been going on for, I think, two or three years, so not only do I know that negotiations have been proceeding but the honourable member also would have that information, I imagine, from his former Ministerial colleague. I cannot give full details at this stage. Several propositions have been submitted, but each department states that the additional area required ought to be taken from the other, and finality has not yet been reached.

WHEAT RESERVE

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture what publicity has been given to the action of the contingency reserve committee in setting the quantity of wheat in contingency reserve at 500,000bush. for the coming years? It is common knowledge that the committee set up by the Government, with Mr. R. R. Loveday as Chairman, has the right to set the quantity for the reserve each year, and I understand that the quantity for the coming year has been set at 500,000bush. I think the Government should make known what this quantity is because, to be put into a reserve, it has to come from growers and they should know what quantity has been fixed.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will refer the matter to my colleague, but some publicity must have been given to it otherwise the honourable member would not know the quantity.

HOVERCRAFT

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say where the hovercraft, which was tested at Salt Creek for the use of the game warden, is to be garaged? If it is to be garaged at the warden's house the hovercraft will have to cross the main highway. Is the Minister aware that there are no speed restrictions through Salt Creek, and restrictions would need to be imposed to enable the hovercraft to cross the main highway? Is the Minister aware that representations have been made to the Minister of Roads and Transport to have speed restrictions placed on the approaches to Salt Creek? If it is necessary to have speed restrictions to enable the hovercraft to operate, will the Minister plead with his colleague to consider the problem at Salt Creek, at which there is a serious traffic hazard, in order to ascertain whether speed restrictions cannot be placed on the approaches?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The type of hovercraft tested at Salt Creek has been purchased for use in the Coorong by the National Parks Commission. However, I cannot say what the ranger intends to do and where he will house the hovercraft. I shall be pleased to examine all aspects of the honourable member's question and obtain details for him.

PASTORAL LEASES

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to the question I asked on August 5 about pastoral leases?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It must be realized that the practical side of keeping large areas of pastoral land out of production but yet free from rabbits, kangaroos, and goats, for periods of 20 years or more so that regeneration of trees can take place, poses many problems. Little scientific information is available on tree growth and their regeneration in the pastoral areas of South Australia. In fact, no proof of the age of mulga and myall trees, for example, has yet been determined, and even 50 years may be little enough to achieve worthwhile results. Successful regeneration depends on the supply and distribution of the germ (seed). If this is supplied and distributed at the behest of nature, then the probability of germination, establishment, and growth will take place according to the laws of nature, and at present these, in pastoral areas, are not understood. Judicious stocking and good station management can do much to foster young trees when they do occur in favourable seasons. Pastoral leases are generally for 42 years, and the question of compensation for the loss of the use of the land and the value of the improvements would have to be considered.

HOSPITAL ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Chief Secretary to the question I asked on August 4 about appointments to hospital advisory committees?

The Hon. L. J. KING: My colleague states that appointments to the advisory committees of the University of Adelaide, the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital will be made within the next week.

ROAD MAINTENANCE ACT

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the committee of inquiry into the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act took evidence in country areas, particularly far country areas? Last week I received a reply from the Minister to my question in which I had asked who were the members of the committee and whether it intended to take evidence in country areas. In reply the Minister gave me the names of the members of the committee and said that it had completed its investigation but that he had not received a report. He did not answer the second part of my question. As outlying country areas are most seriously affected by the road maintenance tax, and as any report would be virtually useless unless evidence had been taken in these areas, I repeat my ques-

tion: did the committee hear evidence from country areas, particularly far country areas?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know what information I can obtain for the honourable member other than what I gave last week. The committee has completed its work but I have not received its report. Therefore, I cannot say what the report contains and where the committee took evidence. We appointed a committee to consider this question and to submit a recommendation to the Government. The committee has completed its work but has not yet reported to me and, until I receive that report, I do not know how I can add to my initial reply.

WHEAT QUOTAS

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my recent question about wheat quotas?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states that there are no current proposals for amendments to the Wheat Delivery Quotas Act relating to the carry over from one season to the next of short-falls in quotas. This question is one of several matters which must be considered in the administration of the wheat delivery quotas scheme. My colleague is confident that these are matters of which the Wheat Delivery Quotas Advisory Committee is fully aware, and that the committee will, if necessary, submit to him at the appropriate time its recommendations for any alterations it considers should be made to the present provisions of the legislation.

PORT NOARLUNGA SOUTH SCHOOL

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question concerning a primary school for Port Noarlunga South?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Recently, each inspector of schools was asked to carry out a survey of the school accommodation in his district up to the end of 1976. The report from the inspector whose district covers Seaford and Port Noarlunga South indicates that planning should commence for the provision of a new primary school on the site that the Education Department owns in section 331, allotment 118, hundred of Noarlunga. At present 61 children who live south of the river attend the Port Noarlunga Primary School. In addition, 26 children from this area attend Noarlunga, and about 20 children are conveyed to Christies Beach. A brief has been prepared recommending the erection of a school on section 331. In the meantime,

a tender is about to be let for the construction of a six-teacher open unit at Port Noarlunga. This will cater for increasing enrolments in the next two years, and will enable the removal of timber rooms when a new school is built at Port Noarlunga South.

NOISE POLLUTION

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation inquire into the method to be used in New South Wales to control noise pollution? Last evening's *News* reports that the New South Wales Government is considering propositions to reduce noise pollution. It is also considering strengthening legislation and regulations to solve this problem.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I read the article with some interest. I will cause inquiries to be made on what progress has been made in New South Wales. South Australia has made considerable progress on noise pollution. Much work has already been done by the Public Health Department, and a report will be made available soon.

FAN STATION

Mr. BECKER: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the fan station at West Beach?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The main sewage pumping station at the corner of Military Road and Toledo Street has been in operation for a number of years and no previous complaints have been received regarding the noise from the station. The main pump and motors are located below the ground and the only noise would come from the air intake to the ventilating system for the station. Investigations will be made into the noise level to see whether it can be reduced. These investigations will take some time to complete. As soon as I have further details I shall let the honourable member know.

MANNUM HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Works say when it is expected that the sports store at the new Mannum High School will be ready for tender? When the new Mannum High School was opened in the first term of 1969, it was obvious that there was insufficient room for a canteen. The room built for a sports store has been used as a canteen, and a sports store is to be built. One has been planned and I think it has been redesigned several times.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Together with the Minister of Education, I will look into this matter.

CRYSTAL BROOK SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Works draw to the attention of that worthy department under his control (the Public Buildings Department) the state of the work at the Crystal Brook Primary School? I was invited at the weekend to visit the Crystal Brook school and to inspect the grounds, and I found that much work had yet to be done on the sealing of the playing area. However, the department had built a new shelter shed, but it is about 8in. too deep, so that all the water runs off the playing area through the shed. The school committee, which is disappointed that the work carried out is of this standard, considers that additional work needs to be done on laying out the playing area. Will the Minister ascertain when the department intends to complete the work and will he call for a report on the standard of work already completed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: So far as I am aware, the information sought by the honourable member has already been sent to the school committee by the Minister of Education. However, if additional information is available, I will let the honourable member know.

TRANSPORT POLICY

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport clear up the important matter of transport? As the Minister is aware—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What is the question?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Whether the Minister will make a statement to clear up the important matter of transport.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. As the honourable member has asked whether the Minister will clear up the important matter of transport, I ask for your ruling whether that constitutes a question.

Mr. Millhouse: That's not a point of order!

The SPEAKER: Order! When I am being asked a question I want to hear what the question is, and honourable members must maintain the decorum of the House.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I take the point of order that the honourable member's purported question was not in fact a question. His purported question was whether the Minister of Roads and Transport would clear up the important matter of transport. That does not constitute a question in terms of the ruling that you, Mr. Speaker, have given previously in this House.

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member will express his question in less general terms, I will consider whether the question is clear.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I want your guidance as to a question in less general terms? I asked the Minister of Roads and Transport a question, and even the Minister of Education has now acknowledged that it was a question. I then proceeded to explain it. In those circumstances, it seems to me that I can specify the question clearly in the last resort only by explaining it.

The SPEAKER: The Minister of Education took a point of order. Explanation is by leave of the House. Unless the honourable member specifies his question, I will call on the Minister to reply. The honourable member appreciates that, when leave to explain is given, it is granted by concurrence of the House, and any member can raise an objection. I think I am being very fair in asking the honourable member to specify his question to the Minister.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I ask, if I may, whether the Minister of Roads and Transport will make a statement to clear up the important matter of transport, and I ask leave to make an explanatory statement.

The SPEAKER: As a point of order has been taken on that ground, I call on the Minister of Roads and Transport.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: What's the question?

The SPEAKER: The question is far too vague. The honourable member will help me, the Minister and himself if he will specify what the matter is.

Mr. Millhouse: You just asked him to specify his question?

The SPEAKER: I asked the honourable member on about three occasions to be specific.

Mr. Millhouse: He was getting up to be specific.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham must learn to contain himself in this House. The standing of this Parliament is not very high and I expect co-operation from members who have had experience in this Chamber. I have given the member for Alexandra about four opportunities, and this is the last opportunity. I asked him on the last occasion to specify the matter to which he wishes to refer.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I should like to ask the Minister who (and on what grounds) is sure and just what are the future traffic and road plans regarding metropolitan Adelaide. The supplement in today's *Australian* is, I would think, probably one con-

cerning which the South Australian Government contributed financially. I notice that South Australia is held up as a hive of industry.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You don't like that, do you!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Premier has an article on legislation for protection, and the article generally is meant to put South Australia in a good light, until we reach the column which, under the heading "Peaceful City's Enemy is the Car", states:

No-one seems sure yet just what are the future traffic and road plans for metropolitan Adelaide.

Further on, it refers to Dr. Breuning, and states:

He has submitted a report which the Minister of Roads and Transport (Mr. Virgo) announced that the Government had "adopted". Again, the question I ask is as follows: Who (and on what grounds) is sure yet just what are the future traffic and road plans in respect of metropolitan Adelaide?

The SPEAKER: Order! I am afraid that I just cannot understand the question but, if the Minister of Roads and Transport can understand it, I call on him to reply.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be interested to read the *Hansard* interpretation of what the honourable member has said.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: He'll have to correct it first.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: He may have to go up and correct it. If he has to do that in order to make sense out of it, I shall be delighted, as I may then be able to make sense out of what the honourable member has been attempting to convey to me. However, I am afraid that like you, Mr. Speaker, I cannot comprehend the terminology that the member for Alexandra has been using. Perhaps it is because of my lack of education; as I have not been a member of the Adelaide Club, perhaps I do not understand the language. However, I remind the member for Alexandra that on the opening day of this session his Leader asked me to stop making statements on transport, whereas his Deputy Leader asked me to make statements on transport: I told them both that when they made up their minds I should be only too happy to comply with whatever request they made collectively, and that position still applies. The member for Alexandra apparently cannot recall the debate that took place in this House when the Breuning report was debated and adopted by a majority of this House. If he cannot

recall that debate or is not willing to look it up in *Hansard*, and if he is not willing to look up the statements that have been made on this matter, I am happy to assist him in his dilemma and to provide him with a further statement, which I hope on this occasion he will keep and treasure.

Mr. NANKIVELL: In view of the statement appearing on page 8 of today's *Advertiser*, under the heading "Documents Displayed", I ask the Minister of Roads and Transport where, in fact, the documents relating to the new transport corridors are displayed and whether, if they are on public display, he will be good enough to make a set of those documents available to this House for members' perusal.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member may not have caught up with the news that the Planning and Development Act is committed to the Minister of Environment and Conservation, to whom I suggest the question ought to be directed.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the South Australian Government contributed to the supplement on South Australia in today's *Australian* and, if it did, why was a confession of confusion about Adelaide's traffic, instead of a clear policy statement by the Minister, allowed to be written? The report that I have cited states that the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan has been shelved, revised, adapted, and so on, and that the volume of road traffic is meanwhile increasing and no highway provision has as yet been made for this. Later the report quotes the Minister, and the whole meaning of the report seems to be that there is a monumental confusion in Adelaide about the traffic problems.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting on the report, not explaining his question. He sought leave of the House to explain the question.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I ask the Minister that question.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not aware that the Government contributed to the report. I certainly did not.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Before asking the Minister of Environment and Conservation a question I should like to have your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I have asked the Minister of Roads and Transport this question, and he has referred it to his colleague, but I have not received a reply. May I now ask it of the Minister of Environment and Conservation, to whom I should have directed it initially?

The SPEAKER: Yes, the honourable member may do that.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation say where the documents referred to as having been displayed by the State Planning Office are displayed and whether, as the documents have been made public, the Minister will make sets of the documents available to members or make them available in the House so that members may see them?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The documents are certainly on display at the State Planning Office and, if the honourable member or any other member wants to get a copy of them, I shall be pleased to find out whether copies can be made available. I will certainly make one available to the member who has asked the question and to any other member who asks me.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Treasurer say how much the Government has paid towards the cost of the supplement on South Australia in today's *Australian*?

The SPEAKER: Order! The question is out of order as it has already been asked of the Minister of Roads and Transport.

PORT PIRIE BLOOD BANK

Mr. VENNING: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health to consider establishing a blood bank at Port Pirie? Although I apologize here to the Minister of Labour and Industry, who represents Port Pirie, this matter affects Rocky River. At present, if blood is required by people in my district, a trip has to be made to Wallaroo to procure it, and the people hospitalized in Rocky River consider that if Port Pirie had a blood bank it would be much easier for blood to be procured in an emergency. Will the Attorney-General (I hope with the co-operation of the Minister of Labour and Industry in this regard) approach the Minister of Health on this matter?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain a reply for the honourable member.

SALT CREEK BRIDGE

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked several days ago about the Salt Creek bridge?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The department has design work in hand on the Salt Creek bridge, and it is expected that construction will commence early in 1972.

GAWLER HIGH SCHOOL

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Education say what is the position in the list of

building or design priorities of the additional solid-structure wing of the Gawler High School? The original design provided for three wings to the main high school structure, with two of those wings being built at the time of the initial building. Subsequently developments on the high school property have been of the prefabricated type of building. The last of these, which is the art centre, is presently being painted before it is handed over. In view of the increasing number of students at the school (the present enrolment is over 800), it is conceivable that within 18 months or two years this additional solid-structure wing will be required, unless the high school is destined to become a series of prefabricated structures.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: From memory, I do not think that the additional wing at the Gawler High School is presently on the design list. I think that the honourable member will appreciate that many secondary schools in the State would have a much higher percentage of temporary buildings than has the Gawler High School. The honourable member having asked this question, I shall be pleased to look into the matter and obtain a reply as soon as possible.

POONINDIE SCHOOL SIGNS

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Minister of Education investigate the need to resite the school signs at the Poonindie school? The school is situated on the main highway between Port Lincoln and Tumby Bay, and cars may travel legitimately at high speeds on that highway. The signs warning drivers that they are approaching a school are erected virtually right on the school boundaries, so that it is impossible for the driver of any vehicle that is travelling at high speed to be able to slow his vehicle to the required 15 miles an hour. If a driver is not aware of the presence of this school (and he has only the signs to warn him of its existence), it is practically impossible for him to observe the law.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member may recall that, when I was in his district, I visited the Poonindie school one morning. I think that he was engaged at Tumby Bay at the time and was not able to come to the school. On my visit, the matter was raised with me. When I got back, I raised it with the Minister of Roads and Transport and the Road Traffic Board, and the board has had the matter investigated in conjunction with the local council. From memory, I believe that agreement has been reached for

the shifting of these signs. I believe that I wrote to the head teacher of the school informing him of what action would be taken as a consequence of the approach made to me. From the honourable member's question, I can see that apparently nothing has happened yet, so I will look into the matter again and let the honourable member know about it as soon as possible.

BRIDGEWATER SCHOOL

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Education have investigated the hold-up in necessary work at the Bridgewater school? A contract was let for this work early in the year, but the contractor walked out, leaving the job. When I raised the matter with the Minister early in the year, I understand that he raised the matter with the department to have some immediate repair work carried out. I point out that at present a large tree, which is in a dangerous condition and which grows between two buildings in the schoolyard, is causing concern. Over windows without glass, two sheets of galvanized iron have been nailed. Part of one building is painted, leaving the balance unpainted. Half of the shelter shed is taken up by unnecessary junk; this shed is also riddled with white ants, whose effect is visible. Generally the school committee is disgusted and disappointed that, although the contractor left some time in early April or late March, nothing has been done since. Some gutterings still overflow, causing water to splash into classrooms when heavy rain falls. Will the Minister take up the matter to see that the necessary repairs and renovations are carried out as soon as possible?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will take up the matter with the Minister of Works.

MAINTENANCE ORDERS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Social Welfare reconsider the decision announced in this morning's newspaper that the Government does not intend at present to pay the costs of persons affected by the recent decision invalidating masters' maintenance orders in this State? The history of the matter was well canvassed by the Minister, in answer to a question, a few weeks ago, but the fact is that people, mainly women (wives or divorced wives), through no fault of their own, may well suffer very great hardship through the failure of their spouse or former spouse to keep up maintenance payments ordered by a master of the Supreme Court. Because of that very hardship they may not have the

money to go to a solicitor to seek advice, and that is what the Minister and his Department suggest that they should do. They may well become (and I am sure the Minister will agree that this could happen in several cases) recipients of public relief because they have been left without their maintenance payments. As the Minister said in his reply, this is predominantly a matter for the Commonwealth Parliament, but apparently he does not know (and we do not know) how long it will be—

The SPEAKER: Order! The information provided by the honourable member is getting a little lengthy.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —before the Commonwealth Parliament can act, if it acts at all. In view of the undoubted hardship that can be caused in this way and in view of the humanity about which this Government prates and boasts, I ask whether the Government—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: — will give priority to this matter and spend some money on people who are in need, rather than on some of the other grandiose plans which have been announced in this House.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Social Welfare.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Just for a short while during the question I had the impression that the member for Mitcham was really concerned about people who were in trouble, but his final remarks disclosed his real concern which, as is quite often the case unfortunately with the honourable member, was merely to score a political point.

Mr. Millhouse: I wish you would answer the question rather than —

The SPEAKER: Order! I allowed the honourable member for Mitcham rather extensive latitude in explaining his question, and I wish he would have the courtesy of letting the honourable Minister reply to the question, extending to him similar courtesy to that which was extended to the honourable member.

Mr. Millhouse: I point out that he started with a gratuitous insult to me.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. L. J. KING: If I managed at all to follow the matter raised by the member for Mitcham in between comments about irrelevant matters in which the honourable member included some gratuitous insults to the Government and me, I did manage to glean, amid those insults, that the honourable mem-

ber was asking a question about the Government's attitude to costs to which people who were forced to seek new maintenance orders, as a result of the High Court ruling, might be put. The position at present is fluid and I am watching it very carefully. The Commonwealth Government has assured me that it intends to introduce legislation to validate the orders that have been called into question, and I hope it does this soon. As the member for Mitcham has said when asking his question, this is a matter of Commonwealth jurisdiction. If it seems that there is likely to be any protracted delay and if it seems that women whose payments under maintenance orders may be stopped are required to incur legal costs to obtain other orders, I will consider approaching the Commonwealth Government for financial reimbursement for those people. At the moment, as I have said, it would be extremely prudent for husbands to continue to make payments under orders made by masters. I am not aware at the moment of any widespread problem, but I realize it could quickly become widespread. A report in this morning's newspaper is to the effect that my department will send a letter giving advice to about 9,000 people, but there is simply no foundation at all for that statement.

Mr. Millhouse: What is the number involved?

The SPEAKER: Order! There can be only one question at a time.

The Hon. L. J. KING: This morning's newspaper states that the department is to send letters to 9,000 people. That simply is not so. The question only arises where the husband refuses to pay. Fortunately, that has not happened in many cases, and I would hope that it did not happen. At present, if the husband does stop paying, the department advises the wife to consult her solicitor for advice on whether she should seek an order from a judge, and at present the ordinary rules applying to costs apply in such a case: the wife would be liable to pay her costs to her solicitor and would be entitled to recover them from her husband. A wife without means has the same right to apply to the Law Society for legal assistance in this matter as has a person in any other matter. I am watching the position closely. If it seems that hardship is caused to women because they are forced to seek advice and obtain orders and if the Commonwealth Government does not proceed quickly to validate the maintenance orders by legislation, I will consider

asking the Commonwealth Attorney-General whether the Commonwealth Government will provide for the costs that these people incur.

NAILSWORTH SCHOOL

Mr. CUMBE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about a new secondary school at Nailsworth?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There has been a need for revision of the plans of the proposed new co-educational secondary school at Nailsworth to incorporate the latest concepts of open-space design. This will cause some delay before final sketch plans are ready for submission to the Public Works Committee. The school council has a special interest in this project because of the incorporation of a subsidized assembly hall and, therefore, the Headmaster and Chairman have been informed of the present situation and assured that they will be given the opportunity to study the plans as soon as they are available. It is expected that the tender call target can be met, so that the completed school will be available for occupation at the beginning of the 1974 school year. However, because this proposal involves basically a replacement programme, it is conceivable that a postponement could occur if the necessary funds cannot be made available at the appropriate time. I have added the last sentence simply to make clear to the honourable member (I am sure he would already have made it clear to his constituents) that a target date of this kind is very much only a target date.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Dr. EASTICK: Is the Attorney-General yet able to tell the House when the statement by Mr. O'Loughlin, S.M., regarding the issuing of summonses will be distributed to justices of the peace? This question follows one asked several months ago about a case in which the Salisbury council had had set aside certain actions it was taking in respect of roadside stallholders. Subsequently, the Attorney-General spoke to Mr. O'Loughlin, who promised to write a statement that was to be distributed to all justices of the peace. On April 1 this year, when replying to a similar question to this, the Attorney-General said:

I will ask the Chief Stipendiary Magistrate what the position is and let the honourable member know.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I can say that Mr. O'Loughlin prepared a statement, which I saw. However, I shall find out what has been done about bringing it to the attention of justices.

NOTICE PAPER CASES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: For a long time I have been advocating the erection of Notice Paper cases outside the House in an effort to increase public interest in Parliament.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What's the question?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I understand the Minister of Works is now in a position to give the House—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: No.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, it says "J. D. Corcoran" on a bit of paper. I now understand that you, Mr. Speaker, can give me definite information on this matter.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member's understanding is correct and, in reply to his question about Notice Paper cases, the firm with which the Public Buildings Department is negotiating the supply of these cases has quoted a delivery time of between three and four weeks. It is expected that the work on the erection of these cases will be completed in six weeks' time.

ELECTRICITY ACCOUNTS

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Works ask the Electricity Trust to consider adopting a system of rendering monthly accounts for all consumers? By rendering accounts monthly there results a reduction in the total amount outstanding at any one time, and thus the trust would be running a smaller risk of non-payment and the trust might be able to extend the time of payment from 14 days to 21 days. Also, it might reduce the amount of any security deposit, which is usually about the amount of the average account last rendered, and it would therefore cut by two-thirds the amount of security deposit required and be less likely to cause hardship. I point out to the Minister that it would also reduce the amount of interest carried by the trust on those accounts.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I was going to say that I would have the matter examined but I think the honourable member would realize (as would every other member) that this system would treble immediately the cost of collection. If the honourable member is advocating any increase in tariff in order to cater for this, he should say so. I doubt whether he is, or at least he did not say so. Does he expect the trust to carry the additional cost in order to meet a few odd (and I say that advisedly) cases that have complained to him? I am not willing to do that, and I point out to the honourable member that I

have checked the methods used by other States for collection and applying deposits, etc. I am willing to make this information available to the honourable member in order to prove to him that the system used in this State compares more than favourably with the system used in any other State. I do not wish to weary the House with the details, but it may enlighten the honourable member if he studies this document.

KINDERGARTENS

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Education say whether finance is available to committees conducting pre-school kindergartens, particularly in country areas?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Money available for pre-school kindergartens is paid by the Government as an annual grant to the Kindergarten Union, which administers the funds. The position, as I understand it, is that once a committee applies for subsidy of its running expenses, often there is a delay before the union can make a contribution. If a kindergarten committee in the honourable member's district is establishing a kindergarten, he should communicate with the Kindergarten Union to ascertain the details that are involved in order to have that committee placed on the waiting list for a subsidy.

STURT PEA

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture what action is being taken to bring to the notice of the public the fact that picking wildflowers, particularly the Sturt pea (our State floral emblem), is prohibited on all Crown land and on private land without the permission of the owner? After the rather heavy rains in the Flinders Range area in 1968, many people visited that district during the spring season in order to see the attractive display of wildflowers. However, much damage was done by unscrupulous people pulling up native flowers, particularly the Sturt pea. Because of a public outcry at that time, the Government of the day brought this area under the control of the provisions of the Native Plants Protection Act. As there has been a good rainfall in this area again this year, people are concerned that there may be an influx of tourists to the area, particularly during the school holiday period, and that many tourists may be unaware of the law and so make themselves liable to be prosecuted, as only a few signs inform them of the offences they may commit.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will discuss the matter with my colleague, but I understood that the former member for Stuart introduced a Bill in this House, in 1968, I think, to protect the Sturt pea.

MAIN ROAD 155

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport make available the total cost of constructing Main Road 155, the road from Murray Town to Booleroo Centre? I understand that the original estimate was \$220,000, but I should be pleased if the Minister could give me the correct figure.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will try to obtain these details for the honourable member.

UNDERGROUND RAILWAY

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say what decision the Government has made regarding the underground railway along King William Street? Recently, I was speaking to one of the traders in the Victoria Square area, and he reminded me of the decision to remove from the festival hall the rubber cushions (or whatever they were) that were originally intended to deaden the noise of the railway as it passed nearby. He drew the conclusion from this action that the future of the underground railway was in doubt, and this is a matter of great concern to him and particularly to those who have businesses in the southern part of the city. The Minister will recall that in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study proposals the underground railway was one of the keys to the upgrading of public transportation throughout Adelaide, and I remind him that, with the Government's proposal to build a large hotel in Victoria Square, it will be even more desirable (if that project should go ahead) that there should be—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting and debating the question. The honourable member shall take his seat. I call on the Minister of Roads and Transport to reply.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think, as the honourable member rightly said, that many of the comments, such as that about the underground railway being the key to the upgrading of public transport, is an extremely debatable point.

Mr. Millhouse: I cannot quite hear you.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not attend to the public address system. I know that the

system is noisy today but, if the honourable member will listen, he will hear me, as he usually can, except when he interjects, which is the only time he cannot hear me. The position with regard to the underground railway is one on which no positive statement can or should be made now. Perhaps I will deal with this matter in a little more detail in an endeavour to satisfy the curiosity of the member for Alexandra and in reply to the question asked by the member for Mitcham. When debating the Breuning report, the House said that we should not plan and carry out those plans merely because the plans had been made, but that we should retain the greatest possible degree of flexibility in transportation. If the member for Mitcham gets an opportunity in the future again to visit the United States of America, as he was given when the Government some two or three years ago invited him over to show him around, I think he will find a vast difference in attitude now from that which presumably prevailed when he was there.

In fact, the Americans generally are saying, "Can we dig ourselves out of the mess of 25 years of concrete pouring?" With this thought in mind, major motor companies are advocating the use of part of what is called the gas tax to upgrade public transport and motor car manufacturers are investing vast sums in research, not into roads but into public transport, particularly the personalized rapid transit sector. The world is changing, and what Dr. Breuning told Adelaide (for those who were prepared to read what he said as a factual statement by a knowledgeable man) was that within the next few years radical changes in the mode of public transport would be available to the world. The linear induction motor is now well on the way to perfection (in fact, I understand that the English have already perfected it). Once that is actual fact, vast new fields will open up. It is on this basis that the Government said that we should retain the greatest degree of flexibility, so that whatever we are doing we can have the most modern form of transport available. This is why it would be incompetent to say that in 1985 we will dig a tunnel down King William Street and spend \$x million on doing something that may not serve our needs or be the best form of transport available.

QUORN SILO

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport consider permitting grain to be transported from the Quorn silo to the terminal—

At 4 o'clock, the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

BEACH POLLUTION

Mr. BECKER (on notice): What are the findings contained in the report concerning the effect of effluent from the Glenelg treatment works on marine growth at West Beach and Glenelg North beach?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Aerial photographs have shown that the seagrass and posidonia beds approximately follow the coastline along the eastern side of St. Vincent Gulf from the head of the gulf to just north of Christies Beach. In the vicinity of the Glenelg treatment works outfall the boundary makes a marked westerly sweep so that in the immediate vicinity of the outfall there is an absence of posidonia, the seabed consisting essentially of sand. Such westerly movements of the boundary are commonly found around the estuaries of all creeks and rivers and may be due to the inability of the posidonia to live in the reduced salinity where the sea water has been diluted by fresh water. The westward movement of the posidonia bed boundary in the vicinity of Glenelg commences at the Patawalonga outflow and extends northwards past the treatment works outfall before moving east to an approximately "normal" position. Thus, the absence of posidonia in this area may be due to the combined effects of the Patawalonga River and treatment works outflow of low salinity water. After a careful study of the available evidence, the Committee on Environment in South Australia in an interim report concluded that "the absence of posidonia beds in the immediate vicinity of the outfall from the Glenelg treatment works is most probably connected with the absence of such beds whenever significant quantities of fresh water, or water of low salinity, is discharged into the sea. There is no evidence at present before the committee which indicates that the absence of the posidonia beds is due to any contaminants in the effluent."

LITTER FINES

Mr. BECKER (on notice): When will legislation be introduced to authorize councils to institute both on-the-spot beach litter fines and general on-the-spot litter fines?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: No decision has yet been taken by the Government to introduce such legislation.

PREMIER'S VISITS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Since June 2, 1970, how many visits interstate has the Premier made?

2. How many overseas trips has the Premier made in this period?

3. What personnel from the Premier's Department have accompanied him on each overseas and interstate visit?

4. What was the total cost of these trips by the Premier and personnel accompanying him, respectively, for:

- (a) fares;
- (b) accommodation;
- (c) incidental expenses; and
- (d) entertainment expenses?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:

1. Twelve (12).

2. Four (4).

3. Overseas: Mr. P. R. Ward accompanied the Premier on each overseas visit, although not for the whole of each visit. Interstate: Messrs. J. S. White, P. R. Ward, J. Mitchell, K. J. Bertram and A. Baker accompanied the Premier on interstate journeys. The composition of the party travelling has varied in each instance in accordance with the nature of the business conducted.

4. Overseas:

The Premier and Mr. Ward—

Fares, \$11,068.72. Accommodation, incidental and entertainment expenses including costs of receptions, business lunches, cables, telephone calls, etc., \$7,525.68.

Interstate:

Premier and personnel listed in paragraph 3—

Fares, \$5,097.90. Accommodation, incidental and entertainment expenses, \$2,400.98.

PREMIER'S DEPARTMENT

Mr. BECKER (on notice): How many persons were employed in the Premier's Department as at May 29, 1970, and July 31, 1971, respectively?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The number of persons employed in the Premier's Department at May 29, 1970, and July 31, 1971, were as follows:

May 29, 1970	July 31, 1971
63	98

The totals of persons employed do not provide a basis for comparison because of the variation in the functions of the department as indicated below:

	May 29, 1970	July 31, 1971
Administration Branch.....	15	23
Industrial Development Branch.....	13	16
Policy Secretariat.....	—	6
Builders' Licensing Branch— (Staff in the Adminis- tration Branch assist with the work).....		3
Government Motor Garage.....	35	—
State Planning Office.....	—	47
Office of Minister of Environment and Conservation.....	—	3
	63	98

SCHOOL TENDERS

Mr. Evans, for Mr. MATHWIN (on notice):

1. Were tenders called for the construction of the Para Vista and Para Hills schools?

2. If so, how many were received?

3. Was the lowest tender accepted?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. *Vide* No. 1.

3. *Vide* No. 1.

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. How many accidents involving railway rolling stock and motor vehicles of any type have occurred in South Australia in each of the financial years from 1966-67 to 1970-71 inclusive?

2. How many accidents in each period:

(a) occurred at crossings protected by warning devices;

(b) involved stationary railway vehicles; and

(c) caused the death of vehicle occupants?

3. How many persons have died at the time of or subsequent to such accidents, respectively?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As the reply is in the form of a statistical table, supplied by the Commissioner of Railways, I ask leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS

	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70	1970-71
1.....	79	61	54	53	46
2.(a).....	28	10	12	10	12
(b).....	1	2	1	2	1
(c).....	12	7	4	7	7
3.....	20	8	6	26	8

TEACHER RECRUITMENT

Mr. FERGUSON (on notice):

1. What countries did Mr. Coker of the Education Department visit on his recent overseas trip for the purpose of recruiting teachers?

2. How many interviews were arranged in each country?

3. How many teachers were recruited as a result of those interviews?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Mr. Coker visited the United Kingdom, the United States of America, and Canada.

2. United Kingdom, 100; Canada, 129; United States of America, 30.

3. There were 144 offers of appointment made. Up to August 13, 1971, 57 of these have been appointed to Education Department schools in South Australia. It is pointed out that other officers who were in the United Kingdom or North America on leave or on a scholarship were also involved in interviews and recruitment.

HOUSING TRUST LAND

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What area of vacant land is held by the South Australian Housing Trust in the hundreds of Yatala, Munno Para and Mudla Wirra, respectively?

2. What temporary use is being made of this land?

3. What charges are payable by the trust on this land?

4. If any of the land is rented, what is the return to the trust?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:

1. Vacant land in broad-acres forms—Yatala, 373 acres; Munno Para, 3,195 acres; and Mudla Wirra, 20 acres; totalling 3,588 acres.

2. All this vacant land, except about 25 acres of future industrial land at Smithfield, is let out for grazing or agricultural purposes: (1) grazing on 30 days' notice at \$4 an acre a year; (2) agricultural on annual basis at \$6 an acre a year. These rates were made in consultation with the Lands Department.

3. The trust pays all local government and Engineering and Water Supply Department rates. (The licensee is responsible for fire hazard and noxious weeds costs).

4. The trust received \$20,957 during 1970-71 for use of the above land.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Brinkworth Area School (Replacement),
Morphett Vale East Primary School,
Roseworthy Agricultural College Redevelopment (Stage II).

Ordered that reports be printed.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from Legislative Council without amendment.

LOCAL AND DISTRICT CRIMINAL COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from Legislative Council without amendment.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND TRUST PROPERTY BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received and read. Ordered that report be printed.

THE REPORT

The Select Committee to which the House of Assembly referred the Church of England Trust Property Bill, 1971, has the honour to report as follows:

1. Your committee held one meeting and heard evidence from the following persons:

Judge G. E. H. Bleby, Chancellor of the Dioceses of Adelaide and Murray; and Mr. J. R. Cornish, Counsel for the Dioceses of Adelaide, Willochra and Murray.

Mr. D. F. Collins, Registrar-General of Deeds, Adelaide.

2. Advertisements were inserted in the *Advertiser* and the *News* inviting persons

who wished to give evidence on the Bill to appear before the committee. There was no response to these advertisements.

3. Your committee is of the opinion that the proposed legislation will be extremely beneficial to the church and that the rights of persons connected with the trusts which may be subject to the legislation are adequately protected.

4. Your committee is satisfied that there is no opposition to the principle of the Bill and recommends that it be passed in its present form.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOAN ESTIMATES

In Committee.

(Continued from August 12. Page 776.)

Engineering and Water Supply Department,
\$33,350,000.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was just about to speak last Thursday when the Treasurer suddenly closed off the debate, having made a short defence of his own position on the matter of the Dartmouth dam. A fortnight ago, in the absence of the Treasurer, I asked the Minister of Works how long the Government considered that this matter could be allowed to run without endangering the building of Dartmouth dam. All he said, in what is becoming his characteristically dictatorial and overbearing way, was that the Government would decide how long. When I interjected, asking him to say how long, he said:

This is a matter upon which the Government will decide. It will be part of the general question under discussion when the Premier returns, and when the Premier is ready to make an announcement to Parliament he will do so.

He has returned, but he has said nothing yet. When we were in office about 15 months ago, we were told that, if there was no additional storage on the Murray River within a short time (which I took to mean a year or so), there would be restrictions on our water supply during one year in three, and that the restrictions would be of such severity as to be intolerable. We are now a little over a year closer to what must inevitably happen when we have a run of drier seasons. The Government and the people of the State have been lucky so far. If there are adequate water supplies to ensure the future development of the State, I should be glad if the Treasurer would say so. I do not believe that there are such supplies. I know that the issue of water licences to people along the Murray has ceased because we are now up to or over the safe limit of our use of the river.

When we announced that we would bring this matter before the Chamber and that there would be an election if we did not succeed, the Premier, who was then the Leader of the Opposition, said that he would renegotiate the agreement within a couple of months, and he has never denied using that phrase. That time has long since elapsed. Although a Bill was pushed through last session, it was merely a piece of window dressing and took the matter not one step forward, as the Treasurer knows. Why did the Treasurer make his promise at Peterborough about renegotiation, when he already knew the attitudes of the Premiers of New South Wales and Victoria and the Prime Minister? Nothing changed from the time he made that statement to the time he came to office (nothing has changed since then, either). Therefore, he has no excuse for not honouring his promise and, if he could not do that, he should have admitted he was wrong. I believe he made that promise simply out of greed for office; I doubt whether he cared whether what he promised was attainable. More and more people in the State are realizing that one cannot rely on a thing the Treasurer says.

Mr. Langley: That's not correct, and you know it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Unley knows that public opinion surveys support this. The Treasurer's credibility among the people of the State is plummeting. During his absence, in answer to the Leader of the Opposition, the Minister of Works said:

I believe that my Party has made it perfectly clear all along that what it has attempted to do is to protect, as well as it can, the future of Chowilla in any agreement entered into regarding the building of Dartmouth.

I ask the Treasurer whether that is still the aim of his Government, and also how long he thinks we can afford to continue without any agreement and without consequently endangering the future water supplies of the State.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): If I may sift from the honourable member's remarks about my personal character, probity, and credibility publicly, the little of substance—

Mr. Millhouse: You're going on just as you did on Thursday.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I suggest that tomorrow the honourable member read his own remarks in *Hansard*, because they do him little credit. Obviously, at this stage the Government will not set a limit on how long it will proceed with negotiations, because that would preclude any success in the negotiations.

If that is what the honourable member asks us to do, I tell him we will not do it.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You said it in your policy speech.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has a poor memory and, if he likes, I will give him a copy of my policy speech so that he may read it. I suggest that members should rely on accurate sources when they make such peripatetic remarks. Since I have listened to the member for Mitcham tipping the bucket on me in that kindly, generous and understanding way for which he is renowned, I think I should be allowed to make a short reply.

Mr. Millhouse: It would—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Millhouse:—help us—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Treasurer.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has negotiated entirely on the basis that it stated and the negotiations have been reasonable. We have now received the support of the Murray Valley Development League and of members of Parliament outside South Australia.

Mr. Millhouse: Which ones?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member will find out in due course. So far, we have not succeeded, but I will not put a time limit on our seeking success in protecting the State by enshrining Chowilla in the agreement, instead of giving it away, as the agreement negotiated by members opposite did.

Dr. TONKIN: The Treasurer has not impressed me. He is out of touch with reality. He has made a name for himself by advocating unrestricted immigration at a time when we are having much difficulty getting our own population under control.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must confine his remarks in Committee to the item under discussion.

Dr. TONKIN: At one time, the Treasurer was willing to set a time limit. If he did not say that he would renegotiate the agreement within a few months, he certainly gave members and the people of this State that impression. That was 15 months ago, but last week he tried to dismiss the issue. Obviously, he is trying to give the impression that the matter is not important, and he criticizes the Leader almost for mentioning it, by referring to a "type of fulmination". I am concerned about what will happen to the city of Adelaide, which depends almost completely on the Murray River for water supply. More than 12 months

ago the four parties did agree about the Dartmouth dam. Three ratified that decision, but the party to whom it was most important has refused to ratify, only because of political greed. The former Government showed real concern for the future of the State but the present Government has been showing its lack of concern by adopting a light-hearted and "couldn't care less" attitude. It is not too late to get the Dartmouth dam, and I ask the Government to go ahead and get it.

Mr. COUMBE: Recently the Treasurer said that the escalation of cost of the Dartmouth dam would be about 10 per cent, and this raises the problem of the original agreement. This matter was discussed in May, 1970: it is now mid-August, 1971, and we are no further forward. The cost has increased by 10 per cent, so that, when the project is completed, we can expect a minimum increase of at least 15 per cent caused by general increases that obtain today. The Treasurer said that he had received letters from the other three parties to the agreement and that he would discuss the matter with them. Reading between the lines, I suspect that the other parties do not agree with the contents of the Bill that we passed.

In our debate last year members referred to the debate in the Victorian Parliament on this matter, and that the Bill was passed there without dissent. In that debate the Australian Labor Party spokesman, Mr. Floyd (member for Williamstown) wholeheartedly supported the concept of the Dartmouth dam, and condemned Chowilla dam. Only three or four months ago I asked Mr. Floyd whether he had changed his opinion and he told me that he had not and would not. He said that what he said in the initial debate in the Victorian Parliament was still his attitude. Unless the Treasurer has some up-to-date information we are no further ahead in obtaining a viable proposition for South Australia than we were when the Bill was defeated in this Chamber in May, 1970.

The present Treasurer defeated the Bill and threw away the chance of constructing the Dartmouth dam immediately. Many hard things were said during that debate, and I was one who said that the present Treasurer voted against the Bill in order to force an election and gain office: I repeat what I said then, because I mean it. As a South Australian, I am concerned that no progress has been made to obtain the water we need in this State. Fortunately, there have been no dry years for some time, but the day

will come when we have a series of dry years, and people living in the River areas and in other parts of the State will know what it means to be short of water and to experience the high salinity content caused by this shortage. A project like the Dartmouth dam (or any dam) takes a considerable time to complete, but at this stage nothing seems to have been done. It is a question of what we are going to do about a future water supply for this State.

A committee was set up by the previous Government to consider the total water resources of the State, but its report has never been presented to Parliament, although Opposition members have asked for this to be done. This is a matter of great importance to everyone in the State. I urge the Treasurer to say whether he can take further action as a result of the letters he has received because, from my experience, there seems to be no hope of the other parties reaching an amicable agreement to enable the Dartmouth dam to be constructed. For the first time since the original agreement was introduced in about 1915 this State was to receive a 25 per cent increase in the quantity of water as a result of the ratifying of the Dartmouth dam agreement, but, because of the defeat of the Bill in April 1970, this increase has been thrown away.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I am surprised at the Treasurer maintaining his facade of protecting South Australia's interest when, at the same time, the matters to which the member for Torrens has referred are not discussed and are even ignored by him. It is not only a matter of a supply from Dartmouth dam but also an increased supply for South Australia that is at stake, because such supplies will not be available unless the Dartmouth agreement is accepted. I am surprised that the Treasurer has denied that he said that he could renegotiate the Dartmouth agreement in a matter of months, because he knows that he said that.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I never said that at all.

Mr. HALL: A few moments ago in this Chamber the Treasurer gave a strong impression that he was denying that he said it. Now he says that he said it elsewhere; but he did say it. It was close to the last election, on the night on which he heard that there would be a challenge on this issue. He has failed to achieve the renegotiations within the matter of months in which he said he would achieve them. The Minister of Education knows that

this is one of the most fraudulent and deceptive political fronts that this State has ever seen.

Members interjecting:

Mr. HALL: The Treasurer knows in his innermost heart that he maintains only a political stance. He is risking the future of South Australia, particularly the district represented (or misrepresented) by the member for Chaffey.

Members interjecting:

Mr. HALL: It is time the public realized that it is being taken for a ride and that the increase in water has been denied it because this Government risks the Dartmouth dam and, with it, the additional allocation of water to South Australia. It will be the second matter that will be more detrimental to us than the question of where the water will come from. It will be the lack of totality of supply, and it will be the Treasurer's personal fault in leading his Government to this position if South Australia is unable to get this supply.

Mr. EVANS: Regarding the proposed Clarendon reservoir, the Minister of Works wrote to me on September 3, 1970, as follows:

I advise that the Engineering and Water Supply Department is continuing its field investigations at the Clarendon dam site and during 1970-71 an exploratory adit will be driven on the right abutment to obtain further geological information and physical properties of the rock at depth. Concurrently, studies are in hand to determine the desirable commissioning date of the reservoir, and it is anticipated that all necessary data will be available before June 1971. A small area of land at the site of the exploratory adit will be purchased in 1970-71 and consideration would be given to the purchase of other properties if it is demonstrated that the present proposals are causing hardship to the landholders. Some owners have indicated their desire to leave their properties and, in these instances, the department is prepared to negotiate with a view to acquiring the land.

There is no direct reference in the Loan Estimates to any expenditure on the dam. Although water is running to waste in this area, there is no guarantee that there will be such an abundance of it in future years. People in this area are concerned that their properties will probably be acquired by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. However, the Government has not said whether the dam will be proceeded with.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): If the building of the dam is commenced this year, we could devote funds from the sum allocated. However, I do not expect that any great sum will be spent this financial year.

Mr. COUNBE: An extra \$170,000 has been allocated to the line "Waterworks and Sewers" this year, but it does not take into account the escalation of costs, let alone the 6 per cent rise in wages in January, apart from any other rises that have occurred, including the metal trades rise of August 2, plus the increase in cost of materials. In effect, less work will be done this year than was done last year. Why the sewage farm redevelopment has been loaded on to the department is beyond me. Last year the estimated repayments were \$4,400,000, whereas this year they are \$5,600,000. As both last year and this year the sum provided by the Commonwealth Government for the Keith main was \$1,500,000, how is the sum of \$5,600,000 made up?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have no detailed information on how the payments are made up but I will get a report on the matter. I should have liked more of the cake than I got for the E. & W. S. Department. One does the best one can for the department under one's control, but the requirements of other departments must be considered, too. Overall, it was decided that we could manage on this sum within the department for this purpose, although we cannot do all that is required. No department gets all the money it really needs. We have now reached the stage where the sewerage for all the major country towns proposed to be sewered (apart from Stirling, which is in the hills and would not be called a country town) will be completed within the next three years or so, with the completion of Victor Harbour, where the preliminary work has been commenced. This will eventually have the effect of reducing the amount of money provided for that country sewerage, although there will always be a need for extensions and replacements of sewers in the metropolitan area. The member for Bragg spoke of the problems in the suburbs he represents. They are real problems. It is intended eventually to effect replacements in that and other areas. I do not expect a decrease in major sewerage works after the country towns have been sewered.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Minister give me his views on the future of the Chowilla dam? He suggested in a reply to me last year that the evaporation from the lakes was about 500,000 acre feet a year. We know that the estimated evaporation for the Chowilla dam is over 1,000,000 acre feet a year. I cannot see what the future of the lakes will be if the Chowilla dam is built.

Perhaps a lock or barrage could be installed in the lower river. It may be that the lakes will be allowed to survive, in a saline condition. It may be that the Government will want to cut off Lake Albert altogether. All these things appear possible in the event of the Government's insisting on the Chowilla dam being built in addition to the Dartmouth dam. What does the Minister propose? The southern districts rely heavily on the lakes from both an agricultural and a tourist point of view.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is a hypothetical question. The honourable member has suggested that certain things could happen if the Chowilla dam was built. That dam is not built and we do not know whether it will be.

Mr. Millhouse: You have got to that point!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Opposition has done its best to undermine the project. I know how important the future of the lakes is to the agricultural interests in that area. I replied to the question last year. There are no plans at present to alter the system in any way. I could ask the honourable member, I suppose: what would happen to the lakes if the Dartmouth dam was built and Chowilla was not? There is heavy evaporation in those areas and in the long term it might be that we would have to look at the advisability of allowing this to continue. There is, however, nothing to suggest that we should alter the present set-up. I am not going to comment on what would happen to the lakes if the Chowilla dam was built. In the reply given last year, there was some suggestion that certain things would have to be done. I say nothing further than that.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I find the Minister's reply disturbing. He is the representative of a Government that is holding up the ratification of the agreement on the ground that the Government does not wish to give away the right to build Chowilla; yet, when I asked a simple and relevant question about what would happen if we did build the Chowilla dam, he said that the question was hypothetical and he could not answer it. We should know the answer before we start talking. We should know that if we are to continue delaying the ratification of the Dartmouth agreement, which is waiting to be signed. Whether it will remain on our plate or whether it will be snatched away again before we can sign it is another matter. The Minister will not tell us what the effect of building the Chowilla dam will be on an important part of

South Australia. It is disturbing that a Minister should admit that he has not that information.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I seek information on the houses and the tramway track at Paringa, which are the property of the River Murray Commission. What is the intention of that body in respect of the track and the eight houses at Paringa, which have no service connections and have been standing empty for some years? I am told that the tramway track is now buried in several feet of sand in many places. Can the Minister ascertain from the commission its intention about this track and the future of these houses, as there is a demand for housing in Paringa at present? These houses could well be occupied, if the River Murray Commission did not intend to use them for some other purpose.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN : The Engineering and Water Supply Department intends to take over those houses, some of which I believe will be shifted to Port Pirie in connection with the sewerage installation there. I am not certain what will happen regarding the remaining houses or the track, but I will find out for the honourable member and let him know.

Dr. EASTICK: I seek information on the cement-lining programme under both "Metropolitan Waterworks" and "Country Waterworks". At this stage last year I indicated that the allocation for 1969-70 had been reduced to \$140,000 and that for 1970-71 to \$110,000. As some workers associated with this work were based at Gawler, I was particularly interested in the matter. The Minister gave me the following information last September:

The work of cleaning and lining *in situ* with cement mortar of old unlined cast iron pipes has been carried out on a large scale since 1948. The position has now been reached where the work has been completed in all regions, except as follows: metropolitan region—should be completed by June, 1971; northern region—should be completed by 1974. The reduction in funds allocated for this work this year represents the normal tapering off at the end of a large works programme.

As \$227,000 has been allocated this year, I should like to know whether there has been a change of heart and whether it is intended to retain some systems that it was earlier expected would be replaced. Will the Minister explain the reason for this considerable increase, having regard to the situation that was outlined 12 months ago?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot tell the honourable member offhand, but I will certainly obtain a report on the matter, for there is obviously an explanation for this.

Mr. GUNN: Under the item "Country Waterworks", I note that \$11,000 is allocated in regard to Andamooka. Can the Minister of Works say how successful has been the trial dam built at Andamooka to serve the township, and what plans the department may have to provide further amenities in respect of the Andamooka water supply? As the Minister is probably aware, the Government has subsidized quite heavily the progress association's activities in regard to carting water from Woomera. Has the Government any plans to build further dams, if the present dam has been successful?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

Mr. EVANS: I seek information on matters that I raised on the first line, the Treasurer having said that he would obtain the information sought and make it available to me. I should like to know whether the Minister of Works now has any of that information. If he has not, I should like to raise one or two matters.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have referred all the matters raised, I think last Wednesday evening and Thursday afternoon, to the department for reports. Certain reports were returned today by way of a letter, and I intend to write to each member regarding the matters raised and to reply in that way. Certain information was made available to members today.

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Works say whether the Government has had any reply from the Commonwealth Government regarding South Australia's application for assistance in connection with the Poldo-Kimba main? If it has not, can he say whether the Government has made any further approaches to the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I suggest that the honourable member note the Commonwealth Budget that is delivered this evening. I am just as concerned as he is, but I am not too hopeful.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister say what is proposed under the item "Country Waterworks", whereby \$26,000 is to be spent on proposed extensions, I imagine, to the Lamerook and Pinnaroo water supplies?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

Mr. EVANS: At present, people living in the Stirling council area are considering the council's zoning plans, which will be either accepted or rejected. These people are concerned to know where the E. & W.S. Department intends to site its treatment works. If it is to be sited in the water catchment area, does the department intend to pump effluent out of the water catchment area? On the other hand, if the department does not intend to place the treatment works within the water catchment area, where will it pump the raw material to be treated outside the catchment area, and what period may elapse before work will commence on sewerage this area?

If we can get more detail on this matter within the next six weeks, the people concerned will be able to consider the information when deciding whether to support or oppose the local council's plans. Also, can the Minister give any further information on the possibility of extending water reticulation services to blocks that are just outside those areas now served by reticulated water supplies? I know that the Minister is conscious of the problem confronting young couples, for example, who own blocks of land just outside a reticulated area and who cannot obtain reticulated water. I understand the Minister's problem if he allows an extension in such cases, for it may well bring a demand from people owning other blocks nearby. I receive letters regularly from people who own blocks of land but who cannot obtain a reticulated water supply. Will the Minister examine these points?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although I do not know what preliminary planning has taken place in regard to sewerage the Stirling area, I will try to ascertain the location of the treatment works and to find out what is happening in respect of the effluent. Concerning the policy on making available direct or indirect water supplies to people outside the boundaries agreed on by the council and the E. and W. S. Department, the honourable member is correct in saying that I appreciate the difficulty that this often leads to. However, as he has pointed out, if in one case we breach the policy of not providing water outside the boundary, this policy breaks down, because it involves not only the individual who may have applied for the connection: it probably also involves another 50 or 60 people in the whole area; indeed, it may involve many more than this. Certainly, some of them are heart-rending cases. I do not see how we could possibly change the policy to do

this, in view of the problem of control that we have generally in the area. I therefore have no intention of changing the policy that has been pursued, except where a distinct promise, which can be proved, was made prior to the policy being implemented. We had to meet several requests in cases where it was properly proved that promises were made in verbal or written form. In certain cases there was a denial that an approach had been made; this caused difficulties but, where there was some doubt, we gave the people concerned the benefit of that doubt. Beyond that we cannot go.

Mr. BECKER: Regarding the provision of \$1,109,000 in connection with Glenelg sewerage, can the Minister of Works say what income the E. and W. S. Department can expect from the sale of reclaimed water from the Glenelg treatment works?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The scheme would not have been agreed to if a reasonable return had not been expected. I am referring to the scheme that will serve the airport, a school playground and the golf course. I do not know what the exact return will be, but I will find out for the honourable member. The other allocation for the Glenelg treatment works is needed to continue the construction of additional facilities there to cater for the increased load. When the scheme is completed, 90 per cent of the treated effluent from the Glenelg treatment works will be used during the summer to water lawns, etc.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Regarding salinity in the Murray River, attention has been drawn in the Gutteridge report to Barr Creek, a very damaging source of salinity in the river. The suggestion has been made that works should be put in hand to commence a diversionary programme in respect of this saline drainage water. If the Minister is not familiar with the present position, will he obtain a report on the work currently being done in New South Wales and more particularly in Victoria to control salinity in the drainage and irrigation schemes that affect the Murray River? In view of the prevailing situation (no progress having been made in regard to additional storages), salinity will become increasingly important. Can the Minister of Works say whether consideration has been given to making salinity control a responsibility of the River Murray Commission?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member will be aware that the work at Barr Creek was contemplated prior to the

Gutteridge report. The Commonwealth Government made \$3,000,000 available to the Victorian Government to commence that work, because of the problem that Barr Creek was causing. In fact, \$2,000,000 of that sum was spent. I will check with Mr. Beaney, but I believe that the works contemplated at Barr Creek have been completed. It was on this basis that the South Australian Government applied to the Commonwealth Government, and this was followed by a detailed submission. Although some Commonwealth officers have looked at the South Australian situation in connection with finance on the same basis as the Victorian Government was given finance to treat Barr Creek, no final decision has been made on this and other submissions to the Commonwealth Government for finance. We recognize the need to do everything in our power to control salinity in South Australia, but it is a very much bigger task than was pointed out in the Gutteridge report.

The sum of \$1,900,000 or \$2,100,000 was referred to in the Gutteridge report, but we consider that more like \$11,500,000 is needed to control salinity effectively in South Australia. I have often said that the River Murray Commission should be responsible not only for quantity but also for quality. The Water Resources Council is looking at this matter, following the report of the Senate Select Committee on pollution. At the council's meeting last week we received a progress report from a standing committee that had been set up to investigate the question of a single authority—not so much on the river itself but over the whole of Australia—to control pollution, which of course would include salinity. We are still awaiting a final report and recommendations from that body. The Commonwealth Government would have to agree that the Water Resources Council was the proper body to handle the matter. The Senate Select Committee's report recommended a national body, but the Water Resources Council believes that it is the body that should do that work. That has to be accepted by the Commonwealth Government. Much technical work is being done by the Standing Committee of the Water Resources Council in order to convince the Commonwealth Government that that is the proper body to handle it. There would need to be effective co-ordination between the States. Members will be aware that the salinity of the water at Waikerie is double the salinity of the same water when it crossed the border. Therefore, it is necessary within our own State to

take measures to offset the problems that salinity causes.

Mr. BECKER: Does the provision for Glenelg sewerage include an amount for continually rebuilding the fence on the Glenelg North beach to protect the sand dunes and foreshore? Damage was caused there in the storm early this year. I understand that this fence is to be built further north towards West Beach to protect the new outlet there. What will be the cost of building this fence?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the construction of the fence has been commenced, it will continue. I do not know what it will cost, but I will find out and let the honourable member know.

Mr. EVANS: The sum of \$450,000 is provided to continue reconstruction within the south-western suburbs drainage area to cope with increasing outflows and to provide for the sewerage of the Blackwood and Belair areas. The next paragraph states that funds are also provided for the sewerage of many new housing areas, including Blackwood, Belair, Christies Beach, Noarlunga and West Lakes. Would the Minister explain the first statement, because it seems to conflict with the second?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I suppose the most important thing is that funds are being provided for Blackwood and Belair.

Mr. Evans: But how can the two statements be reconciled?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It may be a mistake. However, I think what is intended is quite clear: funds are being provided for the sewerage of many new housing areas.

Mr. VENNING: The sum of \$660,000 is proposed to be allocated to extensions, services and minor works on country sewerage. Will the Minister say whether the Government will consider soon those country councils that are doing their best to install effluent systems? One council in my area is certainly doing everything possible in this regard at present.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The present policy of the Government is to provide subsidies for those councils in the watersheds, or on the Murray River or the lakes appended thereto; it does not intend this financial year to extend that policy to other areas. I pointed out when this policy was announced that the Government would, over a period of time, extend its policy to cover the whole State. However, it is unable to do so at present. I also point out that, if the policy were extended to cover the area with which the honourable member is concerned, it would not necessarily follow that the Government would make a contribution to

the scheme, because it would depend on how much each connection in that scheme would cost. The Government has said that if the cost of a connection to an occupied dwelling exceeds \$30, or the cost to a vacant allotment exceeds \$12, it would meet the cost over and above those figures in order to make the proposition reasonable and to encourage councils to install common effluent drainage schemes. I expect that it will be three years before the Government will be able to extend this policy to cover councils outside those currently covered.

Mr. GUNN: I notice that the sum of \$44,000 is allocated to country waterworks in the hundreds of Minnipa and Carina. Can the Minister say whether this is for the replacement of an existing main or for the extension of an existing service?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not certain, but I will obtain that information.

Line passed.

Public Buildings, \$36,950,000.

Mr. HALL: I am prompted to remark on the offer by the Government of Government land for a new international hotel. This line involves expenditure for this year on land and services, as well as on public buildings. I deplore the Government's offer of the people's assets—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. This item deals with various forms of Government school and hospital buildings and the land and services associated with them. The case to which the Leader is referring involves Government land, but not in relation to any Government building dealt with in this line. Therefore, I believe the matter he raises is not covered by this line.

Mr. HALL: This land in Victoria Square was bought for the very purpose with which this line deals: it was bought to have Government buildings placed on it. A sum of \$150,000 is provided for the purchase of land, and also \$250,000 is provided for preliminary investigations and design. That would certainly cover the Government's intention regarding this asset that it already possesses.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot sustain the point of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I take a further point of order in relation to what the Leader said. There has been no provision for the purchase of this land this year. No item in this line deals with the land in Victoria Square, which was purchased some time ago.

The Government's current proposal is that the land should not be used for Government buildings.

Mr. HALL: It is the decision of the Government not to use the land as the site for Government buildings that I want to discuss and obviously this is the line on which the discussion should take place.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable Leader is in order at this stage.

Mr. HALL: I disagree with the Government's proposal to give away at least for 99 years over \$1,000,000 of the people's assets. So far, the Treasurer has tended to talk of the block of land that is now vacant in Victoria Square, but it is not just that block of land that the Government is offering to give away. The brochure that the Treasurer and his department have energetically compiled states:

The property at present standing on the western side of the site will be acquired by the Government and demolished, thus allowing overall development of the entire site. The Government will seek authority for the acquisition of the portion of land privately owned by submitting a resolution to both Houses of the South Australian Parliament ... In the case of the project in question, the Government would be prepared to lay out the site at no cost to a consortium in return for an assurance of the kind of development we required. The Government's programme of aid to development would include a progressive emphasis upon assistance with the provision and co-ordination of Government services.

Therefore what it is being offered to business is far more than the site in Victoria Square that we have been considering. I am reliably informed that the purchase price of the remaining land would exceed \$500,000, for on that site there is valuable refrigeration machinery. Therefore, the free offer for 99 years to people who are already wealthy may well exceed \$1,000,000. Apparently the idea is to give the land away so that a hotel can be built to entice tourists to come to South Australia. In that regard, the brochure defeats the suggestion that it is necessary to make this \$1,000,000 gift, by pointing out that South Australia already has an increasing number of tourists each year. Therefore, the tourist programme is working now, the demands being met by present facilities. In 1962, the number of tourists coming to South Australia was 442,000, whereas the present number is 871,000. The projected figure for 1980 is 2,250,000, and this is without providing Government hotels. People outside South Australia will wonder what is wrong with us

that we need to give away our assets to entice people to build hotels here. In addition, the Treasurer has denigrated the accommodation that already exists in South Australia. In a facetious reply to a facetious interjection, he brought it all down to the level of the Green Dragon.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think that the honourable Leader is drifting away from the point. I ask him to link up his remarks to the line under discussion.

Mr. HALL: The Treasurer has said that the Government has alternative sites for buildings for Government administration purposes. The Treasurer is indicating that, if he does not do something like this with the land, it will be wasted and the asset will not return anything to the State. Therefore, he intends to spend twice as much and give the land away. If it is surplus to Government requirements, the Government should realize on it, not do what no other State has done or intends to do. The Treasurer has implied that other States may be involved in this matter. He states:

... the complete lack of interest by major lending institutions in Australia to finance hotel-type development ...

The statement falls to the ground immediately because of the announcement on, I think, August 14, which states:

Plans are gathering pace for an impressive hotel-office-convention centre complex on a corner of North terrace and Pulteney street.

Mr. Coumbe: How many storeys?

Mr. HALL: The report states that there will be two 20-storey towers on the site.

The CHAIRMAN: The Leader must link his remarks with the item under discussion.

Mr. HALL: We are dealing with Government land valued at about \$500,000. The Government intends to add to that value by acquiring land, and to offer it to private investors. If my speech is a little wide, I submit that we are dealing with a large sum of public money and the subject of land disposal. The Treasurer has also said that we have no hotels in South Australia that are of international standard. He has ignored the Hotel Australia, the Arkaba Hotel at Fullarton, the Travelodge Motel on South Terrace, and the Park Royal Motor Inn. I could mention many others. The Treasurer says that these are not good enough for the type of people he wants to attract. Opposite Parliament House a building will be erected to a height of 20 storeys, 15 of which will be for accommodation, providing 300 rooms of international standard, linked

with an American organization controlling the greatest hotel-motel chain in the world, controlling 1,800 hotels and motels.

The Treasurer intends to give away the Victoria Square site to get something that is defined in the brochure to which I have referred. He has said that we need to offer this incentive to get people here and that otherwise we might lose in comparison with other States, but no such offer has ever been made in the other States and is not likely to be made. Sydney has a shortage of top-class hotels and I understand that the New South Wales Government will offer incentives to investors, but they will not include the offer of free land similar to that being made in South Australia. In Melbourne, there is no such proposal. The Southern Cross Hotel in Melbourne was built on the Eastern Market site, on land owned by the Melbourne City Council, and the rental is \$79,500 a year, to be readjusted in 1975, according to the consumer price index. I understand that that hotel pays both council rates and Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works rates. Queensland, Tasmania and Western Australia have no such proposals as the South Australian Government has.

Our Hotel Australia, which already has 162 rooms, will add seven luxury suites, and I understand that the hotel will be able to cater for evening entertainment for more people than will any other hotel in Australia. The conservative estimate of the present cost of building a hotel similar to the Hotel Australia is \$5,000,000 to \$6,000,000. It is farcical for the Treasurer to give away \$1,000,000 worth of assets to obtain a hotel estimated by Mr. Weinert (who appears to be working closely with the Treasurer on the matter) to cost \$5,000,000. The Treasurer knows that the sort of hotel he wants could not be built for that sum. We are giving away capital and the continuing yield from land tax. The brochure also states:

The unimproved land value for the complete site is \$527,280 and the land tax charge, based on a single holding basis, would be \$16,616 per annum. However, irrespective of the use to which the land is put, it would be exempt from land tax whilst the Crown Minister or instrumentality holding on behalf of the Crown owns the fee simple interest in the land. In negotiations with a consortium, the Government would be prepared, as a basis for tendering, to give consideration to a 99-year lease of the land.

A wellknown belief held by hoteliers is that, if a hotel is built for millionaires, it will go

broke. South Australia cannot expect to maintain a luxury international hotel in the next 10 years or so, on the basis of millionaire patronage. The brochure, dealing with hotel facilities required, states:

It is proposed that the hotel should contain an adequate number of suites in order to meet the expected tourist demand over the next decade for first class hotel accommodation of an international standard. It would need to provide conference facilities with adequate entertainment, eating, banqueting and meeting rooms. It would also need to ensure the provision of international standard services, that is, a 24-hour valet and laundry service, multi-lingual personnel, commercial stores, parking facilities, transport to airport, and secretarial services suitable for overseas and especially Asian business men. It would need to have sauna and swimming pool facilities, massage, and a restaurant providing Japanese food. It would also be desirable to have either a floor or a wing of the hotel catering for Japanese tourists and businessmen in a fully detailed traditional way, using the highest standards of design and including Japanese hostess entertainment and staff services in tea rooms and restaurants.

That is the ideal, but to get this South Australia will give away \$1,000,000. Perhaps the Treasurer, by this proposal, will obtain the support of wealthy overseas investors who will come here for the \$1,000,000 they will get out of the South Australian community. I disapprove of that, and would not make a similar offer to them. I expect that hotels of a proper standard would develop in South Australia without our giving away our public assets. The accommodation the Treasurer is seeking to build is too expensive and futuristic to be a viable proposition. Concern has been shown by those already planning to build similar hotels in South Australia about this discriminatory offer, and perhaps we will lose one or other of the hotels already being planned because of the Government's entry into this field on behalf of a restricted grouping of investors. I have been told that a large international hotel chain has already shelved plans to investigate Adelaide, because of the details announced by the Treasurer. This is a most irresponsible move and, if the State tries to progress by giving away its assets, there will come a time when it will be the poorer for losing these assets, which belong to the people. I urge the Government to reconsider its financial relationship with the Commonwealth Government, which it continually derides, and not to ask the Commonwealth Government to give the State something so that this State can give it away to wealthy overseas investors and to others in Australia.

Mr. Wright: Tell us about private enterprise.

Mr. HALL: The honourable member can be facetious, but let him try to explain to his constituents why they do not have all the Government services they want and why the Government has given away \$1,000,000 of their assets to those who do not need it.

Mr. Wright: We are trying to rectify your mistakes.

Mr. HALL: If private plans and the Government's plan proceeds, South Australia will have a surplus of high-class hotel accommodation. The Government is placing an impediment in the way of those already in the trade and those who want to come here and stand on their own feet. When I came into office I found that the Treasurer had promised the Lysaght company \$1,000,000 worth of land on LeFevre Peninsula if that company would put a rolling mill on the site. I was obliged to maintain that offer in pursuing the company's possible entry into the South Australian manufacturing field, but I was embarrassed by it and not helped. In fact, the giving of \$1,000,000 to Lysaght's was a drop in the bucket compared to their general industrial expansion: it would not have made one iota of difference in the company's final decision. Large companies would prefer to know that the Government would be sympathetic to business and would assist them over the years, rather than take an anti-company attitude that is being taken by the present Government. In South Australia we need a reputation for enterprise and initiative and that we are a going concern: we need an atmosphere of confidence. These conditions can be obtained only if we tell the companies that we want them as a viable concern and that we want them to take part in our activities in support of the South Australian community, and not as a company that would take from the Government that which is offered as a gift instead of having a proper development policy.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I support what the Leader has said about this hotel proposal. I am not sure whether the Treasurer has said that a full feasibility study on the proposal has been undertaken. If it has not, it should have been: if it has been, I would appreciate the Treasurer's making known the contents of the report. I put several points in addition to those raised by the Leader: first, I wonder what Adelaide has that would attract overseas visitors.

Mr. Keneally: A Labor Government.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is the last thing that would attract people from the United

States or Japan to come here. We must be objective about this matter.

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE: During the dinner adjournment, I looked at the *Hansard* references to this hotel project to see whether the Treasurer ever said that a feasibility study was being made, but I can find no reference to that in what he has said. I have also looked at the brochure itself, and there is no suggestion there that a proper study has been made. The only thing I can see here (and it is entirely unsupported) is in the foreword by the Treasurer, where figures of interstate and oversea holiday and business visitors are given. They rise from 442,000 in 1962 to 871,000 in 1970—almost double. Then appears this surprising sentence:

By 1980 it is projected that this figure will have risen to 2,250,000.

However, there is nothing to support that. I should be interested to know from the Treasurer what does support it. I hope I am under a misapprehension here and that a feasibility study has been made by, I should have thought, the policy secretariat in his own department. If the Treasurer can tell me that there has been, I shall to some extent be reassured although, without seeing it, not very much reassured. Certainly I shall be the opposite if no such study has been made.

Let me now move on to two of the matters that particularly worry me about this. First, what is there in Adelaide particularly that will attract oversea visitors here rather than to Melbourne or Sydney or here in addition to Melbourne and Sydney and the other Australian capitals?

Mr. Becker: Our clean beaches.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That may have been the case 10 or 15 years ago, but not now, and I hope something is done about it.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The member for Hanson should tell that to his constituents.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If anyone walks along the beach now from Brighton to Henley Beach or Grange, he can see the condition it is in. Those of us who can remember what the beaches were like 20 years ago or less must make a very unfavourable comparison between the two. It is silly to suggest that they are in top condition now; they are not. They are in a very bad condition.

I do not want to be misunderstood on this. I was born and bred in Adelaide and I love the city. I do not want to live anywhere else, but that does not mean to say that I think

everything about Adelaide or its surroundings is the best or the most attractive in the world. If I were a visitor from overseas coming to Australia for the first time, it would be hard to convince me that I should come to Adelaide, one of the smaller Australian cities, rather than to Sydney or Melbourne, the bigger and more interesting centres of population in Australia. However, two things we do have in South Australia which, in my view, are attractive and, to all intents and purposes, unique are not in Adelaide. They are the Flinders Ranges and the Far North (the outback). The outback, especially, is unique and, if people want something different when they come to this country, they must go there and not stick about in the capital cities to get it. The Flinders Ranges, of course, are lovely hills in which to walk and do all sorts of things.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must connect his remarks to the Loan Estimates.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am, Sir, and if you are following I think you will see that I am. The point I made was that the two tourist attractions of this State with any potential, in my view, are a long way from Adelaide, where it is intended to put this hotel. It simply is not good enough for the Treasurer, as he does in his foreword, to start off by saying that Adelaide is the most attractive of the Australian State capitals. Probably most people who live in this city would agree with that, but only a tiny fraction of people living anywhere else in Australia would agree with it. The Treasurer goes on in the foreword as follows:

It is set amid green park land with a business centre that is a blend of modern skyscraper development and distinctively gracious colonial architecture.

That last phrase gives me some hope that perhaps the A.N.Z. Bank building will be saved, after all. The foreword continues:

Flanked on one side by a low mountain range and on the other by fine surf beaches, Adelaide is a festival city, an expanding commercial centre and a convention city.

That may be just an advertising blurb; whether it stands up to analysis, and whether it will satisfy hard-headed business men, I do not know. If the Treasurer is not careful, it will simply be another of the examples to which I referred in connection with him this afternoon. Why should people want to come to Adelaide? The next point I make is this: what is being done in this regard in other centres of population in Australia? I cannot believe, and from what the Treasurer said in the Chamber a couple of weeks ago I do not think he would have us

believe, that we are the only ones who are thinking along these lines.

The Treasurer referred to Sir Henry Bolte and Mr. Askin as having approached the Commonwealth for help in this regard. I accept what he says at face value for the purpose of this argument, but we are obviously not going to be the only ones in the field, if we get into the field at all. It is impossible for me to believe that people would come here in preference to the other centres. Even more important (and the Leader touched on this today) there are plans, of which we know, for other developments in South Australia. In his brochure, the Treasurer said that at present there is a need in Adelaide for 950 first-class hotel rooms. He refers to 3,849 rooms or suites but does not split them up into classes, so we do not know how many first-class rooms there are now.

However, if there are to be other developments in this State of first-class hotel accommodation, without apparently the large inducement the Treasurer is considering in Victoria Square, we run the risk of having more accommodation than can be economically used. We have the site across the way which has been the site of a hotel for 100 years or more; it is a good site and we believe that there are or were plans for it until they were disturbed by this proposal.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Who said they've been disturbed?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Leader said so, I think this afternoon, and one would not be surprised to hear that those plans had been disturbed. If a rival were to be encouraged and subsidized by the Government, it would disturb me if I were the promoter of a project here. There is a site at the corner of Pulteney Street and North Terrace, to which he also referred. Can the Treasurer say whether any study has been made of plans for other first-class accommodation to be provided in Adelaide? Further, will there be enough room for all of them? These questions have not been answered. Finally, can the Treasurer say what will happen if studies are made, people can be persuaded to go ahead with the project, terms are agreed (something along the lines suggested by the Treasurer—a 99-year lease at a peppercorn rental on the Victoria Square site) and the project turns out to be a flop? Who will pick up the ticket if something goes wrong? How far is the Government to be involved if these things do not work out?

Let us face it: there have been other examples in Australia (the Southern Cross Hotel

has been mentioned) of ventures of this kind that have not been unqualified successes—to put them at their best. If my memory is correct, others have fallen through altogether. Of course, I do not like a Government going into an enterprise of this kind. If it must encourage this kind of thing, it should encourage it in other ways, but not in this way. I am very worried about the difficulties in which we could be involved if the whole project is a failure, and that is not beyond the bounds of possibility, even if it is all carefully worked out at this stage. So, I pose five questions to the Treasurer. First, has a feasibility study been made and, if it has, can we see it? Secondly, does the Treasurer think that this hotel of itself will attract international visitors to this State? Thirdly, what is being done in other States? Fourthly, what is being done in other ways in Adelaide to provide first-class accommodation? And, fifthly, what plans have been made for the contingency of failure?

Mr. GUNN: Will the Treasurer make available to all members and the general public copies of the brochure dealing with the Victoria Square development?

Dr. TONKIN: Apparently the Treasurer is not going to reply to the comments made on this line. I join with the Leader in expressing extreme concern about the Victoria Square development. Because the land was bought by the Government on behalf of the people, I do not think it should be given away. Consequently, I shall be interested to hear what the Treasurer has to say in reply to members' comments, if he is going to say anything about the matter.

I turn now to the shortage of beds at the Glenside Hospital. At present there is a waiting list of 27 for elderly patients. Can the Treasurer say exactly where the alterations and additions that are referred to in the Loan Estimates are to be made and whether they will increase the bed capacity of the Glenside Hospital?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot reply immediately to the honourable member's question about the Glenside Hospital, but I will obtain the information for him. A complete feasibility study on the project has not been undertaken. If members were to look at what would be involved in a complete feasibility project, they would realize the enormous amount of work that would necessarily have to be done. An adequate feasibility study would have to revolve around a plan. We could do feasibility studies on much less expensive and complicated projects in which

there would be some Government involvement and we could dictate the plan involved. Until we have the plan of the proposed building on the site, a feasibility study in relation to it is impossible. Therefore, what we have done is to make an investigation of the general profitability of a proposal of this kind. This gave rise to the brochure that has been printed. The final feasibility study on the project will have to be undertaken by those who are making a submission to the Government that they should be the consortia with which the Government will complete an indenture.

The indenture would then be made prescribing the facility to be provided on the site in return for the Government's letting out the site in the way we have described, and that indenture would then have to be investigated by a Select Committee. There would be special legislation to give effect to that. It would not be possible for the Government to undertake a complete feasibility study of a building the size and nature of which at this stage we cannot forecast. We have already had approaches from several organizations in relation to submissions made. The prescribed conditions of submissions are being prepared currently, and we expect those submissions to be made within some months because it will take a consortium some months to prepare the submissions. When we can negotiate with the group preferred out of the consortia that group will make submissions to the Government, an indenture will be prepared, and legislation will be introduced. I assure members that the Government is concerned to see that it has complete and effective oversight of the development of the project, and that would be a condition of the indenture that we will sign.

So far no other Government has a proposal for an inducement of this kind for hotel development. On the other hand, other Governments in Australia have offered inducements of this kind to obtain industry in certain areas of their States. The inducement of offering land to obtain development is not new in Australia, having been a feature of economic and development policies of Liberal Governments in other States. It is currently a feature of the economic and development policy in Victoria and New South Wales in respect of country industries. There is no departure from previous practice in providing this in South Australia; members opposite simply want to try to make a political point out of it. The Leader was happy to have

money spent by the State on upgrading the grain facilities in his area. Provision was made to lease the bagging plant at Wallaroo at a peppercorn rental. If the Leader wants us to adopt the attitude that we do not spend State money to provide for development by offering State property at low rental, perhaps he wants us to close the plant in his own district.

Mr. Gunn: It didn't cost as much as this.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: To upgrade that plant cost \$7,300, which was not charged to the person who used it. Where is the principle different?

Mr. Goldsworthy: You knew what the result would be.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We knew we were going to attract to an area employment that had not been attracted by any Liberal Government. Employment was not attracted until a Labor Government came to office.

Mr. Millhouse: Come on, get back to the point.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am dealing with the point that the honourable member has been asking me to deal with. There is no difference in principle in what is being done here and what previous South Australian Governments have done or what Liberal Governments elsewhere in Australia are doing now. Further developing countries give inducements to industry. For instance, in Singapore land is offered for hotel development, tax concessions are granted, and pioneer status is given to hotels. The Government has established a complete training facility and a hotel at Government expense to provide training facilities to handle the hotel beds now being provided in Singapore. A short time ago, there were few first-class hotel beds in Singapore.

Mr. Coumbe: Didn't they put a clamp on hotel development there?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They did not. By the end of this decade Singapore will have 13,000 first-class hotel rooms. Hotels there are developing, although restrictions were imposed under planning regulations in relation to hotel development in places where it would destroy privacy. Italy has a regional development project and the Irish Government has a similar scheme. Developing countries are offering inducements greater than the Labor Government in South Australia now proposes to offer in this project. True, at present no other Government in Australia has moved to the extent that this Government has in the hotel area, but other Governments have done

so in relation to other industry, and what is the difference? Previously South Australia has grossly underspent on tourist development and produced the kind of development that the member for Mitcham has mentioned in saying, "What is there in South Australia anyway, to bring anyone here?" I assure the honourable member that, whilst we have many tourist attractions in South Australia now (and he did not mention the Barossa Valley or the developments that we foresee on Kangaroo Island), we will have a series of developments coming off the desk consistently. These will be tourist attractions and will be located not only in Adelaide but also a short distance from the city.

Mr. Millhouse: What are they?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member looks at the Notice Board in this Chamber he will see one.

Mr. Millhouse: What is it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will not make announcements ahead of time. I assure the honourable member that I will make them when I am ready to do so, but these projects are coming off the desk.

Mr. Hall: It depends on how much you can find to give away, I suppose.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Leader thinks I am giving things away, he is being as short-sighted and blinkered as he usually is. That is consistent with his general attitude: nothing that the Government does to encourage industry is right, regardless of how successful we are doing it.

Mr. Hall: Get some industry and show the results.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader has not read today's newspaper. I assure him that the State will have many tourist attractions and many will be within the city of Adelaide. These developments are strongly supported by the Australian National Travel Association, as is the Victoria Square project. If the Leader speaks to the Treasurer of the State branch of his own Party on the subject, he will find how much support the A.N.T.A. gives the matter.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: They don't talk to anyone else.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Sometimes they talk to Mr. Hayward, and I suggest that they do so about this matter. He vigorously supports what the Government is doing.

Mr. Hall: He doesn't make policy for our Party.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: More's the pity for your Party, because I confess that he is

much more enlightened than Opposition members generally are, and I wonder why he does not come over to this side.

Mr. Hall: You are impressed by big business.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I am impressed by intelligence, and that is the important point in this case. Mr. Hayward is one of the people in the Liberal Party that I have found to be very intelligent indeed.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You concede that some members on this side are intelligent?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have found some members of the Opposition Party to be intelligent. I am sure that the honourable member would not suggest that none of them is intelligent.

Mr. Mill house: What is being done in other States, not necessarily by Governments, concerning major hotel development?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Major hotel development is running into much trouble. If the honourable member would talk with hotel consultants in Sydney, he would find that practically every one of the major first-class hotel developments proposed for Sydney in the last two years has been found to be uneconomic. He will know that a consortium bought the Hotel Metropole site, but both feasibility studies have shown that the development of a first-class hotel there would be uneconomic because of the site and rate costs. If he would talk to the management of Menzies Hotel in Sydney, which conducted one of the feasibility studies, he would get the details.

This situation has also occurred in Melbourne. The constant report of consultants on the feasibility of major hotel development has been that the site costs in a prime city area, plus the continuance of high rating in those areas, make the development uneconomic, and that is why this offer has been made. The suggestion that we should make some concessions of this kind has been accepted by the Premiers of Victoria and New South Wales and taken to the Commonwealth Government, which has rejected it and which refuses to treat the tourist industry as an industry needing special assistance, as is given in neighbouring countries in the Pacific basin. Even Fiji can give concessions in this area and produce development where Australia refuses it. Since the other States were not willing to do anything in this matter, the South Australian Government resolved to use assets that were already available to it to obtain the kind of

development that was needed here. I shall never apologize for that for one moment.

Mr. Nankivell: This is a perpetual lease and it cannot be terminated.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have not offered a perpetual lease in this matter: we have offered a maximum 99-year lease, and that is not a perpetual lease. It will be a lease provided for by a special Act of Parliament under an indenture, and it will not be in perpetuity. The State will be a remainderman.

Mr. Coumbe: You said that hotel development in Sydney was uneconomic: what about the two hotels in South Australia proposed by private operators?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader mentioned two hotels. There is a proposal for a hotel development immediately opposite here on the old South Australian Hotel site, and this would be over an airways terminal. There would be two floors of offices above the terminal, and the hotel development would be above this.

Mr. Hall: And hotel development on the ground floor and basement.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. In the basement there will be bar and restaurant facilities and there will be a lobby on the ground floor in addition to the air terminal. The hotel development would be quite a good one.

Mr. Evans: Of world standard?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, it certainly would not measure up, for instance, to the Mandarin Hotel in Hong Kong, and it would not measure up to the Kensington Palace Hotel in Kensington.

Mr. Evans: Will it measure up to the one in Victoria Square?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, but it will be of good standard. It will certainly be a valuable addition to present accommodation in Adelaide. I have had discussions with the finance director of Ansett Transport Industries on the proposed development there. He has discussed a number of aspects of the project with me. It will not measure up to what we are seeking in Victoria Square, but it would be a valuable addition to tourist facilities in South Australia.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the one in Pulteney Street?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is proposed basically as a motel development; it is not a hotel development of international standard. Application has already been made for this licence. That will be of a standard

comparable with the Lion Brewing Company development in North Adelaide. It, too, will be a useful addition to tourist accommodation, but it will not be of the standard which we are seeking in Victoria Square and which will result in a very valuable spin-off—a multiplier, in effect, of employment.

In consequence, we see no difficulty about the development of the other sites. These are not the only proposals for additional accommodation in the Adelaide area, for others are currently projected, including an 80 to 90 executive suite development in Hindley Street. But none of these will measure up to the standard we are seeking in this particular development, just as few developments in Australia will measure up to that. In fact, the Wentworth in Sydney and, on a very much more minor scale, the Parmelia in Perth, come closest to what we are seeking. But in fact if honourable members saw the latest hotel developments in Singapore and Hong Kong they would see the sort of standard which we are seeking and which is far better than anything that has yet occurred in Australia. In this, we are looking for something better than the Southern Cross in Melbourne. This will take some time to develop, but it can develop here.

The member for Mitcham has suggested that we will not be able to attract people of this class to South Australia, but our projections of development here, which were taken from the Tourist Bureau's figures, are soundly based statistically, and I assure the honourable member that we did not undertake this lightly, nor do the people who are coming here at the moment (and they are coming almost daily to make their inquiries and get the basis on which they should make their submissions to the Government) come without realizing that this particular inducement can actually make the edge in making a venture of this kind effective and profitable. Nor are those people coming without the knowledge that there will be an expansion of tourist traffic of the kind that would seek accommodation in a hotel of this standard. So we are convinced that, by laying out this site, we shall get a considerable investment in South Australia, which will be valuable to us in employment, and we believe that our tourist trade in South Australia is an area in which we shall be able to expand much more quickly than in almost any other sphere. For far too long South Australia has been getting very much less than its proportion of the gross national product in tourist trade. We have undersold ourselves

in the past, and the Government does not intend that that should be the case in future.

Mr. HALL: I am amazed that the Treasurer is aiming at hotel standards in South Australia comparable with those in Singapore. He knows very well that the people working in the hotels in Singapore are working on a much lower wage scale than the scale in operation in South Australia. The economic situation behind the establishment of hotels in Singapore and Hong Kong is vastly different from the Australian economic scene. The Treasurer is completely out of touch if he thinks we can establish the same things in South Australia on an entirely different wage scale. Does he intend that the hotel employees be paid less than they are now in South Australia? What does he believe the tariffs will be for the type of service he envisages? Experienced hoteliers will tell him, if he inquires of them, that the clientele of the type he proposes will not come here.

It is interesting that the Treasurer is saying that this projected hotel will not be given a perpetual lease. It is to operate on a peppercorn rental. Is it right that other people who are struggling in agriculture on small areas should pay more rental for their little blocks than the hoteliers with all their millions of dollars in Victoria Square? That is a comparison that the citizenry of South Australia will continue to make. Those people who want more facilities and are hard hit by the economic situation of this community will compare themselves with those who do not need the wealth that this Government is thrusting upon them. Here we have this extravagant gesture of squandering \$1,000,000 of public money, for which the Treasurer is outlining an urgent need, whereas we should be containing inflation in South Australia and curtailing expenditure. That is not a pleasant aspect of our financial management, nor does it augur well for expensive plans for State expenditure.

Everyone knows that the Commonwealth Treasurer does not contain his expenditure wilfully; he does so for the good of the nation, on advice tendered to him. This Government is to squander \$1,000,000 on non-essential expenditure. The Treasurer has already freely admitted that many private hotels will be erected in Adelaide. This is not some brand new scheme to establish in South Australia something that we do not have. It is not a new thing for this State; it is simply an extravagant idea and is reminiscent of those cottage industries that the Treasurer was so

fond of promoting in his previous term of office. Today, where are the cottage industries of South Australia that he promoted; and where is his promotion of them? They are gone, as this will be gone in future years.

Mr. EVANS: On what basis does the Treasurer assert that this project can survive on this piece of ground, even with Government hand-outs, where similar projects have failed in other States? I refer to States that have a greater population and at present a greater percentage of the tourist trade than we have. The Treasurer openly admits that the hotel to be built opposite Parliament House will not be up to the standard of the hotel to be built in Victoria Square, whose charges must therefore be higher. He states that there is not in South Australia at present a hotel of the standard of the one to be built in Victoria Square, and that means that the charges of that hotel will be higher than those of any hotel operating in the State.

Or does the Treasurer intend that the hotel in Victoria Square should undercut the rates of existing hotels operated by both private and public companies, taking their clientele and trying to put them out of business? Is it the Treasurer's intention to encourage a service industry, as he calls it, to the detriment of some other productive industry? Does the Treasurer mean to say that the success or failure of the Victoria Square project, involving land worth about \$1,000,000, lies in fixing a peppercorn rent and freedom to operate without paying land tax? Does he mean that that is all there is between a viable unit and a failure? Is that how small the margin will be on which this project will operate?

Mr. Nankivell: If it is, it will fail.

Mr. EVANS: Yes, definitely. I say that if there is to be a peppercorn rental, which I do not support, the people connected with the project should be given a 15-year lease, to be reviewed at the end of the term, and that land tax should be paid, as it is paid by every owner of rural property, every householder and every proprietor of an industry in this State. Let us not hear the non-payment of land tax justified by the statement that the Government owns the land in question, bearing in mind that those participating with the Government in this venture are competing with private industry. On what basis does the Treasurer say that he must provide this concession? He says it is a small concession, but I assure him that the money would be welcome in other fields. This money could be spent in certain

areas to the benefit of those in our community who are under-privileged. If it is to be a viable unit, the land should be sold to those connected with the venture, who should themselves prove that they can maintain in this State a hotel of world standard. If we are to have a hotel in this State of international standard, no-one would appreciate it more than would members on this side, but let the venture support itself. The Treasurer has, I think, admitted that similar ventures have failed in other States that have a greater tourist potential than this State has.

Mr. GUNN: Is the Treasurer willing to give to every member, and to those of the general public who are interested, a copy of the brochure that he gave to the Leader of the Opposition? It seems to me to be a poor state of affairs if the Treasurer gives away about \$1,000,000 of the people's money to some oversea combine or to Asian millionaires but will not make the information available to members of this Chamber and the public. I think that shows the present Government's attitude: do as we say, or else!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There was a limited run of the brochures printed. At present I do not have enough for distribution to every member, because they were originally prepared for those who were directly interested in making submissions to the Government. However, I shall see whether I can get additional printings made if the honourable member would like a copy and cannot get the one that I gave to the Leader of the Opposition. I would have thought that that copy was freely available: it is sitting there on the front bench. I cannot follow the argument of the member for Fisher, nor can I follow that of the Leader of the Opposition. At one moment he says, "You are handing over money to a wealthy combine so that it can make huge profits." Actually, we are not handing over very much in the way of money at all: what we are handing over is money already spent by the Leader of the Opposition for an area that has remained vacant, about which no plan has ever been drawn, and which has operated as a car park. That is what we are handing over—not \$1,000,000 of money.

Mr. Gunn: Sell it to them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member wants to sell it, but the planners have said that we should develop it as a hotel area. However, some members opposite do not agree with that. The consultants urged the Government that a hotel be established

on the site, and that is what we are seeking to do. The Leader says, "You are handing this over to a wealthy combine so that it can make huge profits out of South Australia." He makes that statement in one breath, and then in the next breath he says, "It will go broke and they won't make any money out of it." He cannot have it both ways. Members opposite put up ill-based criticisms of this project, no matter how utterly inconsistent they may be with what they said in the previous breath. The member for Fisher has complained that we are handing over money to wealthy people so that they can make profits, but in the next breath he says that it will not work—that they will not make any profits out of it, anyway. He says it will become a burden on the State, but it will not. Before there is any development in this area an indenture will be signed, the matter will be investigated by a Select Committee of this place, it will be ratified by legislation, and there will be proper safeguards for the Government's assets. So, there will be no harm to the State: instead, there will be development of the kind urged upon us by the Tourist Bureau, the Australian National Travel Association, and the travel associations in South Australia.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Treasurer fails to understand a fairly simple point when it suits his purpose not to understand it. The member for Fisher said that, if the concessions the Government grants to oversea interests will make the difference between success and failure, then a proposition of this magnitude is doomed to failure before it gets off the ground. I find the whole concept of this hotel fairly nebulous, and I find it hard to justify some of the Treasurer's statements at various times. He has often said that it would be the policy of his Government to tax the wealthy.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot allow the debate to proceed on the question of taxation. The honourable member must link up his remarks to the line under discussion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Treasurer intends to waive for some time the payment of land tax by the company that is successful in obtaining the right to build this hotel. In the light of other statements he has made, I find that hard to justify. I was more than surprised to hear him say that he was prepared to give the Lysaght company about \$1,000,000 worth of property as well as making a wharfage concession (this seemed to me to be a type of bribe) for 10 years. If that was supposed to make the difference

between making or breaking a company such as this, it was offering that company peanuts. However, it is not peanuts when we consider the economy of the State and the needs that exist in many fields.

At last the Government is providing for expenditure on the Modbury Hospital. Before the 1965 election, as part of its electoral campaign to win the Barossa seat, the Labor Party proposed the erection of this hospital. A proposal concerning a community hospital that would have been operating for five or six years was over-ridden by the Labor Party when it came to office in 1965. Unfortunately, at the end of that Government's term of office no work had been done on the hospital, probably to the disappointment of the then member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne). Just before it went out of office, the Government had a couple of Highways Department bulldozers go on the site (this was possibly an irregular practice) and, during the 1968 election campaign, the Treasurer was then able to announce that work on the Modbury Hospital had commenced. I should like the Treasurer to say when this hospital will be completed, staffed, and ready to receive patients. Perhaps some of those who remember the Labor Party promise seven years ago are wondering whether the hospital will be ready to take them in their old age.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to obtain a detailed report from my colleague as soon as possible. I think it will be about 18 months or two years before the work is completed but the honourable member would have seen in the Loan Estimates that \$2,947,000 was spent last year on the main hospital building.

Dr. TONKIN: I think most honourable members are familiar with the linear accelerator. One such instrument, owned by the Anti-Cancer Foundation and purchased for \$150,000, has been operating for several years. The new machine, costing \$200,000, was considered vital for the treatment of carcinoma and it arrived in Adelaide on, I think, April 22. Since then it has been left at Port Adelaide because no accommodation has been available for it. I am relieved that \$235,000 will be spent for this purpose but the accommodation has still not been provided. I am not sure that the calculated risk in placing the order early, possibly to save money, was a justified risk. I pay a tribute to the Watson Victor Ltd. technicians who are trying to keep the machine in order by pumping out the ion

tube every month. The packing case of the machine has a door in the side so that technicians can get in to service it. The guarantee on some components of the machine expires six months after manufacture and, on other components, 12 months after manufacture. Although I am not sure, I understand that Watson Victor Ltd. still does not know who will pay for the servicing.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The company will find out.

Dr. TONKIN: I would hardly expect that cavalier attitude from the Minister of Works, but we have come to expect it from the Government. The provision of accommodation is extremely urgent, not a matter for levity, because many people are awaiting treatment when this machine is installed. I ask that every consideration be given to expediting this work and making sure that this machine is installed as soon as possible so that there is the minimum chance of anything going wrong with it. I hope that the calculated risk that was taken for early delivery to save a relatively small sum does in fact come off. I doubt very much whether that sum will be saved in the long run.

I come now to a much more serious matter. A short time ago the Treasurer, when talking on another matter on this line, accused the Opposition of making a political point. I point out to members opposite that we are able to make political points only because of the Government's performance or lack of it in certain spheres. It is only because it acts the way it does that we can make these points, and we will continue to make them. Another point that needs making concerns yet another example of a promise by a Labor Government that is now not being kept: a promise that is being dishonoured by its lack of reference under this line. I refer to the promise that was made earlier this year by the Chief Secretary and Minister of Health to provide another 25 beds at the Lyell McEwin Hospital.

Mr. Hall: Wasn't it 30?

Dr. TONKIN: I understand that it was originally 30, but that it was then 28 and then 25.

Mr. Gunn: How many now?

Dr. TONKIN: None. Under this line there are items concerning additions and extensions to various hospitals, but I can find no reference whatsoever to additions to the Lyell McEwin Hospital. The Minister of Works may laugh; I suppose we have come to expect that from him. I hope that there has been a mistake in this matter and that we will hear

that provision has been made for these 25 beds and more.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Perhaps the press reported it wrongly again.

Dr. TONKIN: That may be so, and I hope that that is the answer. Provision is made under this line for various hospital buildings and additions. The Chief Secretary was quoted in January of this year as stating that 25 additional beds would be made available at the Lyell McEwin Hospital this year, but I see no reference to it in these Estimates. Various doctors in the Elizabeth and Para Hills area complained that there was a waiting list of six weeks for surgery at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. They spoke of a critical shortage of beds and of the fact that patients who were critically ill had to travel to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. I understand that one doctor has already left the area and that another doctor is considering leaving because of the lack of facilities.

As members will well know, the Government has provided a casualty department at the Lyell McEwin Hospital and as a result of this the number of patients treated there has increased from something under 100 to 1,300 a month. If that is so, the 25 extra beds, although they would certainly not go anywhere near relieving the shortage, would help to some extent. If this has been promised, I should like to know where the provision for it is and where the money is coming from. I should be most grateful for the Minister's reassurance on this matter. If a mistake has been made, it is an unfortunate one, and someone must explain. However, I believe that this was just another of those promises made—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member can seek information, but I cannot allow him to debate a line on the assumption that it is left out.

Dr. TONKIN: I should like to know what has happened to the promised 25 beds?

Mr. HALL: I have been approached by a doctor from the Elizabeth area concerning the promise made by the Minister of Health in the middle of January this year to provide 25 beds.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I called the attention of the member for Bragg to the fact that he could not debate a line on the assumption that it was left out. The Leader can refer to any line in the Estimates, but not on the assumption that it has been left out.

Mr. HALL: I have not said whether it was left out or not.

The CHAIRMAN: The Leader must link his remarks to a specific line.

Mr. HALL: You have not given me much time to link my remarks with anything, because I only said that I had been approached by a doctor in the Elizabeth area concerning the promise made by the Minister of Health in the middle of January this year to provide 25 beds. That is as far as I got before you stopped me.

The CHAIRMAN: The Leader has to link his remarks with a line under this item.

Mr. HALL: I was about to do that. I notice that \$11,950,000 is to be spent on hospital buildings. I wonder whether, under some unnamed line, the promise for the beds at the Lyell McEwin Hospital is honoured. The situation at Elizabeth is one of crisis concerning hospitals needs, and I am told that emergency admissions of patients is creating a most difficult situation.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I call the Leader to order on the basis that he must specify the line with which he is dealing. I will not accept the fact that he is assuming that it is there but probably left out. The Leader will have to link his remarks with a specified line under this item.

Mr. HALL: Would it be good enough for your purpose, Mr. Chairman, if I referred to the Loan Estimates document 1971-72? I refer you to page 12, and five lines from the bottom it states, "Lyell McEwin Hospital \$100,000." Would that be sufficient?

The CHAIRMAN: The Leader would be out of order, because we are dealing with the line "Government buildings, Land and Services".

Mr. HALL: It seems that I am not to proceed to discuss the Government hospital programme. I thought this matter would be included in this line, and I am amazed at your ruling.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That is the non-government hospitals line, and you should know.

Mr. HALL: I am amazed that I cannot continue to discuss this matter, but I will obey your ruling, Mr. Chairman. I noticed that you allowed another member to speak extensively on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN: The Leader must not dispute a ruling from the Chair. I called the attention of the member for Bragg to the fact that he could not discuss an item that was not

shown in the lines. The Leader must not dispute a ruling of the Chair.

Mr. HALL: I was not disputing your ruling, otherwise I would have moved to disagree to it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Nice and cheeky.

Mr. HALL: It is not being cheeky.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I warn the Leader that he must link his remarks with what is contained in this item, otherwise I will order the Leader not to proceed.

Mr. HALL: If there is a more suitable line, I shall adopt it to convey my remarks to the Committee.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You will then be able to congratulate the Government on providing \$100,000 for the Lyell McEwin Hospital.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. HALL: Obviously, I am not allowed to answer it, but I will speak about this matter on another line.

Mr. COUMBE: I do not dispute what we have heard said about hotels, but, as a former Minister of Works who had some part in the original planning, I am personally disappointed that the site has not been persisted in for providing accommodation for public servants, as it would have given the public ready access to Government departments. From the replies given me by the present Minister of Works, I am aware that the Government has acquired other property in Wakefield Street where it will, in due course, build accommodation for South Australian public servants. I do not know the cost of the acquisition of the Victoria Square site; it would be advantageous if the Minister could give members that information.

Training of medical students takes place at the Royal Adelaide, the Queen Elizabeth and other hospitals, and a limited amount of training will be done at the Modbury Hospital. What exercises my mind is the future development of the Bedford Park Hospital in conjunction with the Flinders University Medical School. Can the Minister say what plans the Government has in that respect? He should not need to be told that there is a limit at present on the number of medical students that can be trained in South Australia in our two major hospitals and the medical school at the University of Adelaide. I was aware of the project time table at the Flinders University Medical School and the proposed university—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Committee is discussing a line, and the honourable member must link up his remarks to it.

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister give me the information, if not now, in due course? I turn now to school buildings, which come under the auspices of the Minister of Works. I refer to the Karmel committee's report and, as both the Minister of Works and the Minister of Education are here, they can listen to me and perhaps I shall get the information I seek. Having been both Minister of Works and Minister of Education, I can see both points of view in this matter. The Minister of Education determines the priority of school building works and, after due processes and the *imprimatur* of the Public Works Committee has been received, the Public Buildings Department or a private architect nominated by it supervises the erection of the building, which is handed over to the Minister of Education, and it then becomes his for life, although the Minister of Works has to maintain it. Although I do not agree with some parts of the Karmel committee's excellent report, I do agree with the pertinent point on the matter I am now discussing—the liaison on school buildings between the Minister of Works and the Minister of Education. The report recommends that the allocation of funds and the undertaking of work be taken from the department of the Minister of Works and vested in the Minister of Education's department; that is to say, a division of buildings and plant could be established within the Education Department, architects being attached to that division and the necessary funds going to the Minister of Education. This is a radical departure from the present position and, although I am perfectly aware of what goes on and what improvements have been effected as between the two departments, I ask the Minister of Works, under "School Buildings", what is the Government's policy in this regard.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to obtain for the honourable member the information he seeks regarding hospitals. The second matter is in a slightly different category: the honourable member asks whether the Government will adopt the recommendation in the Karmel Committee report in relation to the Education Department's establishing its own works division, wherein the department will handle its major construction programme, as well as minor works. The Government does not intend to do that at this stage. The honourable member will probably be pleased to note that, following the consultant's report on the inquiry into minor works that the honourable member instituted during his term of office, the recommendations laid down in

that report were adopted on July 1 after protracted discussions with the department, and that the organizing in relation to minor works is off the ground.

I hope that within the next two years this will lead to a far more efficient and satisfactory system of carrying out minor works than has been the case in the past and that, in this respect, it will lead also to a strengthening and decentralization of effort within the department. I refer here to the creation of regional offices that will have a certain amount of autonomy, thus removing from the major design branch the problem concerning the design of minor works. These offices will organize their own work.

Mr. Coumbe: And this will be decentralized?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes. As I have said, it may take up to two years for this to become effective, but at least a start has been made and I am certain that as a result many problems that have been burdensome and annoying in the past will be solved. At present it is not intended to do anything else concerning minor works, although the Minister of Education will have a little more to say about this matter, concerning which there is need to effect improvements. As I think the member for Torrens will recognize from his experience as a former Minister of Works, there is a need to improve the performance of the client department, which is often at fault, the Public Buildings Department having been blamed unjustly for certain delays that have occurred in the past. I hope that the present programme will lead to an improvement in this area, and I think that the Minister of Education can outline certain steps that have been taken within his department that will, from the Public Buildings Department's point of view, improve the client's performance.

Referring to the remarks of the member for Bragg, may I say he is a very kind person! He always sounds off; but, if he had known his way around the Loan Estimates, he would have found that what he said about the Chief Secretary was completely unjustified. He is probably not willing to stand up and apologize for what he said, but his Leader woke up. He could see that provision is there regarding a linear accelerator. Anyone holding a position of responsibility must take a calculated risk; he must use his judgment, and I am confident that the judgment of the people involved in this matter is sound.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): The member for Torrens referred

to the recommendation in the Karmel report with respect to the provision of architectural services in connection with the Education Department. An office described as Principal Planning Officer (Buildings) has been created within the Education Department at a salary of about \$12,500 a year. The position has been advertised, applications have now closed, and the various applications are at present under consideration. What the Minister of Works said is true: client departments do have to improve their own performances *vis-a-vis* the Public Buildings Department. When they have improved their own performance, the extra demands they can make on the Public Buildings Department will carry much more weight. It has certainly been true in the design of public buildings in South Australia that they have tended to be designed up to a standard rather than down to a cost. That has mainly been the fault of the client department, not of the Public Buildings Department.

If a brief goes in for buildings in a certain area, it becomes very difficult for the architect in the Public Buildings Department to tell the client that that is not what is wanted and that something less than that ought to be taken. It is up to the client department to provide the necessary controls within that department so that a brief goes in that is in line with expected costs in this area. If that is done (and that is what we are aiming to do in the Education Department) we believe we will succeed in getting school buildings made available at a much lower cost for each student place than would otherwise be the case, but with a result just as effective from the viewpoint of educational standards.

Where we have established regional offices in Whyalla and Mount Gambier, the decentralization within the Education Department and the Public Buildings Department has already shown up in improved local performances. However, this principle will have to go much further. We expect that when that happens the kind of performance achieved will be much better and that many of the complaints that have bedevilled relationships between the Public Buildings Department and other client departments will be significantly reduced.

Dr. EASTICK: Expenditure of \$590,000 is provided for a new dormitory block, kitchen and dining-room facilities, etc., at the Roseworthy Agricultural College. Half of this money will be provided by the Commonwealth Government. We are reaching the situation where we are providing facilities without considering the teachers who will use those

facilities. On July 14, a Public Service circular indicated that senior lecturers—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must link up his remarks to the buildings at the college.

Dr. EASTICK: No useful purpose will be served in having facilities unless satisfactory arrangements are made for lecturers.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot allow the honourable member to proceed along that line. He must deal with what is provided in the Loan Estimates with regard to this college.

Dr. EASTICK: Facilities are of no use unless they are suitable for the staff. If the Minister would prefer me to discuss this matter under the Budget—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must rule the honourable member out of order, as there are other debates during which the subject he has spoken about can be raised. He must not deal with it while we are speaking to this line.

Mr. EVANS: I wish to refer to the Para Hills and Para Vista schools, reference being made to the Para Hills school in these Estimates. On August 10, the member for Glenelg asked the Minister of Works the following question on notice:

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

In reply, the Minister said:

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.

The honourable member also asked:

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

The reply was as follows:

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

The total figure was more than \$3,000,000. A Question on Notice by the same member today was as follows:

Were tenders called for the construction of the Para Vista and Para Hills schools?

The reply was "No." The honourable member also asked:

If so, how many were received?

Of course, again the answer would be "No." I ask the Minister why the Government has departed from the normal procedure, as I know it, of calling tenders for contracts for Government departments, especially in this case, in which about \$3,000,000 is involved.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The first and main reason why the Government engaged Civil and Civic in this case was that, with

the normal facilities, we could not possibly meet the deadline for these schools to be built. The second point was that the Government considered that the time had arrived to examine the package deal (as it is called in this case) and try it out, because the Government considered that much could be gained by doing this, and not only in experience from examining the techniques used by Civil and Civic. That company, although it is a New South Wales firm, is already based in South Australia and is doing work here. It is a reputable firm, and the Government considered that it could learn much from the techniques that the firm employed by giving it a contract of this kind.

As the honourable member has said, it is a departure from the normal procedure, and I think it is high time the Government made the departure. The Government is not different from any other business and if, as a result of employing people to do contracts of this kind, it can gain experience and make its own systems more efficient, it should do so. I am confident that the experience we have gained from employing these people on these two projects will benefit the Government in the short term as well as in the long term. That is not to say that we will let any more contracts to firms of this kind: we may do so but we may not.

It will not do the industry in South Australia any harm to get a bit of a needle in this regard, because I do not think that in the past we have always got the best deal that we could have got from the normal method. The honourable member may take it that the Government, in this matter, branched out into an area that had not been tried previously and did it with its eyes open because it considered that it and the State could benefit from doing so. The Government has nothing to hide. This was a package deal negotiated between the Public Buildings Department and the firm and it was examined in great detail over three, four or five months. The Tasmanian Government has already had experience with these people and has used that experience. We sent officers to Tasmania to examine the results there. There had been an inquiry in that State because of the employment of the firm, and we were able to examine that. The Government should have been doing this sort of thing some time ago. These people are acting on a guarantee of time and cost: we designed it for a certain cost, and we obtained it at that cost. In addition, we have

a guarantee on time, and that is an important factor.

Mrs. BYRNE: I express appreciation to the Government for the large sum of \$4,500,000 that has been allocated for the new Modbury Hospital. The member for Kavel sought information about the expected opening date of the hospital. He said that, before I was elected as member for Barossa in 1965, it was mooted that a small district or community hospital would be established in this area. The Labor Party put forward the Modbury Hospital as an election promise because it was realized that a small district or community hospital would not be large enough for an expanding area. It was stated that nothing was done during our previous term of office, except that in January or February, 1968, before the election in March, two bulldozers from the Highways Department were reported to be clearing the site. This is true, because it was not possible to build the hospital without first clearing the site.

Mr. Venning: Are you seeking information?

Mrs. BYRNE: The bulldozers were not on the site until February, 1968, because the project was not passed by the Public Works Committee until January of that year. The Opposition had a majority of members on that committee and kept calling extra witnesses in order to delay a decision on the project. In January, 1968, the then L.C.L. Chairman retired after his five-year term, and the Labor Government was able to elect its own chairman and, having a Labor majority, the committee immediately passed this project.

Mr. Clark: Unanimously, too.

Mrs. BYRNE: Of course. The member for Kavel wanted to know when this project would be completed and when patients would be admitted. If the Liberal Government, between 1968 and 1970, had allocated more money to this project it could have been finished by now. In 1968-69, the sum of \$150,000 was allocated under the Loan Estimates, and in 1969-70 a mere \$400,000 was allocated. If that Government had been sincere and really wanted to build this hospital it would have allocated more money to the project. That is why the project is not already finished. Following the change of Government in May of last year, \$3,500,000 was allocated under the Loan Estimates. What a contrast with the miserable sums of money that had been allocated in the previous two years! This year, \$4,500,000 is allocated. Consequently, I expect the projected completion date to be adhered to.

I now seek information on the line "Subsidies towards swimming pools, canteens, recreation halls, etc.—\$400,000". When speaking on the first line, I informed the Minister of Education that, when we reached this line, I would seek information about whether money was being allocated on this line for the erection of a canteen at the Modbury High School, which opened in 1965 and now has 1,079 students, the number, of course, changing from day to day. At present, the canteen is housed in temporary accommodation, but it is not satisfactory for the large numbers of children attending that school. Does this \$400,000 contain an allocation for that canteen? I refer now to "Appendix I, school buildings—Major works for which planning and design is proposed during 1971-72". Modbury Primary School is listed there. When speaking to the first line, I said I thought that this might be a mistake and it should be Modbury South Primary School. Is that so?

Mr. EVANS: I seek information from the Minister of Works, who said that there was a deadline to meet in relation to the two schools. He said that there had been negotiations with the group for up to five months before the contract was let. He also said that there was no guarantee that this type of contract would not be let again in the future. Were other firms given the opportunity of tendering or offering quotes for this project, or were the negotiations carried out solely with Civil and Civic for the \$3,000,000 contract, no opportunity being given to any other firms to offer comparative prices for those projects? If, in the future, contracts are to be let along those lines, could they also apply to other than education buildings—for example, hospitals or some other types of building?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Civil and Civic were the only people with whom the matter was discussed; it was a matter of time, in which we had to settle on a reputable and wellknown firm, and we did this. Although I have said that it is not intended at this stage to let any more contracts or allocate any more work on buildings to project management of this nature, that does not mean to say that it will not be done in the future in respect of either school buildings or other buildings. I think it is the Government's prerogative to decide this, if there is sufficient justification for doing so. In addition, it does not necessarily follow that other firms of this nature will not be involved in the future; in other words, it will not be confined to Civil and Civic. The Auditor-General was completely *au fait* with this matter

and, indeed, took part in some of the negotiations that led to the final contract's being let to this organization.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In reply to the member for Tea Tree Gully, I point out that the present position regarding canteens is that it is on a straight \$1 for \$1 subsidy basis, but the department provides the building shell for the canteen, and the school committee is then responsible for providing the equipment necessary for running the canteen. That means, of course, that the sharing of costs is much more beneficial to the school committee. In regard to Modbury High School, additions are planned and this project is currently on the design list. We hope to be able to call tenders for these additions in the middle of next year. I will need to check whether the provision of a canteen shell is part of that project and that it does not come directly under the provision regarding subsidized projects, which in the main cover a swimming pool, gymnasium or hall. The allocation concerning the Modbury Primary School relates not to a new primary school but to providing a six-teacher open-space unit for the school.

One factor worth noting in relation to the Civil and Civic matter is that it has been absolutely critical for the department to have stage 1 of these schools available, in the case of Para Vista, at the beginning of 1973 and, in the case of Para Hills, early in 1973. Although the Para Vista High School project has just been approved by the Public Works Committee, the Para Hills High School project has not yet been referred to that committee. To my knowledge, there is no previous example in South Australia where a project as large as this one, which has not been referred to the Public Works Committee, is planned for completion or for part occupation within 18 months.

Both schools involve a projected enrolment of 1,250 students, the projected expenditure on each school being \$1,525,000. The cost per student is \$1,200 and, if members care to check similar costs currently applying in relation to other secondary projects (for example, Port Lincoln, Whyalla, Gladstone or Lameroo), they will find no case where secondary costs have been kept down to as low a figure as that. That, of course, is a vital factor. Part of it is due to the open-space design. That has been a significant factor in connection with the Education Department's being convinced that the project management being brought in, in the form of Civil and Civic, with guaranteed time of completion (which was absolutely critical

from our viewpoint), was something that we should seek.

Mr. CLARK: I want to amaze the Minister of Works and the Minister of Education by saying "Thanks". Such an expression has been singularly lacking for the last few hours. At one stage the member for Bragg offered harsh criticism about something that he said the Government had not done, when the Government had actually done it. The Leader of the Opposition thought that one of his clown princes was putting him out on a limb—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have ruled discussion on that matter out of order, and I do not want any more discussion on it.

Mr. CLARK: I was very pleased to hear the member for Tea Tree Gully offer a word of thanks. The sum of \$36,950,000 has been allocated to public buildings. Since the primary and infants schools referred to in the Loan Estimates range from Allenby Gardens to Whyalla, one would have thought that many members would have something to be thankful for. On behalf of my constituents, I particularly offer my appreciation of the major additions planned for the Elizabeth Downs Primary School and of the library, costing \$104,000, at the Elizabeth Boys Technical High School. I am particularly appreciative of the provision for the building of the Elizabeth Technical College on Philip Highway, which college I inspected last week. Of course, I saw the plans for the building when they were considered by the Public Works Committee but, now that the building is being erected, I realize even more than I did before what a great asset it will be not only to Elizabeth but to places as far north as Gawler and places nearer the city, too. It will greatly help young people in the area, because they will not have to travel so far from their homes at night to do technical training.

Mr. VENNING: Although no provision is made for the new Gladstone High School, I expect that some money will have to be spent, since it is planned that the school will be completed in time for the commencement of the 1973 school year.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Is the honourable member linking his remarks with the line?

Mr. VENNING: Yes; a large amount is allocated for new schools. On page 21, in Appendix 1, there is a list of high schools in which Gladstone is referred to. Can the Minister say how much he considers will be spent on early work on this school, in the

light of the fact that it is to be completed for the commencement of the 1973 school year?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Appendix is always a rather peculiar document because it always includes projects as work to be commenced during the year, if the work either does not have to go to the Public Works Committee or has already been there. On page 17, there appears Appendix 1, with a list of major completed works. Under the heading "Major Additions" is listed the Willsden Primary School. On page 18, in the list of major works in progress at June 30, 1971, under the heading "Major Additions" are listed the Port Augusta Park Primary School and the Port Augusta West Primary School. None of those schools appeared on a list at this time last year other than the list on which the Gladstone school appears this year, the reason being that none of them had been to the Public Works Committee at the time the Loan Estimates were prepared, so none of them could be reported on by that committee. All those projects were Samcon projects. Once the project has been approved by the committee and the Public Buildings Department teams are ready to go, they can get the work done very quickly. At this stage last year, the Willsden Primary School had not gone to the Public Works Committee. It was a replacement school, and classes continued on the same site while the building was taking place. I think that work commenced about September last year, and the whole job was completed within a few months.

Now that plans for the Gladstone school have been before the Public Works Committee, if this document were being prepared now that school could immediately be transferred to the other list. The current design programme for August provides the Gladstone High School with a tender call target, which is the start of work by the Public Buildings Department as it will be undertaking the job, for commencement in February next year and completion in November. This will require the shifting of Samcon teams of the Public Buildings Department from other sites to Gladstone. Whether or not they are able to stick to that date exactly will depend on when they complete work on other sites. All this must be integrated with the other programme so that there is a continual Samcon building programme taking place. There has been no change whatsoever in the current plan of the department: the Gladstone

school will be built and ready for occupation at the beginning of the 1973 school year.

Mr. EVANS: In relation to Civil and Civic, the Minister said that a guarantee was given that subcontracting construction work and so on would go to South Australian firms. Was that written into the contract; was it a verbal agreement; or were those subcontracts signed with a guarantee before the main contract was signed? Can the Minister say how much is intended to be spent at the Stirling police station, and whether the old building will be demolished? If he does not have the information, will he get it for me?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I did mention that provision had been made for South Australian contractors to be used in the construction of the school buildings and, to the best of my knowledge, this was written into the agreement. However, I will check that and the other matter that the honourable member has raised.

Mr. ALLEN: I seek information in relation to the proposed Burra High School, major works, for which planning and design is proposed during 1971-72. Can the Minister say whether the proposed high school at Burra will be a Samcon building or of solid construction?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: At this stage, it is planned to be solid construction.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I wish to comment that, if honourable members are going to make debating points here, they ought to tell the true story, not some gossipy version of it. The member for Tea Tree Gully made what was to me the rather surprising charge that the Liberal members on the Public Works Committee had held up the inquiry on the Modbury Hospital, and she suggested that it was only after a majority of Labor members came on to the committee that the report was completed. I was a member of the committee when it recommended the project, although I do not think I had been a member at the beginning of the inquiry. The project was referred to the committee on September 21, 1967, and the committee reported on February 8, 1968. In other words the committee made a recommendation after five months.

Mr. Coumbe: The Royal Adelaide Hospital project took about 15 months to inquire into.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Members who know the work of the committee would not be surprised at the time it takes to conduct an inquiry into a large project. The estimated cost of the Modbury Hospital at the time the committee made the recommendation

was \$12,900,000. For a project costing that amount, five months is not an excessive time by Public Works Committee standard. If the committee has increased its speed lately, perhaps someone can tell me so. I became a member of the committee towards the end of the Modbury Hospital inquiry and at no time was it suggested that there had been any deliberate hold-up or delaying tactics. In fact, I have never heard the charge previously.

Mrs. Byrne: Well, I have.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: That is what I am complaining about. The honourable member picks up some gossip going around the place. I do know that the members of the committee, to a man, were so grateful to the previous Chairman of the committee that they honoured him on his retirement with much extravagant praise. It would have been extravagant, but I think it was accurate, because Mr. Shannon was one of the most distinguished Chairmen that the committee has had. The committee thought much of him and there was no suggestion of anything like what the member for Tea Tree Gully has put forward.

A period of five months for an investigation is not a long time by Public Works Committee standards. As the member for Torrens has mentioned, the Royal Adelaide Hospital inquiry went on for a long time, because new evidence continued to be introduced and the views of many people continued to be obtained. There is nothing more complicated than an inquiry about a public hospital. I well remember the final meeting of the Public Works Committee on the Modbury Hospital project, when the report was approved. I was one who approved it. The report included some lines that I was instrumental in having put in, and there was no dissent from the actual approval of the building of the Modbury Hospital.

Members of the committee knew that the report was wanted urgently because of a pending election. It was a unanimous report that was submitted, and I accept my responsibility for reporting in favour of building the Modbury Hospital. On the night the Treasurer delivered his policy speech he announced that work had started on the Modbury Hospital that day. Unfortunately, it stopped immediately afterwards because of other aspects. The Public Works Committee carried out a careful and sensible inquiry into the construction of this hospital, and I am disappointed that the member for Tea Tree Gully (who is Chairman of one Parliamentary standing committee) should

criticize another committee, and that the Chairman of that committee (the member for Elizabeth) and another member of the Labor Party listened so tamely without putting the record straight.

Mr. BECKER: Because of the reply given by the Minister of Education to the member for Rocky River about the Gladstone High School, can I assume that the alterations to the St. Leonards Primary School will be continued? I refer the Minister to his reply to my question of October 20 last. As the Commonwealth Government has given the State Government additional funds for this purpose, can he assure me that the six-teacher open unit at this school will be available in February, 1972?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Commonwealth Government has given us nothing to provide four or six-teacher open units or for general school buildings, and no change was announced tonight to the Commonwealth Government's policy that applied before the survey. For some years the Commonwealth Government has provided funds for science laboratories, libraries, technical colleges, and teachers colleges, but for none of those facilities are we spending only what the Commonwealth Government has given us. We are spending more than is provided by the Commonwealth, because the funds it provides are not enough.

So far as the actual allocation of Commonwealth funds year by year is concerned, a certain amount depends on when a project is ready to go, particularly in the teachers college area. Towards the end of the last financial year the contract for the Murray Park Teachers College was let. It will cost more than the Commonwealth funds provided, so State funds are involved in it. While the Commonwealth made part provision in the last financial year, this one and the next one, the bulk of the payments were in this financial year, so the return that we get from the Commonwealth depends on when we actually spend the money. It made a budgetary allocation in the last financial year, but we got little return from it there. One reason why there is a slight increase in the Commonwealth funds available this year is that fact in relation to the teachers college.

The St. Leonards school project has been delayed. There is the problem of funds and the lack of any response by the Commonwealth Government at any stage over the last 15 to 18 months to the national survey, in which the six State Liberal Ministers of Education and

the Commonwealth Liberal Minister for Education participated. Apparently, nothing is being done about it; it is a dead letter; it has been pigeon-holed.

Mr. Gunn: What about the ones you have pigeon-holed?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have not pigeon-holed anything. As we are in the process of correcting untruths or alleged untruths, I should like to deal with not an alleged untruth but a mis-statement of fact by the member for Mitcham on school buildings. When speaking to the first line he said:

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.

That is simply not true; it is a complete reversal of the truth. The honourable member has simply failed to distinguish between "gross" and "net" in the Loan Estimates document. The position last year was that out of the provision of, gross, \$16,500,000, it was estimated that the Commonwealth would provide \$2,840,000, so that the net provision last year was \$13,660,000. The net provision this year is \$16,100,000 and it does not matter whether we look at it net or gross—there has been a significant increase in the amount of funds provided. If we did not have lawyers on both sides of the Committee, I would say that lawyers are very good in certain types of argument but, when it comes to simple addition and subtraction, they have great problems, and I suspect the member for Mitcham was having one of those problems. If the figures since 1967-68 for provision in the Loan Estimates are considered in respect of these buildings, we see that in 1967-68 the gross provision was \$10,650,000, and the expected return from the Commonwealth at that time was \$75,000, so the net provision of State funds was \$10,575,000. In 1968-69, the gross figure was \$13,700,000, but there was a large increase in the amount of Commonwealth money at that time (\$1,770,000 estimated to come from the Commonwealth Government) and the net provision of State funds amounted to \$11,930,000. In 1969-70, the proposed gross payments amounted to \$13,800,000, the subvention from the Commonwealth Government was \$2,700,000, and the net provision of State funds totalled \$11,100,000, this being a reduction. Since

1969-70, which was the last time that the Liberal Government was in power at the time of the Loan Estimates, the gross provision has risen from \$13,800,000 to \$16,500,000 last year and to \$19,300,000 this year. The net provision has risen from \$11,100,000 in 1969-70 to \$13,660,000 last year and to \$16,100,000 this year. I think it is important that honourable members recognize that the statement made by the member for Mitcham was completely fallacious and without any basis whatsoever.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I would not have spoken on this line had it not been for some of the comments that have just been made by the Minister.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I hope you will correct the mistake you made.

Mr. Clark: Of course, you say that—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am grateful to members on the other side for making my speech for me, but I intend to make my own.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Mitcham has the call.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you, Sir. I listened with interest to the comments made by the Minister of Education on the national survey of educational needs, or whatever it is called. The Minister has overlooked the point made at the meeting at the Norwood Town Hall on June 16 by the then Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science, namely, that he and the Commonwealth Government were awaiting information from some of the other States so that various State assessments could be put on the same level and compared, and this is necessary before any action can be taken. The Minister might have made that point but, of course, he was only making a political debating point and therefore chose to ignore it. But it does remind me to say something about the meeting at Norwood, which I attended.

Whilst I was there, I met the representatives from the various schools in my district who handed me a list of needs in school buildings and I then did what I know they expected me to do: I put the list altogether in a letter to the Minister, dated June 18. I asked the Minister for his comments so that I could transmit them to those from the various schools who had taken the trouble to compile the lists and who want some action taken. The Minister acknowledged my letter on June 22, but it was a bare acknowledgment, and he said nothing more. I wrote on June 25, stating:

I asked for your reply in detail to the matters raised. I notice you have not referred to this in your acknowledgment. Do you intend to reply in detail as I requested?

On July 16, about three weeks later, the Minister wrote me a patronizing letter, in which he said that he intended to issue a policy statement to cover the general matters, and he also stated:

In addition, my office staff are examining the many letters I have received so that particular problems of each school can be examined and reported on by professional officers of the department. This procedure is being adopted so that the valuable time of professional officers is not swamped by the voluminous number of points which have general but not specific applicability.

We still have not had the general policy statement, so far as I am aware, though it is now two months after the meeting by which the Minister himself set so much store but apparently, again, only for political purposes. When I wrote to him on July 19 I said that I looked forward to hearing from him; further, I said:

I also note the somewhat patronizing tone of the third paragraph of your letter. I believe that I understood the purposes of the meeting on June 16. What possible point can there be in my taking up with my Commonwealth colleagues the particular problems of schools in my area? I look forward to hearing from you again.

There was not even an acknowledgment from the Minister, who is supposed to care very much for the needs of the various schools. He said he cared when he was trying to get into office! Then, nothing was bad enough to say about schools or those administering them. Now, when we raise genuine points, after two months we get nothing—not even a general policy statement, and certainly not any detailed points. Some people in my area and some in other districts are getting mighty impatient about this sort of treatment: it is simply playing politics. When can we expect action from the Minister and replies to the specific points raised?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is a great pity that the member for Mitcham is incapable of understanding some of the facts of life and the purposes of the Norwood meeting, the main purpose of which related to the national survey of educational needs. I am sure that the member for Torrens could explain to the member for Mitcham in words of no more than two syllables the purposes of that survey and the fact that the survey demonstrated a gap between what was needed to be spent on education to achieve reasonable standards and what

could be provided from State resources alone. The member for Torrens, like me, is well aware of that fact, because shortly after he became Minister of Education he sought a special grant from the Commonwealth Government to give us something to go on with. That happened in May, 1970. The member for Torrens and I have not agreed exactly on the total amount of the special grant we wanted, but we agreed on the need for a special grant, at least for school buildings, to get things going. The member for Mitcham is more loyal than he should be to his Commonwealth colleagues when he suggests that the Commonwealth Minister was just waiting for replies from the other States. The honourable member is disingenuous, to say the least. The request from the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science was made in September last year, but his Liberal colleagues in Victoria and New South Wales took months to reply. They have all replied on the question of capital assistance, and they had all replied on that question at the time that Mr. Fairbairn addressed the Norwood meeting. Two replies had not been received from State Premiers to the Prime Minister's letter.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Set the record straight.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member insists on setting the record straight: I am doing that.

Mr. Coumbe: There was a second purpose to the Norwood meeting.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes; I have made it clear that I am aware of that. I am coming to that. The member for Mitcham has not even the decency to admit that he told an untruth in this place. He does not admit he is wrong: he just comes back with a typical politico-legal performance. At the Norwood meeting, the Commonwealth Minister had had for four months replies from all States in relation to State capital projects and had done nothing, and he has done nothing since. Nothing has been announced in the Commonwealth Budget this evening.

The whole tactic of asking the States to rank projects in order of priority was purely a diversionary tactic and an excuse for doing nothing. Nothing has been done and the States have been played for suckers in that survey. Nevertheless, the Commonwealth participated in that survey and knew what would be necessary in consequence of it. Although we have been spending at the rate of \$19,300,000 on school buildings, the sum that should be available is about \$40,000,000. That is the kind of sum

which, over a five-year period, would improve school buildings to a reasonable standard. The member for Mitcham is not prepared to try to persuade his Canberra colleagues about what is needed. He says that that is my job, but they are his cronies. If anyone demonstrated at the Norwood meeting a complete lack of understanding of what were the real problems and needs of Government schools, it was the Commonwealth Minister. One good thing that has happened as the result of the sacking of Mr. Gorton is that we will get another Minister for Education and Science; perhaps he will be a little better.

In May at Brisbane all the Directors-General of Education in Australia passed a unanimous resolution that in their opinion there was a grave doubt about their ability to maintain the standard of education services. Although that resolution was passed on to Mr. Fairbairn, a week or two after returning from Brisbane he had the gall to state that his officers had told him that there was nothing really wrong with educational standards in Australia. That is the kind of lack of understanding and sympathy that we get. Although some members opposite are well aware of the deficiencies of some of their Commonwealth colleagues on this point, other members, such as the member for Mitcham, are simply not prepared to fight for decent education standards. The national survey was originated as the Liberal Party's answer to the fact that the Commonwealth Government made per capita provision for independent schools and no provision for Government schools.

Mr. Coumbe: That's your view.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is why I believe it was done. In answer to a question in this place, the former Minister of Education (Mrs. Steele) made it clear that the Commonwealth had to agree that there should be a survey of needs of Government schools before anything special could be done for them. That survey was carried out and the conclusions reached while every Government in Australia was controlled by the Liberal Party. The Liberal Party's collective Ministerial brains in education (including the Commonwealth Liberal Minister), considered that throughout Australia there was a gap of \$443,000,000 between what was needed and what would be available from State sources. All Liberal Education Ministers understood that the Commonwealth Government would try to help by providing capital, but it did not try then and it has not tried in the Budget delivered this evening.

I can only conclude that the Commonwealth Government does not really care and that certain honourable gentlemen do not think about Government schools and do not intend to know about them: their children do not have anything to do with those schools and the less those Ministers hear about our schools, the better. Unfortunately, this playing the States for suckers has gone on for so long that one must reach that uncharitable conclusion. The member for Mitcham has made pernicky little complaints. I suppose he knows that there are about 700 schools in South Australia and that the honourable, gallant and learned gentleman unfortunately—

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Don't be so bileful.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I feel bileful at the honourable member's lack of understanding and co-operation and his refusal to assist by bringing pressure to bear on his Commonwealth colleagues. I cannot be expected to twist the arm of the Liberals in office in Canberra but, because I am associated with writing Labor Party policy in these matters, I know that the Commonwealth Labor Party policy on education is good and I wish that the Liberal Party would adopt it. After the Norwood meeting, we received many letters. Some school committees wrote to the member for Hanson, telling him that they supported the implementation of the survey of needs and that they called on the Commonwealth Government to assist. However, that honourable member sent the letters to me, asking what I would do about the matter!

Mr. Becker: That's quite right.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is incredible. This Government, not the Commonwealth Government, has been responsible for the record increase in education expenditure in this State. The basic Commonwealth policy in education has not changed since I have been Minister, except for the announcements made in the Budget tonight. The Commonwealth will grant 200 teaching scholarships throughout the whole of Australia. Thank goodness, there will be an increase of some substance for colleges of advanced education, but there is no change in policy towards Education Departments. Opposition members are critical when I complain about the situation, but instead of writing to me they should write to their Commonwealth colleagues in Canberra. I except the member for Torrens, because I know of instances where he has taken up with the Commonwealth Government the case on behalf of South Australia.

The honourable member for Mitcham would appreciate that it takes much time to process the hundreds of letters received by the department. However, I hope that within the next week or so a general statement in reply to the issues raised in the letters will be issued. Most professional officers in the department work hard most of the time, and if the member for Mitcham thinks that these professional officers should be occupied in replying to general inquiries I am sorry, and I hope for South Australia's sake that he stays out of the educational field and remains in a profession about which he has more knowledge. Delays have occurred in replying to the multitudinous letters (and I do not apologize for them), but the letters will be answered.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I believe that the Minister of Education is, or was, an economist, and I was reminded of the old adage that if you put all economists in the world together end to end they would never reach a conclusion—and the Minister has reached no conclusion this evening. The Minister has seen fit to say much about the former Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science. Whilst the Minister was speaking, the member for Hanson gave me a letter written by the Minister (Hon. David Fairbairn) to Senator Davidson, canvassing the matter on which he is now being attacked by the Minister of Education. This may come as an unpleasant shock to the Minister, because it seems that he has banked on the fact that no-one on this side could defend the Commonwealth Minister from the uncharitable and baseless attack made on him. This letter was written a fortnight ago about this matter and, to rebut the nasty things said by the Minister of Education about the Hon. Mr. Fairbairn, I intend to quote from it, as follows:

Dear Senator Davidson, I refer to your personal representations, made at the instance of Mr. H. Becker, M.H.A., on behalf of the Secretary of the West Beach Primary School Committee concerning the nation-wide Survey of Educational Needs and the action the Commonwealth proposes to take.

This, incidentally, was one occasion on which the member for Hanson did not do as the Minister sneeringly said he did (send the letter on to the State Minister), so I hope the Minister will apologize to the member for Hanson for this. The letter continues:

I would point out that the survey was initiated by the Australian Education Council, which is composed of State Ministers for Education. The results of the survey in respect of Government schools and teachers col-

leges were made known to the Commonwealth early in 1970 and the State Minister subsequently published a report of the survey's findings in September, 1970. The information made available by the States as a result of the survey was taken into account by the Commonwealth during the Premiers' Conference in June, 1970, at which the basis of general financial assistance grants to the States was reviewed and new arrangements made for the following five years. Subsequently, the Commonwealth sought further information from State Education Departments on their capital needs and the non-government schools were requested to provide details of their needs. The collection of this information took some time—the last of it was forwarded to me in April this year—

and that gives the lie direct to the allegation made by the Minister of Education a few minutes ago—

but it was brought together in time to be taken into account by the Commonwealth in its preparation for the 1971 Premiers' Conference when the Commonwealth and the States agreed on further changes in the assistance to the States.

Then he refers to a statement illustrating the nature and extent of the general financial support, so I omit that paragraph. The letter continues:

In addition to assisting the States with general purpose funds, the Commonwealth is providing substantial specific purpose assistance to the States for both recurrent and capital expenditure on education. In 1970-71, these grants amounted to \$176,000,000, almost 20 per cent more than in the preceding year, and preliminary estimates for 1971-72 indicate a further significant increase. When Commonwealth expenditure on education in its own Territories and on assistance to students throughout Australia is added, total direct expenditure by the Commonwealth on education in 1970-71 was approximately \$300,000,000. Taken together, the significant increases in direct and indirect expenditure by the Commonwealth and the increased funds available to the States from revenue sources do, I believe, demonstrate the Commonwealth Government's awareness of educational needs and its readiness to help the States who have the constitutional responsibility to deal with them. Despite the progress—

and this I ask the Minister to remember and not say again the very personal, unpleasant and uncharitable things he said about Mr. Fairbairn, a man who, he thought, could not hit back in this place—

that has been made in various fields of education, this Government, along with State Governments and other authorities, recognizes that many improvements are still required. However, real progress can be achieved only where resources, both physical and financial, are available. In the current economic situation there is a particular need to restrain the growth of public authority spending on much needed

works and services. Yours sincerely, David Fairbairn.

It is appropriate that I should quote that letter. I am indebted to the member for Hanson for allowing me to do so, because it deals with the very matters on which he was attacked by the Minister of Education, an attack that the Minister thought would necessarily in this place go unanswered. I make one apology only—to the Minister of Works. I know that the Minister of Education has taken the conduct of the debate rather out of his hands. I hope that I have not provoked yet another long, rambling and inconclusive speech from the Minister.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Apart from the one statement at the end of the letter from Mr. Fairbairn quoted by the member for Mitcham, namely, that the current economic situation did not permit the provision of additional funds or public authorities spending, everything in that letter is a complete repeat of what Mr. Fairbairn said in a much more detailed form at Norwood. The facts of the situation are as I pointed out at Norwood: concerning 1970-71, the provision within the Education Department had not risen and, because there was a delay concerning Murray Park Teachers College, there had been a reduction in the amount of assistance granted by the Commonwealth Government. I am willing to say and to make quite clear that that delay is not the fault of the Commonwealth Government but, allowing for that, the hard facts of the matter are that the assistance given under the various headings by the Commonwealth Government in 1970-71 was no greater than in the previous year in respect of Government schools.

However, there was an increase in the amount of assistance given for other forms of education outside Government schools. I reject completely the argument advanced by the Commonwealth, namely, that the change in the formula governing Commonwealth-State tax reimbursement grants effectively covers the situation; it does not. In the past, the formula provided for a betterment factor of 1.2 per cent; it now provides—

Mr. Millhouse: What's this got to do with it?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Mitcham is at his usual petulant, irritant best (or worst), but if he cares to think for a moment about the nature of that formula he will realize that the betterment factor provided in it is only 1.8 per cent as against 1.2 per cent; that the difference made is marginal; and that concerning the overall five-year period

the bulk of the effect of the change benefited the States in the first year and would not benefit the States in the subsequent four years of the five-year period of the agreement. That is because in the first year of the new agreement there was a slight improvement in the base to which the formula applies. Therefore, there was a more than ordinary increase in the first year, but for the remaining four years of the new agreement it went back to the same kind of increase as applied in previous years.

I reject the argument used by the Commonwealth Minister and I have rejected it previously; I do not think it is a reply to the case that has been put by the national survey. I also reject the statement of the Commonwealth Minister that the survey was only the concern of the States. I think that the member for Davenport, when she returns from overseas, and the member for Torrens can confirm what I say: the States were encouraged to undertake the survey by the then Minister for Education and Science (Mr. Fraser), and the Commonwealth Government participated in it directly in relation to its own Territories (the Australian Capital Territory and the Northern Territory).

Mr. Coumbe: I think the Commonwealth came in at the suggestion of the States.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It may have but it participated in the survey, and it applied the same standards of the survey to the Northern Territory and to the Australian Capital Territory. If the member for Torrens cares to talk again to officers of the Education Department, he will discover that they are firmly of the opinion that the survey was basically undertaken with the encouragement and the full support of the Commonwealth Government. Indeed, I think the member for Davenport is on record in *Hansard* as having said that. Now, Mr. Fairbairn says it is just a matter for the States, but that is completely out of line with the viewpoint taken by Mr. Fraser. All I can go on is the performance that I can see, and the performance I have seen from Mr. Fairbairn on this matter unfortunately has not been good.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You are getting round shouldered through shedding responsibility.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member is anxious to see that his Commonwealth colleagues are not attacked, but he should well appreciate that Mr. Fairbairn in his short period as Minister for Education and Science completely ignored the

attitude of the Directors-General of Education in Brisbane and said the contrary in public only a few days afterwards. He came to Norwood and reiterated the whole argument, and it is only lately that he has started to get a little bit of the message that there are real needs in Government schools that are not being met and that the situation in many respects is still extremely difficult. It is a great pity that the member for Alexandra, among others, does not back up the State and speak for South Australia occasionally. He has never done it in the field of education, and unfortunately I suppose he never will: he is set in his ways. It is a great shame.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am sorry that I missed the earlier effusion from the Minister of Education, but I heard what he just said. In a personal reference to the style of the member for Mitcham, he described him in rather unpleasant terms. I thought the Minister was at his bombastic loquacious best tonight. I did not know much about economists when I became a member of this place, and I still do not. When I was talking to one of my Commonwealth colleagues I said that I had heard a Commonwealth spokesman for the Labor Party give a speech on social services and when it came to the punch line he had not worked out how the deal could be financed. I said, "What is this fellow like?" He replied, "He is not a bad bloke, but his biggest drawback is that he is an economist."

The Minister again insists on shelving his proper responsibility. As Minister of Education in this State he is responsible for presiding over the allocation of funds for education. It is all very well for the Minister to say at Norwood that he makes no bones about the fact that the taxing powers should remain with the Commonwealth. We know that this is the way he wants it. While the chief taxing powers remain with the Commonwealth, the States are spared the odious job of raising the revenue. The Minister always has this escape route, particularly when the Commonwealth Government is of a different political complexion from the State Government here. If things are not going the way he would like them to go, he blames the Commonwealth. If the Minister is to be at all responsible in this matter, the onus is on him to say how the Commonwealth Government should provide the money. Last year it had a Budget deficit of \$75,000,000, and it is said that \$280,000,000 a year is needed to provide adequate education services. About two years ago

the Commonwealth Leader of the Opposition said that we pay too much in taxation in this country. I took out figures that prove that if we want to raise large sums of money in this country in taxation we must tax average people, because there are so many of them.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The debate must not be on the subject of taxation. I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the line under discussion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will confine my remarks to the attack made by the Minister on the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science. The Minister of Education should say whether he believes general taxation should be increased. If the people are convinced that considerably increased expenditure is necessary in the field of education and in other fields, they must be prepared to pay significantly increased taxation. However, we are used to seeing taxation regarded as an impost, and the whole pressure on the tax raising authority, whether Commonwealth or State, is to curtail taxation. By blaming the Commonwealth, the Minister has a foolproof way out. We are sick of his denial of responsibility. If he wants taxation increased, let him say so. The other alternative is that the Commonwealth takes money from other fields and spends it on education. The Minister says that he wants an untied grant to be made to South Australia. Is he trying to convince us that other members of Cabinet would not have some say in how such a sum was spent? We were told that money from the lotteries would go to the Hospitals Fund. Do members opposite expect us to believe that all members of Cabinet do not discuss the expenditure of this money and that it is taken into account in the overall allocation to departments? Although the Minister says that we must have more decentralization in education, he wants the Commonwealth to take over further responsibility. Granted the Minister is an economist, and I do not know what that is. However, he should stop blaming the Commonwealth, or he should say that taxation should be increased.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I repeat that the Commonwealth Government could reduce its expenditure in certain areas, one being by removing its involvement in the Vietnam war.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Vietnam war is not dealt with in the Loan Estimates.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not intend to refer to that again, Mr. Chairman. I repeat that the reduction in taxation by the Commonwealth Government last year, which cost \$200,000,000, was a national disgrace,

because it gave more and more to the people who were better and better off. It purported to assist people on middle-class incomes, but it was directed mainly at assisting people in the top 5 per cent of income brackets. A person on an income of \$3,000 or \$4,000 a year might have paid \$1 a week less, and a person on \$8,000 a year might have paid \$5 or \$6 a year less; and so on up the scale.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I rule that this is not an open debate dealing with taxation.

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Works say how far the \$400,000 provided for the Government Printing Office at Netley will go, and can he say when construction is expected to commence?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The matter will be submitted to Cabinet next Thursday, and I guess that the \$400,000 will provide \$400,000 worth of construction this year.

Dr. EASTICK: An amount of \$2,000,000 is provided in the section headed "general" for minor alterations and additions, grading and paving, fencing, drains, roadways, etc. at schools and \$1,000,000 is provided for purchase of land for school purposes. I take it that these figures do not relate to specific intentions but that they are maximum figures for these types of work and no priority has yet been established for those items.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There is a planned programme for land purchases and minor works and in both categories, if all the matters in the programme came to fruition in the same year, we would overspend. Negotiations for land purchase can be relatively quick and smooth, reaching an easy conclusion, or long drawn out and complicated. At any one time we would have proceeding negotiations involving land costing much more than is provided for land purchases this year. The figure for this year is for cases that we expect to be finalized this year. The same applies to the minor works programme, which would cover works costing well in excess of \$2,000,000.

Dr. Eastick: There is a schedule of minor works?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes.

Mr. BECKER: I am pleased to note that the Government is to spend money on the Tourist Bureau building in Sydney, because it is in a poor location and needs improving. Can the Minister say when the alterations to cost \$100,000 will be undertaken, and whether the establishment of tourist offices in other States has been considered?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Offices are situated in other States already, but I will obtain details of the location and type of building from the Minister responsible for tourism. Also, I will ascertain when work will commence in Sydney and what is involved in that work.

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Education state his views on the future of open-space units? Honourable members who have seen these units are fairly enthusiastic about the work being developed in them, and there seems to be a feeling among many teachers that they have been so successful that the conventional type of school is already outmoded. The point of view has been put to me that building more conventional type schools is equipping the department with a form of structure that is no longer appropriate to the new teaching techniques that are being developed.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Most buildings that we are, or will be, erecting in the next two years will be of modern construction. Some of the present buildings resulted from planning that took place three or four years ago, when plans for open-space construction had not been brought to fruition. Even if we could translate all the existing buildings into open-space units immediately, there would still be serious problems because many teachers would not be readily adaptable to the new environment. The nature of the teaching force is likely to change relatively slowly, and I believe that there will be need for the continued existence of the older type of accommodation.

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Education a schedule detailing the purchase of land for school purposes, and can he say whether the replacement site for the Mannum Area School is on that schedule?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not have that information with me, but I will obtain it for the honourable member.

Mr. KENEALLY: I compliment the Government, particularly the Minister of Works and the Minister of Education, for the work that has been done on schools in my district. Members opposite have been firing bullets at the Government all day, and I think it is about time someone said something truthful with regard to the work that has been done in this State. In Port Augusta and in Whyalla Stuart our school programme has been upgraded very well. We no longer have any old schools in Port Augusta. (Of course, we

do not have any old schools in Whyalla, for obvious reasons.) I notice that the Education Department will provide a new school at Iron Baron, which is most welcome. I hope the Minister will consider providing a similar facility at Iron Knob. I suggest, too, that Port Augusta could, in due course, be given a second high school. Because the Government and the Minister have accomplished so much in my district over the past year or so, I am sure that both those schools will eventuate in due course. I take the opportunity of saying how welcome is the expenditure on the hospital in my electoral district. This facility has been needed for many years at Port Augusta; it is well on the way to being completed. I congratulate the Government on that.

Also, the new Port Augusta gaol is a great improvement on the old building. It is nearing completion. I suggest that members opposite look at it and, if they feel so inclined, stay in it. The Government is spending money wisely in my district. The people there have much to thank the Government for in respect of education and health.

Dr. EASTICK: I understood the Minister of Education to say that there is a schedule of works spelt out in relation to the minor alterations and additions, albeit that the total cost involved is greater than the final amount of money that will be available and there will have to be some pruning. The same applies in the purchasing of land for schools. Can the Minister say, if this schedule is available and this information is known, why it is that the members who make representations on behalf of schools have to wait so long to learn whether or not the work can be carried out?

The Kapunda Primary School has two buildings destined for demolition. Pictorial evidence has been given to the Minister's office of the grave danger of one of them. Broken glass and pieces of iron are strewn around. There is a verandah that is falling down and, although it is out of bounds, students playing football or cricket may chase the ball in that direction. Also, it is possible for vermin to be hidden there and for persons to secrete themselves in the premises, particularly the derelict one I speak of. A request was made of the Minister of Education in June for consideration of or some comment on this problem, and now on August 17 we still have not an answer. If this schedule is available the answer is "Yes" or "No".

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: First, the schedule is in the process of being developed by the Public Buildings Department, because there has not been one in the past. Secondly, any schedule that is prepared is not a fixed thing for a given period of time. It is continually subject to alteration, and additions are made to it. Furthermore, the timing of works in relation to the planning schedule is continually subject to alteration. In relation to land purchases one can estimate when it is likely that certain negotiations will be completed (but it is always subject to variation), and the same applies in relation to any works programme, and even more so to any programme involving minor works.

Much depends on what arrangements the Public Buildings Department can make with contractors. I recall the case at Kapunda to which the honourable member refers. I should have thought the original reference to me was not in June. I am certainly willing to check the date, but I have not yet had a report on the matter, or I would have contacted the honourable member. As soon as I have received the information I will let him have it. If it is not on the current programme of work, the matter has to be investigated, and it is not a simple "Yes" or "No".

Dr. Eastick: The original request was made over 2½ years ago.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It may have been, but if nothing has been done about the matter and the request is received, it does not involve a simple "Yes" or "No". The matter has to be examined, and one has to consider how it can be done, how it can be fitted into the programme, and how it can be financed. Many of these projects are more complicated than members of the public or honourable members would allow, and that may well be the case regarding the instance at Kapunda quoted by the honourable member. Now that he has referred to the matter again, I will certainly inquire for him and see that a reply is supplied as soon as possible.

Line passed.

Advances for Housing, \$26,500,000—passed.

Other Capital Advances and Provisions, \$20,850,000.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I refer here especially to the "Festival Theatre and Associated Cultural Facilities", for which \$1,700,000 is provided. If my memory is correct, the Treasurer said that \$900,000 of this was for expenditure on the festival theatre and \$800,000 for the cultural complex, of which we know little as yet. I

have no objection at all regarding the normal amount for the festival theatre, but at this stage I protest at the \$800,000 for the cultural complex. It seems to me (and I hope the Treasurer will not say that I am simply a boor who takes no interest in cultural matters) that we are going too far ahead to start planning for a cultural complex before the theatre is completed. I should prefer to wait until the theatre is completed before we plunge into something further.

It is said it will be a matter for legislation later, but at this stage the Committee is being asked to vote a significant sum without knowing what it is for. Apparently no-one knows what the sum is for, because the Treasurer says that it is for a cultural complex associated with the theatre which is presently under discussion with the Adelaide City Council. This is just not good enough, and I ask the Treasurer whether he can give a little more information about this. I ask this in the hope that I and other members of the Committee will be satisfied that at this stage it is a justifiable expenditure.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The expenditure of this money was forecast in the Labor Party's policy speech prior to the last election.

Mr. Millhouse: Can we take everything in that speech as gospel?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is what the people voted on.

Mr. Millhouse: There are many things you have not done.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member wants his questions answered, he had better stop his silly chit chat.

Mr. Millhouse: Get on with it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: I apologize to you, Mr. Chairman, for the difficult situation in which I placed you during discussion on an earlier line, when I discussed the Lyell McEwin Hospital. I was then clearly out of order. The problem is that the Lyell McEwin Hospital is a private hospital but it is also partly subsidized by the Government in respect of its casualty department. On January 12 the Chief Secretary announced that another 25 beds were to be added to the hospital this year. A leader in the *Advertiser* of that date said:

It is reassuring to know that a new 25-bed wing is being planned to increase the overall bed capacity to about 185.

I and others have received representations from medical practitioners in the area stating that no sign of the 25 beds has been seen. We are now well over halfway through the year, and those doctors do not know what is happening.

What has happened to the 25 beds? I cannot see how \$100,000 can provide 25 beds unless the hospital planning authorities have hit on a new method of building hospitals and supplying beds. We find in the Loan Estimates that it will cost \$28,400 a bed to replace the Barmera Hospital, it will cost \$23,780 a bed to build a new hospital at Karoonda, it will cost \$34,200 a bed to provide an extra 19 beds at the Keith Hospital, and it will cost \$14,690 a bed in connection with the 20-bed extension at the South Coast District Hospital and the 16 beds in the nurses home there. The sum of \$100,000 provided for the Lyell McEwin Hospital allows for only \$4,000 a bed. I can only assume that the provision is a first instalment. Perhaps the building already exists and it will be filled up with beds; if that is so, I cannot understand the delay.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As far as I am aware, the sum is a first payment. However, I will get the details for the honourable member.

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Treasurer say what is the position of discussions with the Adelaide City Council in connection with expenditure on the cultural centre? What direction is the funding likely to take between the Government and the City Council?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The additional building to be provided on this site, which is illustrated in the diagrams on the board, will be on the land owned by the State Government, not the City Council. Therefore, the City Council's approval does not have to be sought but it is desirable that we should have one administration for the total complex. It would be absurd to have a separate administration of booking and technical staff for the multi-purpose hall at present being built, and another staff with a separate director and technical director and so on for the home of the South Australian Theatre Company, experimental theatre and amphitheatre now proposed as additions.

Consequently, as announced publicly, we have a working committee set up as to the establishment of a trust to administer both complexes as one and to make recommendations as to staff appointments. The position about funding of the additional buildings is that the City Council will not contribute towards the additional buildings, for it is extended as far as it can be at present in providing the building already in the course of erection. As the honourable member will remember from the evidence before us at the time of the Select Committee on the present building, the City Council will not contribute

towards the construction of the plaza or car park either. These will all fall to the State Government or will be paid out of whatever moneys the newly constituted trust raises.

The situation is that in providing the plaza, car park and access roadways we will be faced with an expenditure of about \$3,000,000. We had to re-examine the whole of the access road, car park and plaza provision because the original heights and gradients proved to be unsatisfactory. We had to look at a whole series of ways of separating railway traffic from the traffic serving the festival theatre. Therefore, a new scheme of roadways has been developed that will retain the plaza complex, which I think is essential to the original architectural concept of the hall now going ahead. This will mean that access for traffic to the performing arts areas will be from King William Road and an exit roadway will run along beside the railway tracks to the bridge on Montefiore Road. Railway traffic will have access from North Terrace to the railway station and will be separated from the traffic going to the performing arts area; it will have a turn-around provision under the plaza beside the railway station and there will be an adequate car park as originally planned in the complex.

The new performing arts areas proposed will complete the recommendation of Mr. DeGaetani as to the nature of the performing arts areas required by us. It will not have, as he recommended, a 750-seat theatre, but will have a 600-seat theatre which will be the main home for the South Australian Theatre Company and which will contain its offices, administration provisions and so on. It will also have an experimental theatre area seating up to 200 people that can provide for theatre-in-the-round or almost any flexible type of performing arts activity. There will be an entirely flexible set-up as to the internal arrangement of that facility. Both of those will be under the one roof of the new building pictured in the diagram on display.

In addition, there will be an amphitheatre area which can seat up to 2,000 people for open-air performances and which can be flooded from the plaza between the two theatres. What has been produced here is, I think, the most exciting concept in the performing arts area yet to be seen. It is a much more extensive facility in what can actually be provided for the public than will be the case with the Melbourne Cultural Centre, which is proposing an extremely expensive underground development, or, of course, with the Sydney

Opera House, which was planned from the outside in and the facilities of which for \$107,000,000 will be far less than we will have for \$11,000,000 here. In addition, the total plan, when completed, will be better and more flexible than the Los Angeles centre or the Atlanta centre, and this in a city the size of Adelaide is, I think, a great credit to the architects.

The site is good. It was advocated by the Leader of the Opposition originally. We had some disagreements about that. As was forecast, we have had problems in developing this site, and with the total traffic access and the removal and resiting of other buildings. Nevertheless, when the project is completed, I consider that it will be a great facility in this State that no other State will be able to rival.

Mr. HALL: I do not want to debate the matter at any great length at this late hour, but the old system of the more millions we spend the less care we take in spending them applies to the theatre complex. Over the years the proposal for the festival hall has slowly developed and evolved and I consider that we have in course of construction a festival hall that is something for South Australians to be proud of; but we are embarking on a large total capital expenditure that I consider cannot be justified at this time. Of course, the final cost will not be \$11,000,000. I have not the latest figures of cost of the festival hall with me but I understand that it will be \$6,000,000 or more in excess of that figure. The proposals announced today will cost \$5,500,000 and I take it that the State involvement would be about \$10,000,000 or \$11,000,000 of the total. I understand that the plaza development would be expensive and would add significantly to those expenditures.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The plaza is included.

Mr. HALL: In the \$5,500,000?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Yes.

Mr. HALL: I stand corrected. I read otherwise into it in a quick reading of the original proposal, and at least that cost is less than I thought.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The new building is \$2,500,000 and \$3,000,000 is for car parking, resiting, and access roads.

Mr. HALL: I thank the Premier for that information. I am somewhat mollified to understand that the existing proposals will become a major part of the next expenditure. However, I still consider that the expenditure of \$2,200,000 is being incurred before its

time. I think that more consideration should be given to the matter. We are involved in a constant race against the time when it is necessary to provide essential services in the community and I consider that the one major step we have made in relation to the festival theatre is something that we need time to digest regarding our support of the arts in this way. What may be a small expenditure to South Australia is a major expenditure on a population basis compared with other States. For that reason, I have doubts about the additional expenditure at this time. They are a forecast before the festival theatre has been completed. It is one thing to have plans. We must have them to ensure that the existing building being constructed is constructed so that additions can be made in future, but I consider that it is premature to incur this expenditure at present. As the demolition of the printing works has not begun, I assume that it will be several years before the new printing works is occupied. That will delay expenditure to some extent, but it is possible that the Government could find itself in the position of not having the money available before it finishes the continuation of these payments, and the Government may not always be in the happy position of being able to retain nearly \$15,000,000 of Loan funds in the account. I repeat that I have grave doubts about the early beginning of additions to an unfinished festival theatre.

Mr. EVANS: I believe the Government has received a proposition with the object of retaining the A.N.Z. Bank building as a tourist attraction as well as serving the community either for performing arts or for other cultural activities.

The CHAIRMAN: Can the honourable member indicate the line to which he is speaking?

Mr. EVANS: "Festival theatre and associated cultural facilities".

The CHAIRMAN: Can the honourable member link his remarks to that line?

Mr. EVANS: We are spending about \$1,700,000 on the festival theatre and associated cultural facilities, and I believe that the A.N.Z. Bank building could be used for such a purpose. I believe there is a direct relationship in terms of the culture within the State and the acquisition of properties to preserve past cultures or to develop future cultures. Can the Treasurer say whether a decision has been made about this building and whether

assistance will be given to retain it or for the Government to purchase it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The suggestion by the National Trust about the basis of acquisition of the building is being considered by the Government. However, it forecasts a commitment indefinitely by the Government to a large annual sum in making up the deficiency between the amount of expected rents and the cost of servicing any loan raised on a Government guarantee. It would cost between \$50,000 and \$70,000 a year for an indefinite period.

Mr. EVANS: Equivalent to the loss of land tax on the building in Victoria Square.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, it would be more than that. The land tax on that building would be about \$16,000 a year, whereas this commitment is \$50,000 to \$70,000 a year, and this would put a considerable strain on the Budget. We have not rejected all approaches from the trust, as the matter is still being considered. However, I point out that the Liberal and Country League Government was not willing to lift a finger on this matter. If regulations had been promulgated and action taken to preserve this building, we would not have been in the present situation. We do not like it, and would prefer that the building had not been sold, but I assure the honourable member that the matter is still being considered by the Government.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Fisher sought information on a certain matter and the Chair was not certain whether the matter was covered by the information before it. The Treasurer has given an answer on the information sought. Any further discussion on this matter must be linked with the item now under discussion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am indebted to you, Sir, for that explanation. I have only one query arising from what the Treasurer said. He said that the yearly subvention would be between \$50,000 and \$70,000—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I allowed the member for Fisher to seek certain information, whether the information sought was covered by the item under discussion. The Treasurer has clarified that position and any further discussion must be linked directly to the item under discussion.

Mr. HALL: I refer to the line "Transport research". We are here confronted with an expenditure of \$500,000. What intrigues me about that is that it is not from the current income of the Highways Department or any other facility associated with transport, but

it is to come from the capital funds of the State. It will obviously bear interest for the full period during which the loans are current. I assume, therefore, that this money is to be devoted to capital expenditure on things of a lasting nature. What capital buildings or equipment of a lasting nature will be purchased with this money? Can I be assured that it will be totally devoted to that type of expenditure?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): If the Leader looks at the item closely, he will see that this money is for research. We do not normally start research by buying buildings: we involve ourselves in research. Today's press announces the appointment of a Director-General of Transport. As recommended in the Breuning report, he will be supported by a small team of people engaged in research. This fund has been established so that they can do real and effective research.

Mr. HALL: I am amazed that this money will not be used to purchase capital equipment. Am I to understand from the Minister that this sum is to be frittered away on something that will not remain with us after the next 12 months? Is this to pay wages and salaries for some transient purpose? The information in the Minister's statement is incredible. The Minister is surely not trying to tell us that it has come from a relatively large section of Government that imposes large-scale taxation upon the community? The Minister has this year imposed substantial additional taxation by way of increased motor vehicle registration and has done things in his administration that he criticized us violently for doing when in office. He has already significantly increased the taxation on the motor vehicle user and now he robs the Loan Fund, filching money from the capital funds of the State.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: This is your weakest effort.

Mr. HALL: If it is weak, how does the Minister justify spending money on which the State will be paying interest for over 50 years without receiving a capital return from it? Of course he cannot justify it, and this is one of the weakest of all lines in the Estimates. It illustrates the Minister's determination to get his way, regardless of the welfare of the community. The sum of \$500,000 that could otherwise be spent this year on capital requirements such as libraries, schools or hospitals will not be so spent, because the Minister wants to experiment with some wind-tunnel

machine, I suppose, to see how the southerly winds at Marino will affect that French hover-car or some other fairy-tale device from Disneyland that he intends to introduce.

I have grave doubts about the direction that the Minister will give this programme, which I do not think he is capable of directing; but one cannot finally judge the matter until the results, if there are to be any, come in. I deplore the taking of this money from the Loan Fund without the Minister's sufficiently explaining to the Committee why the sum is not coming from the funds under the department's own management. I ask the Minister now to justify his choice of Loan funds, thereby using interest-bearing capital for his research programme.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In addition to the information sought by my Leader, I ask the Minister whether he can give the Committee some idea of how the money is to be spent. To say that it is to be used on a programme of research development relating to public passenger transport is broad, especially when the Committee is asked to vote \$500,000. I know that the explanation said that a more detailed announcement would be made later in the session, but surely the Minister can now give us some idea of how the money will be used. The only thing I can think of at present is that it will be used for the dial-a-bus experimentation. I do not even know what that involves.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Treasurer say whether provision for a school for pre-clinical study is included in the provision of \$1,800,000 for the Flinders University? I believe that the school will be built in association with the teaching hospital.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Speaking purely from memory, I do not think so. This sum is at the end of the existing triennium, and I believe that the pre-clinical school is in the next triennium. I will get the information for the honourable member.

Dr. EASTICK: The provision of \$300,000 for a loan to the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board is not excessive if we are to have an abattoir that can maintain itself at the export level indefinitely. However, it is necessary to spell out clearly soon whether the abattoir will remain forever the major export abattoir of the State or whether, because of the urbanization taking place around the abattoir, there is to be a shift of the facility either to one central site or to a number of regional centres, which will reduce transport costs and lead to

decentralization of staffing. We know that a licence has been given for Naracoorte to develop an export abattoir. We know, too, that very successful export abattoirs are functioning at Murray Bridge, Peterborough and Noarlunga. However, one is worried about the loss to the State, particularly the rural community, of export funds because of the failure of the Gepps Cross abattoir to measure up to export standards recently.

Because of the demands being made by the major importers (not only America but also France, Germany and Japan), it is conceivable that the facilities that this \$300,000 will be spent on could be a propping arrangement and could leave us in the position of having to find considerably greater amounts in the not too distant future. The provision of this sum for the preliminary design of a new abattoir that will come up to the standards required by importing countries would be more in keeping with the planning that the State should be undertaking. Can the Treasurer say whether the sum is for a long-term benefit or a short-term benefit?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is what we regard as long-term improvement of the abattoir facility. The honourable member will be aware that we have had to change the killing lines at the abattoirs in order to meet the requirements not only of the Department of Primary Industry but also of American importers. This will reduce the throughput, and it also changes the whole set-up of the lines. The long-term policy in relation to export abattoirs is being considered by the Government at present. The Government regards it as unsatisfactory that we are left with the burden publicly of running what are here and at Port Lincoln service abattoirs which are required, in effect, to pick up the slack in other people's trading, and that the losses that arise from an operation of that kind should be loaded on to the general public. The general policy that should be developed in relation to abattoirs in consequence is currently under review and investigation, and we expect that later this year a statement will be made on the total future of the State's involvement in abattoir operations and on how far we should be committed to the development of regional abattoirs.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport tell us in just what way the \$500,000 will be spent on transport research? We know that the Breuning report suggested the setting up of a Transport Depart-

ment at the cost of \$5,000,000. Does this represent the first instalment of that sum? I understand that the Government has advertised for a Director of Transport at a salary of \$17,000.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am happy to give the information. I would have given it 10 minutes ago when the member for Mitcham asked a question, but the member for Fisher changed the subject. Apparently, he wants to stab the member for Mitcham in the back as he did last Wednesday when he attacked him in this Chamber. I think that I have already stated that we intend to engage in research work in the field of public transportation. If members opposite can get their minds down to it without the normal abuse that comes from members such as the Leader, who obviously has not benefited from the trips he made overseas—

Mr. Goldsworthy: That's not a bad bit of abuse that you are dishing out.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member had been in the Chamber he would have heard the Leader ranting on and not only asking questions but answering them as well. If the member for Kavel wants to answer his own questions, I am prepared to sit down. If he wants information, I am prepared to give it to him.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Don't take your bat home now.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If members opposite are not interested, I will not waste my time.

Mr. VENNING: Where will this research take place? Is this for Adelaide metropolitan transport, or will it extend to the country areas? I think of transport in the northern part of the State and grain movements by rail, as against road transport, and I think of the Quorn area, where the growers, as a result of the recent rail freight increases, are paying 16.5c a bushel for rail transport, when road transport can take the produce for half that cost. I hope that some of this money will be spent in examining these matters that affect not only the Adelaide area but also other parts of the State.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Committee has been told that this is a first contribution to finance a programme of research and development relating to public passenger transport. The Treasurer's Financial Statement states:

A more detailed announcement will be made later in the session as planning progresses and, if necessary, enabling legislation will be submitted.

The Committee is asked to approve expenditure of \$500,000 before a more detailed announcement is made. We do not know whether enabling legislation will be submitted or why there should be any such legislation. We are also asking why this expenditure is provided for in the Loan Estimates instead of in the Budget. We are asking the Minister what is involved in this research programme. It seems to be an unusual item to provide for in the Loan Estimates. I thought that the Minister would answer us, but he gave one of the most ridiculous performances that I have seen him give, and that is saying a good deal.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: You're going the right way to get a good answer now.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I do not expect a good answer.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: And you won't get it, either.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have given up hope of ever getting a clear statement from the Minister. If we ask the simplest question that has the simplest answer, he cannot give it to us, because he thinks there must be a trap in it. Why does the Minister not give us the information, instead of grandstanding and commenting about other members of the Committee? Why does he not say something direct?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Are we to understand that the Minister refuses to give us the information that we seek? He would have us believe that he is so thinskinny that a few interjections from this side have so thrown him off balance that he will not answer. That is incredible, judging from the Minister's performance in the Chamber. The only conclusion we can come to is that he does not have the information. The request is reasonable. I give the Minister an undertaking on my own behalf that I will not interject if he gives us the information.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: A few moments ago I offered to give the Committee the information. If members are still interested I will give it, but I do not want to waste my time and the time of the Committee unnecessarily. One member is so interested that he has now left the Chamber!

Mr. Hall: Who is slinging insults now?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am showing how hypocritical are members of the Opposition: they do not want information. The member for

Mitcham is the only member who made a sensible contribution. The first paragraph on page 15 supplies the complete answer to what members are asking. That is what the Treasurer said when he introduced the Loan Estimates.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You do not know the answer, and that is what worries me.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is amazing how the honourable member is raising such a stir about \$500,000 when two paragraphs down the page there is reference to an amount that is almost double this but he is almost dumb about it. It seems to be just a parochial interest with him. The Government has made its policy abundantly clear. We will not pursue the policy that was propounded by the previous Government to desecrate the city and suburbs of Adelaide with concrete freeways, which have proved to be an outstanding failure in other countries. We hope to benefit by the mistakes of others, and we will benefit by starting to do research. In fact, we have already started. I would expect the Leader, in his overseas travels, to have been impressed by the huge sums that other countries are spending on research. The present transport situation will not remain static: that is not only my opinion but also the opinion of researchers and, more importantly, of Treasurers of many of the countries throughout the world.

We can either paddle behind everyone else, as we have in South Australia for the last 50 years, and be 30 years behind other States or countries in introducing new methods, or we can take the lead. This Government wishes to take the lead, and the only way we can do that is by spending money on research. We are spending \$500,000 as the first instalment of a research programme, and I expect that as the years go by this programme will be gradually upgraded. As stated by the member for Mitcham, the first project in this field has already been announced. We have already started research into the dial-a-bus system, but that is not where research starts and finishes. I mentioned this afternoon in this Chamber that the linear induction motor has now reached a stage where the bugs that were previously in it have been ironed out by the British.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Are you doing research on that?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is the most stupid question one could hear, especially from a man who guaranteed he would not interject.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Obviously, we are not researching that. We are engaging and will engage a team of people competent to do the necessary work. The sum of money that has been set aside is, if anything, inadequate for what is needed. However, in view of the time factor, it will probably be sufficient to meet our needs in the current financial year, but we must either step up our research and get into the public transport field or build those monstrosities advocated by the previous Government. The line that any responsible Government should take is the one we are taking.

Mr. HALL: I am intrigued that the Government will learn from the mistakes of others and step out into the brave new world ahead of us. There is a direct contradiction there. The Government cannot have it both ways. I am also astounded that the Minister will not build these concrete freeways. He seems to think that by putting those two words together he can conjure up something undesirable for Adelaide's transport. In answers given previously in this Chamber, he said that some of the roads soon to be built might become part of the freeway system. He is still supporting the State Planning Authority's programme in recommending the acquisition of the freeway routes and we are still uninformed of the Minister's real intentions. He has failed to pay any attention to the main substance of my proposition to him this evening, and the information I seek from him is: why has he gone to the capital funds of the State for expenditures of a transient nature?

I can only assume that, if he will not reply, his reasons are not those that he wants the public to know. That is the only conclusion I can draw—that he has something to hide, that there is something sinister in his approach to capital funds. A great amount of money will be involved by the time interest has been paid on those funds over the next 50 years. I wonder at members on the Government back benches being able to support such a ludicrous method of expenditure in this State. How can they sit there as dumb supporters of a Minister who runs wild, failing to tell the community where he stands on metropolitan transport and failing to explain why he has resorted to this type of business? If the Minister does not answer, I can only assume that his reasons will not bear public inspection.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I favour research into any problem to which one seeks an answer, but we have not been told anything in the Loan Estimates explanation and, as far

as I can see, the Minister is satisfied to explain this as the present-day answer to Adelaide's traffic problems. That appears to be the extent of his immediate planning. He is resting on the Breuning report for all decisions about actual construction. I have said previously, and cannot be contradicted on this, that there is an urgent need for a freeway system from north to south through the metropolitan area at present. Even the supplement in the *Australian* which was included in that newspaper particularly to make South Australia look attractive stated that there is confusion, and no-one seems too sure about the Government's plans. In those circumstances how can the Minister fob us off with this sort of comment about research?

For some extraordinary reason the Minister made a comment that completely surprised me: he said that, while referring to transport research, I had ignored the matter concerning the Kangaroo Island ferry service, for which provision is made two lines further down in the Estimates, \$900,000 being allocated at present. What surprised me was that the Minister should say I was completely dumb on the matter, because I have been consulting the Minister on this matter for more than a year, and at all times he has urged me not to make a fuss about it because he has had the matter under control. He announced shortly after coming into office that he had accepted the recommendations of the inquiry committee which we had set up in this regard and which had stressed that action must be taken soon so that the ferry service could replace the *Troubridge* service which, under arrangement, will operate until June 31, 1972.

However, no such action was taken, and it was not until early this year that a co-ordinating committee was appointed to take control of and implement the project. That co-ordinating committee has made no apparent progress; I do not say it has made no progress whatsoever, but it has run into difficulties, as the Minister has told me. Less than a fortnight ago, I accompanied a deputation comprising representatives of district councils on Kangaroo Island and the Minister, when telling us about some of the problems confronting him, said, "I'd like you to wait for two or three weeks, by which time I'll get a report, and then I can make a statement." That is why I have not raised the matter in this Chamber since then, yet the Minister has the cheek now to say that I am completely dumb on the matter. I have been trying to co-operate with a man

who is not completely dumb but who, as far as I know, is completely incapable of making a clear statement on either transport policy or the Kangaroo Island transport problem.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I apologize to the Minister of Roads and Transport for interjecting when, in fact, I had undertaken not to interject during the course of his reply. However, I must say that I was so excited for a moment, thinking about the Minister's statement on getting bugs out of the linear induction motor, that I forgot the undertaking I had given. I am still not satisfied that members have been given the information they have been seeking, but I can now understand why the Minister has been so reluctant to reply. He said that the Government's policy is clearly set out in the Treasurer's statement and that, consequently, we should have the intelligence to know how the Government plans to spend the \$500,000 on transport research. However, the Treasurer's statement does not spell out how the Government will spend the sum. Does the Minister know how much the Government intends to spend on the project to be undertaken by Professor Potts and a group of students in the Elizabeth area in connection with the dial-a-bus scheme? Also, can the Minister say whether his department plans to spend any money on the linear induction motor, out of which the bugs have now been dusted?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In reply to the first question of the honourable member, I wish to say that I have not the faintest idea. The experiment that the honourable member referred to has nothing to do with the Government. The answer to the second question is "Yes".

Mr. BECKER: On February 23 the Treasurer said:

It is now 17 years since the scales of motor vehicle registration fees have been varied. The Government intends that the fees shall be increased by an average of about 20 per cent from July 1 next, subject to a proviso that pensioners currently qualifying for public transport concessions will be protected against the increase by being given an appropriate percentage rebate upon the normal fees to be prescribed. The increased revenue derived will be next year about \$2,750,000 to \$3,000,000 and the extra moneys will be devoted to three main purposes:

- (1) An amendment of the Highways Act will be submitted to authorize appropriations of up to 6 per cent of the gross registration fees (about \$1,000,000 next year) towards meeting the rapidly increasing costs of police services in controlling and otherwise dealing with motor traffic and road safety. These direct costs already exceed \$1,000,000 a year.

- (2) Making the necessary financial provisions for a ferry between the mainland and Kangaroo Island, both in construction and operation.
- (3) A considerable proportion of the increased revenues will necessarily be required for ordinary direct road provisions to offset in some measure the increased wage and salary costs that would otherwise have unduly restricted roadworks.

In view of that statement, can the Minister say why the Kangaroo Island ferry service has been included in the Loan Estimates?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member is good enough to turn to page 15 he will find that the answer is already there for him.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I thank the Minister for his succinct reply. We now know that the Government plans to spend money on research on a linear induction motor. What is a linear induction vehicle; what sort of vehicle does it energize; how many people does it carry; and where does it carry them? Will the Minister enlighten me?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is a linear induction motor, not a vehicle.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What type?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The size of the motor depends on the size of the vehicle. I think the best thing I can do is to give the honourable member a few technical books and hope he can understand them. If he cannot, I will put him on to some people who can help him.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I should like some facts before we vote on this.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member might find some facts on this in the Parliamentary Library. If I believed the honourable member really wanted to know something about this, I would be happy to give him details, but he keeps on asking these silly questions. A linear induction motor is a device which is a flat-bed motor. There is a primary stator in a stationary position and coils in a moving position; one passes over the other by electro-magnetic circuits. As I do not think that means a thing to the honourable member, I can see no reason for continuing with the explanation. It is sufficient to say that a linear induction motor is a means of propulsion which can be and is being used successfully to propel vehicles of various types. At present such motors are mainly being used in the personalized rapid transit field. However, the Hovercraft company in Cambridge, England, is experimenting with linear induction motors in hovercraft which it is specifically building

for this purpose, and this will be a vehicle of a large size. All this is being researched. If the answers the honourable member is seeking were already available there would obviously be no need for research at all.

Mr. BECKER: A sum of \$250,000 is provided for foreshore protection. It is pleasing that the Government has at long last decided to do something about our beaches and foreshores. This matter goes back to 1950 when a sea-side councils committee was drawn together to discuss the metropolitan coastline as a whole. In 1960, the committee approached the Civil Engineering Department of the University of Adelaide, following a period of storm damage, and sought advice on a rational programme of investigation of beach behaviour. In 1961-62 it was estimated that the likely cost of small-scale research study to make a preliminary appraisal would be about \$20,000 to \$24,000 a year and that it should be set up for a five-year to 10-year period. In 1965 a sum of \$12,000 a year was suggested and the initial period of the preliminary investigation was five years. The Government and councils agreed to have the study undertaken.

[Midnight]

The final Culver report was issued in December, 1970, and made available to the Opposition on March 9, 1971. Five items are highlighted in the recommendations, and I refer the Committee to them. One of my neighbours is a retired scientist who worked with the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization. He has lived in the area for 21 years and has seen the damage to the beaches at Glenelg North and Henley South. After studying the report, he made clear that the depositing of sand on the beach would not be the best answer and said that the only solution would be to build a stone wall the length of the beach at Glenelg North and Henley South. This is estimated to cost hundreds of thousands of dollars, but it would be one of the best solutions. Apparently, this system has been adopted overseas.

The Culver report estimates that the first instalment to replenish sand and rock work would cost about \$800,000. I suppose we can be thankful that the Government has provided \$250,000 to restore our beaches, but I now ask the Treasurer when we can expect Government action to restore our beaches and foreshores, when we can expect the authority to be appointed, and whether he will assure the Committee that this will be done immediately,

as the Culver report states that any further delay will cost us thousands of dollars more.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government intends to proceed with this matter with all speed, but I cannot give the honourable member a specific date.

Mr. HOPGOOD: I hoped to get the call before the Treasurer replied to the member for Hanson, because I would have liked an assurance from the Treasurer that the Government would not proceed as the honourable member has suggested it should. In the debate on the first line I explained as well as I could how I saw the problem on our beaches and I said that I did not think the establishment of groynes across the beach was the sort of thing that we should be going for. The member for Hanson wants us to build groynes across the beach.

Mr. Becker: I'm talking about a stone wall.

Mr. HOPGOOD: I do not care what it is built of: as long as there was a barrier across the beach, there would be a barrier to the on-shore drift. That is, the movement of sand along the coastline from south to north, and this will result in a considerable build-up of sand to the immediate south of that groyne. However, there will be a depletion of sand on the northern side of the groyne. The natural renewing process of the on-shore drift, as sand moves further along the coast, will be stopped because of the build-up of sand on the southern side of that rock wall or groyne. This process will continue, and the natural replenishing process goes on: in other words, Glenelg benefits at the expense of Glenelg North. If an artificial barrier is put in the way of the on-shore drift a problem is created. Certain barriers are there now, but we can do nothing about them. The simple answer, which Mr. Culver and his committee have suggested, is to remove sand from the areas of artificial deposition and place it in the areas which are being depleted but on which, because of the artificial barriers and for other reasons, there is no natural renewal.

Mr. BECKER: My constituent, a retired research scientist who was employed by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, and to whom I have already referred, has written a letter to me, in which he states:

What does Mr. Culver think will happen to the sand when stockpiled? Sand never stays put, as either the first big tide would wash it out to sea or, if this did not occur, the wind would soon blow it onto the esplanades, where it would be a constant nuisance to people living along the seafront who pay high rates

for the privilege of living there. I know this as I have lived on the seafront for over 21 years. Twenty-one years ago North Glenelg was plagued with sand in much the same way as the centre of Glenelg and West Beach are plagued with it now, and we most certainly do not want a repetition of this.

Sand is no barrier to high tides and gale force winds, and will very naturally be taken out to sea in stormy weather, but much of it does gradually return as seen on the main part of the Glenelg foreshore. You only have to go over the sea by plane to see the formation of sand-bars and how shallow the water is. This shows that the sand already carried away has not gone far. You will also see how the Patawalonga mouth is constantly silting up, and the sand having to be removed to enable boats to get out.

What we do need at North Glenelg, and need urgently, is more rock filling to stop further erosion. The existing rock filling has proved very satisfactory over the past five years in protecting our roads against erosion, but more is now needed as the rock has naturally bedded itself down in the sand. The rock needs to be graded from the very large pieces at the base to pieces no smaller than a foot cube at the top of the esplanade, and should have a competent man to supervise the work, preferably the man who was in charge of the building of the breakwater at Glenelg in 1964. The rock should not be just tipped over the side of the road like it has been in the past, but placed in position to form a rock wall. A first instalment of \$800,000 will purchase a great deal of rock which will not be washed away like sand.

Water tables and curbing on the seaward side of the road are also necessary, with controlled run-offs at suitable points to reduce erosion by rain. If the above is done methodically all along our coast line, the beaches will gradually become higher again by the efflux of time. We are already seeing this in front of our own home at the present time.

In a further comment about the north esplanade he states that when he came to live on the north esplanade, Glenelg North, in 1949, the sand on the beach was level with the road, and vehicles used to drive, illegally, on to the beach at Glenelg North on their way to shacks at West Beach. We should realize, therefore, how much sand has been lost: it is estimated that 6ft. of sand has been lost from parts of the esplanade at Glenelg North. So, by putting a rock fence there, we are only protecting the foreshore from erosion. It is ironical that the Engineering and Water Supply Department is doing the very same thing in front of the sewage farm: it is using small rocks and a wire netting construction, mainly to protect the sewage outlet pipe at the Glenelg treatment works.

Mr. HOPGOOD: First, the washing away of the sand is part of the natural process that will continue; that is why the stockpiling pro-

cess would have to be continuous. It is part of what we do as our contribution towards nature's on-shore drift. Secondly, there is the point about the wind carrying away part of this stockpiled sand. We cannot do much about that. Once, we had sandhills, which were nature's defence against erosion, but we have removed them and now we have to pay the penalty. If the honourable member is advocating doing away with the vertical sea walls on the foreshore, I support that. That is one reason for the scouring that occurs. If he advocates such a move, I will certainly support him.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, \$1,700,000.

Mr. HALL: I direct the Treasurer's attention to the second line "Mines Department—Buildings, Plant, etc. Estimated Payments, \$325,000". Do these payments include any initial expenditure on planning for a new Mines Department headquarters? The previous Government intended to build a new headquarters for the Mines Department as part of the mineral science complex at Glenside, although no definite plans were made at the time. As the Treasurer well knows, the negotiations in planning the establishment of a mineral science centre were reaching their culmination about the time I went out of office and he came in.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is intended to proceed with a new Mines Department building but I do not think there is anything on this line for an appropriation for such a building. However, planning is proceeding, but we shall not be able to appropriate money until the matter has been referred to and dealt with by the Public Works Committee.

Dr. EASTICK: I refer to the line "Education Department—School buses", in respect of which the estimated payments are \$395,000 "for the purchase of buses for the conveyance of schoolchildren in country areas". Is it intended that there shall be an increase in the number of buses so that areas not at present covered can be covered or is this purely and simply an up-dating of the bus services to fulfil the needs in respect of the present bus routes?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not aware of any large expansion of bus services on to new routes, although this line in itself does provide a considerable sum for the replacement of buses. I do not think any major expansion of bus routes is involved.

Mr. CARNIE: I note that under "Produce Department—Buildings, Plant, etc." \$33,000 is

allocated for improvements to be effected at the Port Lincoln freezing works. In reply to a question today, the Minister of Works said that a committee had recently inspected the Port Lincoln works and, as a result, I hope that the committee will find that much more than this needs to be spent. Can the Treasurer say specifically for what purpose the \$33,000 is provided?

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

Line passed.

Grand total, \$142,940,000, passed and Committee's resolution adopted by the House.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to authorize the Treasurer to borrow and expend moneys for public works and purposes and to enact provisions incidental thereto. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It appropriates the moneys required for the purposes detailed in the Loan Estimates, which the House has considered. It is in the same form as the Bill passed by the House 12 months ago. Clause 3 sets out the moneys which make up the Loan Fund. Clause 4 provides for borrowing by the Treasurer of \$89,140,000. This is the portion of South Australia's allocation for works and purposes arranged at the June, 1971, meeting of Loan Council which will come from Loan raisings. Clause 5 provides for the expenditure of \$142,940,000 on the undertakings set out in the first schedule to the Bill. Clause 6 authorizes certain advances made during 1970-71 for the undertakings set out in the second schedule. This ratification is required to be included in the Public Purposes Loan Bill next brought

before the House after warrants have been issued by the Governor pursuant to section 32b of the Public Finance Act. Clause 7 makes provision for borrowing and payment of an amount to cover any discounts, charges and expenses incurred in connection with borrowing for the purposes of this Bill.

Clause 8 makes provision for temporary finance if the moneys in the Loan Fund are insufficient for the purposes of this Bill. Clause 9 authorizes the borrowing and the issue of \$50,000,000 for the purpose of financing loan undertakings in the early part of next financial year until the Public Purposes Loan Bill for 1972 becomes effective. In the previous Bill the corresponding amount was \$40,000,000. Because of the inclusion of major housing appropriations in the Loan Estimates and the general growth of the Loan programme, it is desirable that the provision in this clause be increased to \$50,000,000.

Clause 10 gives the Treasurer power to borrow against the issue of Treasury bills or by bank overdraft. The Treasurer possesses and may exercise this authority under other legislation, but it is desirable to make the authority specific year by year in the Public Purposes Loan Bill, as is done with other borrowing authority. Clause 11 deals with the duration of certain clauses to the Bill. Clause 12 directs that all moneys received by the State under the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act shall be credited to a special account to be paid out as required for the purposes of that Act. Clause 13 provides for this Bill to operate as from July 1, 1971.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.24 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 18, at 2 p.m.