

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 26, 1975

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

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

Dr. TONKIN presented a petition signed by 1 039 residents of South Australia stating that the burden of succession duties on a surviving spouse, particularly a widow, had become, with inflation, far too heavy to bear and ought, in all fairness and justice, to be removed. The petitioners prayed that the House would pass an amendment to the Succession Duties Act to abolish succession duties on that part of an estate passing to a surviving spouse.

Petition received.

MODBURY HEIGHTS HIGH SCHOOL

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Modbury Heights High School.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

ADELAIDE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Mr. COUMBE (on notice):

1. What progress is being made with the production and acceptance of the City of Adelaide Development Plan?
2. How is it proposed to finance this scheme?
3. When is it intended that enabling legislation will be introduced and what form will this take?

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

1. On August 14, 1975, the Corporation of the City of Adelaide placed on public exhibition, in an amended form, a plan prepared for the council by Urban Systems Corporation. It is understood that a period of three months from the date of this exhibition is to be allowed for public comment on the plan. It may well be that, in the light of comments received, the council will further modify or amend the plan. The Government has the plan continuously under review but obviously will be unable to crystallise its attitudes until the final form of the plan is decided.
2. Expenditure to give effect to the plan will necessarily come from the usual sources of funds available to the parties affected by it.
3. At this stage, I am unable to say when and in what form enabling legislation will be introduced.

INDUSTRIAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. COUMBE (on notice): What number of applications for financial assistance were approved in the 1974-75 financial year by the Industries Development Committee and the Industries Assistance Corporation, respectively, and what were the total amounts involved in each case of the approvals granted by these bodies?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not the policy of the Industrial Development Division to reveal names of companies and the amounts to which they have been assisted. The number of applications approved and amounts of assistance are as follows:

	Number	Amount \$
Industries Development Committee	9	6 265 400
Industries Assistance Corporation	24	1 586 103

STUDENT TEACHERS

Mr. NANKIVELL (on notice):

1. How many teacher trainees are in Colleges of Advanced Education in South Australia and, of this number, how many are bonded to the South Australian Government?
2. How long will it be before the principle of bonding will be phased out?
3. Of the bonded students, how many receive less than the maximum rate of allowance by virtue of the means test applied?
4. What would be the cost to this State if the means test for bonded students was abolished?

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

1. Number of teacher trainees 5 408
Number bonded 2 977
2. No decision has been taken.
3. 1 701.
4. \$501 637.

POSTAL CHARGES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice): What are the findings of the working party of members of the Public Service Board and the Treasury set up to ascertain means of reducing the postal bill payable by the State Government as a result of the increases announced recently by the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The working party has only recently been formed and, in view of the scope of its inquiry (which includes, amongst other things, the feasibility of a central mailing and delivery service), I do not expect a report for some weeks. I should point out that, like many other working parties set up by the Government, the members of this group have their normal duties to perform in addition to the conduct of this inquiry.

GAS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What steps have been taken or will be taken to ensure that the Gidgealpa gas field will not be subject to flooding?
2. Are gas supplies to South Australia from this field in danger from flooding?

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

1. The flooding of the Cooper Basin region during 1973-74 was of unprecedented extent and magnitude and was related to abnormal seasonal conditions throughout the Continent. Despite the fact that installations in the Gidgealpa-Moomba area were for a time threatened by inundation, resulting from almost 40 inches of local rain during the year plus flooding of the Cooper and Strzelecki Creeks, there was no serious curtailment of supply of natural gas to Adelaide. The levee banks protecting the Moomba plant have since been upgraded, a diversion bank has been constructed upstream of the plant and drainage pumps have been installed to discharge surface waters that may accumulate within the levee. Existing access roads are being progressively upgraded and relocated where necessary on high ground; new roads are

also being built on high ground to obviate all but extreme flood levels.

2. No.

RADIATION CHECKS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Are regular radiation checks taken near Adelaide airport and if not, why not?

2. If checks are taken, what are the results at each checkpoint for the past five years?

3. What are the results at each checkpoint of radiation checks on water storage areas in South Australia for the past three years?

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

1. No sampling station for radioactive fallout is located in the near vicinity of Adelaide Airport. The nearest sampling site is at the Adelaide Bureau of Meteorology. This sampling station forms part of an Australia-wide network of 24 stations which provide daily samples for the measurement of total activity in fallout deposition. Five of the stations, not including Adelaide, also provide daily air samples for analysis for specific fission products. A daily sample of Adelaide milk supplies is also analysed for iodine 131 to establish average radiation doses to the thyroid. The above sampling network and subsequent analyses are controlled by the Australian Atomic Weapons Tests Safety Committee, reporting to the Prime Minister. There is no need for a further sampling site in the near vicinity of Adelaide Airport.

2. The reports of the Atomic Weapons Tests Safety Committee, which are available in the Parliamentary Library, contain the results of sampling at these monitoring stations.

3. The Engineering and Water Supply Department tests the activity in reservoir waters and rainfall at Bolivar, Hope Valley and Happy Valley. Results of these tests for the last three years are available from the Engineering and Water Supply Department. A more detailed report is being obtained from this Department, the results of which I will supply in due course.

GLENELG TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. When will work commence on the installation of traffic lights at the intersection of Brighton and Jetty Roads, Glenelg?

2. What has been the reason for the delay in view of the Minister's letter dated December 23, 1974, to Mr. G. Hill of unit 2, 11 Dunbar Terrace, Glenelg East?

3. Have negotiations regarding these lights been continuing between Glenelg council and the Highways Department for over 10 years and, if so, why have they taken so long?

4. Will pedestrian crossing facilities be incorporated in the lights?

5. Will Dunbar Terrace and Maxwell Terrace be closed at Brighton Road after installation of these lights?

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

1. It is currently planned for late 1975-1976.

2. It has been necessary to resolve technical difficulties re-tram detection so that a standard system will operate at this location as well as other intersections along King William Street in the City.

3. Negotiations have been continuing for about five years.

4. Yes.

5. There will be left turn only to Dunbar Terrace from Brighton Road and no entry to Maxwell Terrace from either Jetty Road or Brighton Road, but there will still be exit available from Maxwell Terrace to Brighton and Jetty Roads.

PRIORITY ROADS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the programme for the establishment of priority roads in the metropolitan area?

2. Are Tapley Hill Road, Morphett Road and Marion Road included in the programme, and when will they be converted?

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

1. There are currently four roads within the metropolitan area which are operating as priority roads, these are Main South Road (Grand Junction Road to Hackham), Glen Osmond Road (Greenhill Road to South Eastern Freeway), the Main North Road (Fitzroy Terrace to Gawler Bypass), and Goodwood Road from Greenhill Road to South Road. The current programme for the establishment of priority roads within the metropolitan area this financial year in their approximate order of implementation is as follows:

- (1) Unley Road and Belair Road (Greenhill Road to Barretts Road completed).
- (2) Fullarton Road (Magill Road to Hogs Road).
- (3) North East Road (Main North Road to Haines Road).
- (4) Lower North East Road (Hackney Road to Hancock Road).
- (5) Henley Beach Road (West Terrace to Seaview Road).
- (6) Prospect Road (Fitzroy Terrace to Grand Junction Road).
- (7) Kensington Road (Fullarton Road to Penfold Road).
- (8) Magill Road (Payneham Road to Glen Stuart Road).
- (9) Anzac Highway (West Terrace to Colley Terrace).
- (10) Torrens Road (Park Terrace to Canning Street).
- (11) Port Wakefield Road (Grand Junction Road to Waterloo Corner).
- (12) Grand Junction Road (Port Road to Hancock Road).
- (13) Port Road to Hart Street (West Terrace to Esplanade).
- (14) Old Port Road to Bower Road (Port Road to Esplanade).
- (15) Hampstead Road to Bridge Road (North East Road to Smith Road).
- (16) Cross Road (Anzac Highway to Mt. Barker Road).
- (17) Marion Road (Henley Beach Road to Main South Road).
- (18) Tapley Hill Road (Old Port Road to Anzac Highway).
- (19) Burbridge Road (West Terrace to Esplanade).
- (20) Montacute Road (Lower North East Road to Stradbroke Road).

2. As can be seen from the table above, Marion Road and Tapley Hill Road are included on the current programme for implementation during this financial year. Further priority roads will be created in subsequent financial years, and Morphett Road will be considered for inclusion.

GLENELG NORTH ACCIDENTS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many motor vehicle accidents have occurred at the approaches to King Street bridge, Glenelg North, for the last two years?

2. What was the total amount of vehicle damage and the number and type of injuries caused by these accidents?

3. What were the reasons for these accidents?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies to questions 1, 2 and 3 are as follows:

Year	Total Accidents	Property Damage \$	No. of Persons Injured	Causes of Accidents The police have assessed the causes as:—
1973	2	700	1 severe bruising	1 failed to give way to right. 1 excessive speed.
1974	4	1 275	Nil	1 failed to give way to right. 3 rear end collisions.

EWES PRICES

Mr. VENNING (on notice): Has the Government considered making to all growers a payment of 75c a head for old ewes delivered to the Gepps Cross abattoir as is the policy applying to such stock delivered to the Port Lincoln abattoir by Eyre Peninsula growers, and, if not, will urgent consideration be given to making this payment?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes. The situation is being kept under constant review, but it is not considered that present stock market prices in the area from which stock is delivered to Gepps Cross for slaughter, justify such a move.

GLADSTONE GAOL

Mr. VENNING (on notice): What plans has the Government for the future of the Gladstone Gaol?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The Department of Correctional Services sought out possible alternative uses for the Gladstone Prison. The Government has no future plans for Gladstone in terms of departmental use. Public Buildings Department have made arrangements to take over the houses as they are vacated and will undertake to maintain the prison facilities at a suitable level of repair. Should any body express interest in Gladstone Gaol as a potential facility of some kind, the Department of Correctional Services and Public Buildings Department would be prepared to consider the proposal.

WORKING ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Have the report and recommendations of the Working Environment Committee, which were presented to the 1975 Annual State Convention of the Australian Labor Party, been adopted as policy of the State Government and, if not, what parts are not Government policy?

2. Will the Government legislate to compel companies to have employee representatives on company boards and management councils and, if so, when will this legislation be introduced?

3. Have any companies or organisations expressed concern to the Government relating to the recommendations proposed in this report?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes, in principle.

2. The report makes it clear that during the next three years the Government will provide for such representation within the public sector undertakings. From the experience so gained a decision will be taken with respect to legislation.

3. No official representations have been made to me.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN BARYTES LIMITED

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. For what amount of money is the South Australian Government currently acting as guarantor for South Australian Barytes Limited?

2. Is it anticipated that the Government will have to pay part or whole of this guarantee and, if so, what amount?

3. Has this company filed an annual report for 1973-74 and, if so, what was the reported profit or loss for the financial year?

4. Has the Government completed the investigation on this company, which was requested by me in the House of Assembly on November 28, 1973?

5. If this investigation has been completed, will a report be tabled; and, if so, when?

6. What action will the Attorney-General take to ensure that the affairs of the company are correctly managed to ensure that the claim against the Government as guarantor is minimised?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. \$242 000.

2. The extent to which the Government may be called upon to pay under its guarantee will be dependent upon the outcome of an appeal by the receiver against a recent court decision favouring a shareholder who challenged the validity of the call on unpaid capital; and the outcome of the receiver's current negotiations to sell the company's Quorn and Oraparinna operations as a going concern.

3. The affairs of South Australian Barytes Limited are under the control of a receiver and manager who has carried on the business of the company since his appointment in October, 1973. A profit and loss account and balance sheet for the year ended June 30, 1974, was prepared by the receiver and manager and has been lodged with the Registrar of Companies. The profit and loss account shows that a loss of \$730 813 was incurred during that year.

4. Yes. Inquiries have been made by inspectors employed in the Companies Office with a view to determining whether a special investigation into the affairs of the company under Part VIA of the Companies Act is warranted.

5. The inquiries were made under section 7 of the Companies Act and not as a formal investigation under Part VIA of the Act. Section 7 provides that information obtained by inspectors must not be divulged except for the purposes of the Act or for the course of criminal proceedings; it is, therefore, not proposed that the report should be tabled in Parliament.

6. The management of the company is in the hands of the receiver and manager appointed by the secured creditors under powers contained in debenture instruments executed by the company. The Government cannot interfere with the management of the company, except in a case where the receiver and manager commits an offence against the law.

AIR TRAVEL

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What is the policy of the Government regarding the class of air travel used when travelling on business by Ministers and public servants, respectively?
2. When was such policy adopted?
3. What are the reasons for it?
4. Is such policy to be reviewed and if so, when and why?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The number of members of Parliament and judges travelling by air is not great, and it is not proposed to alter existing policy. The policy in relation to public servants is that Ministers authorise interstate travel and deal with cases on their merits. Economy travel is encouraged. There are exceptions to the above, as departments are encouraged to make the best use of funds and, in consequence, policy varies somewhat from department to department. For example, in some departments all officers (including the permanent head) travel economy to enable the maximum number of interstate visits to be made. In other departments, usually where few interstate visits are made, first-class travel is the norm. In general, each visit is judged on its merits, meal availabilities, and the pressures on the officer concerned. It should not be overlooked that most interstate visits eat into officers' private time, which is appreciated by the Government.

CITY MISSION

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has a request been made to the Attorney-General to inquire into the affairs of the Adelaide City Mission Incorporated?
2. If a request has been made (a) when was it made; (b) what reasons were given for the request; (c) has the Attorney-General acceded to it; (d) has the inquiry yet been completed and with what result; and (e) if not completed, when is it expected to be completed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. No. In a letter of May 7, 1975, from Dr. K. O. Godwin and Mr. G. J. Charlton, the Attorney-General was asked to give attention to an opinion of senior counsel obtained by Dr. Godwin and others who were and are plaintiffs in an action in the Supreme Court against the Adelaide City Mission Incorporated and others. In the opinion of senior counsel, expressed on March 26, 1975, the action raised fundamental problems of a procedural and substantial nature for the plaintiffs. Senior counsel suggested that an approach be made to the Attorney-General to establish whether the Attorney was prepared to take any action on his own initiative. The opinion of senior counsel was forwarded to the Crown Solicitor for consideration and report.

The Crown Solicitor reported his agreement, in substance, with the views of senior counsel, advising that whether the matter is one in which the Attorney-General should become involved cannot and should not be determined unless and until comprehensive investigation and report have been made upon the affairs of the mission and the manner in which those affairs are being managed. At this stage, there

does not appear to be disclosed evidence sufficient to warrant the involvement of the Attorney-General in any legal proceedings relating to the mission. On instructions from the Attorney-General, the Crown Solicitor wrote to the plaintiffs' solicitors on August 14, 1975, informing them of the foregoing report and affording them, Dr. Godwin and Mr. Charlton, the opportunity to adduce to the Attorney-General, through the Crown Solicitor, any available evidence sufficient to warrant further inquiry whether involvement by the Attorney-General is warranted. The solicitors were informed that an officer attached to the Crown Law Department would be contacting them, Dr. Godwin and Mr. Charlton, in connection with the matter. That was a week ago. Until now, the officer has been unable, because of other duties, to contact those persons. He should be in a position to do so this week.

2. Inapplicable.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Does the Government now propose that the present session should finish by the end of October and, if not, when does the Government propose that the session should end?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The session will end as soon as practicable.

COMMONWEALTH BUDGET

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What economies, if any, in spending and administration does the Government propose to make as a result of the Commonwealth Budget?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As to Revenue Account, the effect of the Australian Government's Budget is generally in line with the assumptions made by the State Government in framing its proposals for 1975-76. Accordingly, it will not be necessary to change those proposals that envisage the achievement of a balanced 1975-76 Budget. As to Loan Account and housing, the specific purpose grants and loans included in the Australian Government's Budget are less in some areas than we had expected and had planned on. Therefore, we are reviewing requirements and propose to keep a close control on all capital spending so that any over-expenditure will be kept within manageable limits and the effect on individual areas will be minimised. It is not possible to be specific about all areas yet, but it is clear that activity in housing and school building will have to be held below levels considered desirable by the State Government.

GEPPS CROSS ABATTOIR

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is the Government satisfied with the administration of the Gepps Cross abattoir and, if not, what action, if any, is to be taken to improve it?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

HACKHAM EAST CROSSING

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): When is it expected that a school crossing will be established in Collins Parade for use by children at the Hackham East Primary School?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There is no current proposal to install such a school crossing. The installation of a crossing in the future will depend upon the extent of vehicle and pedestrian usage and will be subject to priority as compared with many other locations requiring similar treatment.

SCHOOL CROSSINGS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is it Government policy to provide a school crossing at or near every school and, if so, when will this be done?
2. If crossings are not to be provided, why not?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is the practice of the Highways Department to collaborate with the local council to install school crossings wherever they are considered necessary. Crossings are not installed at or near every school. Needs for school crossings are established on the basis of vehicle flow and pedestrian demand. When the number of children and vehicles shows that a crossing is necessary, it is installed as soon as resources, such as funds, materials and skilled labour, permit.

COROMANDEL VALLEY LAND

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Does the Government intend to take any action to purchase from Mr. Frank Smith his land at Coromandel Valley and, if so, when will such action be taken?

2. If purchased, for what purpose is such land to be used?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. As the land offered by Mr. Frank Smith is not a proposed reserve under the Metropolitan Development Plan, the State Planning Authority has not been able to purchase the area, nor have funds been available for other Government purchase. In these circumstances, the open space proclamation applying to the land was revoked by proclamation in the *Government Gazette*, July 17, 1975, page 306. Further discussions concerning the proclamation are being held with Mr. Smith's agents.

2. See 1.

MONARTO

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has the Monarto Development Commission bought land in the vicinity of the Sturt Reserve, hundred of Mobilong, and, if so

- (a) why;
- (b) how much has been bought; and
- (c) at what total price?

2. Is it proposed to attempt to buy more land in this vicinity, and, if so, how much more and at what estimated total cost?

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

1. Yes.

- (a) To assist in preserving important environmental and recreational areas along the banks of the Murray River, proposed for preservation as public reserves by the State Planning Authority. The land in question will provide a future recreation area on the Murray for the residents of Monarto as well as the people of Murray Bridge and will assist in controlling the impact on the river of future population growth in the region.

- (b) and (c) To June 30, 1975, two freehold properties and 11 leaseholds have been purchased at a total cost of \$237 000. It should be noted that two-thirds of this amount has been provided by the Australian Government by way of a non-repayable grant. The commitments entered into by the Land Board prior to June 30, 1975, will require the expenditure of approximately \$56 000 for the acquisition of properties on which agreement on the sale prices has been reached.

Negotiations are proceeding for the acquisition of other properties which will involve expenditure of approximately \$200 000.

2. The total cost of the acquisitions which the Commission will undertake in assisting to establish this reserve will not exceed \$500 000.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Now that the Government has announced an expected expenditure of \$3 700 000 for Monarto during 1975-76, what are the details of the programme of work for 1975-76?

2. Is it planned to reduce or increase the number of employees within the Monarto Development Commission during 1975-76?

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

1. A budget for 1975-76 is being prepared by the Commission for presentation to State Cabinet shortly.

2. There will be no increase in permanent staff during the current financial year. As the Monarto team will be engaged on work in addition to its commitments on Monarto, there will be no staff retrenchments.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Does the Government intend to introduce legislation to correct the anomalies in the Workmen's Compensation Act, and if so, when?

2. What basic sections of the Act will be amended in such legislation?

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

1. Yes, later this session.

2. There will be no departure from the normal practice in that the amending Bill, when introduced, will provide the information sought.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

In reply to Mr. SIMMONS (August 5).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not the practice to keep a waiting list of applications for appointment as justices in districts where the quota is filled. It is not practicable to do this because it is often several years before vacancies occur in a district, and to keep a waiting list for each quota-filled district would be difficult to administer because of nominees changing their addresses, dying or changing their minds about becoming justices. This problem has received consideration on a number of occasions, but it has always been considered that any advantages to be gained by keeping a waiting list would be more than offset by the disadvantages of such a system. If at any time a person wishes to revive a nomination, after having been rejected on the grounds of a quota-filled district, he should phone the department and check the quota before submitting another nomination.

HIGHWAY No. 1

In reply to Mr. KENEALLY (August 13).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Due to the limited funds available for the implementation of priority roads, it is not intended to introduce this system in country areas within the next two years. When the priority road system is, however, extended into these areas, it is expected that Highway No. 1 will be high on the list of priorities for implementation as a priority road. The installation of traffic signals at various intersections within Port Augusta is periodically reviewed and signals will be installed when considered necessary and as quickly as resources permit.

SPORTS STADIUM

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (August 5).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: A brief for a feasibility study into the possibility of a sporting stadium has been prepared by officers of the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Sport. This brief forms part of a submission currently before the Australian Government Department of Tourism and Recreation seeking funds to finance such a study. As part of the feasibility study, potential sites for the sporting stadium will be examined and the request from the Tea Tree Gully Council for consideration of locating the stadium in that council area will be taken into account.

RIDGEHAVEN HIGH SCHOOL

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (August 12).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Education Department owns land in the area mentioned, and the land, consisting of 9.89 hectares (24 acres, 1 rood and 31 perches) is situated in part section 1565. Although plans have by no means been finalised, present intentions are that the land will be jointly developed for a secondary school and a community college by the Education Department and the Further Education Department. No indication can be given at this stage of the likely building date of the complex.

MARDEN HIGH SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. SLATER (August 13).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: A library resource centre for Marden High School has been included on the current design list. However, it is not possible to say when it will be built. It is hoped that funds will be made available by the Australian Government during the 1976 to 1978 calendar years for the construction of library resource centres to approved standards. When funds are provided the priorities according to needs and within the limits of available finance will be established. When design work is commenced the school will be consulted on access and siting, particularly in relation to the present playing areas.

TEACHER HOUSING

In reply to Mr. BOUNDY (August 6).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The single teacher housing programme, arranged by the department with the South Australian Housing Trust for the delivery to country areas of 49 two-bedroom units, was increased to 51 with the addition of two units for Poochera. The following units have been delivered to date:

Town	Units
Balaklava	3
Cummins	2
Keith	2
Loxton	1
Meningie	2
Penola	2
Pinnaroo	1
Mt. Burr	1
Port Lincoln	4
Port Pirie	3
Renmark	2
Wudinna	2
Nuriootpa	2
Lameroo	1
Total (delivered)	28

The trust has experienced delays in carrying out the programme because of site difficulties, commitments to

other clients, and transport arrangements. The following is the situation concerning outstanding units:

Town	Units	Estimated Month of Delivery
Bordertown	2	October, 1975
Clare	2	December, 1975
Gladstone	1	October, 1975
Kadina	4	No date available.
		Negotiating to purchase land.
Kapunda	1	September, 1975
Kingston, S.E.	2	October, 1975
Minlaton	1	August, 1975
*Millicent	2	October, 1975
Peterborough	2	October, 1975
Port Lincoln	2	October, 1975
Yorketown	2	September, 1975
Poochera	2	September, 1975
Total (outstanding) 23		

*Negotiations are proceeding for the department to purchase three two-bedroom flats at Millicent. The acquisition of this accommodation will mean that the two units programmed for Millicent will not be required. The South Australian Housing Trust has indicated that deliveries will continue according to plan and that only unexpected circumstances would cause delays.

WOMEN'S SHELTERS

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (August 14).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Following temporary financial assistance to organisations operating as women's shelters from the State Community Welfare Grants Fund, the Commonwealth Minister for Health announced in June this year that funds would be made available from the Hospitals and Health Services Commission of the Commonwealth Government. In the first quarter of 1975-76 \$12 050 has been granted from that source for the women's emergency shelter at North Adelaide and \$9 000 for the shelter at Ovingham. Applications by the Adelaide City Mission and the Travellers Aid Society are under consideration by the commission. Approximate capacity and average numbers of persons accommodated at the shelters as known to the Department for the six months to May 31, 1975 are as follows:

	Capacity	Average number of persons accommodated each night
Adelaide City Mission	32	26
Women's Emergency Shelter, North Adelaide	23	10
Women's Shelter, Ovingham	18	10
Travellers Aid Society	32	13

Not all those using Travellers Aid are using it as a Women's Shelter.

PETROL TAX

In reply to Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (August 19).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In considering claims by petrol resellers for remission of part of the licence fee because of hardship the Department obtains all relevant facts. Where severe hardship has been shown, I have exercised my executive discretion to give relief in those cases.

MURDER RE-TRIAL

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Premier, as Attorney-General, say on what grounds State Cabinet has rejected an application by Noel Russel McDonald for a retrial on the charge of murder, and give those details to the House? This matter was first ventilated in the House on March 25 of this year, and I repeat, as I said then, that the circumstances of the case are that McDonald pleaded guilty to the charge

in the Supreme Court on September 15, 1970, because, he says, he received advice that if he pleaded guilty the case would proceed immediately and that, because he was a juvenile, he would be detained at the Governor's pleasure, an effective sentence of only a few years. McDonald understood that if he pleaded not guilty the case might continue until after his eighteenth birthday, and that if found guilty he would be liable to the death penalty. This, of course, was wrong, but McDonald claims he pleaded guilty on this advice. Because of this, he has no right of appeal.

The whole case is surrounded by odium. None of his family was notified of the change in plea. One relative who attended court in the afternoon on which the case was set down was told that it had been heard that morning and that McDonald had pleaded guilty, and that was the first intimation the family had had of it. I believe that the Government should make public the facts surrounding the case, and that an inquiry should be held into them. That should be done not only to remove public doubts but also to prevent a possible miscarriage of justice. I understand that McDonald is now, or soon will be, eligible for parole, but he and his family are most anxious that a retrial be ordered.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In this case there were no new facts in the petition to the Governor which would have justified a reference to the Full Court. I do not know whether the honourable member is aware of the evidence in this case. If he were, it would be very difficult, frankly, to see the basis on which any retrial could be ordered (I mean the evidence, not the contentions as to advice about pleas). However, I will obtain a full report for the honourable member.

DISCOUNT PETROL

Mr. WHITTEN: Has the Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs read the warning in this morning's *Advertiser* by the South Australian Director of the Trade Practices Commission concerning the advertising of discount petrol? Will the Minister obtain a report on this matter for the House? I ask the Minister this question, because I am concerned about the advertising practice of one service station at Pooraka which is advertising discount petrol at "10c off". When one reads the advertisement more closely and carefully, one finds that it is, in fact, 10c off in \$1.00 and not 10c a gallon.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I have read the article in the paper referred to by the honourable member. It does seem in the metropolitan area, that some unusual advertising practices are being followed in relation to the marketing of motor spirit. I have much pleasure in telling the honourable member I have called for a report on this matter.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Does the Minister of Works still believe that the Public Accounts Committee is exceeding its statutory powers, as indicated in the letter from Cabinet, and does he still refuse to co-operate with the Public Accounts Committee in its attempts to improve efficiency in the Public Service and prevent wastage of taxpayers' money? The Public Accounts Committee was set up by an Act of Parliament to investigate expenditure in the Public Service, and it bases its investigations on the Auditor-General's Report. The committee based its procedures on those of Public Accounts Committees operating in the Commonwealth and Victoria, as well as in other States, and approval was given for this procedure. The Minister of Works has proved quite obstructive in respect of the efforts of the committee to see that efficiency was

maintained recently in his own department. I will briefly quote correspondence which I considered when a member of the Public Accounts Committee and which bears out this point. This is a letter sent to the Minister by the committee:

Dear Mr. Minister: The committee expresses its appreciation of your action in forwarding with your letter of March 20 a copy of the report by the Director and Engineer-in-Chief concerning our report No. 4. The Director's report has now been carefully considered by the committee, and it was resolved that an invitation should be extended to you and/or the Director to discuss the matter informally with the committee so that you may be fully cognisant of its views. If this invitation is accepted a suitable time early in June is suggested for the meeting.

To which letter the following reply was received:

The Chairman, Public Accounts Committee.

Dear Mr. Simmons, I advise that neither I nor the Director and Engineer-in-Chief (Mr. K. W. Lewis) will be available to attend the informal meeting with the committee proposed in your letter of May 5, 1975.

That is signed by the Minister. I think the facts speak for themselves: the Minister has sought to inhibit the proper function of this Parliamentary committee, as evidenced by correspondence I quoted last week, and in regard to the committee's investigating the operations of the Minister's department he has proved to be quite obstructive.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This seems to be almost a serial. The honourable member was a member of the Public Accounts Committee; he is no longer a member but he seems to possess letters that were probably tabled in his time. Now that he is no longer a member of the committee, he is taking advantage of his previous position, I suppose, to try to embarrass me as regards my relationship with the committee. I supported the private member's Bill moved in this House by the member for Mallee for the establishment of a Public Accounts Committee and, if the honourable member examines that measure closely (I am sure he has already done so), he will see that it provides for this committee to report to Parliament. The fact that the committee chose in its first report to lay down procedures is another matter altogether. Last week the honourable member quoted from a letter I had written to the committee in which I had raised a question as to whether or not the Director and Engineer-in-Chief should be compelled to reply to certain requests made by the committee at the time the report was received in connection with the centralisation of Engineering and Water Supply Department workshops in the metropolitan area. The Engineer-in-Chief naturally reported to me, because he always does so on these matters; he does not report (and never has reported) to any other body, because he recognises, as I do, that the final responsibility for decision making in this area belongs to the Government. The honourable member made a great play on this point last week, and said I had withheld information from this committee. He said I had withheld information that the committee had requested.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Where did I say that?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am only going from memory, but the honourable member may be able to check on it. The statements made last week were reported in the press and subsequently the *Advertiser* saw fit to editorialise on this matter, and led people to believe that I had actually withheld information from this committee. I want to make perfectly clear that, on the same day that the letter that the honourable member quoted last week was sent, a further letter was sent by me exercising what I believe to be my prerogative. It contained all the information that the previous letter had requested from the Director and Engineer-in-Chief. I made the point that I believed

that it was my responsibility to decide whether that information would be given to the committee, irrespective of the procedures laid down in the committee's first report. The matter was said to be so serious, yet no member of the press tried to contact me to ascertain whether I had, in fact, withheld information from the committee. The member for Kavel would have to admit that every facility has been made available to the committee by the Engineering and Water Supply Department in the giving of evidence for the compilation of the reports that have been tabled in the House. In fact, the department was commended by the committee for the effort it made in this direction, and for the honourable member to say that I have been an obstructionist regarding this committee is incorrect.

Mr. Goldworthy: Not half!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Well, I should like the honourable member to point factually to one area where I have denied information to the committee. He cannot do this, and he knows it.

Mr. Goldworthy: Why did you write the letter?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The letter can be one thing and the statements can be another.

The SPEAKER: Order! If interjections are persistent, they will take up the time allotted for Question Time. Every time an honourable member interjects while the Minister is replying to a question, the Minister feels that he is duty bound, I suppose, to answer. I point out to honourable members who have complained about the use of Question Time that they are using up the time of Question Time in interjections of rebuttal that are sometimes not essential. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I challenge the honourable member to come clean on this matter, about which he is so concerned. He can grin if he likes, but this is a serious challenge. I challenge him to show precisely where I refused to supply to the committee, of which he was formerly a member, any information that it had requested of me or of the department, and I expect him to take up that challenge within the next day or so.

HOUSE MAINTENANCE

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Housing say whether the Government intends to legislate to prevent exploitation from supposed tradesmen who say they perform house maintenance work and who accept part payment before starting a job? This has happened several times; only last year I raised this matter of supposed tradesmen, especially painters, demanding part payment. People who are concerned about the condition of their house get flustered when these high-pressure people contact them. This position is highlighted in a report in the *Advertiser* of August 23 headed "Bogus repair men hit elderly". That report may curtail these activities for a time, but action is needed to protect everyone, especially the elderly.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This matter is now being considered by the Attorney-General's Department. I am unable to say precisely what the Government may do to try to ensure that this sort of thing does not happen but, when a decision has been made, I shall see to it that the honourable member is informed.

COUNCIL GRANTS

Mr. RODDA: Is the Minister of Local Government able to give any information regarding a deputation I introduced to him last Monday from the Tatiara council in respect of a request for funds to assist the council in its present predicament with regard to the employment of its

staff and the carrying on of its work in this area? The council approached the Minister seeking a grant of, I think, \$220 000. It pointed out to the Minister (and I referred to this matter in the House on Thursday) the problems it faced and the decision it had taken to put off certain men. I understand there was a ratepayers' meeting last night; there is much concern about the matter in the area. In view of the deputation (and the council acknowledges that it received from the Minister a fair hearing, although he was unable to help them last Monday) has the Minister anything to report in addition to what he told the deputation last Monday?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes, I am able to give the honourable member some information arising from the deputation that he introduced last week from the Tatiara council. True, the council sought about \$250 000 (certainly a sum well over \$200 000) owing to the fact that it had a deficit budget in the previous year. The council made plain that, unless money was forthcoming, it would be necessary for it to dismiss 13 of its staff. I promised the council that I would investigate its claims, but that in the meantime I would get an officer of the Highways Department to examine the actual position on the ground to see whether in fact the situation was as stated. The relevant sums that have been obtained are most interesting. The recorded amounts over the past three years and for this financial year show clearly that the Tatiara council has acted unwisely in dismissing 13 staff members. The figures show that its claim, unless we provided the money action would have to be taken, had no foundation at all. The situation is that in 1972-73 the amount spent in the area through grants and debited order work was \$168 091; in 1973-74, the sum was \$153 508; and in 1974-75, (last financial year, and if there was a crunch that is when it came, not this financial year) the sum available through grants and debit order work was \$55 403. This year the sum available is \$59 028. Of course, we cannot just stop at those figures.

Although the Highways Department considered no amounts provided from other sources, the fact is that, in determining its financial position, every council takes into account all funds it receives from all sources. When one considers this aspect, one gets a completely different picture. In 1972-73 the sum was \$168 091, and, for 1973-74, it was \$153 508, as already indicated. However, when the Australian Government provided an additional \$85 000, as it did last financial year, the council then had available \$140 403. This financial year, with the \$100 000 the Australian Government has given the Tatiara council, it has available \$199 431, or an increase of \$59 028 or 42 per cent over the sums made available and spent last financial year. In the light of those figures, it is crystal clear that the funds were there to pay the wages of those people, so there is obviously some other reason for their having been sacked.

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Local Government say whether the detail in the news release dated July 31, attributed to the Australian Minister for Transport, concerning the rural local road programme is correct? Having had an opportunity to examine the statement, will he tell the House whether local councils will receive further funds this financial year to enable them to avoid laying off staff now or later in the year? This question follows a question I asked last week on this matter and, in reply, the Minister said that he had not seen the report. I made the full report available to him, and no doubt he has studied it. Councils have made known to me that they will be in financial difficulties by Christmas, and it is possible that many will have to reduce their staffs at that time. It

has also been pointed out to me that the reasons for their financial difficulties are that inflation is persistent, that rates in many council areas have been increased substantially (in some cases, to the limit), and that grants have decreased. It has also been brought to my notice that the Grants Commission distinctly says that any money it makes available should not affect any other source of funding.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member had listened to the reply I gave to the member for Victoria earlier today he would have heard me say that, in determining allocations for the financial year, the Highways Department takes no account of the funds made available to councils by the Grants Commission. That is a plain simple fact which everyone can surely understand: it has no bearing on the position. The second point is that whether councils are forced to lay off staff is their decision, and not ours. Unfortunately, all too few councils have taken heed of the unanimous attitude of the House that there ought to be changes in local government in accordance with the determinations of the Royal Commission, and the honourable member was a member of Select Committee that brought down that unanimous recommendation, which was unanimously supported by the House. The recommendation did not go to another place, because it did not have to go there.

I have asked the Highways Department to investigate the numerous points the honourable member raised last Tuesday. One of the points he raised was whether the proposed \$4 100 000 was the maximum that could be expected by councils during the present financial year, and the answer is "Yes". That allocation was made on the basis that the Australian Government would, in its Budget brought down last Tuesday evening, provide an additional \$6 000 000 to South Australia: in fact, the Australian Government provided \$5 800 000, but we believe that we will be able to readjust the various activities so that that \$200 000 will not be reflected in any reductions of grants to local government bodies. It is untrue to say, as the honourable member has said, that local government generally is receiving less: indeed, if he refers back to the reply I gave the member for Victoria today he will see that the Tatiara council, which is allegedly blaming this Government or me for the sacking of 13 members of its staff, will receive a 42 per cent increase in funds this financial year.

Mr. Russack: Not in road grants.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The way in which a council gets the money does not matter: the money is being spent on roads, whether it is as a grant, debit order, or money which is untied from the Australian Government. I do not think that anyone is concerned about what tag is placed on it: the money is providing employment for the people in the area, and it is mischievous for the honourable member to go on in the way in which he is going on.

BEER PRICES

Mr. ABBOTT: Will the Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs investigate the cost of cans of beer that were sold at last Saturday's football match at Adelaide Oval?

Mr. Mathwin: There were a lot of free cans at Glenelg Oval.

Mr. ABBOTT: A constituent of mine has reported to me that he overheard a conversation between a truck driver who was delivering cans of beer to the Adelaide Oval bar last Saturday and the person taking delivery of them. When told that the cans were old stock and were to be sold at the old price, the person receiving

the cans said, "Bugger that, we've been told to sell at the new prices." I understand that the caterers providing these facilities at Adelaide Oval are Cooke and Wallis Proprietary Limited. I shall be grateful if the Minister will investigate the matter to see whether the small crowd at the Adelaide Oval last Saturday was exploited.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: If the facts are as outlined, it sounds as though it was a poor show, and I will certainly obtain a report for the honourable member.

AMERICAN RIVER WATER SUPPLY

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Works undertake to reinvestigate the application for a water supply at American River in order somehow to justify a service to that community? Although it is appreciated that the economics of the various propositions put forward over about the past 10 years are fairly thin, I am sure that the Minister recognises the desperate need of the community for, and the high tourist development potential that rests on, this water supply. To avoid growing unemployment and to encourage the healthy development of American River, it would seem desirable and sound for the Government to invest in this scheme. The residents and tourist promoters of the area inform me that, largely, they could become self-supporting and make a real contribution to the State (which is in line with the view the Premier has often expressed on Kangaroo Island) if this supply was available. I know that at least twice the Premier has spoken about the tourist potential of the community and the contribution it could make, raising the matter when opening the Seaview Motel extensions at Kingscote and the Sorrento Motel at Penneshaw. In relation to this scheme, I have received various replies from the Minister. I appreciate that he recognises the need for this supply, but most of his past replies have rested on the financial situation; in fact, he has often said, "We just haven't any money." I am encouraged to raise the matter now, following a reply by the Premier to a question by the member for Hanson as reported at page 40 of *Hansard*. Referring to the financial situation in South Australia, at the end of the reply the Premier stated:

He (the member for Hanson) will find that the position of the State is not delicate at all, but is robustly healthy. On that note I believe it is appropriate to raise this matter again and to seek the Minister's co-operation about it.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I appreciate the honourable member's concern and constant representations about this matter. Regarding money being available, so far as the Loan Estimates are concerned, the position is little different from what it has been in past years. I believe that the Premier's statement refers to the Budget Estimates. The honourable member knows that the demands made on Engineering and Water Supply Department for extensions to water mains and development of water basins apply not only to Kangaroo Island but also to other places. Moreover, as I have often explained, it is not only a matter of priorities but also of economics. Nevertheless, in view of the honourable member's representations, I shall be happy to take up the matter again with the department. It certainly seems that the honourable member has referred to what is a bit of a chicken and egg situation. What comes first? Certainly, if water were provided, things would follow. However, I could be in trouble in all directions if it were an uneconomic proposition; I will not refer to those matters, as the honourable member can possibly decide them for himself.

FAIRVIEW PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Education say whether it is intended still to construct the Fairview Park (Yatala Vale) Primary School by the date previously stated? The Minister will be aware that recently Cabinet approved the expenditure for the construction of a new primary school at Fairview Park. It was proposed that the school would be constructed in two stages, using Demac units, and the Public Buildings Department construction division would undertake the work. Planning provided for construction to commence on site in September, 1975, with completion in January, 1976. I point out to the Minister that what has prompted this question is a report in the *News* of August 20 (last week) headed, "Education—grim for school buildings".

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The House will recall that last week I stated what I intended to do in this area and mentioned that, although it would be necessary to completely review our whole programme of replacements and certain additional facilities at existing schools, our programme for the provision of schools in new areas where the movement of population dictated that these should be built was unaffected. As the school to which the honourable member refers is in the second category, there will be no alteration in the programme for that school; it will proceed.

PETROL FRANCHISE

Mr. BECKER: Will the Premier tell the House what is meant by the word "hardship" in relation to consideration by the business franchise authority of applications by petrol resellers for reduction in licence fees? A report in this afternoon's *News* states:

Service station proprietors who showed the Government petrol tax had caused hardships could apply for relief from payments, the Premier (Mr. Dunstan) said today. Applications could be made at the end of the present quarter in September.

The report also states:

Mr. Dunstan said criteria had been established for relief to those who could show considerable hardship. Applications would have to be made when the gallonage figures were known. A number of claims had been made in past quarters for hardship relief, but some stations involved had shown a drop of less than 4 per cent in gallons sold.

The report also states that exemptions would not mean a substantial reduction in revenue to the Government, although stations that had sold more than their previous gallonage would not be charged extra. I have had several complaints from constituents who have had a considerable loss in income as a result of other service stations outside the area discounting petrol. One constituent, who stands to lose about \$858, wrote to the department on March 7 pointing this out, but did not receive a reply to his letter. He wrote again in June, asking that his licence fee be considered because of the loss of petrol sales. He then forwarded the balance of his payment on July 14. Finally, the department wrote to him on July 14, saying that it would give him a remission of \$62 but that he had to pay \$287 forthwith. Following that, two young officers from the department went and saw him, telling him that if he did not pay up his licence would not be renewed. I ask whether this afternoon's newspaper statement is correct, and what is meant by "hardship". Does it mean that any reseller who can show that he has had a loss in petrol sales compared to sales for the previous year will have the amount remitted entirely, or will such resellers be in danger of losing their business completely?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, it does not mean that any petrol reseller who shows a reduced gallonage

will get a remission. I have established criteria that I believe are fair in the cases that have shown hardship. I cannot detail these to the House, because, as the honourable member may know, at present litigation before the High Court is involved in this matter and, given the complex constitutional questions concerned, it would not be proper or, indeed, helpful for me to make further and detailed public statements on the matter. However, I am willing to let the honourable member know privately the basis on which we are proceeding in these matters.

WHYALLA SCHOOLS

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Minister of Education say when it is expected that construction of the fourth high school at Whyalla will commence? The Minister would be aware of the concern being felt in Whyalla about the construction date of the new school, and the pressures that would be placed on the Whyalla Stuart High School if the construction of the fourth school were delayed unreasonably.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I cannot give the honourable member a definite date. We are proceeding with discussions with the South Australian Housing Trust and with design for a fourth secondary school at Whyalla. To be located to the south and west of the existing Whyalla Stuart High School, it will service a new area that I understand the trust intends to subdivide. However, we have reviewed the position regarding the population in Whyalla under 21 years of age. A marginal drop in primary school enrolments in the past couple of years has been sufficient to suggest, along with the general levelling off in population increase at Whyalla, that to go into the immediate provision of a fourth high school would be to provide a facility that might have an enrolment of about 300 to 400 for a long time. Therefore, we will instead adjust the zoning at Whyalla so that some of the existing catchment at Whyalla Stuart High School will be transferred into the catchments for Eyre and, indeed, for Whyalla. It is expected that this will relieve some of the pressure on the Stuart school that otherwise would become significantly larger than the pressure on the other two schools. I hasten to assure the honourable member that, in the event of any further change in the demographic pattern that would suggest that there would be a further spurt in secondary enrolments, we would be in a position to go to tender fairly quickly for the projected Flinders High School project. As I have said, the present position is one of adjusting zoning to protect the Stuart school's position and to continue with design and negotiation with the subdividers for the Housing Trust so that, in the event of any modification having to be made, we would be in a position to go to tender rapidly. The upshot is that I cannot give the honourable member at this stage a starting date for the fourth high school. That will be dictated by developments in population in the next few years.

FARM BUILD-UP

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to consider having amended the portion of the rural reconstruction scheme that allows for farm build-up, so that, when a father applies to increase the size of his holding so that he can include his sons in his farming business, his sons will be able to have some of the land acquired in the farm build-up scheme transferred to their name? As the scheme operates at present, a person who owns existing property must purchase property under the scheme in his own name, and he is not permitted to bring

a son or daughter into the properties acquired under the scheme. This is unsatisfactory, and in many cases is defeating the object of the farm build-up scheme. In many cases the viable unit constructed would have to be sold to meet succession and death duties in future. Therefore, I ask the Minister whether he will ask his colleague to find out whether the scheme can be altered.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will discuss the matter with my colleague and let the honourable member know the result.

OIL TRANSPORT

Mr. OLSON: Will the Minister of Transport arrange for the lubricating oils shortly to be refined at Port Stanvac to be conveyed to the Birkenhead storage depots by rail transport? Concern has been expressed by constituents residing near the storage depots because the road system is already overloaded as a result of industrial vehicles operating in the area. In addition to the pollution from petrol fumes and vehicle gases from additional tankers causing discomfort to residents, their introduction to transport the oils to the depots will make the roadway hazardous.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There is already much disquiet over the volume of petrol that is currently being transported by road. I am quite sure if there is any increase in this there will be quite a considerable uprising. I think that the suggestion that the honourable member has made has much merit, and I shall be pleased to have it investigated.

ORROROO AREA SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Works say whether Orroroo Area School will be painted before the Orroroo centenary, which is to be celebrated from Wednesday, September 24, until the following weekend? I spoke to the former Minister of Education some months ago about the impending centenary celebrations and about the school's activities in those celebrations. In the meantime, repairs have been undertaken at this school, but no painting has yet been done, and it is barely a month before the centenary commences.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know what influence the new Minister can bring to bear, but if the request has been made to the Public Buildings Department to do the job I will give an undertaking to the honourable member that I will do everything possible to see that the work is expedited, if it is in train, so as to have it completed by that date. I had better check with my department before I give any unequivocal assurance.

QUARTER BEEF

Mr. VANDEPEER: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture what action he has taken in the dispute at the local cold stores in which union members have refused to handle quarter beef? The dispute has resulted in large-scale disruption of the movement of meat from the farms to the local consumer and to the export trade. The quarter beef that is involved in this dispute is part of the consignment to Russia. The producers have been criticised for some time for being unable to supply enough beef for this market, but much of the trouble has been at the industrial level. These disputes have caused a severe reduction in prices obtained at local markets, to the point where today's Millicent market has been cancelled and the Mount Gambier market is severely restricted to the point where it supplies only local demand.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will refer the matters raised by the honourable member to my colleague, and bring down a report as soon as possible.

APPRENTICES

Mr. CUMBE: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry give any information about the training of apprentices in this State? I have seen the latest departmental report on the number of indentures signed last year. There could be, in some trades, a grave shortage of skilled tradesmen in future years. Therefore, I ask the Minister whether he has considered introducing a scheme similar to that in the new industrial training legislation in Victoria, which provides for free apprenticeship training for school leavers. This subject was touched on at a convention last week by a leading educationist, who was talking about young school leavers. Also, and most importantly, has he considered the aspect of adult apprenticeship training, as is proposed in Victoria under this new legislation, in conjunction with the Commonwealth.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I think it is true to say the Industrial Training Council has been fairly active, but without having much power, in South Australia. The Government is considering the suggestion of making that body a statutory body, which would give it certain rights, in its own right, to obtain finance for adult training. One of the arguments at the moment is who will finance adult training schemes. Employers, obviously, are not happy about doing this. Of course, the Government has to consider how it is to be financed. Last Friday week I chaired a conference on adult training, which was attended by 39 people. Without going into great detail, I would say that some area of compromise, I think, has now been reached. As a former Minister of Labour and Industry, the honourable member would know that certain areas are in dispute between employers and unions with regard to the particular training, where the vacancies occur, and so forth. We are in the midst of considering what was said at that conference and deciding how we can approach the problems and overcome them. I think I shall be better able to answer the question in two or three months time after we have examined the matter in much more detail and had a further conference with people similar to those who attended the last conference. Generally speaking, I believe there is a much better acceptance of adult training than there was prior to the conference. With regard to the question of apprentices, I will have to get a report from the Apprenticeship Commissioner and bring it back to the House, because I am not familiar with what progress is being made in this regard.

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. BOUNDY: Can the Premier say whether the State has failed to spend its allocation from the Australian Government under the State's Grants (Nature Conservation) Act and, if it has, why? In this morning's *Australian* there is a report headed "The States pass in \$7 200 000 for parks." That report states that the States have lost a chance to spend \$7 200 000 in Commonwealth funds on developing national parks and nature reserves. This year the allocation was reduced to \$1 800 000. The Federal Minister for the Environment, Mr. Berinson, conceded that part of the blame was his department's, but he said the main obstacle to spending this money was the lack of co-operation from the States. I ask what is the position of this State in this matter.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am perhaps in a better position than is the Premier to answer this question,

because it is through my department that approaches for funds for national parks have been made over the recent 12 or 15 months to the Australian Government. From the point of view of South Australia that article is completely misleading, and I have already sent a telegram to the Commonwealth Minister pointing out that he should make certain when he makes a statement of that kind that he does not include South Australia. I believe that some of the other States did in fact have offers of money for the purchase of national parks made to them, but they did not prepare their submissions in time for last year's payments. However, we in South Australia provided all the material for assessment of national park purchases that the Commonwealth requested from us. They were certainly with the Commonwealth in plenty of time for it to assess, and in fact approve. The honourable member will have seen, from time to time, press statements from the former Commonwealth Minister responsible for national parks indicating that funds would be made available to South Australia for various national park projects. However, some doubt has been cast on those allocations of money by the Commonwealth department. I think I replied in similar terms to a question last week, when I said that we had informed the Commonwealth that, in the commitments for national park finance, once we had received its approval negotiations were commenced immediately to purchase those tracts of land. Land purchase varies from State to State. The honourable member will know that originally we try, in fairness to the landowner, to negotiate and agree on a price, but if that fails a notice of intention to purchase is provided to protect the landowner's interests as much as the Government's. All the areas of land that were approved by the Commonwealth Government for purchase were taken up immediately by this State, and we have done all we could reasonably be required to do, within the machinery for land acquisition in this State, to purchase any land the Commonwealth had agreed that it would fund. Mr. Berinson, the Commonwealth Minister for Environment, has told me he will be able to inform me within a week about the situation regarding all our outstanding applications before the Commonwealth. I think it is fair to say that the criticism does not single out any State but makes it seem as though all States are to blame. I have drawn to Mr. Berinson's attention the fact that South Australia should not be placed in that category and that he should make a public statement to that effect.

DAIRYING ASSISTANCE

Mr. WOTTON: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture what are the conditions for acceptance of applications for assistance provided for dairy farmers under the Australian Government's dairy adjustment programme and can he say what percentage of the applications has been refused and for what reasons? Because of current economic pressures, many dairy farmers in my district wish to avail themselves of opportunities to extend their dairying projects and, in particular, to purchase and install refrigerated bulk milk tanks and to arrange finance on a long-term basis to cover costs associated with the operation of bulk milk collection. Much concern is being expressed in my district about the criteria for the success of the applications. Concern is also being expressed about the length of time taken to process each application and the amount of detail required in the applications.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think this is a matter that lies properly with the Minister of Lands, and I will refer the question to him and bring down a report as soon as possible.

SUPERMARKETS

Mr. DUNCAN: Is the Attorney-General aware of the widespread practice in supermarket-type stores of informing staff that they have the right to search bags and chattels of persons using the stores? Can the Attorney-General say what steps the Government can take to protect the rights of the consuming public and of the employees of the stores concerned? Will he also undertake to inform these companies publicly that their rights and those of their employees to search the bags and chattels of persons in their stores are very limited indeed? On Friday last a friend of mine who had been shopping in a supermarket approached a check-out counter to pay for the items he had collected from the shelves. The cashier, who was about 15 or 16 years of age, without asking his permission, proceeded to take hold of a bag he was carrying for the purpose of searching it. My friend objected to this practice, and he was told by the cashier that she had the right to search his bag. When he asked her how she obtained this right, she said she was under instructions from her employer. Involved in this matter are three important issues. The first is the humiliation of the consumer in being required to produce his private possessions before a stranger; the second is the fact that supermarkets are not as of right in all circumstances entitled to search customers' private possessions; and third is the use of poorly-paid juvenile employees in such a responsible position and the placing of them in a position where they could be guilty of committing a criminal offence on the advice of their employers. The last point is the most important, and it may be that special courses should be implemented, possibly by the Government or some other body, for cashiers and shop assistants to advise them of their legal rights and obligations. Will the Attorney-General look into this matter and comment on it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: When I was Attorney-General previously, I issued public statements concerning this matter. At that time some cases had been brought to the attention of the public. I know that when Mr. King was Attorney-General he also issued statements on this matter, but since it seems to have arisen again I will follow it up for the honourable member.

MOTOR INDUSTRY

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Premier table in this House the letters of intent lodged by the Toyota and Nissan companies concerning the joint engine venture at Lonsdale? In addition, can he say what will be the likely extent of the shareholding of the Commonwealth Government in this venture? I understand that the Commonwealth Cabinet is meeting today to consider two factors in relation to this joint engine venture. The first relates to letters of intent. As I understand it, the Commonwealth Cabinet will examine these and decide whether or not they are suitable. The second matter is the level of shareholding in this venture by the Australian Government through the Australian Industry Development Corporation. On one other project, namely, the Redcliff petro-chemical plant, the Australian Government stepped in, and we know letters of intent were held. We also know that the Commonwealth interfered with the shareholding of that consortium. It is for this reason that I raise this matter. I believe that, in the interests of this State, the Premier should table this information so that we can assess it.

This plant is not expected to be producing for another three years, and I am concerned about employment within

the motor car industry during this period. During the past 12 months employment in the motor industry in this State has dropped by 1 250, and motor vehicle exports from Australia and this State are only 25 per cent of the level that applied 18 months ago. I believe therefore the future of the motor industry in South Australia is grim, particularly until we get this new venture. We cannot afford the mismanagement of the State and Commonwealth Governments which will again lose a venture for Australia.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am somewhat bemused by the honourable member's curious advocacy of this venture when his Commonwealth leader at the outset of the elections in South Australia bitterly attacked it and said it was undesirable that this venture of Chrysler Aust. Ltd. with the Japanese companies should take place in South Australia and that it would be an issue in the election. Admittedly, when I tackled him about it, no more was heard from the Liberal Party, but since that time Mr. Fraser has attacked the venture again on behalf of the Liberal Party of Australia. I do not know for whom the honourable member is speaking at the moment and what communication he has with the rest of the Liberal Party, but I point out to him that an attack was made on the Labor Party in respect of the letters of intent. I do not intend to table them in this House, simply because they are already public documents and have been tabled.

Mr. Dean Brown: Where?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I published the telexes from the Commonwealth Minister immediately after the elections.

Mr. Dean Brown: They're not in the press, and you know it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will hand the honourable member a copy of the telexes if he likes; I do not mind. These telexes have always been available, and press releases have been made. The press has had this information since the Wednesday after the elections.

Mr. Dean Brown: Why don't you table them?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am unable to table the original letters of intent because I do not have them; they are with the Australian Minister.

Mr. Dean Brown: You don't even have a copy of them?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have the telexes setting out the terms, and they are public documents. I will let the honourable member have a copy of them if he has not yet obtained copies, but I should have thought that he would obtain a copy of them if he was so interested. They have been public documents for so long that it is not true. Despite the constant attacks of the Liberal Party on the venture, it is proceeding. Representatives of the Japanese companies have been here and have consulted with me and with the Chrysler company, and they have been told that the State Government is willing to build the necessary plant on the normal lease-back operation of the Housing Trust. I have been assured by the representatives of Chrysler and associated companies that there is every evidence that, on the completion of the feasibility studies, the venture will proceed.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You've really got one thing off the ground at last.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will not answer the interjection, because, obviously, the honourable member is deliberately blind to what has happened during the past four years.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It was to be Redcliff, and now Monarto.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member makes it his policy to knock this State as hard as he can go all the time; no-one pays that kind of thing, but he can keep on doing it.

Mr. Mathwin: Get on with it!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I suggest that the honourable member and his colleagues concert their attacks on this Government in future and not say something utterly contrary to what other members in their own Party are saying.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION BILLS

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

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 21. Page 421.)

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): When I obtained leave last Thursday to continue my remarks, I was dealing with the inadequacies of housing facing the South Australian community. In last Saturday's *Advertiser*, the political writer (Mr. Eric Franklin) wrote about this matter again. He correctly said that politicians, according to their Party, made the most or least of it, but there could be no ignoring the inescapable fact that the family house on its block of land was fast getting beyond the reach of many people. That statement is quite true. I would not be doing my duty if I let this moment pass without saying something about the family home. I said on Thursday that a happy community is one that is properly housed. We have in the metropolitan area of Adelaide, and in major country towns, a housing situation that is of real concern to the people. I give Mr. Franklin full marks for drawing this problem to the attention of readers of the *Advertiser*. He wrote about "do it yourself" housing, and said that there was no shortage of building materials! That is true—finance is the trouble. The Australian Government and this Government are faced with this situation and it can be fairly said they are not good handlers of finance.

Two leading businessmen were in Australia a week ago. Mr. Carnegie drew businessmen's attention to the fact that they should roll up their sleeves and face the facts, and Mr. D. I. McCulloch, the Manager of P. A. Management Consultants Proprietary Limited, spoke about the need for proper accounting. People in high places are expressing concern at what is going on in accounting practice and the use of funds. In his explanation, the Treasurer said that, regarding special funds for welfare housing in 1975-76, it was not yet known what amount the Australian Government intended to allocate to the State for this purpose. The Treasurer left this matter up in the air, and there is far too much of this sort of practice, since we do not know what we can expect to receive. The Australian Budget presented last Tuesday gave cold comfort in this regard.

At the recent State election my Party put forward the policy of abolishing drainage rates, a matter of much concern in my district and in the neighbouring districts of Mount Gambier and Millicent. Had we been elected

we would have abolished that rate in the South-East, because a committee of my Party, after examining this matter, considered that the amounts paid by some people were so insignificant that this rate could be dispensed with and the State bear the costs of drainage. Rate-payers in the area have approached the two new members and me on this matter, but we have pointed out to them that, as we are not in the Government, they should approach the Labor Government. We hope that the appeals committee now investigating drainage will issue a report soon, and that the job will then be completed. People in prescribed areas will then be confronted with an annual account. Had Mr. Ravesi been elected instead of Mr. Slater as member for Gilles, my Party may have been able to do something for those people.

Regarding harbors accommodation, further progress has been made on bulk grain and phosphate rock loading installations at Port Lincoln and container ship facilities at Outer Harbor. Those concerned with the primary-producing industry favour this move, because a properly constituted seaboard will be an advantage in the despatch of primary produce. I hope these capital works are proceeded with soon. An amount of \$930 000 is to be allocated to fishing havens with improvements to slipway facilities at Beachport, Kingscote and Port Lincoln, the provision of a breakwater at Port MacDonnell, and of a fishing jetty at Franklin Harbor.

Those engaged in the fishing industry will appreciate these new facilities, and this applies especially to the breakwater at Port MacDonnell. The storm last year played havoc with vessels in that area. This facility, which is long overdue, will be much appreciated by those living in the area. People engaged in the fishing industry are having a difficult time, as are all those engaged in primary industry. As fishing is a primary industry, these facilities will materially assist all those in the industry. It is disappointing to see a country like Australia struggling in the grip of inflation but, although we are considering financial matters, we do not know whether the amounts we are considering will be available. A grave warning was given by the Australian Treasurer that adjustments will have to be made, and it will be an interesting exercise at this time next year to consider what we are now discussing.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): The Treasurer, in introducing the Loan Estimates, was sensible enough to say:

At this stage I should add that we have not received firm advice of many major expected grants and loans. In view of the difficult budget situation which the Australian Government faces, it is possible that some of the special contributions may be held to lower limits than have been adopted for purposes of these papers. This matter will be kept under close review to ensure that commitments actually made are in line with funds available.

When the Leader of the Opposition spoke in this debate, he made the point that the Estimates were already out of date, because what the Treasurer had anticipated had, in fact, happened. The Leader went on to say that this merely showed the dependence of the State upon the Commonwealth, not only for its revenue, but also for its capital works programmes. Since then I have had the chance of looking at the Commonwealth Budget papers, Senator Hall having given me a set of them. It is most illuminating to see in them just what has happened to South Australia's anticipations in this regard. I intend to compare what our hopes were at the time when the Loan Estimates were introduced to what, in fact, we will get from the Commonwealth. Let us consider the position. Probably the easiest way to do so is look at the

South Australian Treasurer's statement and compare what he said on particular matters with what was contained in the papers attached to the Commonwealth Budget. The first matter to which I refer (and I am not the first to mention it) is the question of housing. On page 7 (under the heading "Housing") the South Australian Treasurer said:

As to the special funds for welfare housing in 1975-76, it is not yet known what amount the Australian Government intends to allocate to the State for this purpose.

The Treasurer then went on to say that, last year, the Prime Minister had referred to the sum for housing at the Premiers' Conference but that he had not referred to it this time. The Prime Minister is said to have added that the States could expect housing funds this year to be not less than the sums advanced in 1974-75. We have only the Treasurer's word for it that that is what he said. If he did say it, he is a liar, because the States have not got as much as that. Referring to Commonwealth Budget paper No. 1 (which relates to the Budget speech for 1975-76), at page 55 we find, by reference to the table contained in that paper, that the States will receive \$23 800 000 less for housing than they received last year. That sum relates to the six States.

In Commonwealth Budget paper No. 7 (headed "Payments to or for the States and Local Government Authorities in 1975-76"), at page 68 we find that South Australia is one of the lucky States, in that it will get precisely the same sum it got last year. If it were not for inflation that sum might not be too bad; however, in the building industry that figure would have to be reduced by 20 per cent or 25 per cent.

Mr. Nankivell: Can we forget about local government funds?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is right. If we look at the table on page 68 of paper No. 7 we find that New South Wales will get the same as it got last year; Victoria will get the same; and we will get the same. It is instructive to compare the two Budget documents, because the figures never quite tie up and it is impossible ever to tell precisely what is the amount. The South Australian figure is nearly always just a little different from the Commonwealth figure but, with application, it is possible to put the two together. South Australia will get \$56 360 000 (the same as last year) and Tasmania, Western Australian and Queensland will all get less. That is where the reduction of about \$23 000 000 comes from. Whilst in monetary terms for housing we are getting as much as we got last year, it will go only about three-quarters as far as the allocation went last year. As I have said, I am not the first to refer to that, but it just shows the difficulty we are facing now that we, with the assent of the Labor Party, are so dependent on the Commonwealth Government. Of course, it does not always work that way. Sometimes there is a bit of a plus rather than a minus.

At page 10 of the Loan Estimates (headed "River Murray Weirs, Dams, Locks, etc.") we find that South Australia expected to get \$3 400 000 from the Commonwealth for the construction of Dartmouth dam, the project that has caused much difficulty in the past; however, the figure contained on page 139 of paper No. 7 of this illuminating Commonwealth document shows that South Australia will get \$4 000 000. We are therefore a little in front on that project. Each of the States will receive \$4 000 000, and that is a bit of a plus, and shows that we cannot really rely on the papers presented to this House before we hear about what is contained in the Commonwealth Budget.

At page 13 of the Loan Estimates (dealing with school buildings and schools) it is stated :

Grants from the Australian Government of about \$14 000 000 are expected this year.

What do we find if we look at Budget paper No. 7? We find that South Australia will receive substantially less than it expected to receive. For technical and further education, South Australia will receive \$1 200 000 instead of \$1 500 000, which is referred to in our Loan Estimates statement. For Government and non-government schools, which are all lumped together in South Australia, we will receive not the \$14 000 000 we expected but \$11 135 000—a substantial reduction in the amount expected. Remember, South Australia will not receive all that money just for Government schools: the allocation is for non-government schools as well. On page 44 of the same paper we find the following statement:

In 1975 the Schools Commission presented its report recommending grants to the States totalling \$2 070 000 000 over the triennium 1976-78, at December, 1974, prices—

that is to take account of inflation—

Consistent with its policy of budgetary restraint for 1975-76 the Government was unable to support recommendations of this magnitude but has provided for a programme for schools in the 1976 school year, aimed at consolidation of improvements so far achieved. The major implications will be a slowing of new capital expenditure in 1976 and a deferment of the beginning of the first full triennium to 1977.

I am not the first to complain about that or to draw attention to it: there has been widespread criticism of the Commonwealth Government in the way in which it has treated education in its recent Budget. To my mind, this merely shows the danger and the disadvantage of our being so dependent on the Commonwealth Government in fields where the constitutional power remains with the State. Let us consider another aspect, a matter that is dear to the Government's heart: I refer to the Land Commission, which is dealt with on page 15 of the Loan Estimates. The 1974-75 figure indicates that the Commonwealth Government virtually footed the whole bill for the Land Commission. Actual expenditure in 1974-75 was about \$21 500 000, and South Australia received all but \$1 000 000 of that sum from the Commonwealth. That is not the position this year, when the commission's programme contemplated an expenditure of about \$34 800 000. Of that, a request, we are told, has been made to the Australian Government for assistance of \$24 000 000 towards the programme. Again, it is said rather euphemistically that the programme may need to be adjusted to accord with funds available.

Well, let us see just what the Commonwealth Government has given us in this field. At page 74 of paper No. 7 it is stated that the sum that South Australia is to get not only for the Land Commission but also for land acquisition and development in urban areas (in other words, for other purposes as well) is not the \$24 000 000 that we asked for but \$19 699 000, again, a substantial drop in the amount for which we asked. I do not like the Land Commission. I am, as I said during the Liberal Movement policy speech at the Adelaide Town Hall, suspicious of the Land Commission and of the moneys being allocated to it from State resources. No doubt part of those funds will be returns on land that has been sold during the past year, but it seems to me that we are spending, on what is a classic socialist enterprise, about \$15 000 000 of our own State moneys, and I do not like that. I believe that the activities of the Land Commission so far have not been of any help to this State. I have been told that land that the commission has sold has yielded a profit of about 20 per cent

or more, and in my view that is not the purpose for which the commission was declared to be set up. In fact, as I have said, it is merely a socialist undertaking and a good first step towards the nationalisation of land. We are not getting as much money for the Land Commission as was expected when the Treasurer introduced this Bill. Finally, I come to that other—

Mr. Nankivell: Monarto?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, the member for Mallee is right: he is being most helpful today as he leads the Opposition gloriously from the front bench. We come to Monarto, and what do we find here? Again, I am not being original in what I say. The State allocation proposed for Monarto was \$1 200 000 from Loan money and \$2 000 000 of semi-government borrowing authority money. The State Government had asked for \$10 000 000 from the Commonwealth Government, and now we have been told that we will get \$500 000. In fact, that is not, so far as I can tell from the Commonwealth Budget figures, an accurate amount, and I understand that it was stated in a letter from the Prime Minister to the Treasurer that the amount was \$500 000. It does not appear in the Budget documents at all.

Mr. Nankivell: Read the last sentence in the Monarto Development Commission part of the Treasurer's explanation. He says he expects to receive a suitable amount.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I am grateful to the honourable member. The Treasurer stated:

We expect to receive from the Australian Government a contribution sufficient to finance a suitable programme.

Mr. Nankivell: A suitable programme?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is what the Government thought it would get. The figure of \$10 000 000 had been freely mentioned by the Special Minister of State for Monarto and Redcliff.

Mr. Nankivell: He believes in some of his titles!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not, but one almost starts to feel sorry for that Minister. He gave up the Education portfolio, took on Redcliff, which fell through; he took on Monarto, and that has fallen through, whether he likes to acknowledge it or not. All he is left with is the portfolio of Mines and Energy, on which he has to struggle against Mr. Connor, his Commonwealth Government colleague.

Dr. Tonkin: You mentioned Redcliff, did you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, that has gone. It has been deferred, according to this explanation. One wonders what is going on on the front bench on the other side, but it is not really of much moment one way or the other. In regard to Monarto, we see from page 72 of Commonwealth Budget Paper No. 7 that the Commonwealth Government is supporting the State Governments to the tune of \$72 939 000 for growth centres and related projects. In that table, we find the totals allocated to the States for growth centres. New South Wales is to get \$42 186 000 and Victoria is to get \$26 522 000. It is easy to see where the growth is to be.

Mr. Wardle: Where the votes are.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is to be where the votes are, as the member for Murray has said, in the south-eastern corner of Australia. South Australia is to get not \$500 000 but, according to this table, \$879 000, but that includes capitalised interest, so I am willing to accept that \$500 000 is the new money. The remainder is to capitalise the interest we are not paying on the project.

According to the table, Western Australia is to get \$500 000 and Tasmania is to get \$804 000. Tasmania is

to get not quite as much as we are to get. Of course, on a per capita basis it is much more, but it is not as much in absolute terms. If we look at some of the other tables regarding growth centres, it becomes obvious that the amount was split up only at the last moment, because in table No. 107 on page 139 of the same document we see the letters "n.a." for the amounts against each State. The total is given as \$72 939 000, but, when that table was prepared for the purpose of the Budget papers, it had not been decided how to split up the amount, so perhaps some wrangling was going on.

The total for South Australia is \$176 000. We see that the \$879 000 has not been included. That means, of course, that Monarto is dead and finished. I heard the comment by the Leader of the Opposition that the Special Minister of State for Monarto and Redcliff had been whistling in the wind. I thought that that was rather a mis-statement: I thought that whistling in the dark would have been better, but what the Leader has said is true.

Dr. Tonkin: It depends which way the wind was blowing.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That may be. Anyway, the point that the Leader was trying to make was quite right. Monarto is dead, and it is perfectly obvious to see where growth centres are to be supported. They are to be supported in the inner States of New South Wales and Victoria where, as the member for Murray has said, the votes are.

I have referred to those States as the inner States. It was rather revealing to me when I read the other day that a member of the Commonwealth Parliament or a civil servant (I cannot remember which) referred to South Australia, Tasmania and Western Australia as the outer States. That is a significant description by people in the larger States, and this sort of thing shows how much we can expect from the Commonwealth Government. I do not suppose there has been a bigger smack in the face for the State Government than this Monarto allocation, unless it has been in regard to Redcliff, although that was as much a decision by private enterprise as it was obstruction by the Government.

The Monarto project has been virtually killed, yet the Government is going on spending money on it, and I protest most bitterly about that. There is no justification whatever for spending further money on Monarto. This allocation is an absolute insult to South Australia, and it would be better if no money had been allocated. However, today I received a reply to a Question on Notice that I had asked. It was question No. 23 on the Notice Paper, in which I had asked about the purchase by the Monarto Development Commission of land near the Sturt reserve, in the hundred of Mobilong. That is on the riverfront near Murray Bridge. I find that, although I understand this area is outside the Monarto area, the commission is buying up land there. The reason given to me in the reply is as follows:

The land in question will provide a future recreation area on the Murray River for the residents of Monarto—I do not know who they will be: I do not think there are to be any—

as well as the people of Murray Bridge and will assist in controlling the impact on the river of future population growth in the region.

I certainly do not begrudge the people of Murray Bridge more land for recreation purposes, but, when the money being used is Monarto money, I wonder what this is all about. The reply states that an amount of \$237 000 has been spent already on two freehold properties and 11 leaseholds that have been purchased and that negotiations are proceeding for the acquisition of other properties that will involve expenditure of about \$200 000.

I suspect that those negotiations are likely to be broken off now, because there will not be any money for the purpose. The reply also states that the total cost of the acquisitions that the commission will undertake in assisting to establish this reserve will not exceed \$500 000. I consider that this is money that is being mis-spent entirely. In fact, I believe that all the money spent at Monarto is being mis-spent, but that money, more than any other, is being mis-spent if it is being used in the name of Monarto. I have drawn attention to these things just to show how dependent we are on the Commonwealth, financially, for our capital programme as well as for revenue, to show how unreliable the Loan Estimates are and to draw attention to some of the areas in which we are being very badly hit at the whim of the Commonwealth Government, because of the dependence which I have mentioned. Of course, the general points that have been made have been validly made by other speakers, and there is nothing more I need say at this stage, although there are one or two choice things I hope to say in due course.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): In addressing myself to this Bill, I liken it to standing on a giant rabbit warren not knowing from which burrow the next set of ears is going to come, because we find that once again the Treasurer has produced figures, at will, to suit his own case. I want briefly to go back and analyse the document presented to us and then to relate it to other statements that the Treasurer has made in recent times in this House and elsewhere. As has been clearly indicated by other members, the document is dated, not only because of the activities of the Commonwealth Government but also because of the failure of the State Ministry to front up and realistically assess the major projects being undertaken in this State. In other words, the document is a guide only.

Taking in chronological sequence the detail made available to us, we find that the Revenue Budget of 1974-75, which was brought down on August 29, 1974, forecasts a \$12 000 000 deficit. That deficit was to be \$12 000 000 only if the Commonwealth Government came forward with an additional \$6 000 000. In 1974-75 the Commonwealth Government was unable to come forward with the funds which it had promised and which were necessary for us to go ahead, just as has happened in 1975-76, with funds that are necessary if we are to go ahead. So, on August 29, 1974, the Treasurer was outlining in the Revenue Budget a deficit of \$18 000 000. When the Commonwealth Budget was brought in it was pointed out that there would be further difficulties for South Australia, because certain of the requirements of that Commonwealth Budget, represented against the costs of the State, diminished our income by a further \$4 000 000, so, in late August and early September, 1974, we were looking at a \$22 000 000 deficit.

A little later, the Treasurer said that it was a distinct possibility, because of the downturn in income and the problems that were arising, that the deficit would be \$36 000 000. In other words, he was prepared to admit publicly in a matter of months (almost a matter of weeks) that he had been so far out in his calculations, or so willing to bring forward mystical figures to suit his own political circumstances, that we were looking at a deficit not of \$12 000 000 but of \$36 000 000: just a 200 per cent increase in a matter of weeks! It was stated that the increase to \$36 000 000 was caused by a downturn in revenues, and increased costs of supplies and services gave indications that the deficit could worsen. The Treasurer then went on to say, "in the absence of corrective action".

We must then ask ourselves what was that corrective action. It was to increase the inflationary trend further by introducing the franchise taxes, particularly that associated with petrol. Once again I use the Treasurer's own words, "a tighter control of expenditure". I ask, "What is a tighter control of expenditure?" I would have expected a competent Government on all occasions to show that it was able to command complete control on the expenditure of taxpayers' funds. I believe that the Treasurer's statement in this document is an indictment of his own Government in that, up to the time when it seemed that there would be a \$36 000 000 deficit, it had not been exercising the sort of controls necessary of a Government to make sure that the public is getting a dollar's worth of work, services, or provisions for each dollar spent. It is not the first time that the same sort of comment has been made by the Treasurer. Some 18 months to two years ago, when we suffered a recession and a liquidity problem within the State finances, suddenly, within a period of six weeks, the Government put pressures on Government spending and said, "Look what we have done: we have improved our situation by reducing expenditure by \$1 000 000 through good housekeeping." I say again a Government, if it is responsible, must look to the requirements of proper housekeeping the whole way through, not just when it becomes a matter of financial pressure brought about by failures, either at the State level or, as in this instance brought about by the problems associated with the State's economy because of the failure of its Commonwealth counterpart.

In February of this year the expectation, as a result of that reduction or of that tightening (a tightening that was to account for a mere \$9 000 000), was the figure that the Treasurer used at the Premiers' Conference in February—a \$27 000 000 deficit. As a result of \$6 600 000 additional funds that were obtained for the State from the Commonwealth Government in February, it seemed that we would have slightly more than a \$20 000 000 deficit at the end of the financial year. On June 10, 1975, in the Supplementary Estimates, the Treasurer said:

Improvements in revenues have brought about a situation where we were not facing anything like the degree of deficit of \$20 400 000.

Indeed, the Treasurer referred members to page 2421 of *Hansard* of February 18, in looking at the overall costs associated with the Government, when he brought down the Supplementary Estimates in June. Those Supplementary Estimates appear at page 3250 of *Hansard*. In explaining the Supplementary Estimates in June, the Treasurer said that there had been an improvement in stamp duty receipts, that income had been obtained from the franchise, and that this, in addition to various other measures, had improved the situation far beyond what had been expected. In outlining the programme in February the Treasurer said:

First, as to the Revenue and Loan Budgets, the activities are interdependent, as it is necessary always to have in mind the requirement to hold a reserve of Loan funds to cover revenue deficits. Of course, in the most unlikely situation of a revenue surplus, the surplus could be made available to supplement capital programmes.

I refer to the comment made about the most unlikely situation of a revenue surplus. In February, it seemed impossible in those circumstances to have a surplus. Suddenly, by June 30, as a result of a forward completion grant and a \$10 000 000 payment in respect of railways, there was a surplus. In explaining the Loan Estimates the Treasurer states:

Over the last few weeks of the year there was some further improvement with the result that the surplus rose to \$8 400 000.

The sum of \$8 400 000 was an increase of \$3 400 000 on the sum mentioned in this House by the Treasurer on June 10. In bringing forward the Supplementary Estimates he made clear that the best we could expect, assuming we received these funds from the Commonwealth, was a \$5 000 000 surplus. He went on to state realistically that, in the event of the railways agreement not proceeding, the \$8 400 000 surplus would become a deficit of \$11 600 000. Later, the Treasurer states:

As to the cumulative situation on Revenue Account at June 30, 1975, the prospects for 1975-76 and the possible influence of these on the 1975-76 Loan programme, I believe all I need say at the moment is that the Government had a cumulative surplus of \$22 800 000 on hand at the end of 1974-75. . . . that I expect to be able to present to the House a Revenue Budget for 1975-76 that forecasts a balance on the year's activities, and that there is no necessity to hold Loan funds in reserve to assist Revenue Account.

In one breath he was claiming an \$8 400 000 surplus and in almost the next breath he was claiming a \$22 800 000 surplus, without saying whence the additional money was coming. That money is held in the Consolidated Revenue Account. The difference is about \$14 900 000. Certainly, about \$6 400 000 is associated with the amount which has been held by the Grants Commission and which has been made available as part of the railways deal. The sum of \$8 500 000, to make up the balance of \$14 900 000, was received from the Grants Commission to the benefit of the State but has not yet been appropriated to the Revenue Account.

Why is the \$8 500 000 suddenly shown in a reserve account, when on previous occasions the amounts made available from the Grants Commission have been taken up in the ordinary Revenue Account? In the Loan Estimates explanation the Treasurer indicated that a small completion grant of \$2 500 000 in respect of 1973-74 would go immediately into the Revenue Account. One day for political purposes we were going to be X million dollars in the red and the next day we were going to be \$5 000 000 or \$8 400 000 in the black. Three days later, we had a \$22 800 000 surplus. The purpose of the exercise has been to hoodwink the people as to the real financial situation of the State and as to the source of funds from the Commonwealth. I can assure the Treasurer that he has not yet heard the end of his financial mismanagement of this State. His method is to put money from one pocket into another pocket, and use the gravity of a deficit situation to demand sympathy from the public for his own political ends.

In 1973-74, the State spent \$30 741 000 on school buildings, and it was predicted that \$42 700 000 would be spent in 1974-75, which was a sizeable increase of \$12 000 000. The current Loan Estimates show the actual expenditure in 1974-75 as about \$46 861 000, and I do not begrudge the additional \$4 000 000 used for education as a result of increased money made available by the Commonwealth at the February Premiers' Conference. The total expenditure for 1975-76 will be \$48 000 000, which is less than a \$2 000 000 increase in the expenditure on school buildings in this State in 1975-76 over what was actually spent in 1974-75. I accept the fact that pre-school education costs are no longer the responsibility of the State, and a percentage of the difference relates to the Commonwealth's taking up that additional cost. However, even if we go back to the predictions in the 1974-75 Budget of a sum of \$42 000 000 and we look at the \$48 000 000 prediction for 1975-76, the Government has seen fit to increase expenditure on capital works for the

Education Department by only \$6 000 000, or one-seventh of the sum expended in the 1974-75 financial year.

If we take one-seventh as being about 15 per cent, the actual expenditure will be an increase of slightly less than 15 per cent in 1975-76. I remind members that one afternoon last week the Treasurer accepted that, in the area of school buildings, costs had escalated by 40 per cent during 1974-75. Indeed, a letter which is in my possession and which was written early in July states that, for the five years to June 30, 1975, expenditure on education facilities increased by 100 per cent, with a 40 per cent increase occurring in the last financial year. I ask members to examine that 40 per cent increase against the increase of less than 15 per cent in funds made available for education, and to draw their own conclusions. Obviously, there will be a marked reduction in the education facilities that are made available by the State during the 1975-76 financial year. If one examines the various programmes that have been outlined, it will be clear that less money will be spent on several areas of education facilities than has been spent on them in recent years.

Whether the Treasurer wants to hide behind the statements that have been forthcoming from his Commonwealth colleagues, that they hope later to make additional funds available to the States, remains to be seen. Perchance, Commonwealth Ministers are trying to keep a certain sum in reserve to use as bait should a Commonwealth election be called as a result of the refusal of Supply or because of some other cause. I believe (and I say this sincerely) that the people of Australia, and certainly those of South Australia, will not be bought off, as they have been bought off recently, by electoral promises of funds to come from the Commonwealth Government.

Looking at this Bill, I could say much about South Australia's future hospital programme, and our involvement in, and the various ramifications of, Medibank. Suffice to say that I am concerned that only two hospitals in this State which have hitherto been recognised as public hospitals (be they subsidised hospitals or helped by some other means) are being denied assistance. I refer to the hospitals at Keith and Kapunda. Having read the documents that were circulated to all hospital boards of management, the boards of these two hospitals correctly answered all questions put to them. As much as they want to be recognised hospitals for the purposes of Medibank, with the full knowledge that their medical practitioners did not intend to provide the types of service demanded by recognised hospitals, these hospitals were unable justly to accept recognised hospital status. As a result of correctly answering the questions put to them (many other hospitals, although acknowledging that the case would be as these two hospitals accepted, still applied for recognition), these two hospitals have been denied revenue from local government sources, and there is no clear indication that funds will be made available by the State for any further work undertaken on either of these hospitals.

Questions regarding the plight of these hospitals have been asked of the Minister of Health publicly and by letter, and to date no clear indication has been given that they will receive any consideration at all for having been truthful. All we have had thus far is a statement that the scheme, which was to be totally operative within two months, that is, by September 1, has now been delayed for a longer time because the Government recognises that it will not receive from the medical profession the

assistance that is necessary to enable recognised hospitals to function, as originally contemplated, under the terms of Medibank. I believe the Government will need to reassess the situation in respect of all hospitals in this State, particularly those at Keith and Kapunda, so that their position will not be jeopardised even further and that the vital service that these hospitals provide to their respective communities will not be lost.

I should like now to refer to a document that was first read at an annual general meeting of a mining company. Although it goes back into the realms of fairy tales to draw some of its characters, the message that this document conveys is real and will be recognised in the present situation, particularly in relation to this Bill. It states:

Once upon a time there was a little red hen who scratched about and uncovered some grains of wheat. She called her barnyard neighbours and said, "If we work together and plant this wheat we will have some fine bread to eat. Who will help me plant it?" "Not I," said the duck. "Not I," said the goose. "Not I," said the cow. "Not I," said the pig. "Then I will," said the little red hen. And she did. The wheat grew tall and ripened into golden grain. "Who will help me reap the wheat?" asked the little red hen. "Not I," said the duck. "Out of my classification," said the pig. "I'd lose my unemployment insurance," said the goose. "I'm filling in government forms," said the cow.

Then it came time to bake the bread. "That's overtime for me," said the cow. "I'm a drop-out and never learned how," said the duck. "I'd lose my welfare benefits," said the goose. "I'm on retraining," said the pig. "Then I will," said the little red hen . . . and she did. She baked five loaves of fine bread and held them up for her neighbours to see. "I want some," said the cow. "I want some," said the duck. "I want some," said the pig. "I demand my share," said the goose. "No," said the little red hen. "I can rest for a while and eat the five loaves myself." "Excess profit," cried the cow. "Capitalistic leech," screamed the duck. "Company fink," grunted the pig. "Equal rights," yelled the goose. And they hurriedly painted picket signs and marched around the little red hen, singing "We shall overcome." And they did.

For when the farmer came to investigate the commotion, he said, "You must not be greedy, little red hen. Look at the oppressed cow. Look at the disadvantaged duck. Look at the under-privileged pig. Look at the less fortunate goose. You are guilty of making second-class citizens of them."

"But . . . but . . . I earned the bread," said the little red hen. "Exactly," the farmer said. "This is the wonderful free enterprise system; anybody in the barnyard can earn as much as he wants. You should be happy to have this freedom. In other barnyards you would have to give all five loaves to the farmer. Here you give four to suffering neighbours and keep one for yourself." And they all lived happily ever after, including the little red hen, who smiled and clucked, "I am grateful." But her neighbours wondered why she never baked any more bread.

Mr. Slater: The moral of the story is to keep fowls.

Dr. EASTICK: I do not think that is so. The moral of the story is clear to members opposite. The situation is obvious to anyone who wants to recognise the difficult financial situation in which we find ourselves in the Commonwealth and State spheres and which is not assisted by those who take all they can get and demand even more from those who are willing to show enterprise and to work. The important issue in this State, and indeed in the Commonwealth, is that there should be a return of overall confidence. Then, the State and Commonwealth finances will not be as grave as they are at present.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not going to cap that story with another, although I could, but I commend the member for Light for a very pungent story, which has a very deep and clear meaning for all members opposite. I make clear that, in my opinion, these Loan Estimates should be withdrawn, recast, and re-presented to this House, because that would be the only

way that we could consider them with any accuracy. How can the House be expected to approve a document that is patently inaccurate as a result of cutbacks that have occurred since its original introduction because of the action of the Commonwealth Budget, which was presented last week? Parliament is being asked to approve a false and inaccurate document. Those are the facts of life.

An example is the schedule on schools at the end of the Treasurer's statement: it is patently wrong and will have to be altered, yet Parliament is being asked to give its imprimatur to this financial document. Why is this document in the condition that it is? Why is it so inaccurate? In his statement, the Treasurer makes a few forecasts, but it is clear what has happened: his Commonwealth colleagues have let him down. This is the slap-back because the Treasurer dissociated himself very clearly from his Commonwealth colleagues during the election campaign. I may be uncharitable, but the thought occurs to me, that it could be tit for tat. The "Feds" have cut back on what the Treasurer most hopefully put forward in this document when he introduced it in the House recently. We are considering a document which, even at its face value, is not worth the paper it is written on.

Let us consider some of the items that are patently false, for instance, the statement on housing. The amount provided for housing has been cut back drastically and savagely, and it is one of the tragedies of life that this allocation has been cut back. I am sure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in your district this would not be appreciated. Most members are perfectly aware of the long waiting time that exists at present for a Housing Trust house. It is more than three years for rental housing. Now that time is going to be greater, and the waiting time that we hoped would be decreased will be increased. That situation will not please all those on the waiting list or those wanting to get on the list. I am sure the Housing Trust, and the private sector that does much building, will not appreciate the position. Expenditure on school buildings has been drastically cut. People interested in school projects and those in country areas who have been waiting for schools to be built for a long time will be extremely upset. I do not relish the job of the Minister of Education in trying to recast his programme. I feel for him, really I do.

Mr. Mathwin: He didn't do so well when he was Minister of Housing, so he's used to it.

Mr. COUMBE: Is that why he was moved? He has got to take the brunt, and it is up to him to do the best he can with what he has got, although he does not have much. We all have some doubts about our public parks, and I am sure we have got a very frustrated Minister opposite in that regard. Semi-government loan borrowings have suffered too, and as has been pointed out the Land Commission has suffered. I have referred to a few areas of possible reduced expenditure. However, if one considers the whole of the Loan Estimates, one can see where there are likely to be cut-backs. What else is being cut back from what was called a wonderful programme, which has been brought down by an affluent Government, to use its own words? We do not exactly know what other items are to be cut back. I am pointing out that not only is the document inaccurate but it is a disaster that these things have occurred, and I am the first to regret them.

Let us consider the Loan Account, to which the Treasurer referred when introducing this legislation, and compare figures in Parliamentary Paper No. 11 to those of the year before. In 1974-75, a summary of Loan Account transactions was as follows: balance on hand at June 30, 1973,

was \$8 500 000; the deficit in 1973-74 was \$4 000 000; balance on hand at June 30, 1974, was about \$4 500 000; the proposed deficit for 1974-75 was the small sum of \$185 000; and the proposed balance on hand at June 30, 1975, was \$4 300 000. Not long ago there was a reserve of \$10 000 000 in this fund, and shortly before that \$14 000 000 was kept on hand for a rainy day. What is the position this year in the official document? Again I refer to Parliamentary Paper No. 11. Balance on hand at June 30, 1974, was \$4 496 000; the deficit for 1974-75 was \$2 593 000; the balance on hand at June 30, 1975, was about \$1 900 000; there was to be no proposed deficit in 1975-76; and the proposed balance at June 30, 1976, was \$1 903 000. This was the sum that the Treasurer was going to keep in hand but that would be the lowest figure I can recall since I have been a member.

The Treasurer said in his statement that he intended to spend the whole of the borrowed funds available to him, because he would be able to balance the Budget; that is, the Revenue Budget would be balanced, and he could spend all the Loan funds on capital ventures in the State. I wonder, because of the cut-backs that have occurred and the Treasurer's statement that he will spend all his Loan allocations, what will be the state of the Loan Account at June 30, 1976? The Treasurer says its balance will be \$1 903 000. I bet my bottom dollar that that figure will not remain very long, and that in 12 months there will be a completely different figure. I believe the state of the Loan funds will vary considerably. The Treasurer has spoken about balancing his Budget, but I do not know how long this situation will continue.

One thing that becomes apparent from a scrutiny of the sums available in the document and the Treasurer's statement is that the special purpose grants certainly have increased steeply in recent years. A much greater reliance is now placed on tied grants (grants with tags attached) than was placed on them in past years. One has only to look at the credits shown in the totals to see that. A comparison of the actual payments and proposed payments is as follows: actual expenditure of \$168 500 000 in 1973-74 and proposed expenditure of \$181 000 000 in 1974-75, compared to actual expenditure in 1974-75 of \$211 000 000 and proposed expenditure in 1975-76 of \$241 500 000. These grants with tags mean that our masters in Canberra say where and how the money can be spent.

For years, certain sums have been used in this way (section 96 grants) but it has been only in the past two or three years that we have seen the rising crescendo of these loans and grants being made with tags attached. The tied grants, under section 96 of the Constitution, have become almost a flood, instead of the normal allocations. What has happened is that money has become available, but Canberra has said, "You can spend the money here but not there, unless you ask us first."

Mr. Mathwin: They think they know better.

Mr. COUMBE: Of course, those in Canberra in the ivory towers believe they know best how the South Australian Government and local government can best spend their money—and where, how, and by whom. They know far better over here! They have never heard of decentralisation, but they have certainly heard of centralisation, which runs right through the document.

Mr. Mathwin: The octopus!

Mr. COUMBE: That is right. When talking about the revenue side of the accounts, the Treasurer said that he was going to balance the Budget. Good on him! It is quite a change to see him advocate a balanced Budget,

because I have heard him in the House, when in Government and when in Opposition, advocate a deficit Budget time and time again, espousing the virtues, in his view, of deficit budgeting. Now, we have a different situation altogether, and he is coming out as the champion of balanced Budgets. I recall the former member for Murray also talking about this matter when that distinguished gentleman was a member of this House. I ask members: how much reliance can we place on a statement that the Budget will be balanced, considering the movements and doubtful estimating we saw last year, and particularly in view of the Loan Estimates going astray as they have? The estimating last year went haywire, as the Treasurer readily admitted in his frequent statements and, more particularly, in the official statement he made in the House recently.

So, the Treasurer has put before us statements which have now proved to be in grave error. Over recent years, his statements on the balances have gone up and down in a bewildering manner; there is no doubt about that. The Leader of the Opposition referred to them as going up and down like a yo-yo, and they certainly have. They were certainly bewildering. They happened to be conveniently high at election time, but how that came about is beyond me! Surely the Treasurer's credibility is open to question when one closely examines this document. It is patently clear that the document is a case of mismanagement. I am sure that you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, know that as well as I do, because the Treasurer produces figures like a magician and then changes them to suit his own convenience, and the hand moves faster than the eye.

Mr. Mathwin: He waves his magic wand.

Mr. CUMBE: Yes, he waves his magic wand; whatever he does, he hoodwinks the people, particularly at election time. Let us look at the sums available, because that is all-important to the people of this State. About a week ago, I asked the Treasurer a question regarding the escalation in the cost of public works, and he could not give me an accurate estimate of the escalation in the cost of school and other public buildings. It was a perfectly civil question, as all my questions are, from a civil member, but the Treasurer could not answer it. All the indications I have received from my contacts in trade and industry show that building costs will increase between 20 per cent and 25 per cent a year; that, calculated on a monthly rate, is a solid figure. The increase in the cost of building schools, as the member for Light rightly pointed out this afternoon, is almost at the 40 per cent mark.

I have had the opportunity of perusing some of the Public Works Committee reports, which are available for any member to see, and this figure comes out loud and clear. Having seen those figures, I can only say that the Treasurer is unaware of the effects of the inflation rate on this programme he has put before us. In South Australia, far less actual work will be done this year than was done last year because, although in dollars it seems at first glance to be a reasonable programme (and that is the phrase the Treasurer used), when one looks beneath the surface one sees the real picture.

The Treasurer referred to the greater inflation rate that was allowed by the Commonwealth Government last year. The programme before us today shows an increase in money terms (which I emphasise) of about 14 per cent over last year. Although the sum allowed in the original document this year is about 14 per cent over that of last year, the inflation rate in South Australia is currently about 18.2 per cent, and it could go even higher. So, at this time we are considering a programme that allows for a 14 per cent increase in money terms, yet we are facing an

escalation rate of 18.2 per cent in inflation. Obviously, much less work will be done. In other words, the monetary increase is less than the inflation rate, and one cannot get away from that, because these are the fundamentals which stare one in the face when one examines the figures.

However, Government members are complacent about this. They have not objected (I do not suppose they would be allowed to object), but these are the real facts of life: the inflation rate will exceed the actual monetary allowance made in the Loan works programme. Therefore, despite all the Treasurer's ballyhoo that this is a magnificent programme, the effective sum in real money terms available for spending is less this year than it was last year. I emphasise that point. Even the figures in this official document show that less effective work will be done this year than was done in the last year. We have also seen a solid reduction in some lines so that, despite all the trumpeting that has gone on about a robust financial position in South Australia, far less capital works will be carried out in 1975-76 than were carried out in 1974-75, unless the Government gets a windfall or unless it exceeds the amount provided. However, it has not provided for that. The Government has provided for only the mythical figure of \$1 900 000 to be left in the kitty in the Loan Account.

Where does the Government go from there? Certainly, we did not hear much about this financial position during the election campaign. What we heard then concerned revenue items. Much was said about that, but nothing did we hear about the Loan programme. From day to day we heard varying information about the State's budgetary position, yet we heard nothing about its Loan works programme. I say deliberately and advisedly that this document is a fraud. Not only is it inaccurate but it provides for the spending of less real money than in the last year, and less real work will be carried out. I hope that members opposite, who sit so complacently behind their great Leader, realise what will happen in their own districts. Do they realise that, as a result of the conjuring that has gone on, their own districts, as well as those of Opposition members, will suffer because many projects will be held over or deferred? Many of the pet projects of honourable members opposite will not go ahead, not only as a result of the operations of the Commonwealth Budget but because the Treasurer has provided for only a 14 per cent increase in expenditure, whereas the escalation in costs resulting from inflation in South Australia is currently 18.2 per cent. So, the Treasurer has not even provided for enough to be spent this year to keep up with the rate of inflation. Government members should not be complacent about this matter, yet I have not heard any of them objecting.

Mr. Mathwin: They have to live with it.

Mr. CUMBE: True, and the Government has to bear the odium. Time will tell in this regard. I now refer to the position of the building industry in South Australia. I ask all honourable members to imagine what will be the position facing that industry, which is a most important sector of our business life and which employs many thousands of people. The building industry is involved in constructing Housing Trust houses and private dwellings, as well as school buildings and other Government buildings. All the lines providing for construction of such buildings have been cut back. In what position will the building industry find itself in regard not only to skilled tradesmen but also to subcontractors, labourers and others?

I can already see signs that, despite some optimism expressed in one of the national newspapers, the industry in South Australia will go through a rough time. In

making that statement, I foresee this position applying State-wide. Certainly, it will be concentrated in the metropolitan area, but fewer Government buildings and houses will be built in South Australia. Of course, the people themselves will be the sufferers, and parents will, and should, take out their ire on the present Government.

I refer to educational funding. While the Treasurer's statement rightly points out that tertiary expenditure is now the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government, education funding will suffer, especially for those organisations whose finances are based on triennial funding, such as colleges of advanced education and other similar bodies. From the Commonwealth Budget it can be seen that the Commonwealth Minister for Education (Mr. Beazley) managed to get something salvaged in this area, because I believe there were to be even more savage cuts for education than really took place, although the cuts were savage enough.

However, where triennial funding has been adopted, the organisations involved will have their budgets deferred for one year, that is, there is to be a complete pause or moratorium for one year. In other words, organisations whose funds are planned on a triennial basis are suddenly faced with the prospect of coming to a complete halt. Programmes now under way and being constructed will continue, but projects planned to commence in this financial year will not be proceeded with. One can easily imagine the chaos that has occurred in such organisations, including colleges of advanced education and universities. Their planning has been completely upset. I believe that this will be a year lost in the progress of many fine institutions, and I believe that they will never again catch up with this lost year. It will be a year which is lost and which will never be caught up. Kipling referred to fleeting seconds, but this is the case of a year wasted. I say, as a result of my connection with such organisations, that there is complete chaos in their planning.

I now refer to the Schools Commission funds, because its funds are also involved. I am sure that South Australian teachers are not happy with the programme that has been handed down in the Commonwealth Budget. Parents will not be happy, either. I have mentioned some of the main matters that have come out of the Loan Estimates, and I come back to my initial point that this document should be withdrawn, recast and re-presented to this House, because Parliament, of which you, Sir, are custodian, is being asked to approve documents that are inaccurate and completely false. They are a fraud and they are out of date, yet Parliament is asked to put its rubber stamp on them, and I voice my protest most strongly about this procedure.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): The former speaker and the speaker before him referred to the state of the Loan Estimates document, the confusion that must face the Treasury officials in South Australia, and the disappointment that must face the Government and its departments if they are looking for continued expansion and growth in South Australia. When one considers whether this document must be prepared before the Commonwealth Budget, one must take into account that the Premiers met earlier in the year to work out their programmes and to receive approval from the Loan Council, so one doubts whether the Loan Estimates should have been introduced before the Commonwealth Budget was announced.

I believe that the introduction of the Loan Estimates should have been left until after the Commonwealth Revenue Budget was presented. The Loan Account has an impact on the Revenue Account, so it is necessary that it be dealt with before the Revenue Budget is introduced.

When one analyses the Treasurer's explanation in introducing these Estimates, one finds it extremely difficult to ascertain what actually happened concerning the Revenue Account. Confusion still seems to exist about what happened concerning the Revenue Account, in relation to the financial affairs of the State at June 30, 1975, and why that situation applied. At page 4 of the Loan Estimates, the Treasurer stated:

I believe all I need say at the moment is that the Government had a cumulative surplus of \$22 800 000 on hand at the end of 1974-75, that this will be increased shortly by a small completion grant of \$2 500 000 in respect of 1973-74, that I expect to be able to present to the House a Revenue Budget for 1975-76 which forecasts a balance on the years activities, and that there is no necessity to hold Loan funds in reserve to assist Revenue Account.

The situation was that, in the Revenue Account, South Australia had a surplus for the 12 months ended June 30, 1975, of \$8 400 000. However, when one considers the Consolidated Revenue Account one finds that, whereas South Australia had an opening balance of a \$536 000 deficit at June 30, 1974, it finished the year with \$14 398 000 in the Consolidated Revenue Account. Therefore, some of the money remitted to the State by the Commonwealth Government in past grants went to the Consolidated Revenue Account. When that sum is added to the Budget surplus of \$8 400 000, it shows that the Treasurer is quite correct in stating there is a surplus of \$22 800 000, because that is the balance of the Consolidated Revenue Account.

We have also heard statements that the State had a surplus of almost \$25 000 000, but that is so only when the balance of the Loan Account is considered. At the end of operations at June 30, 1975, there was a surplus of \$1 900 000 in the Loan Account. If that sum is added to the \$22 800 000 the surplus comes close to \$25 000 000. It is fair and reasonable to assume that the State is therefore in a healthy position, but from that point only. What the document does not tell us, and what the Treasurer has not explained, is that the Loan Estimates represent merely a holding operation: they are, as the previous speaker in this debate said, such that they will neither inject confidence into the community nor do anything for the expansion of the State. How can any State expect to inject confidence into the community or allow for expansion when it traps itself by beginning large and expensive capital works programmes that eventually catch up with it? Unfortunately, that has been the result of the high inflationary period Australia has experienced in the past two years. The Government and the taxpayers are now paying increased costs for the grand, expansionist ideas of the grand capital works programmes that were initiated when the present Government first took office.

South Australia will face a year of levelling out. What effect will that have on South Australia? What effect will it have on the South Australian economy in the long term? What will be the position in, say, 12 months, 18 months, or two years from now? Will we ever be able to recover the ground we have lost? I think that is the pity of the whole issue. South Australia will get some relief from transferring country rail services, subsidiary lines, buildings, plant and so forth, to the Commonwealth Government. That will mean some relief to the Revenue Account regarding the repayment of loans, because those loans will be taken over by the Australian Government. However, that has not helped the situation at all. It seems that South Australia is just holding its head above

the inflationary level and that there is little room for business enterprises to be confident or for the expansion of industries that are so vital to South Australia. I remind the House of several statements the Treasurer made in explaining the Loan Estimates. I will refer to its effects on South Australia and to the reasons for the Loan Estimates. On page 4 of the Loan Estimates the Treasurer stated:

Because the Government had decided to avoid the harsh step of actual retrenchment of Government employees, it was apparent that the heaviest impact of the State's financial problems had to be borne in those areas of works normally carried out by contract.

No-one will deny the Government's right to retain full employment in Government departments. That is fair enough. We on this side would not want to see anything happen in that regard. The impact of the State's financial problems is being felt by outside business interests, the areas of business that normally let out work on contract. Rumours were abroad in my district (where a section of the Public Buildings Department is located) that if a Liberal Government was elected all P.B.D. employees would be sacked. I certainly never said that. In fact, I tried as hard as I could to convince them that we in the Liberal Party would not advocate such action, because we believe in full employment. However, that is the sort of nonsense that is being spread about by the Government. We are accustomed to nothing but deceit from the Government.

Mr. Max Brown: You never heard of unemployment when your Party was in office in Canberra?

Mr. BECKER: Certainly not in the ratio that is being experienced now, nor of the prospect of seeing half a million people unemployed in my lifetime. That may have been the figure experienced during the lifetime of the member for Whyalla, but I hope it will not be experienced in mine. Other statements made by the Treasurer need to be scrutinised closely. The Treasurer, in relation to the new funds of \$169 400 000, stated:

...the Government expects to receive various repayments and recoveries of about \$71 600 000.

The Government expects to receive that sum. I certainly hope it does, otherwise the State's programme will not proceed. The Treasurer continued:

Certain discounts and premiums on loan issues and redemptions, which form part of our loan programme and are expected to amount to some \$500 000, will not have to be paid in cash by us as further loans will be arranged through Loan Council to cover them.

Loan Council, of course, is the authoritative body. That is all very well if the Australian Government can raise money to assist the States, but, if the Australian Government continues to float Commonwealth loans and is unable to fill them, all Australians will again feel the pinch. We certainly do not want to be part and parcel of the dealings of Australian Government officers when they tried to set up oversea loans with nations dealing in petro-dollars. We all know what type of horse-trading those people are likely to get involved in, and we know what those loan deals have done to the Commonwealth Government's credibility. If the Commonwealth Government cannot raise the necessary funds, Australians could well be forced into going to an unscrupulous money dealer to get itself out of a mess. When a nation such as Australia has to take those steps, the effects will be absolutely disastrous. The Treasurer also stated:

In view of the difficult Budget situation which the Australian Government faces, it is possible that some of the special contributions may be held to lower limits than have been adopted for purposes of these papers.

That, again, is a warning that difficulties are foreseen, but the Treasurer is unwilling to outline them, anyway, and

South Australia goes ahead with its programmes as outlined. The Treasurer continued:

This matter will be kept under close review to ensure that commitments actually made are in line with funds available.

The catch cry is "funds available". The Treasurer concludes his explanation of the Loan Estimates by saying:

Nonetheless, we have succeeded in raising the full programme in other years and I have no doubt that we will continue to receive the support from lenders to enable us to raise the total sums approved.

We already have evidence from the Commonwealth Budget that difficulty is being experienced in the loans area. There will be even greater difficulty after the impact of the Commonwealth Budget is felt by the nation as a whole. Much time has been devoted to housing and to the disappointments in the housing programme to be expected in Australia. The State Bank is in an extremely embarrassing situation, having told intending borrowers only a month ago that their loans probably would be available in December, now having to go cap in hand to Canberra to find out when funds will be available, and having to tell intending borrowers that funds may be available several months later than had been originally expected.

One of my constituents was hoping to settle on his new house within the next six weeks and to borrow bridging finance, expecting his State Bank loan to be available in December. That loan now will not be available until mid-way through next year. The cost of arranging bridging finance at 16 per cent interest will create a situation in which he will have to decide whether or not he can go ahead with his house. I am sure many young couples face a similar situation, not knowing when funds will be available to them at the most attractive rate of interest. It is necessary for them to approach lending institutions charging high rates of interest for bridging finance. With many young couples, it is a case of make or break. This is the situation into which the Government has forced itself in this matter of arranging priorities. Much has been said regarding the Land Commission and the money made available to it. The Treasurer states:

Actual expenditure in 1974-75 totalled about \$21 500 000. Of this amount some \$16 700 000 was for the purchase of land in urban areas, \$3 000 000 for public open spaces and \$1 800 000 for the development of land. Loans and grants from the Australian Government towards this expenditure amounted to \$20 500 000. The commission's programme for 1975-76 envisages expenditure of the order of \$34 800 000. The emphasis this year will be on development of land, for which expenditure of \$16 000 000 has been planned. A further \$13 700 000 will be expended on the purchase of land and \$3 800 000 for open spaces.

Until recently the Land Commission had been able to offer the people of South Australia only about 300 blocks; they have been trickling through since the first announcement was made some months ago. Of the 300 blocks, I understand about 60 per cent have been sold, so one cannot deny that the scheme has received a reasonable reception, although the blocks are not always as cheap as one might expect. I understand the commission has bought about 1 500 hectares of land for subdivision, but much of the land is zoned for 1980, so it will not be of immediate benefit to young people or to others trying desperately to save money to purchase a house.

Gone are the days when young couples could buy a block of land knowing that, by the time the land was paid off, inflation would have given them sufficient security to build a house on that land with virtually no deposit at all. That situation existed in South Australia for many years, and was a great advantage to the majority of people who own or are paying off houses at present. However, the young

people of today have little opportunity to acquire a reasonably priced block of land and eventually to build a house, and, if costs keep rising as they are at present, most South Australians will be living in rental accommodation. This in turn will put tremendous pressure on the South Australian Housing Trust, which seems to be falling further and further behind with its own programme. In the area of housing construction, a certain percentage of the success experienced has been achieved through private contract. Although Government members are quick to kick the speculator and developer, those people made it possible for thousands of South Australians to own their houses. By starving them out and by its interference and its heavyweight controls, the Government has brought about a situation in which young people are not able to do as their parents did and have a house when they get married, raising their families on their own properties.

That is the tragedy of the situation, but the side effect is felt by the consumer manufacturing industries, namely, the furniture trade, the household appliance industry, and so on. This is where the impact of these measures and of the federal Budget will be greatest. Unless we can rectify the situation within a short time (and goodness knows how it will be done; perhaps it will be up to the Housing Trust to obtain a greater share of money from lending institutions), many industries will be forced to close. We do not want to see heavy unemployment or indeed any unemployment in South Australia. However, the Government is not helping the situation, nor is the measure before the House. The Government made advances to the State Bank in 1970-71 for certain development and expansion of that bank. Grants were given for the first time to assist the Municipal Tramways Trust, and eventually money was made available to the bank to assist rural industry and to provide for its housing programme. However, it was not until 1973-74 that the amount was increased to \$2 000 000, and now it is to be \$2 500 000, a small sum when we consider the demands being made on the bank for housing loan accommodation and for assisting people who would not normally qualify for loans at a lower rate of interest. Difficulty is being experienced by single people, whether male or female, in obtaining finance from the State Bank. I believe that programme has been cut out altogether, and it would be interesting to know whether the people I have mentioned fall within the area of discrimination.

The sum of \$18 700 000 is to be made available for the Flinders Medical Centre. The Loan Estimates for 1974-75 provided a sum of \$14 500 000, the figure in 1973-74 was \$1 000 000, while in 1972-73 the figure was \$3 600 000, and that sum included work to commence on the construction of stages 1A and 1B. The estimated cost of the whole project at that time was \$36 000 000. Today we find that, through the Loan Estimates, \$47 900 000 has been provided. The actual expenditure is hard to determine from the documents available, but I am sure it would be much more than that. Money is still being provided for that centre, and this emphasises the difficulty experienced by the Government in building such large projects over a long term. There must be an examination of whether we should go into a large project such as this or whether it could not be constructed more quickly, thereby getting on top of increased costs, and so on. It would take much management. It is a matter of modifying contracts. We may have to engage a consortium of contractors, but this seems to be an area in which we have perhaps lacked the expertise to finance such a project and where we have been caught short by having to provide large amounts of money to

keep these projects going. Another project that comes to mind is the Torrens Island power station, which has been a regular feature of the Loan Estimates for some time. In regard to that project, in the Loan Estimates for 1974-75 the Treasurer stated:

Work will continue on the first stage of the Torrens Island power station B, where expenditure is expected to total \$15 770 000. The first steam unit in this station is expected to be available for commercial use in June, 1975, and the second unit about 12 months later.

June, 1975, has passed, and in the document before us the Treasurer states:

Work will continue on the first stage of the Torrens Island power station B, where the first steam unit is expected to be commissioned next month.

Presumably, it is to be commissioned next September. The document also states:

It is expected that the second unit will start operating some 12 months later. Preliminary work will also commence on the second stage of the Torrens Island power station B.

Mr. Coumbe: What's gone wrong down there?

Mr. BECKER: I do not know. Like many other projects, it is experiencing tremendous industrial problems. There was a picket line and an industrial dispute there not long ago. The whole point is that, again, this project is well behind schedule and the costs are continuing to increase at a time when we cannot afford that. Because of the escalation in costs of the Torrens Island power station and the Flinders Medical Centre, people must go without many other things. The reference to the Municipal Tramways Trust makes very interesting reading. Until the present Government came into office, the trust was able to look after its own programme. The Loan Estimates document for 1970-71 stated:

MUNICIPAL TRAMWAYS TRUST, LOAN to \$1 000 000—For some years prior to 1957-58 the Municipal Tramways Trust was allocated annual sums in the State's Loan programme to assist it in the rehabilitation of the undertaking and the purchase of a diesel bus fleet. From 1958-59 until 1969-70 the trust was able to meet its relatively small capital programme without a further call on Loan funds.

I wonder who was in Government then and how efficient that Government was. The document also stated:

The trust now has in progress a major re-equipment programme to replace the older diesel bus fleet with new diesel vehicles especially designed for one-man operation. I do not know whether members remember the hoo-hah about one-man buses. The unions were not very pleased about them. The document also stated:

The backbone of this programme is the purchase and assembly of 262 A.E.C. Swift chassis and the manufacture locally of bodies and component parts.

That was stated in 1970-71. Now, in 1975-76, the Loan Estimates document states:

Municipal Tramways Trust, \$5 000 000. During 1974-75 an amount of \$4 400 000 was advanced from Loan account to the trust towards its capital programme of purchase of new buses, acquisition of land for depots—

Doubtless, the member for Glenelg will comment on that.

Mr. Mathwin: My word!

Mr. BECKER: The document continued: and construction of depot buildings.

I tell the member for Glenelg that he is not having the depot at Novar Gardens.

Mr. Mathwin: I know what I would like to do to the M.T.T. depots!

Mr. BECKER: There is a place across the road near Cowley's Bakery. It could go there. The Loan Estimates document also states:

For 1975-76 provision of \$5 000 000 is proposed towards a continuation of the programme. Finance is also being

provided by the Australian Government by way of grants under urban public transport arrangements to meet two-thirds of the cost of approved projects. The amount of such assistance to be provided in 1975-76 is not yet known, but we are hopeful that up to \$10 000 000 will be available towards total payments of the order of \$15 000 000. Two major contracts for supply of buses are now under way, one for 67 A.E.C. Swift buses and one for 310 Volvo buses.

Suddenly we have changed from acquiring 262 A.E.C. Swift chassis and the manufacture locally of bodies and component parts to acquiring 67 A.E.C. Swift buses and 310 Volvo buses. This will do much for the local industry and the manufacture of chassis and component parts! It also will do much for South Australia to be buying these foreign vehicles for the State! Doubtless, it is being done because of the \$2 for \$1 subsidy that we receive from the Commonwealth Government. The whole future of South Australia is being taken out of our hands.

Mr. Mathwin: Who are the agents?

Mr. BECKER: I believe that the agents are Commercial Motor Vehicles Proprietary Limited and a gentleman named Crawford. I get on quite well with him. He does not have anything to do with me, but I know whom he supports. It is interesting to note that, in the provision for major school building works to be commenced during 1975-76, provision is made for stage 1 of Camden Primary School, which is to be of Demac construction and for which total \$700 000 has been allocated. I am pleased that the former Minister of Education stuck to his word, and I hope that the new Minister also will stick to the decision made by the former Minister to agree that Camden Primary School would be resited on a larger block of land owned by the Education Department not far from the existing site.

The interesting fact is that the whole school will be built in Demac construction. Having seen this type of construction, I have no objection to that. I hope that, before the units are moved on to the block, the whole area, including the football field and other playing areas, will be landscaped. I cannot understand why this was not done more than 12 months ago, when the former Minister promised that the school would be completed and ready for occupation in 1975. I understand that the school will be ready in 1976, but the present Minister cannot give any guarantee.

I only hope, for the sake of those in the Camden area who have been forgotten by the Education Department, that this promise will be fulfilled and that the Government will not hide behind the bogey that the Commonwealth Government will not provide the funds. I hope that the State Government will not shirk its responsibility and again blame the Commonwealth Government. It is for the Education Department to provide upgraded and first-class school facilities for those in the Camden Park area. At present, the condition of the schoolyard and the whole set-up at Camden Primary School is an utter disgrace.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Several aspects of the Loan Estimates now before us are worthy of examination. However, the foremost is housing, and it must be so. At the risk of being repetitive, I point out once again that the position for young people who wish to buy or rent houses is at its worst for many years. I cannot recall the position being worse in the past 20 years. Despite recent assurances given by the Minister of Housing that there has been a remarkable upsurge in house building in the current quarter, closer examination shows that, in real terms, we are falling behind.

In the December quarter of 1973, 2 468 houses and 959 flats were completed, making a total of 3 427 dwellings. In the following quarter, that for March, 1974,

the total was even higher, at 3 600 dwellings. In December, 1974, houses were 1 790, flats were 675, and the total had dropped to a low of 2 465. In March of this year, 2 110 houses had been completed, and 930 flats, and total dwellings in course of construction were 3 040, an increase of about 400 on the preceding quarter.

Admittedly, there is an indication that building is now picking up but, if the needs of the community are to be met, far more money must be spent both by private enterprise and by Government enterprise than was spent last year. In 1973-74, the Government's dwellings expenditure represented 9.7 per cent of total housing expenditure in South Australia, and there now appears to be little that private enterprise can do to increase its building rate, in view of the Federal squeeze on bank and building society lending, as banks and building societies are pegged to the amount they were lending at the beginning of the year. South Australia's escalation rate, according to the Loan Estimates, is about 18 per cent; yet we are told by official sources that the overall building costs in Australia are rising by 28 per cent a year. This is called the implicit deflator figure—that is, a figure used by the building industry; and it incorporates changes in both labour and material costs. The figures are derived from the Australian Bureau of Statistics, its table being the gross fixed capital expenditure statistics as published in the bureau's quarterly estimates of national income and expenditure, a reliable source.

Another interesting factor lies in the manner in which money is being spent on housing. Based on the current trends for housing quoted in the *Comalco Building Outlook* No. 24, for May, 1975:

Although extra finance appears to be available, any fast recovery is doubtful due to the current level of inflation—
and the building rate of inflation appears to be in excess of the normal accepted inflation rate—
and the present commencement level for houses, which is below 30 000 per quarter.

That is an Australia-wide figure. The article continues:

The only way to improve the situation is for finance companies, trading banks and building societies to expand their rate of lending considerably.

Then we come to the interesting point:

The continual trend for a high proportion of borrowers to seek money for the purchase of existing homes rather than new houses must further slow recovery of the housing industry.

From that, we can make a further deduction that using older homes in that way will, in fact, reduce the number of older homes previously available for rental. Equally important, despite the expected revival of expenditure on non-dwellings from \$29 500 000 in the December, 1974, quarter to the present estimate of \$35 000 000 to \$40 000 000 for the current quarter, there is still a fall in actual non-dwelling building since early 1974.

The building industry is generally the earliest one to portend a depression; and it also tends to reflect improvements in the economy equally quickly. If those figures are pessimistic according to the building industry, one must assume that the remainder of industry is picking up at a much slower rate. A recent move (in fact, I noticed it in a bulletin forwarded to me by the Co-operative Building Society) is that it intends to reduce interest rates on savings accounts by $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. One assumes that this is a move ultimately to reduce interest rates on loans available to householders. In fact, the building society claims that this may not be so. In fact, it hopes it will merely peg the rate to its present

11 per cent instead of having to increase the figure later in the year. I suspect it thinks this is necessary because Mr. Hayden, the Federal Treasurer, in yet one other pre-election move, a subtle one, decided to increase the Commonwealth bond rate to 10 per cent. This would make Commonwealth bonds far more attractive because, on the previous loans he attempted to float, he was quoted as having lost a figure of more than \$90 000 000.

If he is successful in raising a much more substantial loan at the current 10 per cent rate, that must affect all other interest rates and ultimately, if not this year then early next year, one can expect that interest rates, particularly those for housing, will be knocked for six again; and they will continue to rise. We were not told that in the Federal Budget. We must conclude that, as Government expenditure is diminished and private lending continues to be restrained and at higher interest rates, we shall continue to lag behind Western European countries in economic recovery.

Another aspect of the Loan Estimates relevant to my district in the South-East is whether the afforested areas are liable for rates. This is at present being discussed by the Government at Ministerial level. However, this is a two-edged sword, because competition from the Eastern States' softwood forests is increasing, and we cannot afford to fall behind in the planting of new forests. What is the situation? Land costs are rising. The cheap sandy soils of the South-East are almost entirely utilised by the present forests. The land formerly afforested with pines and replanted with fresh pines, after clear felling, is much less productive than it was under the first crop, which grew from 35 years to 40 years. That means we can expect far fewer pine trees to be grown on these reafforested areas of between 250 000 acres (101 175 ha) and 300 000 acres (121 410 ha) on sandy soil.

Therefore, with decreasing productivity in the sandy soil, it is becoming more and more imperative that the Government buy the more productive farming land, which of course creates a problem because there is farmers' resistance—whether to put land under forest or to retain it for agricultural production. So the problem is a dual one: councils are losing financially because the forest areas have not been deemed rateable in the past, and the industry itself is meeting much higher costs because the land that has to be used is far more expensive. The question then is whether the amount of \$6 200 000 for our reforestation and timber milling will adequately meet future needs, whether it will maintain the South-East industry at its present level, if not increase it, as one hopes is being done. The State of Victoria along our border is currently expanding rapidly in afforestation and milling in the western districts of that State. That challenge must be met.

With regard to education, on quite a parochial issue, the northern area of Mount Gambier is growing more rapidly than the remainder of the city. The North Gambier Primary School is already proving inadequate. Homes in its vicinity intended for small families are already showing evidence of a higher density settlement. Because of the high cost of a larger house, larger families are tending to buy smaller houses and are living in relatively crowded circumstances. An inspection of the area within about one kilometre to the west and the north of the school in May of this year showed that there were 117 houses in course of erection, and now over half of those have been occupied, and a figure of 0.8 children to each house appears to be a conservative one. There will soon be a need for a further junior primary school

there rather than the temporary units, which are at present being considered and which admittedly are urgently needed; but one must regard them as a short-term and not a long-term remedy.

Another matter affecting the South-East is an assured power supply. I shall be interested to learn, in Committee, whether the proposed expenditure on power supply to the South-East and the extensions to the distribution systems actually covers any duplication of the Mobilong to Tailem Bend section of the South-East supply line. This is a most vulnerable section of the line. On a previous occasion vandals shot out just one insulator box and, in the ensuing 13 hours, several thousand loaves of bread were lost, because bakehouse ovens cooled off in mid-production. Further, chipboards had to be destroyed because glue could not be cooked in the manufacturing process. Duplication of the line from Mobilong will help to avoid such errors by allowing the power to be switched to the alternative system.

I shall also be interested to learn whether the Loan Estimates include an amount for sewage settling and filtration in Mount Gambier to avoid the present pollution of South-East beaches by city effluent. In conclusion, may I say how pleased I am to see that projects commenced or promised in Mount Gambier over the last few months are, in fact, still proceeding.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I rise to add my support to the remarks of my colleagues in connection with the Loan Estimates, which do not really mean a thing, because they were defused by the Commonwealth Budget. Of course, the South Australian Treasurer introduced these Loan Estimates before the Commonwealth Budget was introduced. As a result of the cut-backs in the Commonwealth Budget, it will not be possible to implement some of the proposals in these Loan Estimates, and the Treasurer knew the situation many months ago. He could not get on to the hustings quickly enough; he called the election, using the Railways (Transfer Agreement) Bill as an excuse, before the horror Budget was introduced by his Commonwealth colleagues, whom he disowned during the election campaign. However, once the campaign was completed, Government members and their Commonwealth colleagues became friendly again.

It reminds me of dancing around the maypole; where one ends up depends on the colour of the ribbon one is holding and on how fast one dances. I am no Rhodes scholar but, when one tries to do the sums, these Loan Estimates do not add up. The Treasurer does such unanswerable exercises with monotonous regularity. I turn now to a matter raised by the member for Hanson. In his statement the Treasurer said:

Because the Government had decided to avoid the harsh step of actual retrenchment of Government employees, it was apparent that the heaviest impact of the State's financial problems had to be borne in those areas of works normally carried out by contract. In the closing months of 1974, I referred often to our inability to let new contracts . . .

The Treasurer was not the only one who said this. The building industry was screaming about the same situation, because the industry was completely strangled by this Government's efforts. The Treasurer completed his statement as follows:

if the objective of reserving Loan funds were to be achieved.

I could not agree for one moment with the sacking of many hundreds of Public Buildings Department employees. Nevertheless, the situation was extremely grim for private enterprise in this State, particularly the building industry. Reading between the lines, as the Treasurer often asks us to do, is one way in which we can say that at last the

Government is realising that there is an unemployment problem, for which the Government is responsible. It cannot be claimed that the South Australian Government is responsible for all the unemployment, but it is responsible for much of it, and it has been aggravated by the Treasurer's Commonwealth colleagues, who have put dampers on the situation.

How often have we seen that Federal allocations of Loan funds have been tied allocations? The money has been allocated to certain districts or certain projects so that the Canberra octopus can control where the money is to be spent. The member for Stuart has on occasions said that the Commonwealth Government should have the right to say where the money is to be spent, because it is the Commonwealth Government's money. Nothing could be further from the truth. It is the people's money, because they provide it through taxation.

Mr. Keneally: Don't you agree with me that the Commonwealth Government should know how to spend it?

Mr. MATHWIN: No, because we know best how the money should be spent. Perhaps the honourable member does not know the priorities in his district; if he does not, I am sorry for him, but I know the priorities in my district, and I am sure that my colleagues on this side of the House know the priorities in their districts. As a result, they can inform the State Government or local government, if they are asked to do so, how the money should be allocated.

Last Wednesday the member for Stuart staged a marvelous performance when he made his bid for appointment as the thirteenth Minister. He was working hard last Wednesday afternoon, when he kept debating in private members' time, in his attempt to get his position ready for appointment to the Ministry.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must call the honourable member back to discussion of the Loan Estimates.

Mr. MATHWIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologise. I was naughty, and I should not have been. I turn now to the very important matter of the housing situation in this State. This Government's housing record is the worst record of any Government for many years. We must go back to 1943 to find a period when the housing situation was as bad as it is now, but we must remember that the population then was much lower than it is now. As a result of the "assistance" given to the State Government by its Commonwealth friends, the present grim situation will become even grimmer, because we will have less money available for this purpose. If one examines the Loan Estimates document, one will see that, under the heading "Housing", the Treasurer said:

In the event, housing funds were increased in late 1974 and again in early 1975, so that the total available last year was \$56 360 000. The State Bank received \$22 800 000, and the Housing Trust \$33 560 000.

We are indeed on a tender spot for the Government when we refer to the Housing Trust, as members have seen it come down from being a grant organisation to the situation in which it finds itself today. Last year, although 10 126 applications for accommodation were received by it, the trust was able to house only 4 018 people. There is, therefore, a shocking short-fall in this area of rental accommodation. The Government says that the people should have rental accommodation even before they have their own houses, as it supports that system more than it does one of home ownership. I suggest that the member for Stuart peruses the Housing Trust report which he and other members no doubt have on their files. He will

then see that, although 10 126 applications for accommodation were received by the trust, it was able to accommodate only 4 018 persons.

Mr. Keneally: You support more socialised housing, then?

Mr. MATHWIN: I would support the socialisation of the honourable member at any time he likes.

Mr. Keneally: Do you support more socialised housing?

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the honourable member for Stuart to cease making interjections that have no relevance to the Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN: I thank you, Sir, for your protection, which I appreciate. The Housing Trust's record is there for all to see. It is on honourable members' files and I ask Government members to familiarise themselves with the problems which are faced by the people of South Australia and for which they, as members of this House, are directly responsible. It can be seen from the report that the Government has a shocking record in relation to trust rental accommodation. I now refer to the private sector of the building industry. The member for Unley, as a former member of the building industry, will know that, when he was busy with his subcontracting business and making much money (this really made him what he is today), there was plenty of work for electricians and all the other tradesmen in the building industry. But what is the situation today? It is indeed grim. Many people, like the member for Unley, have now given away their businesses because the work is not available today.

Mr. Langley: There's plenty of work.

Mr. MATHWIN: There may be plenty of work for the small number of tradesmen now in the building industry but the trade is now losing many of its members each week. People in the various trades are going into other forms of business or to other States, away from this El Dorado of socialism that we have in South Australia. There is a further crisis in the private sector of the industry. As I said in the House last week, people who are fortunate enough to have a block of land and are able to build a house on it find that by the time construction of the house has been completed they are miles behind with the finance that they are expected to provide. They cannot save quickly enough, and the time taken to complete a house is absolutely shocking. It can take between nine and 12 months from the time foundations have been poured until the house has been completed. That is a shocking situation, and I remind the House (and the member for Unley, having formerly worked in the building industry, would know this as well as I do) that not long ago a house could be completed within 12 or 13 weeks.

Mr. Langley: But what happened after that?

Mr. MATHWIN: Nothing happened after that.

Mr. Langley: What about the cracks in houses?

Mr. MATHWIN: It is all right for the honourable member to talk about cracks in houses. But does he suggest that it takes so long to build houses at present because organisations are saying, "We will put down the foundations and leave them to cure for six months so that we do not get any cracks"?

Mr. Langley: But you can't—

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the honourable member to keep to the matter under discussion: the Public Purposes Loan Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I relate my comments to page 6 of the Treasurer's speech, in which he refers to housing. Before I leave the housing situation, I remind the member for Unley that the time taken to build a house is not in any way connected with cracking in houses. That is absolute poppycock, and the honourable member knows it.

Mr. Langley: I don't.

Mr. MATHWIN: The honourable member does. He may be all right with a screwdriver, but he knows much about building also. He realises that what I have said is correct. I now refer to page 7 of the Treasurer's explanation, in which he stated:

As to the programme of the Housing Trust, dwellings completed during 1974-75 totalled 1 589, while 2 364 dwellings were under construction at June 30 last.

I have not been able to check that, because I have not had time to do so. However, I presume that those figures are reasonably correct, as should be the other figures in this document. Or perhaps that is stretching one's imagination a little too far. I now refer to page 9 of this novel where, under the heading "Railway Accommodation", the Treasurer said:

An allocation of \$11 000 000 is proposed in 1975-76 of which \$4 500 000 is for public transport projects and \$6 500 000 for other capital works. As I said earlier, \$6 500 000 is expected to be recovered from the Australian National Railways Commission for the capital payments on account of non-metropolitan railways. Two-thirds of expenditure on urban public transport is also expected to be recovered from the Australian Government as specific non-repayable grants.

So, here again we have the supposition that obtains all through this document: that, according to the Treasurer and the Government, all things will be right, provided the Commonwealth Government comes up with the money. This document contains all the "ifs" and "buts" in the world. The sum of \$2 930 000 is to be spent on improving the public transport service to Christie Downs, yet no reference whatever is made to the electrification of this railway. When is that project to be proceeded with? The Treasurer has not seen fit to refer to it, and I presume that that project, like many other projects, is now a dead duck. The Government could well be duplicating that railway line, but it will not be electrifying it in the near future. So another project has gone by the board because the Commonwealth Government has not made a further allocation of funds.

In the allocation for harbors, reference is made to bulk grain and other facilities, including container berth facilities at Outer Harbor. The suggestion for the proposed container berth at Outer Harbor has probably come from the member for Florey, who recently undertook an oversea study trip to inquire into this matter. I will be most interested to read his report.

Mr. Rodda: Has he reported yet?

Mr. MATHWIN: He has not reported yet, but I understand that he visited Liverpool, and saw the great dock area there, which contains one of the largest container berths in the world. I understand that the honourable member went there to obtain evidence to assist his Government in dealing with containerisation and associated problems in South Australia. The member for Hanson said that I was interested in a matter regarding the Metropolitan Tramways Trust, and that is correct. The estimated payment to the trust is \$5 000 000 in 1975-76, and the sum of \$4 400 000 was advanced from Loan Account to the trust towards the capital programme for the purchase of new buses, acquisition of land for depots and construction of depot buildings.

The Government has proceeded to acquire land, and one of the areas it has acquired is in my district, at Morphetville Park. The Government selected the oldest vineyard in South Australia and acquired land worth more than \$1 000 000 in order to establish a bus depot. It purchased this land without any investigation, without considering conservation or any similar aspects, and without undertaking an environmental impact study. The land in question cost over \$1 000 000, and the Government decided that that was the end of the matter. I give the Government full credit for now initiating an environmental impact study on this matter. That study is in progress, but the problem is that the Government has purchased the land, and that factor will be a heavy lever in the Government's decision to proceed with the construction of a bus depot in this most inappropriate and ridiculous location in Morphetville Park.

The purchase of this land occurred within days of the Treasurer's saying that we should protect old wineries in and near the metropolitan area. He said that we should look after such assets, because they are scarce, and that we are looked upon with envy by other States because we have such wineries so close to the metropolitan area. We have a winery in the centre of the metropolitan area, the oldest winery in the State. It has history behind it, yet the Government has seen fit to take over part of this area in order to provide a bus depot. My fervent hope is that the environmental impact study which is currently being carried out but which should have been carried out earlier will disclose that this vineyard is not the place for a bus depot.

One of the great achievements that this Government has claimed has been the development of its Land Commission. The Government claimed that the Land Commission would end all the problems facing people who wanted to buy land. Recently we had the announcement by the Minister concerned that the average price of a block of land in the metropolitan area was \$4 000 or \$5 000.

Dr. Eastick: It was \$5 800.

Mr. MATHWIN: That was the figure referred to by the Minister as being the cost of an average block of land in the metropolitan area. However, in the ruined area of Hallett Cove (the area being subdivided with the permission of this Government) I saw blocks of land there advertised at a cost of \$12 000 to \$15 000 or \$16 000, and this subdivision is certainly in the metropolitan area. Yet, when the Government established its Land Commission, against all the advice from this side of the House and all the advice from other people in the know about what happens to land commissions (and if the Government does not know what happens to land commissions it would be well advised to investigate the situation in the United Kingdom), we were told the price of land would be contained.

In England, Harold Wilson saw fit to take away, or freeze, the Land Commission, after finding that it was not working. This year we see that the Treasurer is willing to spend further thousands of dollars on the Land Commission. The Minister in charge of the commission told the public in South Australia that the average price of a metropolitan block of land is only \$5 800. Such a statement was ridiculous and was complete poppycock. Moreover, the Minister knew his statement was poppycock when he made it, yet he tried to hoodwink the public into believing that the commission was doing a good job in bringing down or containing the cost of land in the Adelaide metropolitan area.

The Land Commission is a complete folly; it is not working. True, in the southern areas, where the Government has purchased land, blocks are selling for about \$5 000, but they are miles away at Hackham and Reynella, and purchasers are not being provided with any facilities whatever. The Government is not providing any transport for the people living there, yet the Government states that it is entirely wrong for people to use private motor vehicles to travel to offices in Adelaide.

The Government, through the Land Commission, is providing blocks of land for people but is not providing adequate transport facilities. For the Government to do so is bad and completely wrong. I intended to talk about tourism, but I have little time left in which to do so. Tourism is another area where the Government has failed completely and its record is rather shocking. I am still waiting with bated breath for the international, convention-type accommodation that the Treasurer so often has promised will be built on the development site in Victoria Square. It was at that site that we were once to have a Japanese-type hotel providing Japanese-type accommodation, beds and baths.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): In speaking to the Loan Estimates it would be wrong of me not to emphasise the dangers we face as a State in supplying accommodation for people in our society. When I asked a question of the Minister of Housing (he is also Minister of Mines and Energy, and he will need much energy to solve the housing problem in South Australia) about setting up a house-builders club by using some of the resources of the Monarto Development Commission, the Minister either misunderstood the purport of my question or deliberately evaded the question. I should like to believe it was the former. Just after the Second World War, returned servicemen started a house-builders club; they, as members of the club, contributed towards building their own houses. Each person contributed the same number of working hours to construct a member's house. Today we have reached the situation where it is impossible for many people receiving an average salary to face the rather monstrous financial burden (even on a long-term basis) involved in buying a house. If we continue on our present path, the average house will cost more than \$100 000 by 1980. If a person has to pay a deposit on the house and pay it off over 30 years at interest rates of about 11 per cent, his outlay will amount to about \$250 000.

Anyone who has a son or daughter who is now, say, 15 years old, could say to that child, "You'll be looking at a \$250 000 investment for an average house if you wish to build in the early 1980's." The labour component to build a house by the traditional methods that we know today is high. The Government's recent announcement to implement long service leave entitlements to be transferable throughout the building industry will certainly not decrease the cost of a house; in fact, it will substantially increase the cost of a house. In all seriousness I suggest to the House and the Government that there is today as great a need for a house-builders club as there was immediately after the Second World War. I believe the Government can help to get such a club started by making available no more than about \$20 000 from the Monarto project so as to provide a manager and one typist. People in the community who wish to build their own houses could then be invited to join the club at a nominal fee and members of the club would then start to build their own houses.

If the building of a house for, say, a plumber took a total of about 3 000 working hours by club members, he would be expected to contribute 3 000 working hours towards building houses for other club members. The same would apply to an electrician, a carpenter or a clerk. Once the club was a success the Monarto commission representative could drop out as secretary of the club and his position would be taken by a clerk who could be replaced every year. If a clerk was employed full time by the club, that would be regarded as his work effort, and the same would apply to anyone acting as manager for the club. The club will work. However, I know the building industry, including master builders and some tradesmen and unions will not like the suggestion. However, that is a secondary consideration because it is important that people have a roof over their heads at a price they can afford to pay.

The building industry could still rely on people who could afford to foot the bill to contribute to that industry. If it means that that industry must consider ways of cutting costs and that the Government must take some action to cut those costs, the Government should take the necessary action. An area that is obviously causing problems in the industry and increasing costs (it is slaughtering the building trade) is workmen's compensation. It is not the builder or the tradesman who pays the premium for workmen's compensation: it is the person who expects to live in the house being built for him. If it is considered that people should have that protection, I believe it is fair to change the provisions in the Builders Licensing Act to allow people to build their own houses through membership of a club such as I have suggested.

If any honourable member claims that houses built after the war were substandard, I challenge him to accompany me and look at some of them. I challenge any honourable member to speak to ex-servicemen in his district—people who used their own hands to build houses in which they have raised families and who have paid for those houses and are satisfied with them. Many of those houses are equally as good as houses built by the South Australian Housing Trust. I admit it is a way-out idea, but it worked in a time of crisis in the building industry after the Second World War. The building industry in this State faces a crisis equally as bad as, if not worse than, the crisis existing in the period immediately after the Second World War. We are facing such a crisis at a time when most people are not working much overtime and therefore have time available to work on their own houses. The full spectrum of house-building techniques could be included from landscaping to pouring foundations and from painting to building in cupboards.

We face the crisis now—1975. The Loan Estimates give us no satisfaction or guarantee that the housing industry will be any better in the next two years. I hope the Minister of Housing will take up the challenge. The Government will need to advertise the concept but, after all, it has spent moneys advertising this State's lotteries and other projects that the Government wishes to promote. Here is a project where the Government could advertise and help people build and establish their own houses.

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

Mr. EVANS: I am not out to set up another bureaucracy, and I do not believe there is a need for Government assistance for longer than 12 months or two years at the maximum, but it will give the persons who have the initiative and the will-power to use his own resources an opportunity to put them to good effect in obtaining

and owning a house, which is a cornerstone of our democracy; it would be that person's house, his castle, the greatest asset (apart from his freedoms) that any individual can own. It is fitting to recall that the Hon. Frank Walsh—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Leave the dead alone.

Mr. EVANS: The Minister of Transport says we should leave the dead alone.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Respect them, please.

Mr. EVANS: I am respecting the dead when I say that the late Hon. Frank Walsh believed most sincerely in people being able to own their own home: he regarded that as a cornerstone of our democracy, and it would be fitting for those who say they follow him within that political Party, the socialist Australian Labor Party, to adopt the same philosophy. It would be worth their while to remember the great respect that that gentleman had for this aspect of our democracy. I trust the Government will consider this matter, giving those people who wish to participate the opportunity to do so. Some relaxation of the Builders Licensing Act would be necessary and some guarantee would need to be given that the home was not sold within a short period without proper inspections being carried out during its construction. That could be done through the local government authorities, and no worse result could be achieved than that which recently occurred in connection with a house in the Hills. That house was the subject of a court case. It was built under the supervision of a prominent architect by a registered builder. It was a house above the average, but the occupants could use the cracks, especially those in the bathroom, as places in which to keep their tooth-brushes. The number of other major defects totalled about 160. I do not believe the suggestion I have made would lead to substandard housing, and the past has proved that to be the case.

Another aspect of the Loan Estimates relates to houses built by the South Australian Housing Trust: rental accommodation, accommodation for low-income groups for purchase, moneys available at low interest rates, a means test when the loan is to be granted, and other related matters. I refer especially to one problem in the rental section of the Housing Trust that must be rectified. Many Government members recognise the necessity to remedy the situation, but it will take political courage because it will affect a significant number of people. However, those people can afford to be affected to some degree financially in the present situation in which they rent trust houses. The Housing Trust operates on the basis of making available to low-income groups low-cost rental houses, and the rents are low. Regardless of what may happen after the house is allocated, the rent is never increased substantially except when normal increases take place. It is possible for two young people who choose to marry while they are at university, having no significant income, to rent a trust house if they can obtain one. They may both become lawyers, doctors, or engineers, but if they choose to stay in that house for the rest of their lives, under present policy (and also under the policy of the Liberal Government in the past) that has been possible.

I turn now to the types of house available and the rentals in some areas of Adelaide. At Taperoo five-room houses are rented from the Housing Trust to 50 per cent of the tenants for \$11.25 a week (and the rent was last increased in April); 30 per cent of the tenants pay \$12 a week, while the remaining 20 per cent of the tenants pay \$14 a week, all for similar accommodation. The per-

centages I have quoted are approximate only, but they are as nearly accurate as possible. At Mitchell Park for four-room houses the rentals range from \$7.65 to \$13. For five-room accommodation at Mitchell Park the rents differ quite markedly: \$7.80, \$9.75, \$11, \$12, and \$12.50. At Seaton for five-room accommodation 50 per cent of the tenants pay \$11.75 a week, while others pay \$12.75 and \$14. At Christies Beach four-room accommodation rentals range from \$7.50 and \$9 to \$14.50. For double units (semi-detached maisonette-type accommodation), each of five rooms, the rentals are \$9 and \$15, while the five-room single-unit rentals are \$17.50, \$21.50, and \$22.50.

Moving now to West Lakes, we see that, as the more modern estates are being built, people have to pay higher rentals, while those who moved into houses more than 20 years ago are in most cases still on the low rate (that does not apply in all cases, but I shall come to that later). At West Lakes the rental for four-room accommodation is \$25 or \$30.50, while that for five-room accommodation is \$29, \$29.50, \$35, \$37.50, or \$39. Where is the justice in a system that allows such variations in rentals to take place within a Government instrumentality?

Mr. Venning: There isn't any.

Mr. EVANS: There is no justice. In Whyalla and in other areas of the State (Elizabeth, for instance) the same sort of differential exists. We must stop Party bickering on this matter and say quite clearly that members on both sides support a form of means testing every, say, three years, so that tenants who suddenly have a greatly increased income pay higher rentals. In that way we will have more money to make houses available to people in the low-income groups who cannot get them at the moment. At present, in our society, from the most recent figures available, we see that we have fallen behind at the rate of 10 000 families a year in failing to supply accommodation for low-income groups. We are not providing proper accommodation for them, and about 30 000 families are waiting for proper accommodation and proper consideration. At the same time, this sort of injustice continues, with Housing Trust rentals of up to \$39 at West Lakes and down to \$7 or \$9 in another place.

I do not believe that, in regard to rentals, we should attack people who are under-privileged, people in receipt of low incomes, or pensioners. However, I repeat that I have friends who paid more than \$6 000 in income tax two years ago and who have paid more than \$8 000 this year but who are paying \$9.50 for a Housing Trust rental house. They conduct their own business, they have a boat and a shack, and they can go to Queensland or overseas when they wish. We are giving them low-cost accommodation that should be available for the poor, and we cannot sustain that sort of injustice.

I refer now to the scheme that we have implemented with Loan money, through the State Bank, for people in the low-income groups. We are creating exactly the same set of circumstances that we have with the rental system. If a person earns about \$130 a week, is the breadwinner in a house, and wishes to build a new house (he may be renting a house at the time), he can borrow up to \$18 000 from the State Bank at 5½ per cent interest. Many young people get married at an early age, when they are not established in their profession, job or business, and the main breadwinner is earning about \$130 a week.

I do not deny those people the right to borrow money at 5½ per cent, but, if suddenly they qualify in their profession or in whatever their calling may be and move to an

income above the average (their income could be up to \$10 000 or \$11 000 a year), we should be able to tell them that they will pay the normal interest rates that apply within the community, because we are saying to those who are smart enough, "Go and get your loan, even if it means getting married 12 months before you thought you would like to do so, before you graduate from university or before you qualify, because you have money at a low interest rate for 30 years, or until you pay the loan off." That system is unfair and, I believe, is a misuse of public money. We should be able to review the incomes of persons so as to solve that problem after those persons are established.

In the next category (I believe the figure is \$160 a week), if the main breadwinner is receiving less than that amount, he can borrow at 6½ per cent. That is a lower rate than that at which any other section of the community can borrow from normal sources, unless they belong to a credit union in, say, the teaching profession or some other organisation. The same thing applies to those people. Suddenly, they have a collective massive income. They have that loan for the rest of its term. I believe in making cheap money available for people so that they can get a proper house, a roof over their head but, when they can pay the normal ruling rates of interest for house loans in the community, we should have a system that guarantees that they will do so.

The Housing Trust's record, under a socialist Australian Labor Party Government, is disastrous, and what is happening about housing in the State is a catastrophe. In 1953-54, when the total number of houses constructed in the State was fewer than 10 000, the trust built 4 126, or many more than one-third of the total. In 1975, when the total number constructed is more than 13 000, the trust is building, as the Minister has said, 1 589. It is just not acceptable that an institution that used to build more than one-third of the number of houses built in the State now builds only one-eighth of the total number of houses constructed. It is an institution that is now such a big bureaucracy that it cannot manage its own affairs effectively to provide the goods that it was established to provide.

The Treasurer has stated that 2 364 houses are in the process of being constructed. I wonder how far some of them are towards being constructed. I doubt that the plans have been drawn up for some of them. How ridiculous it is to say that in one year we will build 1 589 houses, and at June 30, the end of that year, 2 264 are under construction. All that can be said of that position is that it is utter rot. The trust has not the resources genuinely to have that number of houses under construction.

Some of these houses may be a thought in some person's mind. There may be a block of land, and that is all. I believe that it is not a factual figure. If the figure is correct, the number of houses to be built by the trust next year, with the construction period being only about 22 weeks, will be 5 000 to 6 000, yet the Minister states that the trust can keep up the programme. His statement is a lot of rot and has been made only to show that the Government may be trying to attack the problem, but it is not doing that. The trust stated in 1974 that it was concerned about the time that it took to turn raw land into usable blocks. It said that that time extended to about 180 weeks from when it first set out to create a housing allotment to when it had a usable block on which to build a house. I doubt that that time has changed significantly. I believe that the time for the change from raw land to a usable block is still about 3½ years. Further,

at that time the trust stated that it would import labour and houses that were ready to construct.

We achieved a wonderful result: we increased the number of houses built to about only 200, so we see that that also was just a face saver. No action was taken by the Government, the Minister or the trust to solve that problem, and we all should be aware of that. We all know the problem. We have introduced licensing, restrictions, controls, regulations, workmen's compensation, and now the transfer of long service leave from builder to builder. The Government tried to do away with the subcontractor. It killed the greatest building industry Australia, possibly the world, has ever had. I defy any member here to say that we in South Australia did not have the best standard of housing in the world and the largest percentage of home ownership by individuals. We are killing that, and let the Australian Labor Party remember that, in England and Australia and other parts of the world, the unions that promoted the socialists to power then set out to throttle the socialists. The left-wing unions in Australia are throttling the socialists and at the same time they are throttling Australia; they will destroy the creature they created, and then they themselves will be destroyed because their own members will rebel. The unions have brought this country to its knees through the socialist A.L.P.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): Much has been said about the Loan Estimates, and I hope I shall not go over ground already covered. In his statement the Treasurer mentioned last year's Revenue Budget and the history of the State's finances during the financial year ended June 30, 1975. It was interesting to see the fluctuation of and the apparent concern about the State's finances at various stages of that financial year. Whereas the emphasis in the debate has been on the Treasurer's statement and the other paper that was issued with it, I will refer to the Bill itself, which authorises the Treasurer to borrow and make available funds from the Loan Account. The power to borrow is given in clause 5. Reading through the Bill, one finds there is flexibility for the Treasurer in arranging finances for this State. Clause 5 provides:

On or before the thirtieth day of June, 1976, the Treasurer may borrow, on behalf of the State and in accordance with the financial agreement, the sum of one hundred and twelve million nine hundred and fifty thousand dollars and such other sums as may be approved by the Australian Loan Council.

So what we have before us may not be the final figure: it depends on any other approval that may be given by the Australian Loan Council. However, the sum stands at the moment at \$112 950 000. Clause 6 provides:

On or before the thirtieth day of June, 1976, there may be issued out of the Loan Fund any sums not exceeding two hundred and forty-one million four hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars . . . If the amount mentioned in any line of the first schedule as the proposed expenditure for the purposes mentioned in that line is insufficient for that purpose the Treasurer may issue additional money from the Loan Fund for that purpose but so that the total amount issued under this Act from the Loan Fund during the financial year ending on the thirtieth day of June, 1976, for purposes mentioned in the first schedule shall not exceed two hundred and forty-one million four hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars.

I take it the Loan Estimates laid before us are again flexible and can be changed, provided the Treasurer does not exceed the amount prescribed in clause 6. Then there are other sources. The Treasurer is given authority for advances under the Public Finance Act. Clause 7 provides:

The borrowing on behalf of the State of the sum of thirty-three million two hundred and thirty-four thousand five hundred and forty-four dollars, being the amount advanced by the Treasurer during the financial year that

ended on the thirtieth day of June, 1975, pursuant to section 32b of the Public Finance Act, 1936, as amended, and its application for the purposes mentioned in the second schedule are hereby authorised: but the borrowing shall form part of the borrowing authorised by section 5 of this Act.

In other words, that \$33 000 000 is part of the \$112 950 000. If the Treasurer finds himself in difficulties, there is a provision in the Bill whereby he may be able to raise temporary finance for Loan purposes. Clause 8 provides:

If the money in the Loan Fund is at any time insufficient for carrying out the purposes mentioned in the first schedule, the Treasurer may use other money in his hands for those purposes, but any money so used shall be repaid from the Loan Fund as soon as there is sufficient money in that fund to make the repayment.

So, there is provision for the Treasurer to borrow money, if necessary, beyond the prescribed amount; but there is also provision that the money shall be paid back as soon as there is sufficient money in that fund to make the repayment. That is fairly open-ended. If the fund does not have sufficient money during the prescribed time, that can be left.

Then there is power to borrow and apply Loan money in 1976-77. At the end of this financial year, if there is not sufficient money in the Loan Account, the Treasurer has authority to raise additional loans. Clause 9 empowers the Treasurer to raise an amount of \$80 000 000. It provides:

(1) The Treasurer may borrow, during the period between the thirtieth day of June, 1976, and the commencement of the Act authorising the raising and expenditure of loan money for the financial year ending on the thirtieth day of June, 1977, on behalf of the State and in accordance with the financial agreement, any sums not exceeding eighty million dollars.

(2) There may be issued out of the Loan Fund during that period any sums not exceeding eighty million dollars.

(3) Any sums so issued shall be applied to meet expenditure on all or any of the loan purposes mentioned in the first schedule during that period and the amount to be allocated to each purpose shall be determined by the Treasurer.

Again I say that the Treasurer has a fairly wide field in which to operate. I am not criticising this, because it may be necessary in an emergency for the Treasurer to have that authority. Clause 10 provides:

The Treasurer may during each of the financial years commencing—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The Treasurer read all this to the House before.

Mr. RUSSACK: Not the Bill; it may have been inserted in *Hansard*. I am just repeating it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You mean you are reading it to waste time.

Mr. RUSSACK: I am reading it so that I can come to the road grants in a moment and say something about them.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Are they in there?

Mr. RUSSACK: The Minister should know: I assume he has read it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That is the point that I am raising with you.

Mr. RUSSACK: Clause 10 provides:

The Treasurer may during each of the financial years commencing on the first day of July, 1975, and on the first day of July, 1976, borrow in accordance with the financial agreement—

(a) any sum or sums against the issue of Commonwealth Treasury Bills, for the purpose of financing any temporary deficit in the Revenue Account of the State and any amounts so

borrowed shall be repaid on or before the thirtieth day of June next following the date of the borrowing;

and

(b) any sum or sums not exceeding four million dollars for any purpose by way of overdraft from the Reserve Bank of Australia and any amounts so borrowed shall be repaid within seven days.

So, if there is a deficit in the Revenue Account, the Treasurer can use Loan funds or he can approach the Reserve Bank. Any sum borrowed in accordance with paragraph (a) must be repaid by June 30 next following the date of borrowing. Further, any sum up to \$4 000 000 borrowed in accordance with paragraph (b) must be repaid within seven days. For the benefit of the Minister of Transport, I point out that clause 11 provides:

All moneys received by the State from the Commonwealth by way of grants under any Act or Acts of the Commonwealth relating to roads or transport shall be paid to such special accounts in the books of the Treasurer as the Treasurer shall determine and the Treasurer shall issue and pay out of the money so credited such sums as are required for the purposes respectively specified in those Acts.

The Treasurer has provided the following summary of Loan Account transactions:

	1975-76
	Proposed
	\$
Capital grants	56 475 000
Borrowed funds (in cash)	112 950 000

Programme approved by Australian Loan Council	169 425 000
Added indebtedness to cover discounts	500 000
Repayments and recoveries	71 550 000

Funds available currently	241 475 000

	\$
Balance on hand at June 30, 1974	4 496 605
Deficit in 1974-75	2 593 256

Balance on hand at June 30, 1975	1 903 349
Proposed deficit in 1975-76	—

Proposed balance on hand at June 30, 1976	1 903 349

The member for Fisher referred to the operations of the South Australian Housing Trust. If my memory serves me correctly, I believe the relevant legislation was first passed in 1936, and since then the trust has done commendable work in South Australia. Those who have administered the affairs of the trust are to be congratulated yet, because of the current financial situation, there is a shortage of rental accommodation and rental purchase houses. I hope the Housing Trust will be able to meet the demand for housing not only in the metropolitan area but also in the country. I confirm the statements of other members that there is a crisis in connection with rental housing in the country as well as in the city. In his statement on the Loan Estimates for 1974-75, the Treasurer said:

The rate of interest being charged by the bank on loans from the special low-interest moneys to persons who comply with the means test is 5½ per cent while the rate on other loans is currently 6½ per cent. During 1973-74, the maximum loan available to both categories of applicants was \$12 500. The Government has approved an increase in that limit to a new maximum of \$15 000 for 1974-75.

The Treasurer's corresponding statement in this year's Loan Estimates is as follows:

The rate of interest charged by the State Bank on loans to persons who comply with the means test is 5½ per cent. Loans made in 1974-75 to 1 685 applicants in this category amounted to \$23 319 000. The bank makes advances also to persons who do not comply with this primary means test, but who comply with a secondary somewhat less stringent test. Funds for these loans are obtained from the bank's

internal funds and from allocations of State loan funds, if necessary. During 1974-75 the bank made 1 152 loans in this category, totalling \$16 193 000. The interest rate charged is 6½ per cent.

In March, 1975, the maximum loan available to applicants who satisfy the primary means test was increased from \$15 000 to \$18 000, while the limit for other loans remained at \$15 000.

For some period during the year the State Bank could not make funds available in the second category; that is, to those qualifying for an interest rate of 6½ per cent. I am also given to understand that, for people in the first category (those qualifying for an interest rate of 5½ per cent), the means test applied related to the income of the main breadwinner in the family (the husband and father). The same thing applied for those in the second category but, in respect of the first category, where the lower rate of interest applied, there could be a working wife; so, there could be two incomes, but this was not taken into account. In respect of the second category, where the higher interest rate of 6½ per cent applied, the main breadwinner of the family could have been receiving a much higher salary, but his wife might not have been working. Therefore, their overall income would have been less than that of some families in the first category. This point needs investigating and correcting, so that money can be made available where the need exists. In connection with last year's Loan Estimates, under the heading "Roads and Bridges, \$1 000 000", the Treasurer said:

An advance of \$2 000 000 was made in 1973-74 towards financing the sealing of Eyre Highway. The Commonwealth Aid Roads Act expired on June 30 last, and new legislation is being arranged to grant assistance to States for roads and transportation purposes. The prospects now are that the remaining work on the Eyre Highway will be financed under the proposed National Highways Bill. However, until the necessary legislation is effective, funds may be required to continue work on this project and to cover other transitional arrangements. An advance of \$1 000 000 is proposed for these purposes.

I notice that \$1 000 000 is allocated for roads and bridges; I take it that this is the sum referred to in last year's Loan Estimates. Because there were no actual payments, there is now a credit of that \$1 000 000. I make no apology for again mentioning Mr. Jones's statement, as referred to in the news release to which I have twice referred in this Parliament in the last week, that the Australian Government had accepted the full financial responsibility for national roads throughout Australia. Therefore, additional money must now be available for roadworks in this State. Again, I ask that the Government channel through local government any money that it can for this purpose. Once more, I refer to what the Commonwealth Minister for Transport said:

Based on patterns of expenditure over recent years, it is estimated that the State Governments would save \$12 000 000 in 1975-76 as a result of the Australian Government's decision fully to finance national highways. I am sure the Loan Estimates show that there has been a saving of at least \$1 000 000 on the Eyre Highway, a national highway, because of Commonwealth funding. I now turn to the line relating to the Municipal Tramways Trust. In last year's statement, the Treasurer said:

The Loan Estimates for 1973-74 provided \$400 000 towards the trust's capital programme. The actual payments to the trust aggregated \$4 400 000, as it was necessary to advance a special allocation of \$4 000 000 during the year to finance the trust in the take-over of private suburban passenger bus services previously operating under licence. For the four years 1973-74 to 1976-77, the capital programme of the trust envisages the net expenditure of about \$22 500 000 at present price levels for the transfer of licensed services, the purchase of new

buses, the acquisition of land for depots, the construction of buildings, and purchase of plant. If the whole of this programme were accepted by the Australian Government for support under the urban transport arrangements, then two-thirds of the cost, say, \$15 000 000, would be covered by grants, and one-third of the cost, say, \$7 500 000, would be a charge to State funds. However, we have not been successful as yet in getting approval for the costs of transfer of licensed services to be financed under the special urban transport arrangements and the net cost to the State over the four-year period could be as high as \$9 000 000. A contribution of \$2 400 000 towards the programme is proposed in 1974-75.

In this year's document, the Treasurer stated that during 1974-75 the sum of \$4 400 000 was advanced from Loan Account to the trust towards its capital programme for the purchase of new buses, acquisition of land for depots, and construction of depot buildings. This year, \$5 000 000 has been provided towards a continuation of the programme. The Treasurer continued:

Finance is also being provided by the Australian Government by way of grants under urban public transport arrangements to meet two-thirds of the cost of approved projects. The amount of such assistance to be provided in 1975-76 is not yet known, but we are hopeful that up to \$10 000 000 will be available towards total payments of the order of \$15 000 000. Two major contracts for supply of buses are now under way, one for 67 AEC Swift buses and one for 310 Volvo buses.

I emphasise the pertinent point that it is not yet known how much assistance the Government is to receive from the Commonwealth Government. I wonder, as a result of the Budget that was brought down in Canberra last Tuesday evening, how much money will be available and whether this project will be carried on, as has been suggested in this year's document, depending on the \$10 000 000 that is to come from the Government in Canberra. During the election campaign, the Treasurer wished in many ways to divorce himself from the Government in Canberra.

Mr. Langley: We've never heard that before in our lives.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That is untrue, and it isn't worthy of you to say that.

Mr. RUSSACK: I will say this to the Minister: from all the press reports and advertisements I have seen and television broadcasts I have heard, I gained the impression that the Treasurer did not wish to be associated with the Government in Canberra. However, we now find—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Gouger has the floor.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It was a State election.

Mr. RUSSACK: Of course it was, and the State is so dependent on the Commonwealth Government that we will find that what is disclosed in this document will not be carried out in its entirety.

Mr. Langley: You've always been 100 per cent, have you?

Mr. RUSSACK: No, but there will be some deficiencies, and it will be seen just how dependent this Government is on the Government in Canberra. I wish to raise not only the dependency aspect but also the fact that, because this Government is so dependent on Canberra, the authority that is established in Canberra will be displayed. This is spreading throughout the State, and the strings that are attached to so many of the—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What's this "authority" that you're talking about?

Mr. RUSSACK: Before the State can act, it must obtain approval from Canberra in many cases, particularly in relation to finance.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Doesn't someone have to get your approval before they spend your money?

Mr. RUSSACK: Too right!

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Hasn't that always applied under a Liberal Government?

Mr. RUSSACK: Not always. If a grant is given—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What if money is made available for a specific purpose?

Mr. RUSSACK: If that is the case, why does the Commonwealth Government make such a display of the fact that it channels money into local government to which no strings are attached?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Are any strings attached?

Mr. RUSSACK: There may not be at present, but it is just a sprat to catch a mackerel. There will be, because—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Local government has never done so well under any other Australian Government.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must call the honourable member for Gouger to order. We must discuss the Public Purposes Loan Bill.

Mr. RUSSACK: I was discussing the matter of finance and the avenue from which it comes. I was discussing the allocation for our roads programme. I ask the Minister: what about the money that was made available to Alice Springs and the strings that were attached to it?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What Alice Springs?

Mr. Harrison: I think he's referring to Alice in Wonderland.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo. I think he is, too.

Mr. RUSSACK: What about the news release to which I have referred so many times? It states:

Mr. Jones said—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That was read out of context, as I told you this afternoon during Question Time.

Mr. RUSSACK: The report states:

Mr. Jones said—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Read all of it.

Mr. RUSSACK: The report is as follows:

Mr. Jones said that in the case of rural local roads he had approved the allocation of Australian Government rural local road funds rather than a programme of actual road works. He had also approved the expenditure proposed by the Highways Department on construction and maintenance of rural local roads throughout the State. He said he had taken this course this year because he recognised that local authorities would have been hard pressed to have had their road construction and maintenance programmes prepared in time for his approval at the beginning of the financial year.

Therefore, that necessary information has been provided, and strings were attached.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: No strings are attached. That is approval for work that they want done.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I appreciate the opportunity to speak in this debate, as there are certain matters to which I should like to refer in relation to this measure.

Mr. Max Brown: It's about—

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member can sit back and chatter like a parrot, but rarely does he speak in debates and make a worthwhile contribution.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I must bring the House back to order. We are discussing the Public Purposes Loan Bill, and I ask all honourable members to keep this in mind in their discussions and interjections. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: Thank you, Sir. I was trying to discuss this matter in a logical manner, but I was sidetracked by the member for Whyalla. If the Government were honest and sincere, and if it wanted to inform the public and the House in a proper manner, it would withdraw this document and resubmit it later.

Mr. Duncan: Ah!

Mr. GUNN: The member for Elizabeth and his Minister can grunt.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I did not grunt; I did not say anything; I did not do anything. Certainly, I did not grunt.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. I ask the member for Eyre to confine himself to discussing the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: If the Government were sincere it would withdraw this document, which has been completely sabotaged by its friends in Canberra. The Treasurer has presented to this House a works programme involving \$241 500 000, which represents a significant increase in the amount that was presented to this House last year, but, if one considers the inflationary spiral, which is now rampant in this country and which has been deliberately created by the Government's Canberra friends, one realises that the real value of the sum provided to the people of this State is not as much as it would appear.

Mr. Keneally: I heard that you sacked Eric Butler as your speech writer last week.

Mr. GUNN: Why does not someone give the member for Stuart a dummy? He always rushes in with inane interjections. I doubt whether he has ever read this document, and all honourable members know that he is not allowed to speak.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the Bill now under consideration.

Mr. GUNN: I wish especially to refer to two aspects of this measure. First, I was disappointed that nowhere could I find in the lines any allocation for the proposed new country fire authority's headquarters at Keswick. The House is aware that the Public Works Committee favourably reported on this project, recommending that a building costing about \$800 000 be built immediately. What has happened to that programme? Many suggestions have been put to me, and each is worth canvassing. Representatives of the Emergency Fire Service have been approaching members on this side for some weeks in relation to this project. I hope that when the Treasurer or the Minister of Works replies to the debate that they will be able to tell the House what has taken place concerning this project, because the conditions under which the E.F.S. has to operate in South Australia are far below the standard that should prevail. The E.F.S. provides a great service to country people in relation to fire protection. It has been suggested that the reason why the screws have been put on this project and why we have not had a new Country Fire Services Act is that the Labor Party is under threat from the unions that control the Fire Brigade.

Opposition members are aware of the resolution passed at the recent Labor Party conference (and members opposite have to carry out their instructions) that there ought to be a salaried fire officer in charge of fire services in country areas. This suggestion does not meet with the approval of the Emergency Fire Service or local government authorities in these areas, and we believe, rightly so, that this is why the screws have been put on this project. Although funds are available for this scheme and there is a voluntary organisation doing wonderful work to protect the State against the ravages of bush fires, no funds have been forthcoming. I hope that the Treasurer or the Minister of Works will clearly state what is the situation in this matter. The Public Works Committee has reported on it, and it ill behoves the Government to carry on in such a deplorable fashion as it has done. Secondly, I refer to Monarto. I am pleased that the special Minister of State for Monarto is present.

Mr. Coumbe: He's fast losing his titles.

Mr. GUNN: He is. We were told that when the Monarto project was first brought to our attention that the Government intended to transfer to Monarto the Agriculture Department, the Lands Department, and the Environment and Conservation Department. What will now be the position in relation to these departments? What will happen to the Agriculture Department? The Minister and the Treasurer have been quiet in recent months regarding the transfer of public servants. They were accused of trying to conscript them, and there is no doubt that that is what they had in mind. However, it was obvious in talking to any of the people involved that they would not voluntarily go to Monarto: they would have had to be conscripted and forced to go there. Now that the project has been sabotaged by the Commonwealth Government, which has gone cold on the idea, the South Australian Government does not know what to do.

Dr. Tonkin: I think the State Government sabotaged it, and the Commonwealth Government merely speeded the reality of it.

Mr. GUNN: The Leader is right.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the member for Eyre to come back to the Bill, which is the Public Purposes Loan Bill.

Mr. GUNN: Mr. Speaker, I have not really diverted from the Bill at all. Funds are provided in this Bill for Monarto, as the Minister is aware. The Treasurer said that he was expecting a large contribution from the Commonwealth Government in relation to this project. The Minister and his colleagues will know that for some time the Agriculture Department has been housed in deplorable conditions. I am aware that the department is about to be shifted, but for how long will it be in the new premises?

What plans has the Government, now that Monarto will not proceed, that the Agriculture Department obviously will not be transferred to Monarto? Where is the South Australian Government going to house permanently the Agriculture Department which, after all, is one of the State's most important departments? It carries out research to protect those great rural industries that play such an important role in the welfare of the people of South Australia and Australia. Is the Government going to build new premises in Adelaide, or transfer the department or build new premises for it at Northfield? That site is a matter about which one could talk at great length. Surely the Government has a programme it can relate to the House and the

people of this State, and especially to departmental officers: It is deplorable that the Government has failed to tell people what it has in mind for that department. Obviously it will be many years (if ever) before any large construction projects are completed at Monarto.

I believe that the State Ministers whose portfolios encompass agriculture should consider seriously building proper facilities for the Agriculture Department on the Northfield site. It has been rumoured that the State Government intends to dispose of the Northfield site, probably for housing development which, in itself, would be wrong. It has been suggested that part of the Monarto area is to be used as an experimental farm. I do not believe that is right. Perhaps certain research could be conducted on that site, but it would be wrong to dispose of the facilities that are now situated at Northfield. The member for Davenport could elaborate at much length about the virtues of retaining the Northfield site.

Mr. Duncan: He's done so on many occasions.

Mr. GUNN: The Government has not listened to him, nor could it comprehend his suggestions. Another matter to which I wish to refer is the housing situation that faces the people of South Australia.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It's a crisis situation!

Mr. GUNN: Yes. At page 7 of the Treasurer's statement on the Loan Estimates it is stated:

The Housing Agreement lays emphasis on the construction of rental housing and restricts to 30 per cent the proportion of family dwellings which may be built for sale with welfare housing funds.

I believe that is a disgraceful policy to adopt and that the Government should be ashamed of itself for agreeing to its Commonwealth colleagues' proposition. It is obvious that the Labor Party, in office, is following the plans laid down by the late Mr. Dedman, but I do not wish to talk about that gentleman. He proposed that the Government should spend most of its money on rental accommodation. The Government accepted that proposition and created much chaos in the South Australian housing industry and across the nation. The Government accepted that concept and destroyed all initiative and enterprise in the building industry. The Government, by its policies, has made it virtually impossible for young people ever to own a house. What the Government has set out to do is to make sure that young people are not given the opportunity to buy their own house. It has always been Liberal Party policy, and always will be Liberal policy, that every person who desires to own his own house should have the opportunity to do so. It should be the Government's role in welfare housing to allow people to own their own house. People should not be encouraged to rent houses for their entire life. That concept is all right on a short-term basis, but the emphasis should be on house ownership instead of paying rent all their lives so that they have nothing when they retire.

If people wish to go from a normal family-home concept into a home unit they should have sufficient money to buy a home unit so they can spend the latter part of their life in comfort when a home becomes too large to manage. Under these Loan Estimates (and this would be well known to you, Mr. Speaker, coming from a country area) country areas are facing many housing problems, one of which is virtually stopping the growth of country towns because of the lack of available housing. The Government was wrong in accepting the concept of rental accommodation and should be thoroughly ashamed of itself. It will take Liberal Governments not only in this

State but also in the Commonwealth sphere to rectify the deplorable state of affairs that exists now.

I do not wish to take up any further time in this debate, but I shall have more to say in Committee on the lines, especially to the Minister of Education. I would like him to tell the House what are the plans of his department. I am aware his department is to cut expenditure. Because his predecessor saw fit not to continue with the building of a new school at Miltaburra Corner, I want to know, as my constituents want to know, what other plans the Minister and his department have to provide reasonable educational facilities in the area and whether he will provide facilities at Wirrulla, or extend the facilities there and at Smoky Bay, Nunjirkompita and Mudamuckla.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

First schedule.

State Bank, \$5 500 000.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the Treasurer, that is if he is going to come into the Chamber, which I presume he will because it is his Bill—it is the Loan Estimates! Because the Treasurer is not in the Chamber I move that progress be reported.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Vandeppeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Connelly, Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Progress reported.

The SPEAKER: The question is "That the Committee have leave to sit again—"

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): On motion.

The SPEAKER: Those in favour say "Aye", to the contrary, "No". The Ayes have it.

Dr. Tonkin: Divide.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (23)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Vandeppeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

The SPEAKER: Order! There being 23 Ayes and 23 Noes, I give my casting vote in favour of the Ayes. The question therefore passes in the affirmative.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

That further consideration of the Bill in Committee be now resumed.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I take a point of order under Standing Orders 217, 218 and 219. When a division is called for in this Chamber, the time clock is turned and runs for a period of two minutes, and then the doors are to be locked on the call of the Chair, whether it be by the Speaker or by the Chairman of Committees. Mr. Chairman, you failed to do that. You proceeded for about 30 to 45 seconds after the sand-glass was turned before calling for the locking of the doors. I therefore take a point of order against you, Mr. Chairman, and think that you should give this Chamber an undertaking that in future you will be a fair and just Chairman, and not give the benefit of the procedure of the Chamber to your own side.

The CHAIRMAN: I must inform the honourable member that it is my duty to decide that, not the duty of the honourable member. We shall resume with the line "State Bank, \$5 500 000."

Dr. TONKIN: I am pleased that the Treasurer has seen fit to come into the Chamber. The reason why the division occurred was that he was not in the Chamber when the matter came before the Committee. The member for Davenport has raised a point of order, which you have ruled upon, Sir, and it is not for me at this stage to differ with your ruling, nor will I do so, but I think that the incident was obvious to everyone in the Chamber.

Mr. Wells: That's a reflection.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It is not a reflection: it is a statement of fact. We waited for 2½ minutes and your bloke didn't show up.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I tell the member for Davenport that I am not a biased Chairman. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Dr. TONKIN: I ask the Treasurer to what extent the Loan Estimates in relation to this particular line for the State Bank depend on specific funds being made available by the Commonwealth Government. I also ask whether these funds have been received or whether provision has been made for them in the Commonwealth Budget. If such provision has not been made, by how much does the sum promised in this line or received from the Commonwealth Government fall short of the sums listed in the Treasurer's statement?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I take it that the honourable member is referring to the provisions on page 3 of the statement, under "State Bank". The answer to the question is that no funds set forth in these provisions are in any way financially dependent on the receipt of moneys from the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I raise with the Treasurer a matter that I have mentioned to him previously in connection with money made available from the State Bank on loan to prospective house owners. It was a question of discrimination against single women. The Treasurer may recall that about two or three weeks ago I gave him a letter from a constituent who is a single lady. There is a positive discrimination against her in her situation without children, yet unmarried women with children seem to be at an advantage regarding housing. I ask the Treasurer whether this policy of the State Bank is under review, particularly in view of the Sex Discrimination Bill, which has been vaunted publicly in this State. I expect a report from the Treasurer in due course on that matter but, on a question of policy, is there any reason why the State Bank should discriminate against single women who have the

necessary deposit but are denied access to a loan based on a favourable rate of interest such as the State Bank provides?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The matter is under review. I do not see any reason why single women should be discriminated against, and I have taken the matter up.

Dr. TONKIN: To what extent is it expected that the State Bank's Loan programme for housing will be affected, in terms of effective loans, for this current financial year?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Regarding the trust's prospective programme, I have outlined, following introduction of the Commonwealth Budget, that the amount of money made available from the Commonwealth in respect of concessional interest money under the housing agreement, the fact that we were kept to last year's amounts in money terms, would, if nothing else were done, reduce the State Bank's programme very significantly from about 40 approvals a week to about 25. At this stage, naturally enough we are looking to other means to obtain an additional rate of approval beyond what would be forecast if we were kept for the whole year to this sum. The Commonwealth Government has undertaken that, if it is shown that the building rate in South Australia overall were to fall markedly, the amount of money provided under the agreement would be reconsidered. We are looking at other ways to try to see if we can provide some moneys to increase the rate of approvals to something near the increased rate that had occurred during the last months of last financial year.

Mr. BECKER: In 1974-75 estimated payments for student hostels were \$40 000, with no actual payment being made. For this financial year, \$40 000 is proposed. Estimated repayments are \$20 000 and proposed net payments are \$20 000. Can the Treasurer explain what this means?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The student hostels programme is an old programme on which little reliance is placed now. We have fewer occasions for applications. This is a State subsidised programme to hostels for students' accommodation. We do get, under the provisions of the previous advances, some repayments but, as the honourable member will see, it is only a very small amount.

Dr. EASTICK: In relation to the statement made that the advance of \$2 500 000 to the State Bank will be used mainly for housing loans in cases where applicants fall outside the means test under the housing agreement, what are the means tests applied in respect of this line? Has there been any change, having regard to the present financial circumstances of people seeking houses, or is the matter under consideration? If it is under consideration to what extent is it being considered?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The means tests applied are two-fold. The 5½ per cent interest rate is applied to people who qualify for welfare housing under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, and there is a specified family weekly income. I do not have the details with me but they have been previously published; the details of the agreement have been made available here previously. In addition to this, in respect of some people who are a little above that level of income, we provide money at 6¼ per cent and we have been able to get the agreement of the Commonwealth for about 15 per cent of the total money to go into that area. We then provide additional moneys for people who fall close to but are just a little outside the welfare housing means test.

The difficulty that South Australia faced with the provision of this means test was that, whereas it provided extra moneys in the welfare housing area in those

States that were really dealing only with welfare housing from public funds, in South Australia publicly funded housing comprised directly 20 per cent to 21 per cent of the total, and the State Bank was in addition financing about 25 per cent of the private house building. People in South Australia rely on public funds for housing much more than people in other States do, and we spend twice as much per capita as the other States do on housing from State funds.

Dr. Eastick: It goes back to Playford's days.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course it does; in fact, it goes back to 1924, in the Gunn Labor Government. But this has not been a partisan matter: it has been the history of housing within the State. In consequence, we were able to induce the Commonwealth to agree that there should be some provision in South Australia that took account of that fact and, in provisions to the State Bank, we provided additional Loan funds so that it was able to use money towards this programme of helping people who were not in the welfare housing income range but a little above it, people who traditionally relied on State Bank finance to build their houses and who would not really have any other source of finance in South Australia.

Dr. Eastick: Has the limit changed with escalating costs?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have constantly made representations about that. There have been some difficulties with the Commonwealth at times, because it has taken a rather, in our view, too tight view of the means test, but we have managed to get some alterations.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Treasurer give some details of the Housing Trust's programme for the coming year?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That does not come under the State Bank.

Mr. EVANS: Some of the houses from that organisation were sold through the State Bank; there is no other line where the Housing Trust will come under the Loan Estimates.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, but that question is out of order.

Mr. EVANS: Then I will ask another question. How many houses are financed through the State Bank that are purchased from the Housing Trust?

The CHAIRMAN: That question is out of order.

Mr. RUSSACK: I thought I heard the Treasurer mention an interest rate of 6¼ per cent, but it is 6½ per cent in the statement. Is 6½ per cent correct? Also, the primary means test as outlined by the Treasurer was to a certain level of income. I have been given to understand that this qualification is taken on the income of the major breadwinner in a home and, in the case of the secondary means test, it is possible for just the husband to be working, and in the primary means test for both the husband and the wife to be earning, and into that house is coming more money than in the case of the secondary means test. Could that anomaly be considered and something be done to overcome it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member's figure is correct. We have had considerable arguments about this matter. In the old Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement back in 1944 the provision was for a family income test. That was not accepted in the housing agreement made in 1973. There, it was the breadwinner's income that was considered. It is certainly possible that in some cases people who qualify for welfare housing as breadwinners in the means test may have a total family

income just above that of the people who are in the higher range means test. We have not been able to resolve that. There are arguments either way because, when we tried to use some sort of family income test in relation to remissions of rates for pensioners, we ran into the direct trouble, so we simply wiped out from consideration any other income of the pensioner. In the same way, as there are problems about taking a total family income, which can vary fairly quickly, so the breadwinner's income has been taken purely for that purpose.

Mr. EVANS: In the second reading debate, I raised the matter of people qualifying under the \$132 for the primary means test obtaining loans at 5½ per cent and subsequently rising in their professions and going into a higher income bracket, but still having the loan at 5½ per cent for the rest of their working lives. That seems to be an injustice. Has any consideration been given to this at Treasurers' conferences? I support the view held by the member for Gouger that it is possible for the main breadwinner to be earning \$132 a week and for the other person in the house (the wife) \$128 a week, the total income being well over \$250 a week coming into the house. In the secondary means test group, I believe it is \$160 a week, there being only one breadwinner, and he is \$100 a week worse off but still qualifies only for the 6½ per cent. Has the idea of having a continuing means test been considered by the Treasurer to see whether he can vary the interest rate as the years go by for a person reaching a higher income bracket?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not aware that it has been considered. On the face of it, most people would think it impracticable to alter the interest rates on the basis of a changing income.

Mr. RUSSACK: Under the primary means test, the amount of money available has been increased from \$15 000 to \$18 000, whereas the limit in the secondary means test has remained at \$15 000. In the circumstances outlined just now, this would lead to greater inequality. If the sex discrimination legislation is successful and a woman can accept the responsibility of a mortgage, and a wife has a greater income than her husband, would either person, in those circumstances, be regarded as the breadwinner?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not considered that point. The reason for the increase from \$15 000 to \$18 000 in the lower range of loans is that we had substantially more money available at the concessional rate of interest in that area. We were therefore able to increase the amount of the loan while keeping a fairly high rate of approvals. We have very much less money for the other group.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Last year \$40 000 was voted for student hostels, but the actual payments were nil. Is anything definite proposed in this connection, or is it a vote to keep the matter on the books?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We keep a small figure on the books against the possibility of getting an application in the area. Because the legislation is on the books, it is reasonable to keep a small figure there against what is a perfectly possible demand being made on us under the legislation.

Mr. BECKER: The Auditor-General's Report for the year ended June 30, 1974, states that the State Bank had 35 branches and 16 agencies; during that year it opened one new branch at Robe. Can the Treasurer say whether it is intended to expand the bank's operations by opening more branches? Is the bank fully capitalising on its services to customers; in other words, where it is granting

housing loans is it trying to obtain other banking business from people who borrow from it? In the long term, is the Government still looking to the possibility of amalgamating the State Bank and the Savings Bank of South Australia, thereby offering a complete banking service?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As the honourable member will have seen from a public announcement made some time ago, a special investigation is being undertaken by Sir John Marks and Sir Walter Scott into the potential of the banking services of the State and into whether we can expand services for the benefit of the people of the State. Until we have the completed report from that investigation by those two prominent and experienced people, the Government will not take any decision to alter the existing policy of the bank in relation to provision of services.

Dr. EASTICK: Regarding loans to producers, has any of the assistance given to organisations resulted from difficulties associated with devaluation or the alteration in tariffs? Were the organisations in financial difficulty as a direct result of Commonwealth Government action; if they were, can the Treasurer give members details of the criteria used for determining which industries received assistance and which industries failed to receive assistance? Not all of the organisations that applied for assistance in connection with loans to producers were accommodated.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will inquire for the honourable member, but I do not remember such an application.

Line passed.

Highways and Local Government, \$4 475 000.

Dr. TONKIN: In 1974-75 the estimated payments for roads and bridges amounted to \$1 000 000, but actual payments were nil. The proposed payments for roads and bridges in 1975-76 are nil, while the estimated repayments amount to \$1 000 000, and there is therefore a credit of \$1 000 000 under the heading "Proposed net payments". In the detailed explanation, there is no mention whatever of roads and bridges. Can the Minister of Transport give details of those transactions, and can he give the reason for the credit?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): The sum of \$1 000 000 was made available to keep the Highways Department in funds for continuing projects; that sum is no longer required.

Dr. TONKIN: To what extent does this proposed programme of expenditure depend on funds being made available from the Commonwealth Government? Will Commonwealth Government funds be an essential part of the Loan programme, or will the State programme stand by itself?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There are two pieces of legislation in the Commonwealth area, the National Roads Act and the Roads Grants Act, under which funds are provided for the States, as determined in the schedule. These funds were supplemented during 1974-75, and in the Commonwealth Budget announced last Tuesday they were further supplemented from South Australia's viewpoint to the extent of about \$5 800 000.

Dr. Tonkin: Was that as much as you expected?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We hoped we would get \$6 000 000. As I told the member for Gouger this afternoon, we have been able to rearrange our programme in such a way that, although it will be tight, we will be able to live within the situation.

Mr. RUSSACK: It would appear that some money made available for work on the Eyre Highway last year was not used, because a credit of \$1 000 000 is shown. What has happened to that sum?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The moneys for the Eyre Highway were included in the national roads programme. We were awaiting the passage of the legislation through the Commonwealth Parliament before moneys could be made available.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I refer to the allocation for public parks. One of the problems that other members and I have found in our districts is that, when a council wishes to purchase land for parks, it finds that Government funds have dried up and it has no real indication whether the purchase of land it wishes to make will be subsidised. This happened in relation to the Tanunda District Council. Although the land that council wished to buy was available, it was told that the fund had dried up. Had the council not purchased the land, it could have lost the chance to do so. The Minister at that time undertook to investigate the matter to see whether some way of rationalising the granting of funds to local government could be conceived so that councils would be able to plan. Then, when land became available, councils would be able to make firm decisions on the basis that grant money would be made available from the Government. Will the Minister say whether his department has found a solution to this problem so that councils will be in a better position to decide whether or not they can purchase properties? Will he also ascertain whether a decision can be made by the Government at the appropriate time?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Government is delighted with certain aspects relating to public parks, although with other aspects it is not so pleased. When the Government came into office, money was available in the Public Parks Fund but it could not induce local government to take it up. As a result, the provision was extended so that a 50 per cent subsidy was available from the fund for the development of land. This was done to get local government interested in the matter. That has been a signal success and, when the Revenue Budget is brought down, the honourable member will see that the allocation in the Loan Estimates will be supplemented considerably. Therefore, the problem to which the honourable member has referred will, at least in part, be solved. I do not think we will ever be able fully to solve the problem. However, the Government is adequately meeting the situation, and rarely must it say to local government that it ought not to proceed because funds cannot be made available in the reasonably near future.

Mr. EVANS: Does the Minister have in front of him specific details of how the \$250 000 was used last year? To which councils, and for what projects, was it allocated? This is of interest to me, as I have already raised with the Minister the matter of some land at Coromandel Valley. This land is on the boundary of the Meadows and Mitcham councils, and the local councils seem reluctant to acquire it. Is this an area in which the Minister could perhaps lean on councils to see whether they would co-operate in acquiring that land through this fund? If I knew how the \$250 000 was spent last year, I would have some idea whether that project could be considered in relation to this fund.

Mr. COUMBE: I seek some information regarding the south-western suburbs drainage scheme, work on which has been continuing for eight to 10 years and must surely be nearing completion. The sum of \$75 000 has been set aside for this purpose, and there is a credit of

\$70 000, leaving \$5 000, which is, I assume, for minor works. Will the Minister tell the Committee what stage this project has reached? It does, after all, encompass many metropolitan councils and it is a major work.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Some of the councils it does not embrace are those of Prospect and Walkerville. As the member for Torrens has said, the south-western suburbs drainage scheme is now in its closing stages. However, I am not sure whether it will be completed this year. Work at present being undertaken includes final works on the Patawalonga Basin and drain No. 1. Hopefully, that work will be completed this year, although there may be some carry-over into the next year. I will obtain more specific details for the honourable member.

Dr. EASTICK: Does the Government consider that a series of park acquisitions by various departments would be as beneficial and efficient as it would be if all acquisitions were controlled by one authority? The Minister for the Environment, having a major role to play in this matter, would have officers with certain expertise, and it seems to me that there may be an opportunity to have one officer better employed than to have various officers employed on a part-time basis. Has this matter been considered?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That the Government has retained the two areas of public parks and national parks in separate portfolios and not combined them is a clear indication of its attitude on this matter. We believe the scheme is working admirably at present. Of course, some problems arise from time to time. As the member for Kavel said earlier, there are occasions when the reservoir of money is a little low in relation to the demand for public parks, but this applies equally to the national parks area. The Government has examined this matter a couple of times and does not see any advantage in changing the situation.

Mr. MATHWIN: I seek information similar to that sought by the member for Torrens regarding the south-western suburbs drainage scheme. Surely, the Minister would know whether there is a winding-down of the scheme. In 1973-74, estimated payments were \$900 000; in 1974-75, the allocation was \$450 000; and in 1975-76 it is only \$75 000. If one couples that with inflation and all the other nasty things about which we speak from time to time, one can see how much the allocation has been reduced in two years. Either the scheme is nearly completed or not much work will be done on it this year.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I ask the member for Glenelg to read the reply I gave the member for Torrens and, if he does, he will realise that I said that I will get the details for him and, when I do, I will provide the honourable member with a copy.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Concerning public parks, are funds being made available for the purchase of land as a public or recreation reserve in the Woodville council area? I refer to an area of sand dunes at West Beach. I understand the Commonwealth Government has provided a grant of about \$250 000 for this purpose. If an allocation has been made, how much is it?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: So far as I am aware, the area to which the honourable member has referred involves the Minister for the Environment, who handles matters dealing with coast protection, and I will refer the matter to him.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Concerning subsidies for the purchase of land by district councils, I understood from the

Minister's earlier reply that money would be available and that there would be plenty of money to go around.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I hesitate to endorse the phrase "plenty of money to go around". There will be money available in the Revenue Budget which, in addition to moneys allocated in the Loan Estimates, will be a reasonable amount to go around, taking all the other competing matters into account.

Mr. RUSSACK: Concerning roads and bridges, a credit of \$1 000 000 is shown. Does that mean that if necessary the Government can still use that sum? Why is it shown?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I understand that that sum has been advanced for the purposes of roads and bridges which are to be met as funds become available from other sources and, as such, then become a credit to the Loan programme.

Line passed.

Lands, Irrigation and Drainage, \$5 300 000.

Mr. ARNOLD: The Treasurer stated that \$275 000 would be spent on an aerial survey aircraft. Last February, I introduced a deputation to the Treasurer from the River Industries Liaison Committee concerning problems involving the Lands Department, Engineering and Water Supply Department, and the Agriculture Department, all of which required aerial surveys of the Murray River and adjacent horticultural and irrigation areas. All three departments required their own aerial surveys at great cost. It was submitted to the Treasurer that one set of photographs should be taken and made available to the three departments. Will the aircraft made available to the Lands Department also be made readily available to the Agriculture Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): Yes, I think there is sufficient liaison between the departments.

Mr. Arnold: There hasn't been in the past.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member has raised this matter, and I will check to see why that has been the case. Perhaps time was not available, or the Lands Department was not able to do the work for the various other departments. I am certain that treating them as client departments, as I expect it would, it would do the best it could for those departments. For many years the department hired from Trans-Australia Airlines a DC3 with high-powered engines. However, that aeroplane has been put out of service and a committee was established to look at the economics of the situation and to see whether we should hire an aircraft to do the work previously done by the DC3 hired from T.A.A. or whether it would pay the Government to purchase a plane. I believe the cost of the aeroplane would be about \$850 000. Although I am not certain of the make, I know that it is a make of aeroplane that is extremely suitable for the work done by the Lands Department as well as for the work of the various departments it services. Moreover, I believe it can be quickly converted into a normal aircraft, if the need arises, and rapidly put back into service for use as a survey aircraft. I will follow up the points raised by the honourable member and find out whether there is a break-down in the area to which he has referred and, if this is the case, I will see what can be done to remedy the situation.

Mr. ARNOLD: Following the deputation, I believe the Treasurer took up the matter. We asked that he co-ordinate the work of the three departments concerned. Will photographs be made available to other organisations that need such material?

Mr. RODDA: Will the most sophisticated survey equipment be installed in the aircraft and will the department be undertaking marine surveys, similar to those undertaken in some overseas countries?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not aware that the department intends to use the aircraft for marine surveys. Such surveys fall into a special category, and I believe that the department has sufficient work for the aircraft, when weather permits, to keep it busy undertaking normal survey work in which the department is currently engaged. However, I will put the question to the department and let the honourable member know whether there is any likelihood of that happening.

Mr. ARNOLD: The sum of \$3 700 000 provided for "Irrigation and Reclamation of Swamp Lands" is an increase of about \$1 000 000 over the sum spent last year. The Treasurer indicated that most of this increase would be spent on the rehabilitation of the irrigation distribution system at Waikerie. Can the Minister of Transport indicate accurately when it is expected that the new system in the Waikerie area will be completed? In addition, can he indicate when the Berri distribution system, which is being rebuilt, will be completed and what is the estimated expenditure on that system?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): I will get that information as quickly as possible for the honourable member.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Regarding use of the survey aircraft previously referred to by the members for Chaffey and Victoria, can the Minister say what has been the situation in the past?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will get the information for the honourable member as quickly as I can.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport) moved: That the House do now adjourn.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I rise to draw attention to a matter that was discussed briefly this afternoon concerning the position of hospitals under Medibank. On the opening day of this Parliament in another place the Minister of Health indicated in reply to a question asked of him that hospitals at Keith and Kapunda were the only two hospitals that had failed to be recognised for the purposes of Medibank and that they would therefore be considered as private hospitals. These hospitals, like all other hospitals in the State, received many documents from various Health Department officers in which they were asked to consider their position as regards providing Medibank services.

A major issue in applying to be a recognised hospital is that a hospital must indicate to the Health Department that medical practitioners are available to provide Medibank care in that hospital. It was clearly indicated in the documents that it was necessary for hospitals to show that they could fulfil the requirements of a recognised hospital. Certainly in the case of Kapunda, and I believe in the case of Keith, the hospital board was completely correct in indicating that, although the position was clear and the board was willing to apply to have the hospital recognised, it had been told by the medical practitioners involved that they would not make their services available for the treatment of Medibank patients in those hospitals.

The hospital board, having notified the Health Department about this matter, realised that the hospital would not get recognised hospital status and would be considered as a private hospital, thereby losing funds that were available

to subsidised hospitals from the Government. More importantly, the hospital would lose the subsidy made available to recognised subsidised hospitals by local councils. The sum involved in the case of Kapunda Hospital was about \$2 000 from the Kapunda council and about \$100 from the Freeling council. Many other hospitals that applied to the Health Department to be recognised under the Medibank scheme did so with the full knowledge that medical practitioners in the area would not provide services.

Indeed, in Gawler, and in the Elizabeth area associated with the Lyell McEwin Hospital, as well as at Angaston and other hospitals, medical practitioners have persisted in their attitude of not providing the type of service required under Medibank. Notwithstanding the inability of hospital boards to fulfil Medibank requirements, those hospitals are enjoying the status of recognised hospitals, and are in line to receive subsidies from the Health Department and also from councils. It was indicated that it was intended that all facets of recognition would need to be completed in the first two months of the current financial year and that any hospital that did not fulfil all the requirements of a recognised hospital would lose its benefits as from September 1 this year. However, we now find that the Health Department has failed to appreciate that the medical profession has not been willing to provide the services in question, and for good reason: the date on which the hospitals concerned would lose any benefits has been extended beyond September 1. A letter written by the Secretary of the Board of the Blyth District Hospital clearly crystallises the situation. The letter states:

1. It is reiterated that, whilst the board was desirous that the hospital should become recognised, it appeared unlikely that agreement with the doctor could be reached regarding the billing for medical service of hospital service patients. This situation remains unchanged.

2. The board respects the stand taken by the doctor and, as previously stated, "is not prepared to apply any pressure at all on the doctor to have him agree to Medibank terms".

3. The board disagrees that it should be the negotiating body to have the doctor accept the terms of Medibank.

With that I am fully in agreement. The letter continues:

4. Following the stand taken by many other doctors in country subsidised hospitals, the doctor here has resigned as Medical Officer to the board. The board has given him the right to use the hospital for the treatment of his private patients.

5. It appears now that this hospital is in breach of the arrangement made between your department and the Australian Government in that we cannot supply a full hospital and medical service to hospital patients. (Doctor is prepared to care for all hospital patients for a limited time).

6. It is understood that most other country subsidised hospitals are faced with a similar situation and it would appear that there is no hope of the problem that now confronts us being resolved.

7. In recent newspaper articles you have referred to a pending confrontation over this matter with the doctors. This letter was directed to the Director-General of Medical Services. It continues:

8. It is the utmost desire of the board that the people of this district should receive the best possible standard of medical and hospital care. We also require that this hospital continues to function as a hospital that can provide all medical, surgical and hospital care without prejudice for the good of the people of the area. With the present uncertainties and indecisions, the "waiting to see what may happen" attitude at present prevailing it seems that the aims of the hospital are not being achieved.

9. The board feels that it should advise the residents of the area to maintain their private health insurance to the top limits as the future of all country subsidised hospitals appears uncertain.

10. It is felt by the board that this matter must be resolved immediately, that we cannot afford to procrastinate any longer otherwise the whole hospital and health

system could break down, that the confrontation you refer to should now occur, and the whole matter be satisfactorily resolved, otherwise this hospital and probably many other hospitals may find that we do not have a doctor to care for the sick.

That letter from the Blyth Hospital has been circulated to other country subsidised hospitals. It is a reasoned approach to a difficult situation that will be to the disadvantage of many South Australian people. It is all very well for the Director-General and the Minister to huff and puff about what they will do. It is all very well for the people involved at Government level to try to use their dictatorial powers to force people who provide their services *gratis* to comply with the demands of the Government. I have a letter registered with the Minister of Health seeking information on the position of the Kapunda Hospital, in particular. It has been in his hands for almost three weeks, but there is no clear indication that the Minister recognises the impossible position in which that hospital has been placed. Being truthful and being factual in reply has caused it to lose funds from a traditional source. I believe the matter requires urgent attention.

Mr. WHITTEN (Price): It grieves me to hear our Opposition with its total lack of appreciation and its disregard for what has been done in the short life of the Australian Labor Government. In the short time in which that Government has been in power—

Mr. Evans: It has ruined Australia.

Mr. WHITTEN: If the honourable member spoke a little louder I could hear him. I am an ordinary joker, a boilermaker for many years, and perhaps I do not hear interjections quite as well as I should. It upsets me that all our opponents can think of is knocking, without any regard for what has been done for the people. For many years the Australian Labor Party has advocated policies that are good for people, not for the few who are born with a silver spoon in their mouth.

Mr. Coumbe: I think it has suffered from self-inflicted wounds.

Mr. WHITTEN: Despite what the honourable member may think, in the 23 years before the Australian Labor Party came to office in the Commonwealth Parliament, there had been a total disregard for people. In a short time, pensions alone have been increased from \$20 to \$38.75.

Mr. Arnold: And what has the inflation rate been? It's 100 per cent, isn't it?

Mr. WHITTEN: On the figures that I have, the inflation rate from December, 1972, to December, 1974, was 31.6 per cent, while the increase in pension rates in those two years has been 80 per cent, so that gives the lie to what members opposite say about inflation. Under a Liberal Government, supporting mothers received nothing.

Mr. Coumbe: Are you talking about something that has to do with this Parliament?

Mr. WHITTEN: It could have. Under Liberal Governments, the area that I represent, part of Port Adelaide, was neglected for 23 years. Nothing was done in Port Adelaide, but much has been done in the past two years.

Mr. Evans: They nearly had a shopping centre at Queenstown, didn't they?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WHITTEN: In the District of Price, social workers have been made available to general practitioners. That is something that our opponents would never do. Two

dental clinics have been established, one at Pennington and one at Ethelton, and they will benefit the ordinary schoolchildren, who have been so neglected in the past. In the past two years \$500 000 has been made available to the Port Adelaide and Woodville councils.

Mr. Evans: How is the Spastic Centre at Woodville going?

Mr. WHITTEN: Unfortunately, the member for Eyre is not in the Chamber this evening: he admitted that Labor Governments were spending large sums of money.

Mr. Mathwin: They're collecting large sums too, aren't they?

Mr. WHITTEN: Why not? They are taking it from those who have the ability to pay, as the member for Eyre said one evening recently.

Mr. Mathwin: Make the rich pay!

Mr. WHITTEN: Why not? One evening last week the member for Eyre was grieving about the poor widow that had to pay \$50 000 in succession duties. What about the poor old worker? If he had one-quarter of that amount in assets, he would think himself very lucky. How do people who have to pay \$50 000 in succession duties collect property to such a value? Probably, during the depression years, when they have had a man, wife, and two or three children working for them, they paid them 10 bob a week and keep. That is how those people amassed those assets.

Mr. Wells: The workers were on bread and dripping.

Mr. WHITTEN: They got the dripping if they were lucky. The policy of the A.L.P. always has been to look after ordinary people, not people like the member for Hanson. Because of Medibank, people who could not get well because they were worrying about the debts they would have will now have no more worries. Also, every family has been saved at least \$60 a year in contributions to private funds. Not only have unemployment benefits from the Australian Labor Government increased from \$17 to \$38.75 for a single person, but many people who previously had been starving and begging for a little bit of crust were able to get some work under the Regional Employment Development scheme. Some of the people represented by members opposite have not done very much work, and they have got their assets by investing money, to the detriment of ordinary people.

Mr. Wells: And by exploiting the workers.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WHITTEN: That is all by exploitation, and no other way. It grieves me that there is a total lack of appreciation of what has been done for people by the Australian Labor Party in the short time it has been in Government. Not once in the time I have been in this House have I heard expressions of appreciation from people from the Upper Murray areas, those self-employed workers who work hard for not much better than wages, who believe they are two-bob capitalists, and who would never vote Labor unless they wanted to get rid of a crook member they have had. They realise what a good go they get from the Australian Labor Government. They will toss out those people who have been in office under false pretences. The Opposition, in the time I have been here, has never appreciated what has been done for the people of Australia and the people of South Australia.

Mr. ABBOTT (Spence): I take this opportunity to talk about the inadequacies and the lack of proper superannuation and retirement benefit plans for wage-earning employees in private industry. Of course, in many industries there are no superannuation schemes or pension benefits of any kind;

there is nothing to provide employees with a foundation on which to prepare for their retirement. On the other hand, many employers regard long service leave as a payment and an excellent start for a worker's future years of retirement. This is totally wrong and cannot be accepted, because long service leave is what it is: it is an award entitlement and must not be regarded as a payment for any worker to prepare for his or her retirement.

Before explaining some of the inadequacies and the lack of superannuation benefits to workers in private industry, I want to commend and congratulate the South Australian Government on implementing the Superannuation Act, 1974. I have spoken to many Government employees, who say it is the best Superannuation Act for weekly paid workers in the whole Commonwealth. If it can be done for these workers, surely it can be done for all workers. The existing superannuation schemes in the automotive industry were introduced when age pensions were means tested, but it is now a well-known fact that it is the object of both major political Parties to remove the means test and provide age pensions as of right. The Federal Labor Government is committed to increasing the age pensions to 25 per cent of male earnings. However, the age pension is not sufficient for retirement, and it remains for all industries to provide a pension scheme that will free employees from the fear that long retirement may bring financial problems.

The schemes provided by the major automotive companies are totally inadequate for this purpose. Their first major defect is that the companies offer non-contributory schemes to their employees which are, in fact, non-contributory—but only by the company. These non-contributory schemes are funded by the interest earnings from the contributory section of the company schemes. There is also ample scope for the companies to utilise their employees' contributions to the companies' own profit. The amounts payable to employees at retirement are paltry in today's economic environment and do not provide a suitable basis for retirement. The schemes are old, and inflation was overlooked when they were initiated. An industry-wide superannuation scheme is to be desired which covers all companies with uniform contribution rates and benefits.

Mr. Mathwin: This will look good in a rank and file publication next week.

Mr. ABBOTT: If it makes the honourable member happy to think that, I hope he continues to think that, because I would hate to see him looking sadder than he now looks. An industry-wide superannuation scheme is to be desired which covers all companies with uniform contribution rates and benefits. This would allow maximum labour mobility between firms and corresponding portability of superannuation rights. However, this concept would more than likely be rejected by individual companies because of their competitive environment, especially as the main purpose of existing schemes appears to be to reduce employee turnover within each company, and for no other purpose. Chrysler's contributory scheme was introduced in 1950, and a non-contributory scheme was added in January, 1973. Under the non-contributory section, provided 10 years or more of credited service is completed at normal retiring age, the benefit at retirement or death is \$150 for each year of credited service, provided at least 10 years has been served and subject to a maximum of \$6 000. The benefit prior to retirement or death is nil.

Under the contributory section, based on a two-for-one formula, which a worker can join only after three years service, the benefit at retirement or death is the company

contributions plus interest, or \$150 for each year of service up to a maximum of \$6 000. I know of no worker who has qualified for the maximum. The benefit prior to retirement or death under the contributory section is the employee contributions plus 25 per cent, no matter whether a worker has served continually for 40 years or 50 years.

Let us take the case of Joe Bloggs at Chrysler's. Joe Bloggs has 20 years of service and for personal reasons desires to leave the company. He receives back only his own contributions plus 25 per cent. In other words, he receives \$364 plus \$91, making \$455. On his contributions the trust would have earned 10 per cent annum compounded clear of administrative expenses, which would amount to \$291—or \$200 clear profit out of Joe Bloggs' contributions. This money is used presumably to pay what the company calls non-contributory amounts to retiring employees. The situation is practically the same with the contributory and non-contributory schemes operating at General Motors-Holden's. It is clear from this that an employee would receive a much better dividend if he was to invest his money outside the fund. At least he would earn the flat 25 per cent in 2·8 years with a building society, for example.

The most obnoxious feature of the scheme is that people who are on the contributory scheme and leave before retirement are subsidising the payments made by the company which are called non-contributory. That is, in fact, a fallacy. The same inadequacies apply to the General Motors-Holden's pension plan, and it is conceivable that, based on high labour turn-over, these companies are actually profiting out of the schemes while the workers think they are getting something for nothing.

I think we should encourage the development of schemes by which employees will receive, on retirement, a lump sum equivalent to 60 per cent of their average weekly earnings based on their last five years of service and contributed to by the companies on a two-to-one basis. We should also include in the provisions adequate cover for the surviving spouse in case of death of the employee, protection against invalidity, and improvements where employees resign after a long period of service or are retrenched. Finally, union participation should be established in the control and operation of these schemes.

Motion carried.

At 10.13 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 27, at 2 p.m.