

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.**

Wednesday, August 26, 1964.

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

**QUESTIONS.****WALLAROO MINES SCHOOL.**

Mr. HUGHES: In the list of new school buildings to be commenced in 1964-65, three prefabricated modular types of school are to be erected as an experiment at a cost of £139,000. As the school proposed for Wallaroo Mines is one of the three mentioned, will the Minister say what material will be used and what the method of construction of the school will be?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: After much experimentation, the Public Buildings Department has evolved an entirely new type of school called a "demountable". Perhaps I could best describe it as a cross between the solid construction and the prefabricated type of building. Although it will be cheap compared with the solid construction buildings, it has novel features which I have not seen in any of the other States or even in Canberra. I am sure this method will prove a great success. Such a building can be used in the hottest climates, because there will be a modified type of air-conditioning as well as other modern improvements. I am sure the honourable member and his constituents will be delighted when they see this new school.

**SOLITARY CONFINEMENT.**

Mr. SHANNON: I was disturbed yesterday to hear the Leader of the Opposition direct a question to the Premier relating to a case heard at Yatala concerning penalties imposed on a prisoner who had attacked a warder. I made it my business to obtain certain information. The offence committed by the prisoner seems to have been anything but what might be called a simpler type of offence. On the contrary, it was a grave offence, and I ask the Premier to inquire regarding the offence for which this prisoner was sentenced to solitary confinement. What powers are vested in visiting justices of the peace to take appropriate measures to protect the life and limb of warders employed in our prisons? It seems to me that if our warders are to be subjected to assault without having any redress we shall soon be very short of warders. Will the Premier comment on this matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I promised the Leader yesterday that I would obtain a report. I am now in the course of getting that report, and I will see that it refers to the further matters raised by the honourable member.

**WATER CONSERVATION.**

Mr. LAUCKE: As water supplies in South Australia will ultimately determine the maximum degree of development the State will be able to achieve, it is essential that our children be made cognizant of the importance of water conservation. To amplify my question I quote from a pamphlet issued by the Water Research Foundation of Australia:

Development of the vast continent of Australia is dependent on water perhaps more than on any other single thing. Australia is given an average rainfall of only 16.5 inches a year, compared with Europe's average of 23.4 inches, U.S.A. 29 inches, and South America's 53.1 inches. If you average our rainfall over the total land surface of Australia it is only one and one-third inches a year, in the United States of America it is 9 inches, and the average of all the world's land surfaces is 9½ inches. Just those few figures show how severely Australia's developmental potential is handicapped by the limitations of our natural rainfall. The diligence and imagination with which we attack the problems of conserving and using—

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member had better ask his question.

Mr. LAUCKE: Very well, Sir. This quotation indicates the need for our younger generation to be fully aware of this nation's problem. Can the Minister of Education say whether consideration has been or will be given to including studies in our school curricula of the vital importance of water to the nation's welfare so that the rising generation may be aware of the nation's major problem?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be very pleased indeed to favourably consider the honourable member's suggestions and requests, because I consider that we are so fortunately placed in South Australia with our splendid system of water reticulation (which is not excelled by any other State in Australia) that we become complacent about the matter. Not only the younger generation but the older generation, including myself, could well be taught that water conservation is needed. I think that a suitable form of lesson could be devised for use in our schools (at least in all our departmental schools) and I am indebted to the honourable member for the suggestion, which I shall take up in ample time for the ensuing hot weather.

## WIRRABARA POLICE STATION.

Mr. HEASLIP: Three years ago the police station at Wirrabara was condemned and the police officer transferred to Laura. I was given to understand that a new building would be erected at an estimated cost of about £18,000 and a police officer again stationed in the town. On inspecting the existing building, I find that all the walls are solid. Will the Minister of Works obtain a further report from the Public Buildings Department on whether the existing building could not be put into a satisfactory habitable condition at a much lower cost than the estimate for the new building?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I shall be pleased to do that. I should like to know from the honourable member whether it is proposed that a courthouse as well as a police station should be part of the building.

Mr. Heaslip: Yes.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will inquire and obtain up-to-date information on the cost of the restoration of this building.

## FIRE BANS.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether, with the modern methods employed by the Bureau of Meteorology, the bureau could issue a fire ban on the eve of the day on which a ban is to be applied so that country people wishing to carry out burning might know the position earlier?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: There is already much trouble with the present early morning forecasts of fire bans and I am afraid that, if we tried to give the warning on the night before, even more trouble would arise. However, I do not wish to imply that the suggestion is not worthwhile. I can discuss with the Deputy Director of the Bureau of Meteorology the possibility of a warning being given about the likelihood of a ban. I know that there are spells of dangerous weather and that the present system might be improved without announcing the ban earlier. At present the first notification of a ban is given at about 7.14 a.m., which is generally early enough to enable most people to make their arrangements. However, it would be convenient for them to have additional advance information, albeit not a definite ban, and I will examine, with the Deputy Director, the possibility of an overnight warning.

## METROPOLITAN DRAINAGE.

Mr. COUMBE: Some time ago the Premier and the Minister of Roads invited councils in the metropolitan area to meet them and confer

on the possibility of a co-ordinated plan for metropolitan drainage, and that meeting was held. Can the Premier say whether he and the Minister of Roads have again met the councils, and whether a policy has been determined? Can he tell the House about legislation that may be introduced as a result of the meetings?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: After conferring with me on this matter, the councils had a further meeting at the Adelaide Town Hall and another meeting at which the councils passed resolutions. The Mayor of Burnside, who chaired the second meeting, interviewed me and asked whether the councils had the right to submit their own proposals about the working of the proposed board and I assured him that that was the intention of the Government. As far as I know, the councils are at present drawing up detailed plans for regional committees regarding drainage and I expect that their proposals will be in a suitable form and that the Parliamentary Draftsman will be able to consider them before Parliament re-assembles after show week. I believe that all councils, except the Adelaide City Council, have expressed approval of the proposals and that the matter is proceeding smoothly.

## CROP SOWING.

Mr. McANANEY: This year an area of many thousands of acres in the sandy areas of the State has been swept with wind, and is now being re-sown, or has been re-sown, by the recommended practice of leaving it rough, which is the usual procedure. However, I have seen instances this year where seed has been culti-packed into the sandy places and has been re-established, whereas seed which is left loose in paddocks alongside is still being blown. Will the Minister of Agriculture ask his departmental officers to inquire into this practice?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes. I assure the honourable member that departmental officers appreciate all types of seedings that are likely to blow. Probably it is true that culti-packed seedings can resist blowing in some circumstances, whereas in other cases seedings left rough will be better than rolled seeding. It depends largely on soil types. I will obtain a considered statement from the Soil Conservator and let the honourable member have it.

## TOWN PLANNING ACT.

Mr. COUMBE: Amendments to the Town Planning Act were passed last session providing for regulation-making powers to be instituted. In view of the interest created in

Adelaide this week by a town planning conference, can the Premier say what progress has been made in preparing these regulations?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As far as I know, disappointing progress has been made. I do not remember any recommendations concerning regulations. I will inquire, but I know that many background matters had to be considered before recommendations could be made. That is probably the reason for the delay.

#### TUBED BUTTER.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: On August 20, an article appeared in the *Financial Review* headed "Army Gets First Tubed Butter", which states:

Butter in aluminium tubes, for squeezing out like toothpaste, is one of the latest encouraging moves in the dairying industry's energetic efforts to expand market outlets for its product at home and abroad . . .

Has the Minister of Agriculture any knowledge of tubed butter research being undertaken in South Australia?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: No, but I shall inquire and get a report for the honourable member.

#### THE BUDGET.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Does the Premier intend to introduce the Budget before the Royal Show adjournment?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, next Tuesday. The Budget Papers, which are now completed and being printed, will be available to honourable members on Tuesday. It is not intended to debate the Budget until after show week, because I do not think the Auditor-General's Report will be available until the House re-assembles after the show adjournment.

#### DRAINAGE.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): I move:

That a Select Committee of the House be appointed—(a) to inquire and recommend what works should be undertaken to provide effective drainage by First and Second Creeks in the eastern suburbs of Adelaide and the North Unley Creek in the southern suburbs, and to prevent flooding in the vicinity of the said creeks; (b) to make recommendations as to the means of carrying out such works, the estimated cost of the same, and by whom and in what proportions the cost should be borne; and (c) to make recommendations as to the responsibility for the maintenance of the said creeks thereafter.

This motion arises from a problem existing in the area of the member for Unley (Mr.

Langley) and in my area. At this stage I will confine my remarks to the problem particularly in my own area. Two main creeks run through the Norwood area: First and Second Creeks run for most of their length in the Norwood council area through private property. They cross roads, but for the most part they are the property of private residents. They have been subject to flooding for some years and, indeed, just after the Second World War the flooding in the St. Peters council area, into which Second Creek runs, became so great that it was plain that the outlet of Second Creek to the Torrens was inadequate to carry the water coming down the creeks. After investigation, an agreement was made between the various councils through whose area the creeks ran. Some councils in the eastern suburbs were parties to an agreement that certain improvements be made to Second Creek from the edge of the St. Peters council district to the Torrens River.

All councils concerned were to contribute towards this cost, because they were all contributing water to the outlet. The proposed costs were fixed as between the councils, and an estimate of the cost of the works was obtained. However, unfortunately, the work did not proceed and the problem, after some period, became considerably worse and residents in the area have been subjected to periodic flooding. Later, the various councils were asked to meet the Highways Commissioner and to undertake the original proposal for widening and straightening Second Creek. Unfortunately, agreement at that stage could not be reached between the councils. The cost of the proposal by this time had grown apace: it was many times the original estimated cost. The Kensington and Norwood council, particularly, was not satisfied with the estimated cost, nor was it satisfied with the sum stated in the original agreement as to its contribution to the work, because it considered that, in the meantime, building had taken place in the Burnside council area, which was now contributing much water to the floods in Second Creek. Agreement could not be reached, although negotiations proceeded.

In the meantime last summer's flash rains brought severe floods in both First and Second Creeks. Prior to the summer, I had sought that all councils in the area might meet and inspect the two creeks and see whether agreement could be reached between them as to the work to be done on the creeks and as to who was to accept responsibility for that work.

However, the Kensington and Norwood council, although I received helpful response

from the other councils, adamantly refused to meet me to discuss the matter or to inspect the creeks. At the time of the flash rains that occurred in the summer of this year, severe flooding in the Norwood council area occurred. Thousands of pounds worth of damage was caused to private property in that area, and residents were moved to sign a petition that I presented to the House earlier this year. I believe that some hope exists that negotiations can be successfully concluded on the widening and straightening of Second Creek in the St. Peters council area, and that this may do something to alleviate flooding higher up the creeks. However, the problem in the Norwood council area remains. The creeks for the most part are not walled and reeds are encouraged to grow in order to conserve the banks. The quantity of water now flowing down these creeks must be far greater than that normally borne down those creeks when they were originally formed by nature.

They have become a public drainage system for the eastern suburbs. Under these circumstances it seems to me most unjust that the private persons, through whose property these creeks pass, should be required to maintain a public drainage system, but that is what is being required of them at present. The Kensington and Norwood council, despite a different view taken by other councils in the eastern suburbs in relation to these creeks, has insisted that the private persons through whose properties these creeks pass shall maintain the creeks; that they shall remove silt and debris from the creeks; that they shall maintain the creek walls; and that they shall do such works as the council demands of them by notice under section 643 of the Local Government Act, to clear the creeks. That council has demanded in some cases that the reeds be removed from the banks, with the obvious result that portions of some properties will be swept away, because the banks will not be able to hold the water. I believe it is necessary, for the protection of the residents of my area, that public responsibility for these creeks be assumed and that work be done urgently to widen and deepen the creeks and to erect creek walls; otherwise, numbers of residents with valuable properties in my district will be subjected to periodic severe damage, as they have been during the summer of this year.

A similar problem exists in the district represented by the member for Unley where, as he will tell the House later in this debate, people have periodically suffered severe damage,

because there has been a flooding of the North Unley Creek, the same as the flooding of First and Second Creeks. So far, despite continued representations from citizens in the eastern suburbs and from me, I have not been able to get agreement on this score. However, I was interested in the reply the Premier gave the member for Torrens earlier this afternoon concerning a metropolitan drainage authority. I have been unable so far to discover whether the Kensington and Norwood council, in agreeing to the creation of such an authority, is prepared to submit a proposal concerning these creeks within its area. I do not know whether these creeks will be adequately covered by public responsibility under the authority. If it were the case that the creeks could be adequately covered in this way, then I would see no reason to proceed with this motion, but, unless they are to be covered, it is necessary for us to proceed because relief must be obtained urgently for those people who have been so severely damaged already within my district.

Because that information may be vital to the further proceedings on this motion, and so that I may obtain further information on the subject, I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### FLUORIDATION.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That in the interests of dental health, a Select Committee of this House be appointed to inquire into and report upon the desirability of adding fluoride to the water supplies of the State.

The aim of this motion is to enable a Select Committee to inquire whether South Australia should consider adding fluoride to its water supplies—fluoridation, as it is normally called. The motion does not express either support of or opposition to fluoridation: it merely seeks an inquiry into the pros and cons of the whole question, and to this I hope there can be no objection. Whatever one's personal opinion may be, I concede that opinions on this matter differ, but surely no-one can object to the matter being examined and its merits and demerits weighed. Indeed, I believe strongly that that is the function of Parliament. Fluoridation has been for a long time a matter of controversy. On the one hand its benefits seem to be obvious, and on the other hand opposition to it is fanatical. It has become a political hot potato. However, this is no reason why we as members should ignore the issue. We do ourselves less than justice, and the institution of Parliament positive harm,

by refusing to face issues of importance to the community merely because they are difficult or controversial; it is our job to tackle them.

The first part of the motion refers to the interests of dental health. What is the state of dental health in South Australia? Is it such as to call for improvement? I believe that the answer is "yes". I have here an extract, a reprint from the *Australian Dental Journal*, of an article headed "Dental Services in South Australia" and written by Mr. P. C. Reade who is a lecturer in periodontia at the University of Adelaide. I interpolate to say that periodontia means the study of diseases of the gums and surrounding tissues. Mr. Reade has a table headed "The Caries Experience of Groups of the South Australian Population". That table shows that, in the age group one to four years, 87.6 per cent of the 112 children examined had dental decay. In the seven to 14 years range, 99 per cent of the 199 children examined had caries experience (or dental decay), and in the 16 to 27 years age group 100 per cent of the 382 people examined had dental decay. He says that this serves to illustrate the incidence of dental caries. He states:

It can be seen that if the average number of decayed permanent teeth per school child in the age range five to 15 years is four, and there are 205,000 children in this age range in South Australia, then they have as a group 820,000 teeth to be restored. Periodontal diseases were found to be universally present in adults and it was assessed that at least half the schoolchildren examined exhibited the need for orthodontic therapy. Approximately 20 per cent (that is, 40,000) of schoolchildren in this State have orthodontic deformities that require extensive treatment. It is difficult to calculate with any accuracy the number of dentist-hours required to remedy this need. It is obvious, however, that the present dental work force can hardly scratch the surface of the dental disease that exists in our population.

Members may have seen also an account in the *Advertiser* recently of an interim report by Dr. Elizabeth Fanning of the University of Adelaide, as follows:

A total of 2,468 children were originally enrolled in a study which began in April 1964 and will continue for three years. Their average age is 13. The dental caries increment in these children will be determined by annual examinations. A pre-trial examination has already been completed to obtain information on the past caries experience so that the subjects can be placed in comparable groups. This is the important part of the report:

The results of the preliminary examination confirm previous findings that the permanent

teeth of girls have a higher caries experience than boys. Furthermore, in the total sample of 1,215 boys and 1,166 girls, one boy and one girl had complete permanent dentitions free of decay.

In other words, only one boy and one girl out of the total of 2,381 examined did not have teeth decay. Those results are not dissimilar from experience elsewhere. I have here an extract, this time from the *Medical Journal of Australia* of an article entitled "Fluoridation, Basic Dental, Medical and General Aspects" written by M. J. Flynn and N. D. Martin. This is what they say of general dental health in Australia:

Dental caries is the major public health problem in Australia. This problem is not peculiar to Australia, but exists in all countries where living standards, dietic conditions and patterns of eating are similar to those in this country. Studies of the prevalence of dental decay, which have been carried out in Australia on groups of children, have shown that 98.5 per cent of the children in the age group six to 15 years are affected by decay. A recent survey by the Division of Dental Services of the Department of Public Health of a sample of 12,000 New South Wales primary schoolchildren showed that each child had an average of four defective teeth, which needed treatment. Because of the disproportion between the amount of dental treatment which can be provided by the currently available dental personnel and the amount of dental treatment which is needed by all sections of the community, the state of dental health, particularly in the adolescent and child groups, is exceptionally poor. The fact that dental caries is a chronic and progressive disease results in an increasing back log of unfilled teeth as potential sources of ill health and infection.

In Ireland last year there was a High Court case that lasted for 65 days. Mr. Justice Kenny, the presiding judge, on page 8 of his judgment, described the question of dental disease as follows:

Professor Steyn, who came from the Union of South Africa to give evidence for the plaintiff (a person who was challenging fluoridation) dealt with this topic in a very vivid way. He said that the preponderance of evidence showed that fluorine builds up the tooth enamel and makes it caries-resistant. He went on to say that caries is the most serious disease of our civilization, not merely because it causes bad teeth but because bad teeth run down the human system, and he added that it was desirable that modern societies should take steps to deal with the problem of dental caries.

I need only mention the financial effect on the community, the direct cost of treatment and the indirect cost caused through loss of time, to show or to underline the importance of this matter because that cost, direct and indirect, must be very high indeed.

The sad fact is that, as with so many things, we are so used to putting up with dental decay and its consequences that we come to accept it as inevitable, unchangeable and not too bad anyway. We run the danger of losing our will to do anything about it. This is an attitude of mind we must resist.

If our state of dental health is so poor, will fluoridation do anything to improve it? Its proponents say that it will. Children who have been drinking fluoridated water since birth have less than half the number of decayed teeth as those who have not been drinking it. That has been the common experience where studies have been carried out and I intend to quote from the first report of the World Health Organization expert committee on water fluoridation presented in 1958. The report states:

Reports of the results after 10 years of controlled fluoridation in three cities, two in the United States of America and one in Canada, show a remarkable uniformity. The prevalence of dental caries in the permanent teeth of continuously resident children who had used the fluoridated drinking water throughout life was decreased by some 60 per cent, comparison being made either with the findings among their counterparts prior to fluoridation, or with the findings among children in the control cities selected for the separate studies. Dental caries prevalence in the deciduous or primary dentition was similarly reduced; the reduction ranged from 50 per cent to 60 per cent.

That would apply to the milk teeth or first teeth of children. The report continues:

The results obtained in the three studies confirmed the hypothesis that the use of drinking water with 1 p.p.m. fluoride produces identical dental and general effects whether the fluoride occurs naturally or is added by mechanical means. Dental caries experience in the teeth of children born prior to fluoridation was also appreciably reduced. The extent of the reduction among these children, however, was inversely related to their age at the time fluoridation was started. Maximum benefits, equal to those observed in children of communities having naturally occurring and optimum concentrations of fluoride in the drinking water, were found in children born after fluoridation began.

Perhaps I should mention there were seven members of that committee, one from Sweden, who was the chairman, one from England, one from Brazil, one from Switzerland, two from the United States of America, and one from India. The report is available for any member who wishes to check the credentials of the members of the committee. That shows the improvement in the teeth of children, but I point out that the longer the period since the original fluoridation the greater the proportion of the community to receive its benefits.

Fluoridation is the adjustment of the natural level of fluoride in a water supply to the best concentration to prevent tooth decay. Fluoride is, in fact, present in most foods and water supplies. It is essential to life itself, and for my authority for that statement I refer again to the article by Flynn and Martin at page 156, as follows:

While it is obvious that fluorine and its compounds, the fluorides, can be toxic substances, and it is obvious that excessive amounts of fluorides can cause ill effects on plant and animal life, it must also be remembered that fluorine is a naturally occurring element which is universally present in traces in food and water, in vegetables, meat, cereals, fruit, fish, eggs and tea, and which is ingested daily in food. Accordingly, it is a normal constituent of the body, particularly the skeleton and the teeth. Many other elements, such as iodine, iron, copper, zinc and manganese, occur in trace amounts in food, and as in the case of fluorine, in large quantities these elements can produce extremely toxic effects. However, they are essential in very small quantities for the maintenance of life.

Unfortunately fluoride is not naturally present in sufficient concentration in most water supplies in this State to prevent tooth decay. As was mentioned in one of the extracts I have read, the optimum concentration is usually regarded as one part a million.

I have here, by courtesy of the Engineer-in-Chief (Mr. Dridan) a table of the results of the biennial fluoride survey in South Australia. These are the figures of the fluoride present in the various water supplies in South Australia, made up to January, 1964. The lowest fluoride content of .14 parts a million was in the Happy Valley reservoir which was tested on January 14, 1964. For the benefit of the member for Victoria (Mr. Harding) I refer to the Naracoorte bore where No. 1 bore showed 1.3 parts a million—just above the optimum amount. No. 4 bore showed 1.2 parts a million, and No. 2 bore .82 parts a million. I point out that those who take their water supply from those bores are, in fact, drinking just about the optimum amount of fluoride now. The highest reading was at Ulbana where the concentration was 2.2 parts a million, about twice the optimum amount for dental health.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Who wants to drink water, anyway?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Lands, as a wine maker, very properly asks that question, but perhaps not everybody is in the same position as he is.

Mr. Hall: Do you favour fluoridation?

Mr. Riches: This is the first time you have ever supported the appointment of a Select Committee, isn't it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think that at all. May I say, in answer to the member for Gouger, that I hope to be able to make a strong enough case for an investigation of fluoridation: that is all I aim to do. I emphasize that as strongly as I can. I hope that I will give the House sufficient information for members to see that there is a need to investigate the pros and the cons of fluoridation. Those are the figures in South Australia, and I do not think it is necessary to read them all or have them incorporated in *Hansard*.

The SPEAKER: I do not think it is, either.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The list is available if anyone wants to see it. It was provided by courtesy of the Engineer-in-Chief and the figures are authoritative. Fluoridation does not add a foreign substance to the water: it produces a small difference in the concentration already present. I will not go into the pros and cons although drawn by the member for Gouger to do so. The literature on the subject is now enormous and, in any case, that will be the task of the Select Committee I hope will be set up.

I will refer only to five reports favouring fluoridation, indicate the nature of the many arguments put forward against it, and mention some places where fluoridation operates. One of the most authoritative reports was made in 1954 by a South Australian, whom I think all members know and respect, Mr. H. J. N. Hodgson (Engineer for Water and Sewage Treatment). That report was published by the authority of the then Minister of Works (Hon. Sir. Malcolm McIntosh) in December, 1954, and there is a copy of it in the Parliamentary Library. It has a foreword by Mr. Dridan, part of which is as follows:

To the best of my knowledge Mr. Hodgson's report is the most comprehensive and authoritative on the question of fluoridation yet prepared in Australia and it should be a valuable addition to available overseas literature on this subject. Mr. Hodgson has a high reputation as an authority on water treatment and his conclusions and recommendations are commended as worthy of the most earnest consideration by public health and water supply authorities.

I do not propose to read all of Mr. Hodgson's conclusions on the matter, but these are the most relevant of them:

(a) It has been demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt in America that both among children and adults who have been born and brought up in areas where drinking water contains fluoride at a level of one part per million or more there is much less caries than in areas where the water is free of fluoride. In these areas there is some 60 per cent less

caries among children up to 16 years of age, and the evidence is that benefits persist up to 40 years of age and possibly further.

(b) Results from study centres (in both the United States and Canada) indicate that where fluoride has been added to the supply the results parallel those obtained in areas where fluoride occurs naturally and the evidence is conclusive that equal benefits are being obtained.

(c) The weight of professional evidence available supports the contention that an artificially fluoridated water is similar in its action to one containing naturally derived fluoride and there will be the same benefits. At the concentrations used, one part per million, it is the fluoride ion that is important, not the particular salt used.

(d) The risks and the incidence of mottled enamel within the range of fluoride usage are negligible.

(e) There is no substantiated professional evidence available to indicate that there are any health hazards associated with the use of fluoride in drinking water at this concentration (certainly the presence of any hazard has not been proved), and it is significant that some four million people have been living in ordinary good health and under varying climatic and diet conditions in America for many years in areas where the water supply contains fluoride at the level of one part per million or higher.

(f) Except for the incidence of mottled enamel the professional evidence available indicates that much heavier concentrations of fluoride, and even as high as eight parts per million, do not injuriously affect health. This is important as it ensures that with the dosages contemplated a big safety factor is available.

(g) Mechanical application equipment, the technique of application, testing and safety precautions, etc., have been developed in America which ensures that desired doses can be applied with certainty and great accuracy to water supplies in pipelines, channels, at treatment works, reservoirs, etc., and, in fact, in any situation where a reliable metering device can be employed.

That is all that I shall read from the conclusions of our own Engineer for Water and Sewage Treatment. I refer to a document dated November 22, 1963, published by Dr. M. J. Flynn and entitled "The Fluoridation of Public Water Supplies". The report is addressed to the Minister of Health in New South Wales. This report is a Parliamentary Paper of New South Wales and, therefore, is readily available to any members who desire to study it. His conclusions are, in part, as follows:

The shortage of dentists and health educators, and the general apathy of the public about health matters, highlight the need for a simple method of improving resistance to dental decay. All methods of fluoride prophylaxis have some value in controlling dental decay. Fluoridation of water supplies is the best single method of fluoride prophylaxis, and by far the best

method of preventing and reducing dental decay. The evidence of the efficacy, safety, economy and practicality of fluoridation of communal water supplies stands on a firm basis of studies in many countries with naturally and mechanically fluoridated water. There is no controversy about fluoridation among health authorities, although some professional persons and laymen have expressed doubts about the compulsive element.

That is one of the strongest arguments by those in opposition to fluoridation—the compulsive element.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: It appeals to you, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: While I have my own views at present, I hope and believe that I am open to conviction one way or the other after hearing all the evidence.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: You may have an entirely different view then.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Possibly. The report continues:

The extent of dental decay in Sydney and generally throughout New South Wales is such as to warrant fluoridation.

Those are some conclusions in New South Wales as late as November, 1963, and that is a public Parliamentary Paper of January, 1964, in that State. There have been many other investigations and inquiries, and all I have seen have expressed support for fluoridation. In 1957, in New Zealand, a Royal Commission was appointed, consisting of a judge of the Arbitration Court, a professor of bio-chemistry, and a merchant. Their report, to which I think I need not refer in detail, favoured fluoridation, and it has been introduced in various communities in New Zealand. There is permissive legislation in that country for communities to fluoridate their water supplies. It is interesting to note that, in the last couple of weeks, the Privy Council in London has upheld the right of the City of Lower Hut in New Zealand to add fluoride to its water supply. This decision was challenged and went first to the New Zealand Supreme Court, then to the New Zealand Court of Appeal, and finally to the Privy Council, as the final court of appeal from New Zealand. I have already referred to the World Health report to illustrate the benefits in the reduction of dental decay. I desire now to quote only one paragraph from the summary of the report. Paragraph 6, on page 20, states:

Hundreds of controlled fluoridation programmes are now in operation in many countries. Some have been in progress for the past 12 years (this report was published in 1958), so that conclusions are based on experience. No other public health procedure, during the initial stages of its application, has had such a background in time or extent.

The committee's conclusions are as follows:

1. Drinking-water containing about one p.p.m. (part per million) fluoride has a marked caries-preventive action. Maximum benefits are conferred if such water is consumed throughout life.

2. There is no evidence that water containing this concentration of fluoride impairs the general health.

3. Controlled fluoridation of drinking-water is a practicable and effective public health measure.

The last report to which I refer is the United Kingdom report of 1962. Honourable members may recollect that I referred to this report during the Address in Reply debate last year. The conclusions, after studies in the United Kingdom, were to the same effect as the other conclusions that I have read. They are as follows:

1. Five years of fluoridation at a level of one p.p.m. (part per million) in three study areas has brought about in each a substantial improvement in the teeth of young children.

2. The results of fluoridation obtained so far are in line with American experience.

3. No evidence of harm from fluoridation has been discerned despite continuous vigilance.

4. The addition of fluoride to water supplies at a specified level has presented no technical difficulties.

In spite of what I personally believe (and I would be hypocritical if I did not admit at this stage that the great weight of authority is that fluoridation is beneficial), there is still vocal and persistent opposition to fluoridation. Since I gave notice of this motion, I have received eight letters and one telephone call on the subject. Some of those letters are from people whom I know and respect. Others are from people who are unknown to me, and some have been anonymous letters. However, the general drift of the opposition expressed to me has been not only to fluoridation as such but even to investigation of the matter. Mr. Hodgson, in his report, described the American opposition to fluoridation in these terms:

From 1951 onwards organized opposition to fluoridation has grown in America, and in the main has been directed by three groups of people—(a) a group of people holding religious beliefs against taking medicines of any sort, and to which group can be added those whose social philosophy causes them to oppose what they term mass medication without choice by the individual participants; (b) the "crackpot" fringe of the community; (c) certain disgruntled professional men of standing, and to which group can be added a minority of other professional men who are genuinely convinced that the practice would be undesirable but who do not appear to have been able to substantiate their views very adequately at any properly-constituted inquiry.

I think it is fair to say that the opposition in Australia is much the same as that in America, described by Mr. Hodgson in 1954. In 1960, there appeared a booklet entitled *Classification and Appraisal of Objections to Fluoridation* by Kenneth R. Elwell, and Kenneth A. Easlick of the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. This document sets out 150 objections to fluoridation, and all the objections I have seen are contained and discussed in it. It is arranged in eight sections, and I will mention some arguments which I have heard and which are contained in this book.

Mr. Hughes: Why doesn't the honourable member save some of them up for the Select Committee?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am going to mention, not canvass, them to show the type of argument that has been put forward, rightly or wrongly, against fluoridation. The eight headings under which objections fall are: toxicity for animals and human beings; interference with commercial activities utilizing water; expense; problems of engineering control; displacing better methods for administering fluoride; interference with human rights; lack of evidence of value; and other objections. Under the last heading one of the matters is the complaint that dentists and physicians must be profiting from fluoridation or they would not favour it. Within those headings are all the objections I have heard. The Select Committee should be prepared calmly and detachedly to study and evaluate each argument, both pro and con, which is put before it. I have already said that in the Irish High Court last year someone challenged the right of the Irish Republic to fluoridate its water supplies compulsorily. The validity of the legislation was challenged both on the grounds of health and also on constitutional grounds. The hearing lasted for 65 sitting days—

Mr. Jennings: This might, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member will be pleased to know that I have nearly completed my remarks. Expert evidence, both pro and con, was given. This is what Mr. Justice Kenny concluded, after having had both sides of the case presented to him:

Having heard the evidence and read the literature which it was agreed I should read I am satisfied that the fluoridation of public water supplies at a concentration of one part per million will not, in our temperate climate, be dangerous to anybody—old, young, healthy or sick. I am also satisfied that there is no reasonable possibility that it may involve an element of danger or risk to life or health to any of the citizens of this country.

That was his conclusion.

Mr. Shannon: It was not a Constitutional decision, was it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, it was.

Mr. Shannon: Obviously, that was a decision not on the Constitution but on the virtue of fluoride.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the honourable member is interested I shall lend him the judgment, which runs to 26 pages, which deals in detail with the Constitutional aspects arising out of the Irish Republican Constitution, and which canvasses the evidence one way and the other.

Mr. Shannon: I thought that was what you were going to give us.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I could do so, but I do not think it is worth doing now because it involves a consideration of the detailed sections of the Irish Constitution. That is the last report I shall refer to, Mr. Speaker. I point out that in Australia fluoridation is supported by public bodies and professional associations, including the Australian Medical Association, the Australian Dental Association, and the National Health and Medical Research Council, which as late as last year reaffirmed its belief in fluoridation. But, Sir, finally the proof of the pudding is in the eating. I point out that at present in the United States of America more than 44,000,000 people have fluoride added artificially or mechanically to their water supply, and more than 7,000,000 people there have it naturally occurring in the optimum quantities in their water supply.

In summing up, I say that surely the experience abroad is sufficient to at least make out a case for an investigation of fluoridation. That is all that I ask in the motion. No member will be committed to fluoridation by voting for this measure, nor, I point out respectfully, would the House be bound by the report, whether it favours or opposes fluoridation, once it is tabled. It simply ensures that this important question will be examined so that we may be better informed on whether fluoridation would benefit dental health in South Australia and whether or not consideration should be given to introducing it.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I second the motion.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I do not intend to delay the House by discussing this matter for very long. However, I should like to speak briefly on two or three issues, the first being the practicability of adding fluoride to our water supplies. As far as I can see, no great

problem is involved in adding fluoride; all the waters are under the control of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and if it is the desire and wish of the House that fluoride be added to the water, then for a cost of probably £60,000 or £80,000 (and that is purely a guess) it could probably be done. Therefore, I will not say anything on that aspect.

Nor do I intend to say much on the medical aspect. I doubt whether any member could say with any confidence what is the medical effect of using this chemical in our water. We see and hear of all sorts of reports, some for and some against. Strangely enough, South Australia has one area where the natural water supply contains the recommended percentage of fluoride, and that supply has existed for many years. Although statistics of the effect on the teeth of people in that area may show a slight margin in favour of using fluoride, when we analyse the matter further we find that half the children surveyed there use tank water anyhow, so the statistics seem to break down in that respect. Many people in the group surveyed have never used the natural water supply.

People make all sorts of assertions about the benefit of fluoride in water, but I do not claim to be competent to speak on the subject. If the motion had contained an assertion that fluoridation was beneficial, I would have been compelled to oppose it. I would not today support a motion that stated categorically that fluoridation was beneficial because, quite frankly, I do not know, and I have seen expert opinion for and against it. Another aspect gives me some concern, and it is on that matter that I wish to speak today. Whatever the merits or demerits of fluoridation may be, many people do not want to be forced to have it. If anyone has any doubt on that question, I shall get a wheelbarrow and bring down the letters of objection I have received.

Mr. Bywaters: I have had a few, too!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Ever since this matter has been the subject of public debate over the last two years, I have had continuously from all sorts of sources and all sorts of people letters saying that they object to being compulsorily subjected to this treatment. Honourable members will see that we have to consider this matter carefully. It is all very well for me to look across at the Leader and say, "Well, now, you want some Aspros; that is what will do you good." The Leader may have other views on that question. I notice that the member for Mitcham referred

to the interests of health, but I point out that one of the fundamentals of our health plan has always been that it is voluntary. I believe that a Select Committee will have the greatest difficulty, whether or not it takes expert medical advice, in arriving at a definite conclusion. There will be no technical problem in adding the chemical to the water. A small financial problem exists as about £60,000 to £80,000 will have to be provided. A peculiar economic problem arises in that the liquid will be added to thousands of millions of gallons of water of which only a few cupfuls will be consumed. However, putting these problems aside, the greatest difficulty is that many people forced to drink the water with this chemical added would have a grave and, in some cases, even a religious objection to doing so. This matter has often been examined by Cabinet and this difficulty was considered.

The Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson: It is a matter of conscience.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In many instances it becomes a matter of conscience. I have grave doubts about whether it is in the interests of this House to have teeth treated in this way by compelling many people to have treatment they do not desire. I have grave doubts whether this House should force medical treatment on anyone who does not desire to have it. If the motion had been worded that the House should confirm this treatment, I would have opposed it. I could not support something that went against a person's privilege to have the treatment he considered best for him. On the understanding that my support of the motion will not be taken as an acceptance of it and that I am not necessarily going to abide by the committee's decision or recommendation (because I believe the recommendation of a committee does not remove the responsibility of a member to follow his belief), I do not oppose the motion.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE (Minister of Lands): In spite of members opposite I shall have a few words to say. I do not oppose the motion and I have the same reasons as were given by the Premier, namely, that it is only for the purposes of constituting a committee to examine the pros and cons of fluoridation. I have carefully examined this matter and I have a wealth of literature both for and against it. It strikes me most forcibly that world-wide authorities with high academic qualifications and degrees can be found in support of both sides. Most children in this

State have dental caries and bad teeth, as a recent report shows. Existing conditions make their teeth bad, but fluoride will not remove the cause of bad teeth. It is silly to worry about fortifying teeth against something that decays them and not try to remove the cause of that decay. Decay is caused by the rubbish that is sold under the *nom de plume* of food. There are over-sugared commodities and other carbohydrates that are detrimental to teeth and they will continue to be sold. To add fluoride to the water will cost much money. I believe it would be better to spend that money on an educational campaign about what will damage children's teeth rather than to institute the use of fluoride which is, in itself, a poison. It is said that there will not be sufficient fluoride to cause any harm.

Mr. JENNINGS: What about giving evidence before the committee?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: There are other poisons such as oxalic acid in rhubarb. The effect can be seen on a sheep that absorbs this acid in soursobs. In any case, I am opposed to a measure that leaves the primary evil still in existence. In South Australia, children are being taken to the Adelaide Children's Hospital suffering from rickets and scurvy. These diseases are the product of ignorance. If some women in South Australia bring up children so that they are affected by scurvy or rickets, they should be sent somewhere and taught how to feed their children in the same way as drivers who commit an offence are sent to practise driving. Much ignorance existing today on the question of food values is exploited commercially. Millions of pounds worth of de-natured food sold in Australia should not be called food at all. That is what I am opposed to. I am a living example of good food and if somebody could tell me how to take off a few pounds I should be pleased.

Mr. CASEY: Manual work would take it off.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: No, that is not the cure. I have done as much manual work as the honourable member has and I have never lost weight. Good proteins keep it there. I will give evidence before this committee because I would be fearful that my approval of the setting up of this Select Committee might be interpreted to mean that in some way I favour this additive. As a winemaker, I see one advantage of it: it might be a way to effectively wean people off water, and that would benefit them if any more rubbish is to be added to it. The most magnificent food in the world is available in Australia in quantities

that are the envy of all other countries, yet many children here are losing their teeth. It is wrong merely to fortify the teeth against the inroads of the real cause of their falling out. I support the motion.

Mr. MCKEE secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### SCHOOL CANTEENS.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Frank Walsh:

That in the opinion of this House the Government should continue to provide for payment of electricity and gas used in all departmental school canteens.

(Continued from August 19. Page 514.)

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON (Minister of Education): The motion is short, simple and limited in its scope, but with your generous indulgence, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition enlarged it into a series of sweeping charges of maladministration against the Education Department. Despite the precedent thus created I have no intention of trading on your good nature by copying the Leader's example, and replying in detail to these allegations, which are extraneous to the resolution, because, in my opinion, the appropriate occasion for such a discussion is in the Budget debate, when every item of departmental expenditure is subject to the closest scrutiny of Parliament. Therefore, at this stage, I shall content myself by merely remarking that for a department which is alleged to be so incompetent it has produced some rather striking results.

In the last 11 years, in addition to the construction of 4,800 prefabricated classrooms or their equivalents, 144 new schools in solid construction, mostly of over 12 rooms and many of over 20 rooms, have been built and taken into use. In addition, 25 large new schools are at present under construction, and another 24 are in varying stages of planning and design. Between 1953 and 1964 there has been a vast increase in enrolments in our primary and secondary departmental schools, an increase of over 75 per cent. But in that same period the number of our full-time teachers has increased by nearly 120 per cent, from 3,780 to 8,265. In these 11 years the number of students in training to become teachers in our teachers colleges has grown from 430 to 3,000, a seven-fold increase. During this period the average size of classes has been reduced from 41.3 to 35, despite the fact that we have rapidly increased our opportunity, remedial and special classes to 86, and have established six occupation centres, as well as assuming the

full educational responsibility for the children at Townsend House and Minda Home and the schools at Glandore and Magill, as well as at the aboriginal mission stations.

Moreover, for a department that is alleged to be so woefully inefficient in accounting, it is somewhat strange that the Director of Education should receive an unsolicited testimonial from the Auditor-General, dated May 14, 1964, stating that the standard of the work in the Accounts Branch was excellent and that he was most gratified by the assistance extended to his staff. Although the Leader of the Opposition will strenuously deny it in public, we, in this House, all know that he saw in this minor and relatively unimportant administrative decision of the Education Department concerning power charges for school canteens, a cheap opportunity to jump on the band wagon and play Party politics with easy abandon. One of the characteristics of the member for Port Adelaide (and I am glad to see his shining countenance just appearing) is his engaging frankness. He makes no secret of the fact that he came into this House to play Party politics, and that he intends to do so for all his worth. Indeed on August 5 I heard him say in his place in this House:

I can tell the Government now that I am elected and paid to play politics, and I am going to earn my remuneration. I make no bones about it.

Mr. Ryan: Do you want me to deny that?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: No. I am praising the honourable member. Indeed, I am a great admirer of his if he only realizes it. I am a great admirer of honesty and candour in public life. No-one can quarrel with that clear and unambiguous statement of fact wisely made by the member for Port Adelaide. Indeed, it would have made an ideal preamble to the speech on this motion delivered by the Leader, for that speech absolutely reeked of Party politics. It was just a cheap and shoddy cheer-chasing speech; but in one respect, at least, it was successful. It was played up to a carefully chosen group in the gallery—

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The Leader is a cheer-chaser and he obtained his cheer.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think the Minister is in order in referring to the gallery.

Mr. Jennings: Of course he is not. There is no danger of his getting any cheers from it.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I am not referring to this particular gallery, Sir. I am referring to the gallery who were circularized (presidents and secretaries of the various welfare clubs and school committees) and especially invited to come in force.

Mr. Ryan: By whom?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I am not referring to this gallery.

Mr. Ryan: Did you get one of the circulars?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: It was a purely histrionic display of mock heroics and brought the Leader a little temporary success. However, in striking contrast, the speech of the Deputy Leader was reasonably restrained and in good taste, and it was also relevant to the motion. I yield to no-one in my admiration of the splendid services rendered to the cause of education by the parent bodies of our departmental schools, and I take every suitable opportunity to place on public record my appreciation of their efforts. For example, when officially opening the newly established city offices of the South Australian Public Schools Committees Association on April 16 of this year, I said, as reported in the August edition of the *South Australian School Post*, the official organ of this association:

It is a privilege to perform this ceremony, because it gives me the opportunity of publicly congratulating the members of the association on their initiative, enterprise and enthusiasm in embarking on this ambitious undertaking. It is also a pleasure to do so, because it enables me to place on record my appreciation of the valuable assistance and co-operation which I have always received from the President (Mr. R. E. King), the Secretary (Mr. C. W. Reed) and the members of the executive of the association, and also from their predecessors, with all of whom I have been happily associated during my term of office.

I concluded a lengthy speech as follows:

The various school councils, committees, clubs and other parent bodies affiliated with the Public Schools Committees Association are an integral part of our system of education. I appreciate this further opportunity of paying tribute to their members for their self-sacrificing services and their magnificent achievements on behalf of the youth of this present day and generation and those who will come after them. The successful operation of our system of education depends in large measure on their interest and effort. In addition to raising large sums of money for equipment and amenities, they give our schools a feeling of warmth and friendliness by their personal participation. This personal interest is most important because, just as a house does not of itself constitute a home, so a school

building alone does not make a school. A school can function properly with happy children and contented teachers only if it has a large membership of parents and friends actively interested in its material progress and the development of its corporate spirit.

Moreover, I have endeavoured to show my appreciation in a practical manner by generously subsidizing the efforts of these parent bodies. For example, in the 1953-54 year the total departmental subsidies to school committees and councils amounted to £55,600, whereas in the year 1963 they reached the record figure of £203,804. The total departmental subsidies for this 10-year period have been over £1,250,000, the annual figures being: 1953-54, £55,600; 1954-55, £75,150; 1955-56, £86,095; 1956-57, £108,007; 1957-58, £116,859; 1959, £122,086; 1960, £139,513; 1961, £173,967; 1962, £192,237; and 1963, £203,804—a total of £1,273,318.

Mr. Ryan: That would be for new schools too, wouldn't it?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I agree, but at the same time we have subsidized an increasing range of articles, and, if I may say so with becoming modesty, we have had a more generous administration of our subsidies system. A new and pleasing feature of school life during the last five, six or seven years has been the rapid development of school canteens in many of our larger departmental schools. The parent bodies of these schools consider that in a properly run canteen not only are the children supplied with good, wholesome meals at reasonable prices but they are also under proper supervision during school hours. I emphasize the expression "properly run canteen", because all canteens are not properly run: some committees are out for profit. Canteens were first instituted after I became Minister of Education, and one reason that actuated me to grant permission for them to be established was that many parents objected to the type of food (the type the Minister of Lands was speaking about earlier) sold at delicatessens and other shops. The children were filled up with sweets and rubbish, and it was put to me that if canteens were established they would supply good wholesome meals at a reasonable cost, and that the children would be kept under the supervision of teachers during recess time; thus, they would not be running the risk of meeting with street accidents or of meeting undesirable people. I think that in the vast majority of canteens that ideal has been largely achieved. Most canteens have been established in existing school buildings provided by the Education

Department—not necessarily provided for this purpose initially, but adapted with little or no cost to the parent bodies. In other cases, where the canteen building is erected for this special purpose, the capital cost is subsidized pound-for-pound by the Government and in every case the equipment in these canteens is subsidized pound-for-pound by the department. What is more important, and what is not frequently understood and explained, is that the profits derived from their operation are similarly subsidized. Thus, substantial funds are accumulated to provide further equipment and extra amenities for these schools, and the articles so purchased from these canteen profits are in turn also subsidized.

On August 11 I supplied to the House information requested of me some time ago by the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) concerning the profits made last year by those high schools operating canteens and also their credit balances. I said that the total profits last year of the 32 high schools with canteens were £22,631, and that their credit balances at the end of last year amounted to £45,380. I now have similar figures for technical high schools, area schools and primary schools. Canteens are operated at 109 schools. Last year these canteens made a total profit of £51,810. At the end of December last, their total credit balance was no less than £80,630, which is not a bad effort for canteens that were supposed to be non-profit-making, and were to supply wholesome meals at very cheap prices and to keep children in school premises. As will be seen from those figures, canteens are indeed very profitable concerns. They do not pay rent, rates and taxes, maintenance or repairs.

Mr. Ryan: Or labour.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Many of them do pay for labour. That is a very important point. Many larger canteens are engaging paid labour, and I give all credit to them.

Mr. Clark: Usually the supervisors are paid, but they are in the minority.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: That may be so, but I want to put the record straight, because many incorrect statements were made here last week. I repeat that they do not pay rent, rates and taxes, maintenance or repairs. Moreover, they are not subject to competition as are other shopkeepers and traders: they enjoy a virtual monopoly in that many hundreds, sometimes over 1,000 and sometimes up to 2,000 in some larger high schools,

are what might be called captive customers. They are not allowed to leave the schools, and they are therefore captive customers of the canteens on every day of the school week. I am all in favour of it. I am only pointing out that they are profit-making concerns that enjoy the unique benefit of getting an original subsidy and then a subsidy on the profits.

For some years the Director of Education and his principal officers, most of whom are former school teachers, and many of whom have had practical experience as senior masters, headmasters and inspectors, have been concerned as to whether the department is adopting a proper policy in extending rather than restricting the range of articles on which subsidies are granted. As the total sums expended each year on these subsidies have grown to such huge proportions, these officers have expressed the opinion that much of this money could be devoted to better purposes, such as for example on the purchase of additional aids to teaching.

I might ask my honourable friend opposite, the member for Gawler, who has had much experience in teaching, the pertinent question whether he would agree with the opinion of former teachers and headmasters of the department, and some teaching members of the South Australian Teachers Institute, that a large proportion of this huge sum spent on subsidies could be better spent in supplying teaching aids. The Director and Deputy Director and superintendents and others concerned considered that however generous the Treasurer might be to the Education Department there was a limit to the sum that could be spent on education. They said they would like £100,000 of the £200,000 subsidy so that they could spend it to better advantage on teaching aids. That is not my proposition, and I will make it clearer still that it is not. As long ago as June 14, 1961, the Director in a minute to me stated:

I feel myself that it is reasonable to discontinue the payment of subsidy on the purchase of articles of equipment which are of income producing nature, especially those used in school canteens.

It is true, of course, that school canteens do produce a steady income for the school concerned, and often especially in secondary schools this income reaches considerable proportions. The profits which are derived from these canteens are, of course, subsidized as soon as they are used for the purchase of amenities for the school.

Accordingly, I recommend that you should approve of the policy of not subsidizing the purchase of equipment of an income-producing nature, and that this would apply in particular to equipment for school canteens.

That was the written submission, a strong and direct recommendation of the Director of Education after a staff conference and discussions. I realized the force of the Director's arguments that in subsidizing the profits from these canteens the department was in some instances granting a subsidy on a subsidy, but during the ensuing three years I have consistently declined to accept this departmental recommendation for two reasons: firstly, because I strongly favour the continuance and, indeed, expansion of school canteens throughout the State; secondly, because I do not wish school parent bodies to be discouraged or the attitude of the department to be misunderstood or misinterpreted.

However, for some time the Education Department's auditor, who is an officer of the Auditor-General's Department, has been concerned about the overhead costs of school canteens, including electricity and gas charges, which were being paid by the Education Department, instead of by the operators of these canteens. Accordingly, this officer of the Auditor-General reported to the Director in writing as follows:

School canteens are profit-making organizations, set up to provide a service to teachers and pupils and for the raising of funds to be devoted to school purposes. There is sufficient mark-up on the goods sold in a delicatessen for an entrepreneur to make a profit after meeting costs and it is not unreasonable to expect a school canteen to do likewise.

Again, I am quoting not my opinion, but the opinion expressed in writing by an officer of the Auditor-General's Department to the Director of Education. These two high-ranking officials are virtually of the same mind, and have been for a considerable time. The Director, Deputy Director and Secretary considered this matter and came to the conclusion that after receiving generous assistance in the provision of canteen buildings and subsidies on their equipment, these canteens in all other respects should be self-supporting.

They also considered that as canteens are profit-making concerns, unless costs of operation are met from receipts, the department is in effect subsidizing the provision of meals and sales of cool drinks, ice creams, confectionery and other items in those schools large enough to conduct canteens, a privilege not enjoyed by the very much larger number of smaller schools without canteens.

These officers took the view that it is logical for these profit-making concerns to bear their own operating costs, because otherwise the department is giving a double subsidy, firstly,

when it meets part of the costs of running the canteen and, secondly, when it subsidizes equipment purchased from profits inflated to the extent of the costs paid by the department.

This is one passage in my speech to which I want to give very careful consideration in view of the criticism made of me personally by the Leader of the Opposition last week. On these grounds the Director decided that in future canteens should pay for their own electricity and gas. He also justified his decision on another very important ground, namely, that lack of accountability encourages irresponsibility and he considered that the acceptance of responsibility for these charges could result in the more economical use of electricity and gas in canteens.

The Director, believing that his decision was of a routine, administrative nature, did not refer it to me; but, in due course, on his instructions the Secretary of the department on May 21 forwarded a circular letter to the heads of all schools with canteens notifying them that it had been decided that the cost of electricity and gas used in school canteens should be charged to canteen funds and that at some time in the future arrangements would be made for the installation of check meters in the canteens, after which they would be further advised on the rendition and payment of the charges involved.

On July 1, I received a letter from the Secretary of the South Australian Public Schools Committees' Association stating that his association was most concerned to learn of the intention of the Education Department to arrange for school committees to be charged with the cost of gas and electric power used in school canteens and appealing to me to have this matter reconsidered. I repeat again that neither the Director of Education, the Deputy Director, the Secretary of the department nor any other officer of the administration of the department mentioned that decision to me or to my secretary. I say definitely and unequivocally without the faintest shadow of doubt or contradiction that this was the first time I had ever seen or heard anything about the department's decision or intention. However, after calling for and perusing the relevant docket and receiving reports from the Secretary and Deputy Director, I replied to the association as follows:

I have given this matter careful consideration following departmental reports, but have come to the conclusion that it is reasonable and justified that canteens should bear their own operating costs.

However, I did not state that any meters would be installed. Moreover, no steps have been taken to install either electricity or gas meters at any of the school canteens concerned, and the department is still paying all these electricity and gas charges. Indeed, during June, before I received the letter of protest from the Secretary of the association and long before the Leader of the Opposition knew anything about the matter, I had completed the detailed departmental Estimates of Expenditure for the 1964-65 financial year—much more detailed than will even be shown in the Budget—and no line or provision of expenditure of any kind was included for the installation of meters at canteens. That was for the very good reason that I knew nothing about them, but the responsibility is mine and we shall find when the Budget is introduced that there is no such line.

Mr. Curren: That could be another routine administrative detail.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The honourable member is, of course, an expert on public administration, as on other matters, and I bow to his knowledge. This is the eleventh year in which I have had to prepare the detailed Estimates of Expenditure for this department.

Mr. Ryan: It will be your last!

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Honourable members opposite have been prophesying my early demise for several years, but I am glad to see them opposite me year after year, and I look forward to seeing them in the self-same positions again this time next year. However, the fact remains that it is necessary to establish a line on the Estimates for any new item of expenditure. The Treasurer, the Under Treasurer, and the Auditor-General will not allow such expenditure unless a line is established. No such line was established, and no such line is established now. At the beginning of July these estimates were forwarded to the Treasurer and subsequently approved by him. Consequently, during the current financial year, no meters will be installed and the department will continue to pay all the electricity and gas charges at these schools. Finally, the decision of the Director has at least served a useful two-fold purpose: first, the resultant publicity has focused public attention on the heavy expenditure on light and power used by these schools with canteens. For the last financial year the total cost for electricity and gas consumed in 108 secondary schools where canteens were in operation was about £51,000. By way

of contrast, in the 57 secondary schools where there were no canteens the total charges were only about £12,000. For more than half the total number the cost was down to about a quarter.

Mr. Clark: Is that in all schools?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yes. If honourable members wish it, I could give them some striking illustrations. For example, the Thebarton Girls Technical High School, with an enrolment of 571 and with a canteen, received a light and power bill last year for £521. The Thebarton Boys Technical High School, with no canteen but an enrolment of 555 (only 16 students less), received an account for £132. Indeed, there may be extraneous reasons for that difference but the fact remains that large sums are expended for schools with canteens. The Eudunda Area School has an enrolment of 398 and, having a canteen, it spent £559 on light and fuel last year. The Ceduna Area School, with a larger enrolment of 423, spent £116.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: With higher charges!

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yes. I could quote many similar cases, too. All I am trying to say is that the Director's decision has focused public attention on the large sums spent by the Education Department on light and power in schools with canteens.

Mr. Curren: Would the Minister like to quote the figures for the Glossop High School?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: That also is a pertinent interjection, because that was a school the auditor specifically queried. He came across a bill for £65 2s. 9d. for the three months, which he regarded as exorbitant for a comparatively small enrolment, and he reported the matter accordingly.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: That had a separate meter?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yes.

Mr. Ryan: What was the enrolment?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: About 580. I am not complaining about this: I am trying my best to assist honourable members by replying to specific questions. The auditor complained vigorously about this matter to the Accountant in the department and he, in turn, brought it to the notice of the Auditor-General. It is those estimable gentlemen who have to fight it out. The second useful outcome of the Director's decision was that it has highlighted the double subsidy paid to, and the favoured treatment received by, a few more than 100 schools with canteens, compared with the far less generous treatment

meted out to well over 500, and probably nearer 600, schools. We have about 670 schools all told in South Australia; 109 of them have this favoured treatment—a subsidy—and the balance of nearly 600 (and mainly the smaller and in many cases the less affluent schools) do not. That is why I am so surprised that members of the Opposition are on the side of the affluent. Surely, in their districts are many schools that are far less affluent and people who have not been able to enjoy the benefits received by some of the more favoured people because they have not been fortunate enough to possess canteens. It is a striking reversal of form.

Finally, I wish to state that on some suitable occasion when time and circumstances permit I intend to make a personal Ministerial investigation into the respective merits of all the classes of articles and services that are subsidized.

Mr. Ryan: You will have to hurry up; you haven't much time left!

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: That may be so. Apart from the articles and services in canteens that are subsidized, there is a most voluminous and rapidly extending list of articles—good, bad, and indifferent—which are being subsidized. The Leader of the Opposition keeps reminding me (as he is entitled to) that this matter is my responsibility. I am trying to tell the Leader, the House and the public that I am assuming full responsibility for this matter in the future, and I intend to make a personal Ministerial investigation into the respective merits of the classes of articles and services of all kinds which are subsidized, in all kinds of schools, whether or not they have canteens. I shall review our whole system of subsidies generally. Having done that, I will make recommendations to Cabinet, which will consider them and approve or disapprove them or send them back to me for alteration. If those recommendations are approved, all our schools, whether new or old, large or small, in the metropolitan area or in the country, will in my opinion receive even-handed justice.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): We have listened to the Minister of Education with much interest for some time, and perhaps it might be a good thing if I get back to the seed of this matter and point out that the motion states:

That in the opinion of this House the Government should continue to provide for payment of electricity and gas used in all departmental school canteens.

Although the Minister has spoken for a considerable time, he has left not only me but many members in some doubt on the matter. I am still not certain whether or not the Minister has climbed down over this. I took it from the tenor of his remarks from start to finish that he was supporting very strongly and very forcibly the case for these payments, yet I fancied I heard him say that they were not going to be continued. But, Sir, along with my colleagues I want to try to make certain that this decision will certainly not be implemented.

It is in the Minister's favour that he did something that is seldom done in this Chamber by a member of the Government when making the first speech after the adjournment on an Opposition Bill or motion: he did not try to misconstrue the motion. When the Opposition moves a motion or introduces a Bill a Government speaker usually bobs up and says, "Well, how badly drawn this thing is; it does not mean what it is supposed to mean, and we are not certain what it does mean." I congratulate the Minister on not doing that. That may be the only thing in his speech on which I shall be able to congratulate him, but being a kindly disposed person I am glad to do that.

The Minister said many things that I would love to have the opportunity of quietly reading in *Hansard* and replying to, but I am afraid if I did that my speech, although not boring, would be far too long for members to endure. Although I will not deal with much of what the Minister said, one or two of his remarks are worth mentioning. The Minister told us strongly that the decision was not known to him until everything had been done about it and until he heard of it from welfare clubs. I fully believe that that was so, but I feel strongly that a decision such as this should have been known to the Minister. Earlier in his remarks he described this matter as a minor and relatively unimportant issue.

The Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson: If you don't mind my saying so, I should like to be quoted fully. I said that the Director regarded this as a minor administrative decision, and that for that reason he did not consult me.

Mr. CLARK: I realize that. If the Minister will forgive me, I came in after he had started his remarks. At that stage he was speaking about this being a political move, and his exact words were that Opposition members were making a lot of fuss politically over a minor and relatively unimportant issue. Will the Minister concede that he said that?

The Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson: Yes, a relatively minor issue.

Mr. CLARK: Actually, I was relating the words the Minister used on one occasion to another occasion, but the Minister did say that. The Minister went to the trouble of quoting many interesting and illuminating figures to show members the enormously increased cost of education, and, Mr. Speaker, I submit that nobody would deny that for one moment; nor would anybody deny that these enormously increased expenses were necessary. We were told of the large sums paid out in subsidies, and no-one denies that either. There is a large expenditure on new schools, but surely that expenditure, necessary as it is, and the large subsidies, necessary as they are, only accentuate the niggardliness of the decision made on a matter such as this which could, at best, save the Government or the department only a few thousands pounds. Forced to build new schools, we are building beautiful schools in South Australia, some secondary ones costing over £250,000, yet here we are cavilling about something that could not involve more than a few thousand pounds.

The Minister spoke about our making political capital of a minor and relatively unimportant issue, but I assure him and all honourable members of the House that, as far as I am concerned, as far as my Party is concerned and, I am sure, as far as school canteen committees, parents and friends committees, welfare committees and mothers club committees are concerned, this issue is not minor and is not relatively unimportant. I think the Minister knows (he has given me credit for this on many occasions and I know he is sincere about it) that I have a genuine personal interest in schools and everything that goes on in them. I know the Minister would not for a minute deny that.

The Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson: No; I strongly support what the honourable member says.

Mr. CLARK: Because of that, I strongly resent the statement that I for one am speaking on this purely because it is a political issue: I am speaking on this because I believe in it 100 per cent. In fact, before a question was asked on this a few weeks ago by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I had planned to ask that question. Other honourable members may have wished to ask similar questions but, when I spoke to the Deputy Leader about it, I discovered that he had prepared a question, so I was only too happy to let him ask it. I resent the implication that as far as I am concerned

it is "cheer-chasing"—those are the words of the Minister. The Minister of Education should be the last member of this Cabinet to talk about cheer-chasing. We have been told that these canteens are not subject to competition. That may be so although, in a sense, they are subject to competition. One reason why school canteen profits are so high is that the school canteen committees would have a great difficulty in purchasing many of the articles sold if they sold those articles as cheaply as they would like to sell them. In other words, suppliers would not be anxious to supply school canteens if they knew that a small price was to be charged for the articles.

The Minister invited me to say something about school aids, but I was not quite sure of the point. I fancy he meant that the department would prefer to provide additional teaching aids straight out rather than pay this amount as subsidy.

The Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson: Departmental expenditure.

Mr. CLARK: I know many teachers, particularly young teachers who are taught at the teachers training colleges, realize the value of school aids. However, when they have been teaching for a few years, they come to depend on their stocks in trade and their skill in the profession, and school aids are often forgotten. Young teachers in particular discover that the cost of school aids is great.

Mr. Riches: Many buy them out of their own pocket.

Mr. CLARK: Yes. Those things should have been either supplied or subsidized long ago, but I do not know that they should be supplied at the expense of something else. I say that particularly of young teachers going into schools on their own. Everyone who has anything to do with school committees knows what happens in most schools. Only last Monday evening I was at a meeting of the Gawler High School council, and the headmaster was showing me a beautiful map cover that they had just purchased—no doubt on a subsidy. Many of these things should be supplied on subsidy, anyhow.

I listened with much interest to the Minister this afternoon. I was surprised to hear him say that it was 11 years since he became a Minister. I well remember that I always looked forward to hearing him as a private member, as he was in those days, when he had more chance of speaking than he does now as the Minister of Education. He was a debater well worth hearing. I remember one famous occasion when the then member for Glenelg

replied to the former member for Mitcham (Mr. Dunks) on members' salaries. I thought that speech was a gem. I recommend new honourable members to read it. Therefore, I was anticipating hearing from the Minister this afternoon something well worth listening to, but I am sorry to have to say that I was disappointed. That just goes to show that even a good debater has to have a case in this place. Unfortunately for him, the Minister just did not have one. I realized that last week when, in theatrical terms, we had a particularly good "house" in this place. I should have thought that, if the Minister had had a good case, he would have been only too happy to speak last week. I am not suggesting that he would have been cheer-chasing, but I believe from my experience of him (and I do not say this at all unkindly) he has not been normally averse from the limelight or any glamour or publicity that the limelight may give him. He has one great attribute that is denied to bald-headed old fellows like me: he is photogenic. Had he had a really good case, I think he would have been putting it before us. After all, who can blame anyone for cheer-chasing? But the Minister last week avoided it like the plague; he preferred to speak today.

We have been told there is no line on the Budget for this expenditure. I am worried about that because in the future it can be taken to indicate that these committees will have to pay for the installation of extra meters, and so on. I hope it does not mean that. I hope, too, that the debate this afternoon will not be adjourned, because my colleagues and I do not want this type of debate dragging on while the Budget is being debated. We should like to see it well and truly finished before the Budget debate commences.

Mr. Shannon: Will you promise not to give it all to us again in the Budget debate?

Mr. CLARK: I am afraid I am not able to do that. I would not be worried by a promise by the member for Onkaparinga. I like to hear him and usually enjoy his remarks. I am sure that his innate sense of justice and fair play will make him support this motion. When I speak on the motion I have not, of course, the resources that are available to the Minister through his departmental officers. I must speak from personal experience in canteens. Before I left the Education Department I helped form at least two canteens and watched them grow from strength to strength; this has continued to happen since I left. As I said in the Address in Reply debate, I believe that this decision (which we are now not

certain will be implemented) was deplorable and should never have been made. The only reason given for it was to save money. The Minister said, in reply to a question by the member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens) and also today, that this was one measure forced on the Government by the difficult budgetary position, but I submit that these facilities are necessary for schools and that they often have difficult budgetary positions, too.

The history of this matter in the House began when the member for Hindmarsh, on August 11, asked several questions of the Minister of Education, but there was only one answer. We were told then that economies had to be effected because of the difficult budgetary position; that one of the avenues scrutinized for this purpose by the Director of Education was the subsidizing of school canteens; and that in the future canteen committees would have to pay for their own gas and electricity charges. The Minister said then (and he repeated it this afternoon) that when the matter was finally submitted to him he entirely agreed with the decision. Therefore, the onus must rest on him or the Director or both of them. Surely the State's difficult budgetary position had little to do with the few thousands of pounds paid for the supply of power for school canteens. Surely something else besides school canteens should have been blamed for the difficult budgetary position. The Minister then attempted to bring the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) into this matter as he had asked questions about canteen profits. I thought that it was possibly unworthy of the Minister to make this inference. However, I will not pursue this, because I am sure the member for Port Pirie will do so.

We know the profits canteens make and we have heard much about it this afternoon. It should be understood that, first of all, these profits mean better and cheaper services for children. Also, this means that more money will be made available in subsidies to the schools and that more money will be available for items that the Government does not always supply directly to the schools. However, the most important consideration for the school canteen committees is that they can make available better and cheaper services to the children. I hope no school association has lost sight of this objective when considering profits and, if one or two have, I regret that very much. We know what the canteens are; but what don't we know? Even after hearing the Minister this afternoon, it is possible from

the figures he gave to draw all kinds of conclusions about the cost of electricity and power in school canteens. However, they are only conclusions and nobody can really be certain.

Mr. Shannon: Except at Glossop.

Mr. CLARK: I was going to say that I would take the example of Glossop High School that the Minister used in his reply to my question. He said that the cost of the electricity used in the canteen at Glossop was about a quarter of the total cost for electricity in the school. Of course, this was a fairly rough calculation and it is not easy to get an accurate figure. The Minister was unable to give me figures for more than the one school. However, if the cost can be reckoned as about a quarter of the total cost for electricity at a school, this enables some figure to be arrived at. I do not know that Glossop is a fair example because, after all, it is a country high school where I have no doubt much light and power is used for various night-time activities. The member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren) could probably enlighten the House about this. Nevertheless, I think it is fairly safe to assume that the cost of electricity for canteens is between £10,000 and £12,000. That **assumption seems reasonable** if the figure for Glossop is taken and allowance made for the fact that Glossop is a country high school. However, we do not know the figure for sure.

In his reply last week, the Minister said that there were 116 canteens with 14 more being established and that the cost for electricity and gas in 108 schools was £51,000. From those figures I think that £10,000 for the cost of electricity is a good guess, although it may be £1,000 or £2,000 out. Therefore, that is the sum that we can assume will be saved by this decision. However, is this saving at all? We should remember how canteens work. I could not follow the Minister's point about the unfortunate schools that did not make this saving as they did not have canteens. Canteens do not just grow out of nothing. Parents and friends associations, school committees and other organizations must work hard to set up canteens in schools. There is nothing to stop them if they wish to do this and if they can raise the funds to get a subsidy.

Mr. Shannon: If they can raise the funds, but some cannot.

Mr. CLARK: It is amazing what these organizations, even in unprosperous areas, are prepared to do for schools. I know of canteens that have been established in areas that are certainly not prosperous.

Mr. Riches: Do they put up their own building?

Mr. CLARK: Yes, but the cost of the building is subsidized and it becomes the property of the department. All members realize that canteens are inspired by school committees, welfare clubs, and parents and friends associations, which are devoted bodies, wanting to help the children. Many parents do not have children attending the school, but are interested in children, the town and the district, and want to help. Once the spade work is done the building is erected, or use is made of an existing building. However, this could be hazardous, because, naturally, the first call on an existing building is for the work of the school. The canteens try to provide schoolchildren with wholesome lunches, and this is most important. The lunches are cheaper than those bought from the average shop because the overhead is less. The decision referred to in the motion will increase the overhead and thus the cost of articles bought from canteens.

One great advantage of the canteen is that it keeps children on school premises and under the supervision of teachers. This is important, particularly for secondary schoolchildren. Unfortunately, some secondary schoolchildren, and indeed some primary schoolchildren, particularly those who have reached a certain age, have no difficulty in getting into bother when away from school premises. The least important factor, is that canteens receive an income that can be used for school needs. It is necessary to have it and, as the Minister said, I am sorry for the schools that do not have an assured income as do those with canteens. The profits from the canteens help buy the things the department cannot, will not or do not think necessary, such as assembly halls, gymnasiums, machinery for ovals, school band uniforms, and many types of equipment.

Establishing a canteen is an arduous and costly undertaking and running it is a labour of love. The Minister has often paid a tribute to the work of these people, but will they now wonder about that tribute. It is necessary for them to make a sacrifice, and every honourable member commends them for that sacrifice. Figures were presented this afternoon showing that welfare clubs and school committees raise about £250,000 annually, which sum does not include the voluntary subscription introduced over the last few years to help the school. These subscriptions are brought along by the children. It can safely be said that funds from school canteens are used to pay completely, or

in part, for items the department has not supplied. How much will this parsimonious idea save the Government. If £10,000 or even £15,000 is the cost of light and power for canteens, that would be £30,000 with subsidy that could be spent at the school, and this sum could hardly be spent now. Without subsidy it is £15,000. Obviously this income cannot be ploughed back annually into the schools, as it has been, and used for necessities.

I wonder who will pay for the requirements now: will the Government? I am doubtful, because of the stringent Budget position. Will schools go without? Some will have to, but in most cases the committee interested in the school will be forced to spend whatever money it has available on the necessary and urgent items, and the other items will have to wait. It is difficult to regard this refusal to pay the power charge for canteens as an economy. It could lead to parents restricting their interest in the canteens. I doubt whether it will dull their keenness, but who could blame them if this happened. The restricted income could mean dearer goods, less wholesome and poorer food supplies, and delays in improving the type of food supplied in canteens. Many canteens have investigated the introduction of the Oslo lunch: some have introduced it, but the profits from it are not high. I do not think we should talk about the enormous profits.

Mr. Shannon: Is profit a deciding issue?

Mr. CLARK: No, and I have tried to show that it is not. I have tried to make it clear that, with canteen committees, the main object is not the profit. We should not talk about enormous profits made by canteens, or the large sums we hear about. One newspaper, now defunct, preached continually about the large sums in school funds. I do not object to that state of affairs, nor should other honourable members, because in almost every case the school is accumulating funds for a costly project that will be of great advantage to it. Perhaps this decision would save a few thousand pounds, but this has to be compared with the millions the Minister mentioned this afternoon. I do not want it thought that I am reflecting on the sum being spent, because every penny spent is necessary expenditure. A remark by the Minister, in his reply to the member for Hindmarsh, gave me food for thought. He said, "One avenue of expenditure . . ." I am a little worried about this, because the use of such words causes me to think there will be other economies that may be even more niggardly than this. We may find that school committees will have to install special meters

so that any water used on schoolgrounds they have to care for will be paid for by the parents. Perhaps additional light meters will be installed in the schools so that when there is a parent association meeting or something not directly connected with the children money will be debited to the association.

I do not suggest that everybody works in canteens for nothing. I know that a nominal fee is sometimes paid to those in charge and their assistants. Perhaps there will be a departmental instruction that the pie or sandwich with a cup of tea, which I have heard whispered are provided free to the assistants, will have to be paid for. However, perhaps I should keep my big mouth shut or I might put ideas into people's heads, which is the last thing I wish to do, but, after all, these suggestions are not at all silly.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Do not put the idea of a pie and cup of tea into their heads!

Mr. CLARK: No, I will not. However, the things I have suggested are no meaner than what has happened. Do not let any of us try to discourage the parents who do so much for us. I was in departmental schools for many years and I cannot imagine that in the main there are parents anywhere who are better than those in this State. When I was at the Gawler school, if there was a function and a request was made for flowers—Gawler is a good town for flowers—so many would be received that the whole place would look like a bower. If something was requested for a lunch day, the amount of food provided by the parents, who also gave their children money to buy things, was simply astonishing. When I say that I believe the parents in this State are wonderful, I am sincere.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: They love doing it, don't they?

Mr. CLARK: Yes, they get much pleasure from helping their own and other people's children. When I have gone into canteens I have been impressed by the number of young mothers who have come there at great inconvenience. Many helpers are not parents, but they come because they like to help. I appeal to the Government to clarify this matter. As I have said, I am not 100 per cent certain now what will be done. If I had been satisfied that this thing—and no doubt it is a thing—would be dropped forever, I would have sat down earlier. If the Government cannot be swayed, I ask members to vote in favour of the motion. After all, these parents work for our children and grandchildren and for other people's children and

grandchildren, and I believe they have done wonderful work. I support the motion; in fact, I would be ashamed of myself if I did not.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): Obviously, the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) supports his Leader. Let me give my own background, briefly. Many years before I became a member of Parliament I was interested in schools. During that period I had children attending school, and I accepted the responsibility of the chairmanship of the local school committee; it was not a council, as the school was not a high school. I am, and have been for many years, a member of the Hills Schools Committees Association, and for many years I have been president or patron of that organization—one or the other; all I know is that I pay and attend the annual meetings. I have taken a personal interest in schools in my area, as most people in my area are aware. I take second place to no member on either side of this Chamber in my admiration of the excellent work done voluntarily, especially by women in the schools favoured with canteens. I must not leave out the men, because in my home town I have experienced the valuable assistance rendered by male members of the committee. Hills areas unfortunately have heavy soil, and playing fields are not made to order. The work was done by pick and shovel in my early days by the men. I give them full marks for the effort they put into providing playing fields at many places in the hills.

The Minister made an excellent statement on this matter and with all due respect to the member for Gawler (whom I admire and whom I have learnt from serving on the same committee to respect), who was speaking about something about which he had first-hand experience, I cannot agree with him that the Minister did not clarify the position. I listened with great interest to the Minister, as I hope the honourable member did. The Minister had a carefully prepared statement and I do not think he missed a point of interest, yet the honourable member suggested he got away from the subject matter of the motion. I do not think that comment was well founded. The Minister dealt with every aspect connected with the motion, and that was directly opposite to the line the Leader took in moving it. The Leader did not worry about the motion, as he was talking to his prepared gallery and looking for tears without paying regard to the motion.

The Minister has made it abundantly clear. I think most members understand that a *fait accompli* in this field is not possible overnight.

I think the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren) put his neck out a little when he referred to Glossop, where there is only one meter for light and power.

Mr. Jennings: That is why he asked.

Mr. SHANNON: I do not think so. I do not think he was as innocent as that: I think it was just an accident.

Mr. Curren: They are the only figures that can be quoted.

Mr. SHANNON: The member for Gawler is prepared to quote figures, but I am not, as no figures exist. It is physically impossible to separate the light and power used by a canteen from that used in the rest of the school unless there are separate meters, and any attempt to do this must be wide of the mark. I do not propose to go into that facet.

Mr. Curren: The Minister was quoting figures for school canteens.

Mr. SHANNON: The Minister was careful not to say how much, because he and his officers would not know what would be effected in savings as a result of making school committees or high school councils pay for light and power in their canteens. He gave us certain comparisons of schools with canteens and of others without canteens. I know that disparities occur. I was amazed at the statement by the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark). A number of schools do not enjoy benefits from canteens and have no opportunity to make money from their small customers. All these schools are left out in the cold when it comes to subsidies, except those with committees that run functions to raise a few pounds by hard work; and mostly it falls upon a handful of women to organize such functions, which are the only source of revenue upon which they can receive a Government subsidy. Mr. Clark said that the profit motive was not important, and that the Oslo meal may not be an attractive proposition for canteens, because of its lack of profitability.

Mr. Clark: I did not use that word.

Mr. SHANNON: The honourable member may not have used it, but that is what he meant. The honourable member said there would not be much profit.

Mr. Clark: Whatever I said, I stand by it. Does the honourable member think there would be more profit?

Mr. SHANNON: It is the policy to decide what should be supplied to the children from these canteens; that is, it is measured by profitability. If that is to be the measuring stick, I would be in sympathy with school committees or high school councils who seek to get

the maximum amount of profit from the children, who of necessity have to buy their lunches from the canteen.

Mr. Hughes: I do not think that any of them do that.

Mr. SHANNON: The member for Gawler suggested that the profit from supplying an Oslo lunch would not be attractive to school committees or high school councils. The Director of Education told the Minister, in effect, that there was too much demand for subsidies on profit-making equipment in canteens. After consulting with his chiefs of staff, all of whom have gone through the ranks and have had experience in schools, it was said there was no uniformity in what was happening at the schools. It is obvious to me and to any thinking person that the profitability of a canteen has outweighed its real service value.

Mr. Clark: The honourable member will grant, I think, that I was trying to make the point that because of these increased charges they would have to think about profitability. However, I did not use that word. It is an awful word.

Mr. SHANNON: I agree that it is a rather clumsy word. No doubt every member understands what I am trying to say—that it should not be a matter of profit at the expense of the really first-class service to the children who are getting their meals from the canteens. I am prepared to accept the evidence that the Director and his chiefs of staff have gathered on this profit-making equipment. I am only pointing out that this profit motive is outweighing the service that should be the prime aim in these canteens.

Mr. Clark: But it is not.

Mr. SHANNON: If the report that the Director gave to the Minister is inaccurate, I suggest that the Minister is easily led and that he has been blindfolded if he does not understand what his Director has been trying to put over him. I do not believe that for a moment. I know that Mr. Mander-Jones, the Director, does his job efficiently and is reporting to his Minister what he thinks should be the position.

Mr. Riches: There may be a wrong interpretation.

Mr. SHANNON: After all, the Minister did not know anything about it until an outside organization told him. Why scrape a tiny piece of butter on the bread? I could go the whole hog and say that the Government

should pay for all the materials, including goods for food preparation that are supplied in the canteens.

Mr Clark: Let the Government run them, and I bet it would be interested in profit.

Mr SHANNON: It would be a total loss, but what is wrong if the principle you are trying to apply in this debate is good? What is wrong with making all the provision required to feed the children in their canteens at Government cost!

Mr. Riches: No-one suggested that.

Mr SHANNON: I am telling honourable members opposite that the principle they are now applying is a step in that direction. The full story is that we should supply everything free. This is not something new. It is done in Norway. I do not know whether it is the objective of members opposite, but if it is they should say who would pay the bill.

The principle suggested is not a new one but the motion suggests that Parliament go part of the way (whether or not it be by supplying free power and light) and having done that increase the profit of the canteens. By doing this, the Government would then be subsidizing the power and light bills again. The Minister did not quote details relating to some of the schools of which I personally have knowledge, one in my own area especially. I know why the Mount Barker High School has no canteen attached to it. This school went through trying periods in the late 30's, including the depression years, and when I first became a member of Parliament there was the question of whether the department should close it. That is how light the attendance got. During that period there was a small store across the road from the school and it became the provider of school lunches. Today it has an enrolment of 542, is a thriving high school, and is what all high schools should be—a multi-purpose high school. A student can take practically any course—academic, commercial, agricultural, or straight-out arts and crafts subjects. The whole gamut of subjects is taught at the Mount Barker High School, which has no canteen. Its bill for light and power in 1963 was £422 for 542 scholars. This can be compared with Urrbrae High School, an agricultural high school, which has a canteen. It has 517 students enrolled, which is 25 less than Mount Barker, and its bill for light and power was £987. Honourable members will tell me that no possible hope exists of segregating these figures and saying how much the Urrbrae school spent on canteens, when we know that Mount Barker—

Mr. Fred Walsh: I suggest that you compare the Mount Barker school with the Thebarton Boys Technical High School, which has about the same number of students.

Mr. SHANNON: That school had a light and power bill totalling £132. The Minister quoted these figures—

Mr. Fred Walsh: How do they compare?

Mr. SHANNON: I am saying how impossible it is for the member for Gawler to arrive at his guessed figure of £10,000.

Mr. Fred Walsh: The Thebarton school worked in consultation with nearby stores.

Mr. SHANNON: A similar position applies at Mount Barker.

Mr. Lawn: The member for Gawler was not adamant on £10,000.

Mr. SHANNON: The Waikerie High School has 309 students and its bill, with the canteen included, was £713. The Victor Harbour High School, with no canteen and 337 students had a bill for £150. We are reaching a disparity that cannot be explained. It is impossible to segregate the figures in a satisfactory manner and say how much or how little this motion affects high school committees or councils. I agree with the Minister that it would be futile to attempt to say how much expense was specifically involved in schools with canteens. A principle is involved, and one that I heartily favour, namely, that we should discourage the profit-making drive that some school committees and councils are making as their first objective. "Make as much money as we can" seems to be their motto.

Mr. Hughes: Are you not over-emphasizing the profit scheme? Don't you think you should have more consideration for the voluntary labour?

Mr. SHANNON: I give full marks to the volunteers in this field, but I am saying that we have evidence from the Minister that the profit motive outweighs the service motive. I think the Minister mentioned that the overall figure in the canteen fund at the moment was about £80,000, which is the accumulated profit for the whole State.

Mr. Hughes: Of course, much of that has been saved for larger projects.

Mr. SHANNON: Who saved it? Has the honourable member thought about that? Who put the £80,000 in kitty? It was put there by the schoolchildren attending the 100-odd schools where canteens are installed. They are the contributors; make no mistake about that! Another aspect is involved, in respect of which I think the Minister was very kind to the Opposition. Indeed I think he was rather

too kind, as he mentioned the matter in a gentlemanly way. The member for Gawler mentioned this so-called "tiddly-wink" which, although only a pinprick, might discourage the efforts of school councils and committees. Why do we make so much political capital out of such small things? Why do we organize a full gallery to hear the Leader speak on so small a topic?

Mr. Curren: Is it not because of public interest?

Mr. SHANNON: The honourable member should tell me. I think this is purely and simply playing politics.

Mr. Riches: Who organized the gathering?

Mr. SHANNON: The honourable member does not need to be told that. Fancy telling the organizers what they have done! When we have a Government in office doing such an excellent job, a Government whose armour is so difficult to pierce, and when it is difficult to find anything about which the Government can be criticized, it is a pity that we have to come down to what an Opposition member refers to as a "minor happening". If that is all he can do, I am afraid the Opposition is likely to be the opposition for a long time.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I naturally support the motion. Indeed, I commend it and assure honourable members that I do so with all the sincerity that I can command. I also want to assure the House that I support the motion far more in sorrow than in anger. I was amazed when the action about which we are now protesting was taken. As its ramifications became more evident, my amazement grew. Indeed, it continues to grow, and it grew alarmingly after hearing the Minister of Education today. I was hoping that my fears and depressions about this matter could have been allayed after hearing the Minister's explanation, but that was not so. What is the Minister going to do? He is persisting with his opposition to this motion, but we do not know (because, after all, we have not seen the budget) what steps will be taken in the next 12 months in regard to this matter. Separate meters are not installed in schools. If, indeed, nothing is to be done and the figures cannot be segregated (and the member for Onkaparinga tried to tell us several times about this, but got horribly mixed in the process), what will happen at the one school that has a meter? Is that going to be the only school in the whole State paying for electricity and gas? Is that to be the position there?

Another thing I am concerned about is that the Minister, according to his admission here today, was about the last person in the Education Department to know what was going on. What we would like to know is: who is really running the Education Department? I am most afeared of another thing as a result of what the Minister said today, something which is carrying further the logic (or perhaps the illogic) on which he has based his argument. He gave us a hint about it. I certainly hope we are not to take it from what he said that because these canteens are sheltered (as there is no competition and they do not have to pay rates and taxes and so on) further restrictions will be imposed. The Minister mentioned competition. Will we see now, as a result of the department's making this move for some obscure budgetary purposes, that it will set aside a little part of the playground and charge Glover Gibbs or someone £100 a year rent to sell pies there privately or, as the member for Gawler mentioned, will it install separate meters for water for school canteens and things of that nature? Are we to take it that that might be another logical or illogical step leading on from this one?

I think the futility of the proposal has become abundantly clear. We must ask ourselves, Mr. Speaker, what it does. We certainly know, from what the Minister said today, that, if it does anything, he does not really know what it is going to do anyway. Not only does he not know, but he admits that he has no way of finding out. So what does it do? I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, what it does. Without any doubt at all it disaffects thousands of voluntary workers for the Education Department in this State. It disaffects those people to the extent that their enthusiasm, just because they are human beings, is going to wane. These people, who are needed so much by the Education Department and on whom I think the department depends to a tremendous extent, will gradually lose interest, not to the extent of completely losing interest in their children and other children who attend schools but certainly to the stage where they will say, "We have been doing this on a voluntary basis for a long time now, and all we have got is contemptuous treatment by the Education Department on a petty issue, so we will restrict our activities in the future." I think it is inevitable that that will happen.

I assure the House that I did not have anything to do with organizing the gallery last week. If I had thought of it I would have done so, but I did not, and I do not

believe any of my colleagues did. I am usually fairly well up to date with any moves on this side of the House, and I did not see any move to organize the gallery.

Mr. Riches: It was said the member for Gawler did that.

Mr. JENNINGS: I am certain that nobody on this side of the House did any organizing of the gallery. The gallery last week, and to a lesser extent this week, reflected a spontaneous burst of interest in this matter; there is not the remotest doubt about that. The applause was absolutely spontaneous, too.

Mr. Lawn: I understand a few were organized by the member for Mitcham today for his fluoridation motion.

Mr. JENNINGS: No organizing was done from this side of the House.

The Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson: Did the invitations just send themselves out?

Mr. JENNINGS: I did not see any invitations, and I am surprised that any got into the Minister's possession; perhaps he did a bit of forgery or something. I think some people may have said, "This is a matter that vitally affects our welfare committee, and we should get up there and see what is going on."

The Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson: You can't explain the letters away.

Mr. JENNINGS: I have not seen any letters, and if the Minister has seen them he is the only person who has.

Mr. Lawn: Let him produce one.

Mr. Riches: Who signed them?

Mr. JENNINGS: I was about to say, Mr. Speaker, that since this action has been taken by the department I have seen much evidence of gross and grave dissatisfaction by parents who work voluntarily not only in canteens but in other ways for schools. Let me say that I have not gone looking for that evidence. I have had many telephone calls at home at inconvenient hours, and, as members know, one does not go looking for those. In each case I have told the caller that we are doing our best in the matter. I went to a school in my district on the Friday before this motion came on for debate. I had arranged the appointment with the headmaster and the school committee about three weeks before, so obviously it had nothing whatever to do with this matter. The appointment was for 10 o'clock and, with my characteristic punctuality, I got there at one minute to ten; and as I was walking past the canteen I saw a lady whom I do not know by name but whom I have seen working at that canteen every time I have been at the school in the 11 years I have been in this Parliament.

By the way, Sir, I assume from that that she has no children of her own at that school or possibly her children have left that school and gone to work, but, still having an interest in the school, she is working there. I emphasize that this is a primary school, and as she has been working there for about 12 years it is unlikely that she still has children attending the school. This inclines me to believe that there are a number of people who do not have children at a particular school but are doing their bit to help their friends' children. I think the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) also pointed out that a number of people are carrying on with their voluntary school work long after their children have left school. Even if the parents continue their voluntary work with unabated enthusiasm, which I doubt after this action by the department, then these other people who have been valuable workers certainly will not.

I do not think for one moment that this voluntary work is restricted to people working in canteens. On the contrary, I know that many people who have served as presidents and secretaries of school committees have stayed on in those capacities long after their own children have left, and I think that if the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) will call to mind a school in which we are jointly interested he will have to admit that.

Mr. Ryan: He does not want to do it publicly, though.

Mr. JENNINGS: We have mentioned—and I do not want to take this matter any further—that this school canteen service has provided very good food for the children. The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) this afternoon tried, in his rather peculiar fashion, to throw some doubt on that, but whilst there may be a certain amount of pie and pasty stuff, nevertheless it is a lot better than the sweets and ice creams across the street where the children previously went. The Minister himself has said that the children are by this means throughout the lunch period kept largely under the control of the teachers and in the school grounds, so they do not run the risk of crossing streets busy with traffic to get to the local delicatessen. The only constructive points that the Minister made in his speech supported the motion. The rest of his speech was a mass of statistical irrelevancies, and nothing more.

He produced every kind of figure, which he could not himself relate to anything. He said that the Auditor-General had been critical of some things but had praised the accountancy

of the Education Department. We know that is true because we read the Auditor-General's report, but I cannot see that that had anything to do with this motion in regard to canteens because surely it would have been known that only one school had a separate meter attached. So, how could we come to any firm conclusion about the money that would be saved by this scheme? The Minister admitted that he could not give a figure. The member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) was game enough to take what he admitted was only a calculated guess, although it was probably a calculated risk. The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) repeated what the member for Gawler and the Minister had said in that regard. But the point is that it is on this wild and woolly and completely unrealistic basis that this step is taken. The Minister does not know how much money he will save or how much money will be involved one way or the other; yet for this we shall disaffect those thousands of voluntary workers upon whom the Education Department has depended for so long.

Mr. Ryan: How long would the schools last without their help?

Mr. JENNINGS: The schools would be merely shells. Many of the amenities provided now from the money raised by the canteens and subsidies from the Government would not be available. The Minister this afternoon went out on his way (and the only thing that astonished me was that he took so long to do it) to do as he always does: to pay a glowing tribute to all the voluntary workers who help his department. I should have been the most amazed person in the world if he had not done that, because I have heard him do it many times in this House. I have heard him do it eloquently on innumerable occasions at public and school functions, and I have never once had the slightest reason to doubt his sincerity. Indeed, I do not doubt it now. I am only wondering: has he completely subordinated himself as Minister of Education to Treasurers, Auditors-General and Directors of Education?

The Minister quoted this afternoon from a speech he made at the opening of a teachers college, or some function like that. Anyway, he said it would be an appropriate place to say it—but then almost any place would be an appropriate place to say that! I notice he read from the speech he made then. I have attended many functions with him and have never noticed any script, so whether he always has one and is good at memorizing it or whether he has some kind of ingenious thing

that they call a "giggle sheet" (which the Premier uses every Wednesday night on television channel ADS7) I do not know. At least, we do know now that we can always check accurately to find out what the Minister said at one of these public functions, because he has a script hidden away somewhere. All I can say is that, even after the Minister's explanation today, we still do not quite know what his department intends to do. But even if the department intends to go ahead with this idea, we can still appeal to him and ask him to regard the scheme as ill-conceived and misbegotten and to change his attitude even at this late stage. If he does not, I think that we can make some arrangements about it after next March.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): The honourable member who has just resumed his seat and the honourable member for Gawler have said just about everything that can be said in support of this motion. However, the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) who is commonly known in his Party as the "hatchet man" or "Mr. Fix-it", made a very weak attempt to save the Government's face this afternoon.

Mr. Bywaters: He has slipped back.

Mr. McKEE: Yes, so I suggest that he introduce his hatchet to the grindstone because it is getting a little off-edge. However, I listened intently to the Minister this afternoon. In his opening remarks he said that the Leader of the Opposition's motion was brief and to the point, and I do not think he had any difficulty in understanding the meaning of it. But he went on to say that the Leader when speaking to the motion spoke at length on matters not associated with it. All I can say is that the Minister got square this afternoon when he was speaking because he went on to tell the House how much the Government had spent on school buildings in the last decade. If anybody was playing politics or wanting propaganda, the Minister took every opportunity to indulge in that this afternoon.

Mr. Casey: He is probably the most able man either inside this House or outside at doing that.

Mr. McKEE: Of course, as the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) remarked, the Minister has a very good press and is photogenic. However, it seems rather an unusual decision for the department to impose financial restrictions on these committees, because they are assisting the Government to supply amenities to the schools which, after all, should be supplied by the Government in the first place.

The committees have helped tremendously in new schools by meeting half the costs of establishing essential facilities. To ask them to pay for power and gas seems a clear-cut case of biting the hand that feeds you.

There is no doubt that this decision was arrived at because of the Government's concern at not being able to meet the demands for subsidies by these committees. It is true (and the Minister again mentioned it this afternoon) that I did ask a question last year about canteen funds, when the Minister rather evaded the question; he did not give me a complete reply. He omitted to mention the funds accumulated by primary and technical schools. Therefore, I did not get a true picture, for the purpose I required it, of the actual funds accumulated. These funds now embarrass the Government: schools in my district and in other districts have been waiting many months to build changing sheds for ovals and various other essential facilities. Of course, the result has been that they have been put off because of the cost involved to the Government in the subsidy.

Although there are many arguments for and against school canteens, the arguments for outweigh the arguments against, as has been clearly pointed out by the two previous speakers from this side. Also, the Minister of Education has said this afternoon that he completely agrees that there should be canteens in most schools where there are no shops handy. This is important to the welfare and for the convenience of the children. As was pointed out by the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark), canteens keep children in the schoolgrounds and under the discipline of the teachers, and this is important in many cases. Canteens also keep parents in close contact with the school—another important factor.

Parents should show an interest in schools, yet the Government's action would discourage that interest. I do not intend to speak at length because most of what could be said in favour of school canteens has already been said. Most canteens are run voluntarily by the mothers. These mothers want children to have the best facilities possible because this encourages them to stay at school and acquire the necessary qualifications for their future lives. Of course, it seems now that all that has been achieved by the generous actions of parents has been another opportunity for the Government to avoid its responsibility.

Education is already costing parents too much and the Government's action has placed a further load on their already over-burdened

shoulders. These canteens have been and still are a "fairy godmother" to the Education Department. They have provided half the money required to purchase amenities which, had it been left entirely to the Government, would never have been supplied. I cannot see how any good purpose can be served by cutting one's nose off to spite one's face. However, if I understand him correctly, the Minister has said that the Government will continue to pay costs for school canteens where meters have been installed. As the Minister has indicated that I have understood him correctly, I need not labour the issue further. The Minister has claimed that we were seeking political capital but, whether there is political value in this debate or not, I point out that our actions are sincere.

Mr. LAWN: It seems that every time we do something it is supposed to be for the purpose of making political capital.

Mr. McKEE: That is so, but the Labor Party's action in this matter is sincere and it will no doubt be commended by many committees for having forced the Government to see the light on this important motion.

Mr. LAUCKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

[*Sitting suspended from 5.49 to 7.30 p.m.*]

#### EXCHANGE OF LAND: PARNDANA.

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. P. H. Quirke:

That the proposed exchange of allotments 82 and 85, Town of Parndana as shown on the plan and in the statement laid before Parliament in terms of section 238 of the Crown Lands Act, 1929-1960, on February 18, 1964, be approved.

(Continued from August 25. Page 571.)

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I do not intend to delay this motion for the proposed exchange of allotments 82 and 85 in the town of Parndana. This exchange will enable a satisfactory arrangement to be completed by the Parndana Hall committee and the local Returned Servicemen's League sub-branch when the hall is built. The arrangement for the use of the clubroom in conjunction with the hall is a good way of achieving the desired result at a substantial saving to the community. It seems that this young community, in the main made up of soldier settlers, has accepted the responsibility of providing other essentials for the spiritual needs of its families. Now, it is planning for the essential part of social life, and is prepared to share in order to keep costs to a minimum. I understand, from the

Minister's explanation, that the proposal has been investigated by the Land Board, which recommended the exchange. Both lots have been valued at the same price; therefore, it is a fair exchange, and I support the motion.

Motion carried.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL  
(MINISTERS).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 25. Page 573.)

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): I support this Bill. When I spoke previously on a similar measure, I based my support on the growth of the economy of South Australia requiring greater activity on the part of those who, in Cabinet, conduct the affairs of the State and whose duties have grown enormously. In my opinion, it is desirable to ease the pressure on those who have encompassed, rather remarkably, all the work that comes from a rapidly expanding economy. Yesterday, I listened with keen interest to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. It seemed to me that fundamentally, he based his opposition to this Bill on his objection to Executive control, but I point out to him that Executive control is part of our Parliamentary system. Whatever Party provides the Government, we have this Cabinet system of government. I am not so concerned with his argument in support of his expressed fear of undue Executive control. What worries me is the prospect of a greater bureaucratic control developing through sheer inability of a given number of men to attend to the diverse and onerous duties placed on them in a State in which it has taken 125 years to attain the first million of population, but in which it is expected that our second million will be achieved in a quarter of a century. One must note the development, too, in three brief years of our primary and secondary production, which has increased at an average of between £11,000,000 and £12,000,000 net. Behind this is a story that, as the economy expands and the population increases (as it is doing in South Australia more rapidly in proportion to past population than in any other State), by virtue of that steep increase in population, the demands of social services, provision of schools, hospitalization, and all kinds of service, apart from the supply of basic requirements such as water, power reticulation, road and rail systems and so on, a huge volume of work is being brought to the desks of those who

at present form the Cabinet in this State. In 1938, when our Premier assumed office, the annual Loan Estimates totalled £5,000,000; this year they total almost £65,000,000. That further indicates the great development that must bring with it greater responsibilities. I regard the direction of any State or any governmental activity as being parallel to the conduct of a private business, in which the staff must be increased to meet the demands of increased business.

Initially, in South Australia we had five Ministers under the first Constitution Act. This number was increased to six in 1873, reduced to four in 1901, and increased again to six in 1908. The figure remained at six until 1953, when it was increased to eight, but this figure now bears little relationship to the expansion of the State's economy. With the extended and expanded activities within the State more Ministers are needed to shoulder the responsibilities arising from that increased development. It amazes me to note how the Cabinet in South Australia has attended to its multifarious duties so efficiently and minimized bureaucracy as it has. I pay a tribute at this stage to the excellent Public Service we have in South Australia. We have the most skilled, the most able and the most dedicated men that could be found anywhere.

Mrs. Steele: And women, too.

Mr. LAUCKE: I am sorry; men and women. I embrace women—and I hope that statement will not be misconstrued. Before long we are to lose from the Engineering and Water Supply Department three of our most experienced and able administrators—Mr. Dridan, Engineer-in-Chief; Mr. Arch Campbell, Engineer for Water Supply; and Mr. Ray Harvey, a District Engineer. These men have been giants in the department. Even though my remarks may be away from the subject matter of the Bill before the House—

The SPEAKER: I hope the honourable member will connect his remarks with the Bill.

Mr. LAUCKE: I am relating my remarks to my statement that bureaucracy in this State has thus far not impinged on the setting so as to be deleterious to the interests of a democracy. I pay a tribute to our Public Service. In pursuing the subject I have borne in mind that my thoughts today are the same as they were earlier this year, when I supported a similar measure. As I do not wish to reiterate what I said then, I will content myself with the remarks I have already made and indicate my support for the measure.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I support the second reading. Yesterday we heard the Leader of the Opposition, speaking on behalf of his Party, oppose this Bill. Although he indulged in much desk thumping, I do not think he advanced any real argument to support the stand against the Bill that he and members of his Party have adopted. I think he confused the enlargement of the representation in this House with the need for an increase in the number of Ministers. The position that obtains in the Lower Houses in other States may be of interest to and surprise members. I will take the States in order of size. In New South Wales there are 94 members of the Legislative Assembly and the Cabinet consists of 16 members—a ratio of about one to six; in Victoria, there are 66 members and 15 Ministers—a ratio of one to four and a half; in Queensland, 78 members and 13 Ministers—a ratio of one to six; in Western Australia, 50 members and 10 Ministers—a ratio of one to five; in Tasmania, 35 members and nine Ministers—a ratio of one to four; whereas in South Australia, with 39 members, we have five Ministers—a ratio of one to eight. This is interesting, in view of the expansion and development that has taken place in South Australia. It is all very well for the Leader of the Opposition to say, as he did yesterday, that industrial advancement had taken place in South Australia but that not all of it was brought about by any one political Party. I think he also went on to say that the Premier had been preceded by a Premier of the same political Party who had laid the foundations for such industrial expansion. I do not suppose that anyone would deny that Sir Richard Butler also was anxious to expand and develop South Australia. However, the Leader knows quite well—and so do most people in South Australia—that had it not been for the good industrial and political climate of this State capital for the expansion and development of commerce would not have been attracted here. Who provided the necessary background and developed the facilities that are the essentials to development?

In water supplies we have a record second to no State in the Commonwealth, bearing in mind the State's barrenness and the developments that have occurred in reticulating water to almost 96 per cent of the population. Electricity in this State is cheaper than in any of the other States except Tasmania which, of course, has a vast hydro-electric scheme. We know that this happy position is due to what was formerly almost a one-man show. Naturally, I refer to the development of the Leigh

Creek coalfield some years ago, and to the Premier's battle, not only with the Opposition but with members of his own Party, to ensure that the field was developed to provide the basis of what is now one of the best electrical systems in the Commonwealth. As a result, electricity is provided at a cheap rate in the country as well as in the towns.

This afternoon the Minister of Education gave a most impressive list of the schools that had been built even in the 10 years or so that he has been Minister. I do not think any South Australian could fail to be impressed and proud of the level of school building and the provision of school amenities in this State. We also have a record housing position, despite the criticism that is so often levelled against the Government's policy by the Opposition. Housing costs are cheaper here than in any other State. Houses are constructed with practically almost every recognized type of building material and it is done more cheaply than anywhere else in Australia. When speaking on the Prices Bill yesterday, the Premier said that this State could build a 12-square house of five rooms for at least £750 cheaper than any other State.

Mr. Loveday: Except Western Australia!

Mrs. STEELE: The Premier did not say that, and I am quoting only what he said. This statement can be confirmed by a reference to the *Quarterly Summary of Australian Statistics*, published in June, 1964, by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics in Canberra. It refers to the comparative percentage of houses built in the Commonwealth between 1958-59 and 1962-63. In New South Wales there was a four per cent increase in house building in that period; in Victoria a fall of six per cent; in Queensland an increase of 10 per cent; and in South Australia an increase of 17½ per cent. Unfortunately, I have not taken out the figures for Western Australia, but I think the figures I have just given will bear out what I am saying, namely, that the South Australian situation is well in advance of the position in the other States. Who provided the basis for the undoubted development that has taken place? I say without any hesitation that it has been the Liberal Government led by the Premier (Sir Thomas Playford), and, as I have said, some credit must go to the Premier that preceded him.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

Mrs. STEELE: I would also like to ask members: in whose interests has this development taken place? It has been in the interests

of the people of South Australia. No-one will deny that above all the Premier has been South Australian minded and that the development of this State has been his prime object. I invite a denial that the Premier is a person who has South Australian interests always at heart.

I feel that in the interests of future expansion and development here we would be foolish if we did not recognize the challenge that other States are now making to South Australia. Some years ago the Victorian Premier (Mr. Bolte) copied with great success the methods that have been used by the Premier here. Mr. Bolte went overseas on several occasions and attracted to Victoria a considerable amount of capital and developed an interest amongst industrialists overseas to establish their industries in Victoria. Now, more recently, we are seeing this on a much greater scale in Western Australia. I would like to dwell for a moment or two on the expansion taking place in Western Australia, because it is all related to the comparable expansion in South Australia and the need which this expansion creates for an extra Minister.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must link up her remarks with the subject matter of the Bill, which consists of only two clauses.

Mrs. STEELE: I will, Mr. Speaker. I have just recently been in Western Australia, and I was amazed at the great development which had taken place in the two years since I had been there previously, and which is still taking place. This shows that Western Australia has effectively copied the lead set by this State. In one area south of Kwinana a number of major industries have been established, and in the north of the State great development is taking place in the Ord River development scheme for the growing of rice, cotton, safflower and other tropical primary products. In addition, the Pilbarra field has made a tremendous difference to the State's mineral resources. We are now seeing the first stages of the building of the standard gauge railway that will link Perth with Kalgoorlie, and ultimately result in a continuous gauge across the continent. Western Australia has a Minister who has copied very effectively the work that has been done in South Australia to develop new industries. While I was in Western Australia I read that the Director of Industrial Development, who had recently been appointed, had returned from overseas with news of a number of industrialists who intended to establish industries in that State.

The SPEAKER: I point out to the honourable member that this Bill provides not for a Western Australian Minister but a South Australian Minister.

Mrs. STEELE: I agree, Mr. Speaker. I am pointing out that if we are to meet this challenge we need an extra Minister to develop and direct the further industrial expansion in South Australia. Incidentally, when I travel in other States I do so with a very constructive outlook, for I like to see and compare what is being done in those State and perhaps see if South Australia cannot learn a few lessons. We would indeed be blind if we did not realize that other States are following our lead, thus creating a very real challenge.

Mr. Riches: Western Australia has an oil refinery and a coalfield.

Mrs. STEELE: That progress, however, is as nothing compared with the expansion now taking place there. Western Australia has had a Liberal Government for a long time now. As a former resident of Western Australia, I may say that that State never went ahead in the days when it had a Labor Government.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must get back to the Bill. This is not a development Bill.

Mrs. STEELE: My feet are well and truly placed on the soil of South Australia but I think (I have said this before and I say it again) that we should not be doing our duty to South Australia if in trips that we made to other parts of the Commonwealth we did not observe what was going on and were not in a position to make comparisons, because this is a service we owe to the people of South Australia.

This afternoon I indulged in some mathematical exercises. The member for Yorke Peninsula (Mr. Ferguson) will verify this. It is a long time since I did such concentrated mathematics but I was working out some interesting percentages. I want to dwell for a moment on the exports from South Australia and compare them with exports from other States. Again, the comparison is for the years 1958-59 to 1962-63.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member explain how she connects her remarks with the Bill?

Mrs. STEELE: I thought this was all obviously pointing—

The SPEAKER: This Bill refers to only one Minister. I do not see how these figures can be connected with that.

Mrs. STEELE: I thought a Premier's Department was to be set up for the purpose of

expanding present industries and trying to get new ones to come to South Australia, and I am trying to show why it is necessary to have an extra Minister, because of the challenge from other States. In New South Wales, the most populated State, in those four years exports have increased by 40 per cent; Victoria's exports have increased by 35 per cent; Queensland's by 19 per cent; South Australia's by 16 per cent; and Western Australia's by 41 per cent. The reason I took out those figures was to show just to what extent there is a challenge from Western Australia but, even so, South Australia's figures on a population basis are most satisfactory compared with those of New South Wales, which has four times our population—4,086,293 as against our 1,020,000. Even so, New South Wales has not expanded its exports to the extent it should have in view of its large population compared with ours.

We hear much talk from honourable members opposite about decentralization. A little earlier this session I made a few remarks on this. We have all had ample time and opportunity to study the report of the Industries Development Committee, and a most thoughtful and thought-provoking document it is, too. Over a considerable period members appointed from both Houses and from both political Parties devoted much time and thought to investigating the possibilities of establishing industry outside the metropolitan area. Many propositions were submitted to the committee and their merits and demerits were fully discussed. Their report, when presented to Parliament, was the carefully considered submissions of the members of that committee. There were the germs of success in a few good schemes on a modest basis in some of those presented, but a good deal more research and investigation are needed before they can be considered by the Government as propositions worthy of its financial and departmental assistance. Who is going to undertake this work—the already over-worked Ministry and the staffs of the various departments? Most Ministers now, with the exception of the Minister of Education, carry more than one portfolio and it is unthinkable that the new department that is envisaged to handle the kind of development and work that I have mentioned should be added to their burdens.

The member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) paid a tribute to the Public Service, as I was going to do, but as he did it so ably I will not add to his remarks. Could the Premier, who every thinking person will agree has spared no effort physically or mentally in persuading or, in fact,

convincing overseas investors to come to South Australia, be expected to take on further unremitting spade work in addition to his already formidable responsibilities? I think we should really be thinking in terms of three extra Ministers and not one. I refer again to the figures I gave showing the ratio of members to Ministers in all the other States. I am not suggesting that all the Ministers should be in this House, because I do not think that would be in the best interests of Parliament, but I believe, quite frankly, that there should be a separate Ministry of Health. Let us consider the growth in population, the availability of hospital and medical services which has encouraged people to be even more conscious of the advantages of good health; the increase in the number of public hospitals and subsidized and community hospitals; the advances made in mental hospitals and ancillary services and public education in mental health; new drugs; and new training schemes for nursing staffs—and we will shortly have a Bill before the House on this particular matter. Those are just a few of the things that have come about as a result of new advances in medical science and in the use of drugs. I can only conclude that, like the Premier, the Chief Secretary obviously has a remarkable constitution and capacity for hard and constant work, when we realize the extent of his duties as Chief Secretary, Minister of Health and Minister of Mines.

The vast Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Public Buildings Department should, I consider, be the responsibility of separate Ministers. I believe the portfolio of Works is too restricting and too modest in title and in name when one realizes that, in addition, the Minister administers Harbors and Aboriginal Affairs and to each and every one of these separate responsibilities gives meticulous, considered and informed attention. I think it is just too much to expect any one man to carry such a burden with such obvious merit as does the Hon. Mr. Pearson. I am sure that members would not think that I was being too generous when I pay these compliments to the Ministers, because all members know they do an excellent job. They know that Ministers give a great deal of time to members personally and, when members come to them with problems on behalf of their constituents, or when they want a new school or school amenities, a new road or bridge, or when they come with the multitudinous requests that are always directed to any one of the Ministers, they receive the

utmost attention. The Leader of the Opposition made a curious remark in the course of his speech yesterday.

Mr. Millhouse: Only one?

Mrs. STEELE: This one in particular, I think, was rather intriguing. He said that apparently Parliamentary life is a very good social life as long as one does not have to sit in Parliament. I realize that I have quoted it out of context, but I think the remark was a bit out of place anyway, because all members have to undertake much social activity. I know he did not mean it in that sense, but as his remark was more or less out of place in the way it was made, I am taking him up on it. Every member knows that these so-called social activities are part and parcel of the duties which a member of Parliament, and particularly a Minister, has to accept, and which he does most willingly. However he meant it, he was a bit wide of the mark, whether it related to the Premier or any other Minister or member. Of all people, this remark could not be applied to the Premier. If the Leader thought that the main purpose of this Bill was to give the Premier an official title, which he has borne for countless years, I suggest that he was somewhat off the track. Having made this small contribution, I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I congratulate members on this side of the House who have spoken to this Bill, and consider that they have not been short of material to prove that this Bill should be passed. Each has pointed to the growth of activity in this State and in the work of the Ministry, and has advocated that this legislation is necessary to further the interests of this State and its people. The contribution of the member for Burnside was especially valuable, and her reference to the ratio of Ministers to members in each Parliament was an enlightening one. Another Minister could be appointed in this House without flouting any rule, if there is one, of the number of back-benchers compared with the number of Ministers. An increase of one could be made in this House, but I agree with the member for Burnside that we need more than one. I suggest an additional two here and one in the Legislative Council. However, that is not within the ambit of this Bill which is to consider the appointment of one additional Minister. It is unusual that we should be dealing with a Bill that was only recently considered by this House. We

know that the voting was close when it was previously before the House. You, Mr. Speaker, then gave a negative vote when expressing your opinion, but I hope that, if you are again required to vote, you will reverse that decision and support the Bill. When explaining the Bill the Premier gave many reasons why it is necessary, one of the most important being that a new department was needed to attract new industries to this State. The Premier's reference to the investigation of the Industries Development Committee on decentralization was a valid one, despite yesterday's derogatory reference by the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader said that he would support a move to give the Treasurer the title of Premier. I believe that, if the Leader were in a position to occupy the benches on this side of the House, he would have to show a great deal more stature as a politician and statesman to fill the office of Premier than he showed in his attention to this Bill. His statement in yesterday's *Hansard* reads pathetically, to say the least, although it is intelligible and tells a story. I listened carefully, and now find that it is the policy of the Opposition, as enunciated by its Leader, to hold this State and its people to ransom because of the political ambitions of the Opposition. It seems to me to be wrong that the Opposition will not separate the need for an increase in the representation of this Parliament from the need for another Minister to serve this State.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: In 1953 some of them advocated ten Ministers.

Mr. HALL: I am obliged to the honourable member for reminding me that before I entered this House some members opposite were advocating a bigger Cabinet. I believe that at that time they would have accepted a measure similar to this Bill without wanting a proviso that the House be increased in size. It is wrong that the welfare of this State should be held to ransom because of the political ambitions of members opposite, whose attitude is either an increase in numbers is agreed to or they will not agree to an increase in the Executive to handle this State's affairs. There is no other way to interpret their attitude, and it is a deplorable attitude from the Leader, who holds himself up to the people of this State as the alternative Premier. Members opposite often seek improvements in facilities for the people they represent, saying that their constituents need these things, yet they say that there should not be an additional Minister. The inference to be drawn is that

they do not care and that, for the sake of their political ambitions they are prepared to do without extra efficiency at the top. The Leader made this amazing statement:

We in this State are subject to too much Executive control.

I believe that is one of the reasons he advanced for opposing the appointment of another Minister. Members of the Opposition last week violently decried, to an audience in the gallery, the action of a public servant taken without reference to his Minister, yet now they talk about there being too much Executive control! The Leader also said that too much Executive control was at the expense of Parliamentary control. What did he mean by that? Is the Premier deficient in presenting the fiscal policy of the Government? We have recently dealt with the Loan Estimates, and I do not believe there was any complaint that they were inefficiently presented; in fact, we know they were most efficiently presented. Soon we shall have a Budget presented most efficiently. Whether or not the Opposition agrees with the policy inherent in that Budget is another matter, but it is no good members opposite coming here and saying they have no opportunity to criticize or redirect the Government's policy. If they are unable to do that, it is because they are short of numbers. We are being held to ransom merely because of Labor Party policy, which, as we know, is dictated to that Party from outside this House.

Mr. Millhouse: By the faceless men!

Mr. HALL: Not so faceless in South Australia, because we get a better look at them, but that comment applies in other States. Before it is too late for this State's advancement, I urge the Opposition to get its thinking on this matter in its proper perspective and separate the need for additional Ministers from its desire to obtain an electoral redistribution. Members opposite are doing themselves and this State a great disservice in not being able to separate those functions. Most people seem to believe that the passing of this measure needs an absolute majority of the members of this House, but from opinions I have gathered I believe that this measure does not need an absolute majority to pass.

Mr. Loveday: You disagree with the Speaker's ruling?

Mr. HALL: I have a personal view and I believe the Speaker would not prevent my putting it here. The Constitution Act, 1934-1961, is the title of an Act to consolidate certain laws relating to the Constitution of the State and for other purposes incidental thereto.

The Constitution is then divided into four parts: the first is entitled "Preliminary"; the second is "The Legislature"; the third is "The Executive"; and the fourth is "The Judiciary". I believe that they are effectively separated under their various headings. The pertinent section that forms the basis for believing that this amendment to the Constitution Act needs an absolute majority is section 8, which states:

The Parliament may, from time to time, by any Act repeal, alter, or vary all or any of the provisions of this Act, and substitute others in lieu thereof: Provided that (a) it shall not be lawful to present to the Governor for His Majesty's assent, any Bill by which an alteration in the constitution of the Legislative Council or House of Assembly is made, unless the second and third readings of that Bill have been passed with the concurrence of an absolute majority of the whole number of the members of the Legislative Council and of the House of Assembly respectively:

The title of the Act relates to the Constitution of the State, and section 8 deals with the constitution of the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly. Earl Jowitt, in the *Dictionary of the English Law*, defines "Constitutional law" as:

All rules which directly or indirectly affect the distribution or exercise of the Sovereign power, the law relating to the Legislature, the Executive, and the Judiciary.

This eminent scholar divides these matters into three categories as our Constitution has so divided them, and I believe that the matter of whether a man shall or shall not be a Minister of the Crown, as provided under the part entitled "The Executive", does not constitute an alteration to the constitution of the House of Assembly. I think it is reasonable to assume that this House is constituted before the Ministers are appointed. Ministers are appointed by the Governor. Section 65, under "Part III—The Executive", states:

- (1) The number of Ministers of the Crown shall not exceed eight.
- (2) The Ministers of the Crown shall respectively bear such titles and fill such ministerial offices as the Governor from time to time appoints.

The House is constituted by an election. All members, as they are sworn in, constitute the House of Assembly, whereas Ministers are appointed by the Governor. The provision in the Act is not mandatory, for it uses the word "may". I believe this is the crucial difference regarding the constitution of this House. It is constituted before the appointment of the Ministers. I humbly agree with the opinion of Earl Jowitt, who was Lord Chancellor of Great Britain at one time and a

most eminent lawyer, for he distinctly separates the Legislature, Executive and the Judiciary. Indeed, they are separated in our Constitution. I remind honourable members again that this House is constituted before the Ministers are appointed by the Governor, and I repeat that the provision in the Act is permissive and not mandatory. Consequently, to alter the number of Ministers does not alter the constitution of this House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): This afternoon when we were debating the matter of school canteens we heard much about "playing politics". Several suggestions were made that one side or the other was doing it. All I can say is that the opposition to this Bill is a far better example of playing politics than anything I have known in this House during the nine years that I have been a member. As I say, the opposition to the Bill is a prime example of the ability of the Opposition to play politics. Why do I say that? During this debate so far everybody has skirted around the real reason for the opposition to the Bill, a reason that developed during the last session of Parliament. I intend to say something about that, because I suggest it proves that the Opposition is simply playing politics in opposing this Bill. You, Mr. Speaker, will remember only too well that it was a surprise when this Bill was defeated last session. It was indeed to many people in South Australia a great surprise when it was known that the Opposition proposed to vote against it, because on other occasions when this matter had been debated the Opposition had advocated a larger Ministry. This was the first time that the Opposition had ever turned turtle on this issue. Then it gave the most specious reason one could possibly imagine for its opposition, for it said it was not opposed to increasing the size of the Ministry if the size of the House were increased as well. That was something that nobody had ever thought of before. All I can say is that whoever thought that one up and had it adopted as Opposition policy had an agile mind. However, that was not the true reason why this Bill was opposed by the Labor Party. The real reason was given subsequently by the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) when speaking at the university. I was not there; I make that quite clear, but I believe that this was the reason that he gave, and if I am wrong I suggest that the honourable member can easily say so. I understand he explained the matter by referring to another Constitutional Bill in the offing at the time this Bill was introduced. In fact, I think three Constitutional Bills were introduced last session.

The one before the House at present was called the Constitution Act Amendment Bill (Ministers). Another (the one to which I refer) was called the Constitution Act Amendment Bill (Electoral). This present Bill failed to pass this House on February 19, 1964. The second reading of the Electoral Bill was given on February 20. In other words, this Constitutional Bill preceded the other Bill which the Opposition was pledged to oppose with the utmost of its force. We knew that was going to happen. I suggest with some confidence that the Opposition expected you, Mr. Speaker, to support the third reading of this Bill last session, as you had supported the second reading.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: And it brought one of its members in especially, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. It had a sick member of its Party brought in so that the voting would be 19 all to give you, Sir, the chance to exercise a casting vote to make it 20 votes to 19, and thus allow the Bill to pass in the affirmative with a Constitutional majority. The reason why the Opposition was anxious for this to happen was that it wanted an opportunity to challenge in the courts of law the Constitutional validity of what you did, and that was to be a dress rehearsal for a similar proceeding on the next Constitutional Bill—the one dealing with electoral plans. Sir, its plan misfired rather unexpectedly and rather dramatically, as we all remember, late one afternoon, and that never did happen. But what the Opposition expected was that it would be able to get up in this House and oppose this Bill on the most specious of grounds and then do everything it could to let it pass so that it could challenge you, Mr. Speaker, in the courts of law.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: And it brought a sick man into the House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. Opposition members thought that they would be able to challenge your authority, Mr. Speaker, to give a casting vote on a Constitutional matter. Some members opposite are laughing, but I am only pointing out what one of their colleagues, the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan), gave at the university as the reason for the opposition to this Bill. If I am wrong, let members opposite get up and say so. I believe that what I am saying is correct. Now, Sir, Opposition members are hoist with their own petard. The Bill has been introduced a second time and they—out of cussedness or because of some other reason which I will not go into—have to oppose the Bill on this occasion as well. But,

Sir, it is pretty obvious, I think, that they do not like opposing this Bill. What have we had? The Leader of the Opposition made a speech yesterday, but not one other member opposite has spoken. The Opposition was so keen to get a vote on this matter yesterday that we had a division on the adjournment.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It wanted to get the Bill out of the way.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course, in the hope that it would be forgotten as quickly as possible before the election, because it knew, as we know, that this Bill is a commonsense Bill. It is a measure that is overdue, and it is one that is supported, I believe, by an overwhelming number of people in South Australia. Sir, I support the second reading.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support the Bill which, in my opinion, is extremely important. It is so important that members on this side are prepared to speak on it, but I am waiting in vain to hear some support from members opposite for the speech given yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition. I have not heard any Opposition member express the same views as the Leader expressed.

Mr. Loveday: Quite a change, isn't it?

Mr. COUMBE: I am led to believe that the Leader, once again, is a voice crying in the wilderness. This is an extremely important Bill, as I have said, and one that will benefit South Australia and its people, for the reasons explained by the introducer of the Bill. I would have imagined that there would be no politics in this sort of Bill because, after all, the appointment of a Minister does not give any Party a political advantage. The Bill is specifically designed to benefit the development of South Australia, its industries and its people. But what do we hear? We heard yesterday from the Leader one of the most hypocritical speeches that I have heard in this House. It was full of expediency and humbug, in my opinion. It was hypocrisy of the first order—and I am not afraid to say it. I say that deliberately because I am reminded of what happened in this House last year. A reference to *Hansard* will deny any refutation of what I am saying.

Who were the most surprised members last year when this Bill was defeated on your casting vote, Mr. Speaker? When I say that, I am not reflecting on you, Sir. I am asking, as a result of your ruling, who were the most surprised members? They were the members of the Opposition who had deliberately fostered and encouraged a debate on the matter to the extent of bringing the honourable member for

Semaphore (Mr. Tapping) into this House from his sick bed. Here let me say that I join with other honourable members in deploring his present absence from the House. But, unfortunately, he was brought here then deliberately to make it equal voting on that Bill, which was defeated as a result of your casting vote, Mr. Speaker. I suggest, however, that the Opposition members were the most surprised of any members in this House.

Mr. Millhouse: And the most disappointed.

Mr. COUMBE: I agree. I noticed that some members immediately after the voting were dismayed and chagrined. One member expressed that view to me personally. On that occasion there were honourable members opposite who would have liked to see another Minister appointed, and I suggest that there are today members who, in the interests of their constituents and of South Australia generally, would like to see another Minister appointed. I am afraid the indications are that nobody opposite will deny that.

What is the position of the Labor Party and its past thinking on this matter? I want to cite just one or two passages to illustrate the change of thinking as a matter of political expediency. First, let me quote from the 1953 *Hansard*, wherein is recorded the debate that took place in this House on the appointment of two further Ministers—the Minister of Education in this House and the Minister of Local Government in another place. At page 639 the member for Semaphore (Mr. Tapping) had this to say in support of the Bill:

For many years I have considered six Ministers to be insufficient; in fact, I favour 10 to carry out the onerous work and assist members and all other South Australians.

The honourable member advocated 10 Ministers in 1953, at which time we had exactly the same strength in the House as we have today—and there is no suggestion that it will be increased. At page 681 the member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens) had this to say:

Like the member for Semaphore I would support the appointment of even more Ministers.

Those two honourable members were supported, in turn, by no less an authority than my good friend the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) who, at page 642, had this to say:

We certainly need two new Ministers. I would go so far as to say that more than two are necessary.

Mr. Millhouse: He did not say anything about the size of the House being increased?

Mr. COUMBE: Not a word was said about not increasing the number of Ministers unless

we increased the size of the House. Two honourable members said that we should have more Ministers and a third said that we should have at least 10 Ministers.

Mr. Millhouse: That is right.

Mr. COURCELLE: That is quite a change of heart. I am suggesting that exactly the same circumstances exist today as then and that this change of thinking and heart is craven, is the direct result of political expediency, and is full of hypocrisy. The Labor Party has gone even further than that. During the last election campaign the Labor Party went to the hustings and, amongst other things, advocated a separate Minister of Housing. Would not that have meant the creation of another separate Minister? Further than that, we heard in this House in the debate on the Bill last year exactly the same proposal propounded by the Leader of the Opposition: he wanted a separate Minister of Housing. Members opposite cannot have it both ways: either we are going to have another Minister or we are not. The Labor Party has advocated in the past that we increase the size of the Ministry. It said at the last election that it should be done, and it was stated in the speech by the Leader of the Opposition last year. When these comments were made in the past there was no suggestion of increasing the membership of the House and for the Labor Party to say now that the size of the Ministry should not be increased unless the number of members is increased is pure political humbug. I venture to say that, in their hearts, all members opposite agree that we should have an extra Minister in the State to assist the present Cabinet in the onerous and important work it is carrying out. Members opposite, especially the Leader of the Opposition, have made great play about Executive control. I remind the Leader that he has also advocated greater Ministerial control and in another debate today, to which I cannot refer, he implied that there should be greater Ministerial control and less control by members of the Public Service. If he wants greater Ministerial control over the departments, the only way to get it is to increase the number of Ministers.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The Opposition insisted on that in the Aborigines legislation.

Mr. COURCELLE: Yes. I thank the Minister for pointing that out to me. The Labor Party has consistently advocated greater Ministerial control and less Executive control. That is an extremely important point and in using the specious argument members opposite have used today they have reached an all-time low

in their arguments in this House. Many reasons have been given by previous speakers for having an extra Minister. I do not want to canvass them at length because they are so important that they need no emphasis.

I pointed out last year in a debate on this measure that the responsibility of the individual members and of Cabinet collectively has increased enormously in recent years. In 1953 the Premier presented a Budget of about £50,000,000 and last year the sum had grown to £100,000,000. In other words, the Budget had doubled and the Loan Estimates have increased tremendously. Great development has taken place in every department and yet the Ministry remains at the same size, the inference being that the Ministers have twice as much work to do. I suggest that the possibilities and potential of this State warrant an increase in the size of the Cabinet. What were the reasons given by the Premier for an additional Minister? The main reason was that the new Minister, apart from assisting other Ministers, could assist in the development of the State and its natural resources and in bringing new industries to South Australia and in assisting those already here. Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition made some comments about the report of the Industries Development Committee, which I read with some interest. I could not quite connect his remarks with his reference to the report of the committee. He quoted that report, in part, as follows:

As set out in the body of this report the committee believes it to be desirable that industrialists have some definite point of contact with the Government which can give information on the various aspects of the State's industrial and economic forces and give advice and assistance on the various technical aspects of choosing and operating from a particular location. This can best be achieved by setting up a special department or branch of a department to promote country industrial expansion and, in association with local committees, publicize the natural advantages which certain locations may possess. Such a department could provide a most valuable service to industry generally and to decentralized industry in particular. The committee does not propose to set out in this report its views on the scope of the functions of such a department, but it believes that the head of the department should have direct access to the Premier and that it should be staffed by personnel—administrative, technical, public relations and accounting—to give a service to industry and to publicize the advantages of South Australian locations in general and, where applicable, of country locations in particular.

The Leader tried to use that as a reason why we should not have another Minister. In fact, that report proves, *prima facie*, why we should

have another Minister, and why the department should be set up. If the Leader considers it important to have this department, it is important that we should have a Minister in charge of it. Last year I quoted the ratio of the Cabinet Ministers to members in the Lower Houses of Parliaments in Australia, and, with the exception of Queensland, which is in a peculiar position in that it has no Upper House, the South Australian Parliament has the lowest ratio. That speaks volumes for what we have been able to do in the past with a small Cabinet, and for the ability of our Ministers and their physical fitness, and we could be in a parlous position should sickness occur. In Cabinets in other States and in the Commonwealth Parliament, Ministers have special designations, such as Minister of Labour, Industry, Electricity Undertakings and Development.

These special portfolios are set up to handle developmental projects. In this State we have the Department of Labour and Industry, which is represented in Parliament by the Minister of Industry, a member of the Upper House. The main function of that department is to deal with safety precautions, wage board determinations, and interpretation and implementation of awards in industry, and its main duty, with a staff of about half a dozen, is to assist industry. It is incapable of doing the work that is wanted today. It is no use suggesting that we already have a department with the necessary machinery to carry out what is now required in the State. The report of the Industries Development Committee, sitting as a special committee to inquire into decentralization of industry, states:

The committee has noted that in both New South Wales and Victoria there are branches of the Premier's Department charged with responsibilities such as those mentioned above. That is, to attract industries and to help in the decentralization of industries. The report continues:

Similar departments or sub-departments exist in Queensland, Western Australia and Tasmania. The committee is not able to judge whether the existence of these sections has achieved any marked and permanent decentralization and it is noted that they have other functions relating to development of industry generally. They do serve the purpose, which appears to be lacking in South Australia, of co-ordinating the efforts of local authorities and committees, of providing information to them and to industries, of providing rationalized publicity and of actively seeking industries generally or for specific locations. The committee believes that a similar organization should be set up in South Australia. It believes that such actions would be welcomed by industrialists and by local authorities and committees—

That means local authorities and committees right through the country, as the committee held its meetings in many country towns—

—that it would receive cordial support from similar organizations in other States and that it would provide an extremely useful information and advisory bureau for the Government.

That is an extract from the report of the committee, to which some members opposite were signatories. Do they go back on that recommendation? If they do, why do they not say so in this debate? If the Party opposite does not support that report, it is going back on the views of its members who were on that committee. If the Opposition does not support the Bill, it is doing a disservice not only to its own Party but to South Australia and South Australians.

Mr. RICHES: You know very well that this Bill has nothing whatever to do with setting up that department.

Mr. COURCELLE: Please grow up! Give us credit for some semblance of intelligence. If the honourable member really believes that, he has only to read the Premier's second reading speech. What else are we debating? What is the purpose of the Bill if that is not it? I am not talking about the trivial matter of the Treasurer's title or about what the department shall be called; what I am concerned about, and what every member of this House should be concerned about, is that every facility should be given to promoting the welfare of South Australia and South Australians; and this will create more employment in this State. I would have thought that any measure coming before this House that tended to create further employment would receive the whole-hearted acclaim of the Opposition. How can members of the Opposition frankly and candidly go into their districts and explain why they opposed a Bill that would increase employment in this State?

Mr. RICHES: It does not do anything of the sort.

Mr. COURCELLE: The opposition to this Bill is hypocritical to the extreme. It is entirely for political expediency, and I have not heard that denied. I am eagerly waiting for some member opposite to rise and support the views expressed by the Leader, who is the only member opposite who has spoken in this debate. I presume all members opposite support their Leader.

Mr. RICHES: Will you in your great wisdom explain why this department cannot be set up without the Bill?

Mr. COUNBE: In moving the second reading, last year, the Treasurer explained that it was desirable that this department be set up and that there be another Minister to run it and assist other Ministers, especially the Treasurer.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The whole purpose of the Bill was to assist in establishing industry.

Mr. COUNBE: Exactly, as was explained last year and again this year. It was introduced for one purpose only. The member for Stuart (Mr. Riches), has been here longer than I, and he knows that another Minister cannot be appointed unless the Act is amended.

Mr. Riches: I did not say anything about another Minister; I asked why the department could not be set up without this Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Torrens.

Mr. COUNBE: During the Budget debate last year the Minister of Education said that provision was being made for the salary to be paid to the extra Minister when he was appointed, but I did not hear any member of the Opposition oppose that line. The line for the Minister's salary went through quickly. I did not hear anybody oppose it on that occasion.

Mr. Millhouse: They had not made up their minds at that time.

Mr. COUNBE: No. I suggest that the action of the Opposition was a brainwave cooked up on the spur of the moment and, if I may say so, regretted ever since by members of the Opposition. In summing up, we had yesterday—

Mr. Riches: In summing up, can the honourable member say what would be wrong if Parliament adopted the Industries Development Committee's recommendation?

Mr. COUNBE: You are a member of that committee. I could not speak on it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. COUNBE: Why don't you get up and make a speech about it?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should address the Chair.

Mr. COUNBE: In deference to you, Mr. Speaker, I shall do that. The member for Stuart has referred to this report and I have quoted several extracts from it, but I have yet to hear him say that he does not agree with what is in it. If the honourable member wishes to move something about this report he is a member of that committee, and I should have thought it was incumbent on him

to do something about it. I was not a member of that committee.

Mr. Riches: Doesn't the honourable member know that expenditure cannot be the subject of legislation introduced by a private member.

The SPEAKER: Order! This Bill has no reference to the Industries Development Committee's report.

Mr. COUNBE: The extracts that I have taken from this report are germane to this argument and have not been denied or refuted in any way. This Bill is designed for one specific purpose only: to create an additional Minister in the South Australian Cabinet from this Parliament, whose duty it will be to carry out certain duties that were set out by the mover of the motion. The main objects, once again, are to promote the welfare of industry and the people who work in industry in South Australia. I should have imagined that nobody in his senses would have had the temerity to oppose a Bill that was so straightforward. For the Opposition to get up and oppose it merely for political expediency is quite beyond me.

Mr. Millhouse: The irresistible inference is that the Opposition is not in its senses.

Mr. COUNBE: They are the words of the member for Mitcham, not mine. How can such opposition to this Bill be justified? The only reason we have received (a specious reason at that) is that the House is not big enough and that the Opposition will not agree until its size is increased. The Government made an offer last year to increase the size of this House from 39 to 42, but the Opposition would not have that. It cannot have it both ways. What does the Opposition want? Does it want this State to develop or does it want all the Ministers to work themselves to death?

Mr. Millhouse: They would not care.

Mr. COUNBE: I do not think they could. This Bill is one of the most important before the House at the moment. We have had agreement on other less important Bills, and I should have imagined that the Opposition would have agreed to this measure, for it can do only good and it can only improve the present service that is being given. Indeed, it is amazing that the Ministers have been able physically to carry out the work and the duties that are entailed in their respective portfolios. I suggest that many members of the Opposition privately would like to see this Bill carried; that was most apparent last year when the Bill was (to them) surprisingly beaten.

As I said earlier there should be no politics in this Bill. No Party gets any advantage and the Bill is for the welfare of South Australia.

To suggest that taking another member from the back benches to the front bench would reduce the effectiveness of the voice of an electoral district is pure humbug. I should imagine that the district of the Minister would get better representation from his being in the Cabinet and that it would be to the advantage of the electorate to have a Minister.

Mr. Clark: Are you suggesting that Ministers favour their own districts?

Mr. COURCE: No, I would be the last one to say that, but I think that the Minister's district would get valuable representation. The only specious argument that the Leader has put up for not having another Minister is that we would denude the back benches. I hope that good sense will prevail on this occasion.

Mr. Millhouse: Even at this late stage?

Mr. COURCE: Yes. Financial provision has been made for the appointment of the Minister and I assume that it will be brought forward in the Budget and that all we need do then is to assent. When the vote on the legislation was taken last year the Opposition went to the extreme trouble of bringing Mr. Tapping (member for Semaphore) from his sick-bed to get an even vote so that the Bill could pass.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the attention of the honorable member to Standing Order 144, which states:

No member shall reflect upon any vote of the House, except for the purpose of moving that such vote be rescinded.

I take it that the honourable member will not move to rescind; therefore, he cannot refer to the vote.

Mr. COURCE: I regret my infringement; it was not intentional. I hope that this Bill will be carried, as it should be carried, for the benefit of everybody in South Australia.

The House divided on the Hon. G. G. Pearson's motion "That this debate be now adjourned":

Ayes (18).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, McAnaney, Laucke, and Millhouse, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson (teller), Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Burdon, Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Pairs.—Ayes—Mr. Nankivell. Noes—Mr. Tapping.

The SPEAKER: There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote in favour of the Ayes. The question therefore passes in the affirmative.

Motion carried; debate adjourned.

#### ABORIGINAL AND HISTORICAL OBJECTS PRESERVATION BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

#### STATUTES AMENDMENT (DOG FENCE AND VERMIN) BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

#### CREMATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works): I move:

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

Its purpose is to permit cremation in certain cases before registration of death. The principal Act provides that the Registrar of Deaths may issue a cremation permit where a coroner, having held an inquest into the cause of death, certifies to the Registrar that the cause has been duly inquired into and that no further examination of the body is necessary. However, no permit can be issued until death has been duly registered. In the past, this has sometimes caused much delay and inconvenience where a person has died in another State, in Victoria for example, and it is desired to cremate the body. Under Victorian law a coroner may permit cremation before registration of death, but no cremation may be permitted here until after registration of death.

Clause 3 (a) amends section 5 of the principal Act to permit cremation before registration of death where the deceased died in another State which itself permits cremation before registration of death. For the sake of greater clarity, clause 3 (b) inserts a definition of "coroner" into section 5 to make it quite clear that the South Australian Registrar may act on the certificate of a coroner in another State. I do not foresee any difficulties regarding this Bill, which is perfectly simple and clearly self-explanatory. I commend it to the House.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): Having listened to some recent debate in this House, I am of opinion that this measure should have been introduced earlier, but I do not desire to develop that line of argument. We on this side have examined the Bill and know from recent statistics that in 20 per cent of deaths today cremation rather than burial takes place. However, when burial does take place we feel that

the costs of leasing graves and providing appropriate memorials are too high. Will the Premier recommend that the Prices Commissioner investigate funeral charges in view of the current public feeling that in some cases they are excessive? I do not like to reflect upon a particular industry. I know that most funeral directors conduct their business efficiently, but perhaps these costs and charges could be investigated. I support the second reading of the Bill.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): In reply to the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition, may I say that the Prices Commissioner has examined this matter and has today forwarded to me recommendations on it. I will examine them and take any necessary action. I point out to members opposite that, with a small Ministry, it takes time to examine these matters.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### FESTIVAL HALL (CITY OF ADELAIDE) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 20. Page 536.)

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I can recall on previous occasions when the Opposition has asked the Government to provide something that would have required a sum of money the Premier has found it convenient to reply that the request could not be complied with because Parliament had not provided any money for the purpose. Yet, while the Premier finds it convenient to place the responsibility upon the Parliament when it suits him he can, and does, when it suits him, promise the expenditure of small and large sums, together with loans of large sums, without in any way first consulting Parliament. This case is an example. Approximately £500,000 was promised as a grant, with a further loan of about £400,000, and the first knowledge members had of it was when they read about it in the press. This is treating Parliament with contempt, and it is not an isolated instance. This position has probably been brought about because the Government has been in office too long, and because of the gerrymander of electoral districts.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr. LAWN: Once again I have rung the bell. Government members glory in the fact that we have a political gerrymander in this

State. They think they cannot be tossed out of office.

Mr. Jennings: They would not be on that side otherwise.

Mr. LAWN: Of course, that is what I was about to say. Because of the gerrymander—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in this Bill about a gerrymander.

Mr. LAWN: —the Government has remained in office. I am giving instances of where the Government has made announcements outside Parliament that involve its making grants, and I claim I am in order in making the complaint. Also, I shall vote whichever way I want to. I criticize the tie-up that this Government has with Channel 7, which it uses to make public announcements instead of making them in this House. It then comes to this place with a Bill and asks us to support what has been announced outside by the Premier.

Mr. Jennings: The Cabinet might as well meet there.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. Anyhow, it is a one-man Cabinet, so the meeting of Cabinet can take place wherever the Premier is. I should like to see him caught in the lift. He could hold a Cabinet meeting with himself. We had a few visitors earlier this evening and they left the lift door open, and until a member shut it, the lift did not work. Another instance was on Wednesday, August 12, 1964. The member for Frome asked a question concerning the totalizer agency board system.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot mention T.A.B. here.

Mr. LAWN: I am not speaking about that. I am speaking about the announcement involving the expenditure of money made outside this Parliament instead of in this building, after a question was asked of the Premier. I do not wish to discuss T.A.B. The Premier, in answer to the member for Frome, said:

True, I said I would make a statement on this matter after Cabinet had considered it. Cabinet has considered it and has approved of certain recommendations which are being conveyed to the racing clubs that made the first submissions to me. Those recommendations will, I hope, be delivered to the clubs concerned this afternoon.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. LAWN: The Premier's answer continued:

As they should be in transit at the moment I shall not make a statement until the information has been supplied to the people who made the original submissions.

At the time he replied to the member for Frome he had already taped a statement in

connection with T.A.B. for his usual 6.55 p.m. talk on television.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member had better get back to the Festival Hall Bill.

Mr. LAWN: I am speaking to the Festival Hall Bill, but I am objecting to the manner in which it was announced by the Government. If you rule that I am out of order, Mr. Speaker, I shall move to disagree with your ruling. I shall speak to the points in the Bill in a few moments.

The SPEAKER: You had better hurry up.

Mr. LAWN: I object to the manner in which the Government made this announcement about the festival hall, and that is what this Bill refers to.

Mr. Bywaters: You are giving a few legitimate illustrations?

Mr. Ryan: It was announced on Channel 7.

Mr. LAWN: Of course it was. Although the Premier refused to give the information to the House in reply to a question, he had already given the information to the *Advertiser* television network. About 12 months ago he did a similar thing in connection with a question asked by the member for Enfield. I am trying to show that this is not an isolated case, and I hope that it will not happen in the future. I know that I am being optimistic. However, perhaps next March we shall have a change of Government. On Wednesday September 4, 1963, the member for Enfield asked a question of the Premier about the Gepps Cross Hostel, the Premier replying:

I have now been able to reach agreement with the Commonwealth Government, and I can inform the honourable member that the agreement will give him everything he desires.

The Premier knew the answer to the question, yet that was the answer he gave to the member for Enfield. That same morning he had already given the information sought by the member for Enfield to the *Advertiser* television network to be passed on to the people in his talk over that channel at 6.55 that evening, but he refused to give the information in the House that afternoon. That is all I desire to say on that aspect. However, I resent announcements of this character being made over Channel 7 instead of in this House. We are asked to support a Bill involving a grant of £500,000 to the Adelaide City Council and the loan of £400,000, but were we informed of it in this House? Of course not; we were informed of it over Channel 7, the *Advertiser* network. In providing these premises, Adelaide (and the State of South Australia) is doing only what

other great cities have done at a comparable stage of their development for the proper growth of the cultural side of the lives of the community. Adelaide has outgrown the facilities available for adequately presenting to the people music in all its forms, ballet, and theatre. Symphony concerts, solo recitals, ballet, dramatic presentations, intimate theatre and organ recitals are all among the possible uses of the building. It could be eminently suitable also for conventions, meetings, lectures, social gatherings, and various types of exhibitions.

Mr. Clark: Will it be available for political conventions?

Mr. LAWN: There may be some objection on the ground that the hall may be used only once every two or three years when we have the Adelaide Festival of Arts, but I do not believe that is correct. I believe it could be used for all the occasions I have mentioned and, as one of my colleagues has suggested, I think one of the most fitting uses for it could well be the Australian Labor Party convention. I wonder whether during the construction of the building it should be wired for language translations for international conferences, if it were needed for that purpose in the future.

Australia is playing an increasingly important part in world affairs. As a result, it falls upon us from time to time to be the host country for various assemblies dealing with international problems, and it is possible that this building could be used in the future for international conferences if it were wired for language translations. I suggest that this matter might well be considered by the Select Committee if the second reading of the Bill is passed, although I am not optimistic that it will be passed. As each year passes, more international conferences will be held here. I do not know what this wiring would cost, but I think the matter could be investigated.

Mr. Frank Walsh: They have not even got the land yet!

Mr. LAWN: I realize that. I would like South Australia to have a decent festival hall because we have to show other States as well as overseas countries that we are a cultured people and that we cater adequately for the arts. I was in Melbourne earlier this year while the Adelaide Festival of Arts was being held, and there was no doubt that there was jealousy in Melbourne over its success. Apparently the Melbourne Moomba Festivals are failures, and Melbourne people are jealous of our festivals.

The hall will be a centre for the education and entertainment of the people of this State and will be something of which Adelaide can be proud. I hope that it will not be a profit-making venture but, on the other hand, I hope there will be no need for further subsidies. There should be no capital charges, for the Government is to make a grant of £500,000 towards the cost of the hall and the Adelaide City Council is to find the balance. The controlling body should merely have to meet the cost of day-to-day maintenance and administration, and I believe the income from rentals would be sufficient to cover this. At the same time, rentals should be low enough to compare more than favourably with the rentals for existing accommodation of similar capacity. This would result in admittance prices to the public being as low as possible and would give as many people as possible the opportunity to attend the concerts, etc., to be held from time to time in the festival hall.

I want to see everyone given the chance to avail himself of the use of this building. We must not forget that the hall is not to be constructed by private enterprise if the Bill is passed. If the Bill is passed the ratepayers of the Adelaide City Council will provide a substantial part of the cost. Therefore, the people of this State should be able to participate in the use of that hall when something in which they are interested is taking place, without having to depend upon how much they have in their pockets. As the Minister said in his second reading explanation:

The object of this short Bill is to enable the Council of the Corporation of the City of Adelaide to construct a festival hall within the city with Government assistance.

Clause 5 provides that this assistance will be in the form of a £100,000 grant "for the purpose of assisting the council to purchase or acquire land", as well as a further grant of up to £400,000 and a loan of up to £400,000. Clause 3 (3) provides that "the festival hall shall be constructed and provided in accordance with designs approved by the Treasurer." I agree with the Premier's stipulation that, if the Government is to be involved to such a financial extent, the festival hall "shall be constructed and provided in accordance with designs approved by the Treasurer". If the people are to find half the total cost they should have some say in its design.

As the Government is providing nearly £500,000 for the construction of the festival hall and purchase of land, and a further loan

of about £400,000, as well as demanding that the construction and designs of the festival hall meet with its approval, I see no reason why clause 4 of the Bill should vest the care, control and management of the festival hall in the Adelaide City Council. That is what the Bill does, and I object to it. I believe that Parliament should have some say in the control and management of the hall, therefore I suggest that clause 4 could well be amended to provide that a committee, trust or board of management be appointed, with Parliament being represented on that body by three members. I visualize a committee of five, so at least two representatives would come from the Corporation of the City of Adelaide.

In conclusion, last session and on other occasions when Select Committees have been appointed by the House the time granted for the committees to investigate and report back to the House has been far too short. I particularly have in mind the Select Committee, of which I was a member, appointed last year on the Morphett Street Bridge Bill. I suggest to the Minister that, should the second reading of this Bill be carried, in moving the motion for the appointment of a Select Committee he ensure that the committee be given sufficient time by specifying that it have at least until the last week in September before being required to report back to the House.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): In supporting the Bill, I find that on this occasion I must agree for the most part with my colleague, the member for Adelaide. The honourable member and I both have the privilege of representing the City of Adelaide. I should point out that, although in many respects the honourable member and I appear to see eye to eye, I do not agree with some of the remarks he made early in his speech. I certainly agree with his last remarks regarding the time allowed Select Committees to investigate matters and report back to the House. I, too, was a member of the Select Committee on the Morphett Street Bridge Bill, and I heartily agree with the honourable member's suggestion that on this occasion we should have ample time to consider this matter.

Mr. Lawn: Don't say we agree!

Mr. COUMBE: I am happy to agree with the honourable member on this occasion.

Mr. Lawn: I don't know that I am too happy if the member for Torrens agrees.

Mr. COUMBE: I am sure that this Bill will be supported by every member of this House, for it gives some fillip to the Adelaide Festival

of Arts, a wonderful achievement in recent years and one acclaimed all over the world. This festival is recognized as comparing in some degree with the Royal Festival and the Edinburgh Festival, and this Bill will ensure that the Adelaide Festival of Arts will continue the lead it has gained in Australia in cultural achievement. This is a great thing for Adelaide, and I believe that everyone in South Australia is jealous to see that this reputation is enhanced.

This latest move to build a hall has come about because of the necessity for a suitable venue for world-class dramatic presentations and concerts. I had the privilege of serving on the Lord Mayor's committee that did some work on the investigation of a site for this hall. To give an indication of the popularity of this project, no fewer than 57 submissions regarding possible sites were made to the committee. I am very pleased indeed that the selected site—a most commanding position—happens to be in my district. The site is not specifically mentioned in the Bill. When built this hall will, in my opinion, materially assist the furtherance of culture in South Australia; it will not be used solely on the occasions of the Festival of Arts every other year, but will be used often, if not continuously. From my understanding of how it is to be run, it will be available for many concerts throughout the year, and in fact it will have to be filled many times in a year to make it a financial proposition.

The Premier has stated publicly outside this House that the sum proposed in this Bill will be the upper limit that the Government will grant. The Adelaide City Council will have to make do with this amount. The important thing to remember is that this is a community effort.

The Government and the City Council are participating financially, and the citizens of Adelaide and of South Australia will be asked to subscribe £100,000 towards this project. Therefore, it is not being confined to one section of the community as all people wishing to subscribe may do so.

The running of the hall is important. Under clause 4 the council shall have the control and management of the hall. This is the same condition as applies in the Local Government Act to most country town halls. I believe that the hall built at Whyalla is under the control of the Whyalla City Commission, and that is as it should be.

Mr. Loveday: We had to raise all our own money for that.

Mr. CUMBE: In my district we had to do that, but they have the care and control of their own hall. The design and construction of the hall, after approval by the local committee, have to be approved by the Government because it has provided the money. Last session a Bill provided Government finance to build the Morphett Street bridge: the Government provided the grant, the city council provided the balance, and the grant was made specifically on the understanding that the construction and design had to be approved by the Minister. On this occasion the same procedure is adopted. This Bill will be welcomed by almost every person in South Australia. It has to go to a Select Committee that will consider all aspects. I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr. CASEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.38 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 27, at 2 p.m.