

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, August 27, 1969.

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

### PETITION: ABORTION LEGISLATION

Mr. JENNINGS presented a petition signed by 453 persons stating that the signatories were deeply convinced that the human baby began its life no later than the time of implantation of the fertilized ovum in its mother's womb (that is, six to eight days after conception), that any direct intervention to take away its life was a violation of its right to live, and that honourable members, having the responsibility to govern this State, should protect the rights of innocent individuals, particularly the helpless. The petition also stated that the unborn child was the most innocent and most in need of the protection of our laws whenever its life was in danger. The signatories realized that abortions were performed in public hospitals in this State, in circumstances claimed to necessitate it on account of the life of the pregnant woman. The petitioners prayed that the House of Assembly would not amend the law to extend the grounds on which a woman might seek an abortion but that, if honourable members considered that the law should be amended, such amendment should not extend beyond a codification that might permit the current practice.

Petition received.

### QUESTIONS

#### NURIOOTPA ROAD

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Attorney-General any information from the Minister of Roads and Transport about whether the Highways Department intends to repair the main bitumen road between Tanunda and Nuriootpa soon?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Consideration is being given to hotmix surfacing the Tanunda-Nuriootpa section of the Sturt Highway later this year when the weather is favourable for this type of work.

#### MODBURY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of August 19 about a sewerage project for Modbury?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: In the original scheme proposed for Modbury the trunk sewer was to be laid in Clyde Street. However, extremely hard rock was encountered

and it was decided to lay the trunk sewer in an easement at the south of the blocks abutting Clyde Street where a sewer had to be laid in any case to serve the blocks. This alteration will result in considerable savings in rock excavation and will enable the whole job to be completed more quickly. The gang has not been removed from the area, but the work has been scattered because of the intermittent rock encountered and the necessity to go back and complete the sewer across the river, which work has been held up because of the wet conditions. It is expected that the approved sewers in the area, including Victoria Drive, Clyde Street and Ladywood Road, will be completed in less than a month.

### ROADSIDE SIGNS

Mr. GILES: Last Saturday, when travelling east from Gepps Cross on Grand Junction Road, I noticed on the median strip two boards advertising that houses were open for inspection. As we oppose this sort of thing throughout the State, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether this practice is allowed (if it is, I disagree to it) and, if it is not, whether appropriate action can be taken so that it cannot be repeated?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

### PORT PIRIE OIL BERTH

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to my recent question concerning fire-fighting equipment on the oil tanker berth at Port Pirie?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: Holdings of foam are kept variously at the fire station, at the oil companies' premises, and in the Marine and Harbors Department store at Port Pirie, which is directly opposite the oil berth. Three hose boxes containing hoses and nozzles are situated near the oil berth: the boxes are painted red. The contents of these boxes were checked recently by the harbourmaster and each box was found to contain its proper equipment, namely, one nozzle, and one 50ft. length of hose, coupled to a 10-gallon container of foam compound. The safety regulations for tankers carrying flammable liquids were revised and brought up to date last year and promulgated on August 29, 1968.

### MURRAY BRIDGE SILO

Mr. WARDLE: A recently completed silo in the Murray Bridge railway yard will hold about 300,000 bushels. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture what

portion of the silo, if any, will be allotted to wheat and what will be allotted to barley?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will ask the Minister for this information.

#### SEVENHILL WATER SUPPLY

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about a reticulated water supply for Sevenhill?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The Engineering and Water Supply Department intends to extend its survey of ratepayers in the Watervale area in order to check also the attitude of landholders as far north as Sevenhill. The possibility of providing a water supply would depend on the outcome of the survey.

#### SWIMMING POOL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the swimming pool in the north park lands?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The swimming pool to be erected in the north park lands will be under direct control of the Adelaide City Council, which will appoint a manager, not a lessee. The Prospect council has agreed to this, and arrangements have been made for it to discuss any problems that might arise directly with councillors on the Parks and Gardens Committee. The Government has removed the subsidy ceiling of \$200,000.

#### MILLICENT DRAINAGE

Mr. CORCORAN: In the Loan works programme the sum of \$750,000 has been allotted for "other urban drainage", and the Treasurer, when explaining the Loan Estimates, said that this amount would include moneys to be made available to councils not only in the metropolitan area but also in some country areas. I am aware that approaches have been made to the Minister of Local Government by members of the Millicent District Council regarding assistance in connection with drainage work required in a certain street in Millicent. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Local Government whether some of the moneys set aside in the Loan funds will be made available to the district council for this purpose?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

#### RAILWAY FINANCES

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Although, strictly speaking, my question concerns railways, I will address it to the Premier, as it deals with a matter of Government policy. When I was

speaking last evening about South Australian Railways finances. I suggested that major economies should be effected in the railway services to help reduce the enormous annual losses sustained by that department. Can the Premier say whether he has any plans to effect such economies?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will get a report for the honourable member.

#### MIGRANT SCHOOLCHILDREN

Mr. LANGLEY: As the Minister of Education is well aware, between 50 per cent and 60 per cent of children commencing in many of the inner-suburban schools are from families who have migrated to Australia from Europe. Most of the parents concerned do not speak English at all, and at times it is difficult and awkward for an infants schoolteacher to cope with the situation that arises when these children are placed in classes with youngsters who can speak English. Will the Minister of Education say whether consideration is being or will be given to introducing separate classes for migrant children until they reach grade 3, at which stage they could commence normal primary school education?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I am well aware of the problem. In my own district considerable concentrations of children come from families who have migrated from Europe, and they constitute the bulk of enrolments at some of the schools. This matter has received much attention from the Education Department, and special classes are held for training teachers in this regard. Having previously given a reply to another honourable member on this subject, I should like to give the member for Unley a factual report dealing with the matter as it stands at present. For this purpose I will make a considered reply after checking in *Hansard* on what has previously been said. I will try to look up the relevant reply for him this afternoon.

#### TRANSPORT STUDY

Mr. McANANEY: I understand that the Minister of Roads and Transport has announced that an annual report will be made to Parliament on the past actions of the Highways Department, as well as on its plans for the coming year, in respect of the work undertaken in connection with the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study. Can the Premier confirm this statement?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I think the reference that the honourable member makes is to a statement made by the Minister of Roads and

Transport in another place, I think during the week before last, in which it was clearly pointed out that the Government would bring down each year a report, as is the case at present regarding Government departments. However, this report would go much further: it would include not only a reference to past and current proposals but also estimates for the coming year relating to expenditure in connection with the M.A.T.S. plan. In this way, planning and the implementation of proposals relating to the programme could be discussed by Parliament concerning not only the overall effect but also the effect on each individual department. Therefore, there will be a full report, covering not solely the past but also the future, that Parliament will be able to investigate and debate thoroughly.

#### SEACLIFF PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the closing of a section of Barwell Avenue, which runs alongside the Seacliff Primary School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: This matter of closing portion of Barwell Avenue which separates the Seacliff Primary School from the infants school was raised by the Marino Progress Association with the Brighton council. It was not raised directly with the Education Department or with me, although a copy of the association's letter to the council was sent to the Education Department. The Brighton Town Clerk has now informed the Education Department that the council has considered the association's suggestion for the closing of a section of Barwell Avenue but has resolved to take no action. The closing of a part of this street would create a dead end and therefore a traffic hazard.

#### WHEAT QUOTAS

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question whether share-farmers will have their names and quotas shown on wheat quota cards?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Wheat Delivery Quota Advisory Committee has no intention of showing the name of the share-farmer or his quota on the quota card; also it is expected that the draft Bill will contain provisions to protect the rights of the share-farmer.

#### GLENELG TREATMENT WORKS

Mr. BROOMHILL: In February this year, when I asked the Minister of Works a question about the Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works and

the disposal to sea of sludge through a pipe, he told me that the project was hoped to be completed in April this year. Can the Minister say whether the work has been completed and, if it has, whether the pipe is operating successfully? Also, can he say whether any complaints have been made regarding possible water pollution as a result of this activity?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: To the best of my recollection this work has been completed. Of course, I recall being down there when the pipe was laid out to the sea. Although no complaints about pollution of the water have been made to me, I will certainly find out whether any have been received by the department. The honourable member would appreciate that, before this work was undertaken, the previous pipe had been laid for many years following a Public Works Committee inquiry into the matter, and that pipe worked well indeed. In fact, as far as I know, no complaints were received during the time that pipe was down. For the information of the honourable member, I will have this matter checked in detail and give him a reply.

#### FREIGHT RATES

Mr. VENNING: Almost a month ago I requested the Attorney-General to ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to consider having rebates on freight operate more universally than they operate at present. At present, anyone railing two rail trucks or more of stock to Adelaide buyers receives a 25 per cent rebate on freight. However, anyone taking stock out from the Adelaide abattoir (and there is quite a bit of stock movement at present) does not receive this benefit. Requests have been made that consideration be given to having this rebate operate both ways. As it is nearly a month since I asked this question, will the Attorney-General check with his colleague to see what has caused the delay and whether a favourable reply can be brought down?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will inquire.

#### TRANSPORT SUBSIDY

Mr. FERGUSON: I ask my question as a result of the statement made by the member for Wallaroo yesterday, when discussing the Loan Estimates, and, in particular, the replacing of the railway service to Kadina, Wallaroo and Moonta with a bus service. Replying to an interjection by the member for Light, the member for Wallaroo said:

Perhaps the honourable member has not considered how much subsidy the Government would pay to this private enterprise.

As I am sure that all members are interested in knowing whether this private enterprise is paid a subsidy, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether the Government pays a subsidy to any firm that provides a bus service in place of a railway service that has been closed, particularly Yorke Peninsula Bus Lines, which serves Kadina, Wallaroo and Moonta?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Certainly.

#### TEXTBOOKS

Mr. CORCORAN: No doubt the Minister of Education and every other member of this Chamber have received complaints from parents about the cost of secondary school textbooks over and above \$16 a year, which has been the Government allowance for some time. Certain examples have been given to me where parents have had to pay \$30, even though some secondhand books have been purchased. There are instances of people on low wages, or even middle incomes, who have two or three children at secondary school at the one time, and this imposes a financial burden on them. Can the Minister of Education say whether the Government has considered increasing the Government subsidy for the purchase of secondary school textbooks? If it has not considered this matter, will it consider increasing the subsidy?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Yes.

#### NORTON SUMMIT SCHOOL

Mr. GILES: The Norton Summit school is situated on a small piece of land and, as it has very little playing area, there is a problem at the school and the school committee has asked that the playing area be extended. The Education Department owns a piece of land through which runs a district road, and I have been told by the Chairman of the District Council of East Torrens that, as far as he is aware, the council has no objection to closing off a section of the road. If this is done, it will enable the schoolchildren to use this small piece of land below the present district road, and there will not be any danger from the odd car that happens to pass. Will the Minister of Education inquire whether this road could be closed soon so that the children might have an additional playing area?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The honourable member will recall that I spent a pleasant morning with him visiting this school, and

that we looked at the piece of land to which he has referred. I think I said at that time that representations had been made to the department by the school committee for the department to approach the district council to see whether the road could be closed, thus ensuring the preservation of the children's safety. If he will ask the school committee to refer this matter to me, I will consider it.

#### MURRAY BRIDGE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. WARDLE: I understand that, although many months ago a new toilet block was to be provided at the Murray Bridge Primary School, necessary work has not yet commenced. Can the Minister of Education say whether this building is likely to be ready by the commencement of the first term in 1970 and whether work on the new classroom block is expected to commence in this financial year?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: This question also reminds me of an extremely pleasant morning I spent with the member for Murray, visiting schools at Murray Bridge, including the primary school. I will obtain a report on the latest position regarding provision of extra classrooms and the toilet block, although I hope that they will be provided by the end of the year.

#### EUDUNDA SCHOOL

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Although the Minister of Education will not have at her finger tips information about the progress being made in response to representations made to her by the Eudunda Area School Committee on the pleasant occasion of her visit to the school some weeks ago, does she recall that pleasant experience and will she find out what is the present position about the facilities requested?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: This question and the two preceding questions bring to the attention of the House how active the Minister of Education is in visiting schools, and I hope that members will note that. I will obtain a report about the provision of improved facilities at the Eudunda Area School and bring it down as soon as possible.

#### GOODWOOD PLAYGROUND

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Immigration and Tourism a reply to my question of August 21 about a subsidy in respect of a building to be erected near the Goodwood station?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I assume that the honourable member's question refers to a subsidy granted in August, 1968, towards the cost of providing facilities for an amateur

swimming club at the Unley Memorial Swimming Pool. The Town Clerk of Unley states that this work has been deferred because of the possible effects of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan, and the Tourist Bureau is awaiting further advice from the Town Clerk. When the whole position is clarified, I will give a more definite reply.

#### LEIGHTON SCHOOL

Mr. ALLEN: Several months ago the Leighton Primary School Committee asked me to find out whether hot water facilities could be provided at the Headmaster's residence, and officers of the Public Buildings Department have suggested the installation of an electric hot water system and electric pump. At present a gas stove, supplied from a gas cylinder, is being used. Can the Minister of Works say what progress has been made in providing this hot water system?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I will inquire about this matter.

#### PENSIONERS' SPECTACLES

Mr. McKEE: The Premier will recall that earlier this month I asked a question about the supply of spectacles to pensioners in Government-subsidized hospitals. As I consider the matter to be urgent, several people having spoken to me about it, can the Premier say whether he has discussed it with the Chief Secretary and whether he has a reply?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The only information I can give at present is that the Director-General of Medical Services is inquiring into the feasibility of meeting the request. When that report is available, I will inform the honourable member.

#### MURRAY RIVER

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked yesterday about the possible effect on Lake Albert and Lake Alexandrina of the construction of both the Chowilla and Dartmouth dams?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: Lake Albert and Lake Alexandrina are both affected by any storage development that reduces the flow of water out of the river into the lake system. Generally, the greater the storage volume, the greater the reduction in flow. Basically, the flow through Lake Alexandrina is the flow of the river less water diversion and system losses. Chowilla, by its high evaporation loss, could reduce the flow through the lower river by more than 10 per cent. Any drop in flow through Lake Alexandrina

tends to lower levels and extend periods of increased salinity, both of which add to the problems of maintaining Lake Albert.

Mr. McANANEY: Because of a substantial drop in the level of the Murray River at Jervois, Woods Point, and in the lakes area, settlers are perturbed that there may not be sufficient water available later in the year, although I understand that a large flow is coming down the river. Will the Minister of Works obtain details of this flow in order to reassure my constituents?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: The honourable member is correct in assuming that there is likely to be a large flow of water down the river later and, as this will occur not only in the area referred to but in other parts of the river, advantage is being taken of the present position to adjust pool levels in several locks to achieve a degree of flushing out. This has been done in anticipation of a higher river level later in the year. However, I will obtain the detailed figures for the honourable member.

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Works say whether the lowering of the Murray River by 2ft. at Lock 3 has taken place in conjunction with the study at present being undertaken of the movement of water in Chambers Creek and Lake Bonney, with a view to improving the quality of water both in the creek and in the lake?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: It is connected with that project. This matter was referred to in the reply I gave a few moments ago on the level of the river. The lowering has occurred principally to enable collected salinity to be quitted. Concerning Lake Bonney, the opportunity is being taken (by lowering the Lock 3 level by 2ft.) to drain out of Lake Bonney some of the impurities that have collected in the lake over the last year or two. In relation to the application made by the honourable member and the District Council of Barmera some time ago regarding Chambers Creek and the entry via Napper Bridge into Lake Bonney, the honourable member will recall that I authorized expenditure for experimental work to be undertaken in Chambers Creek. Part of the flushing now occurring will be noted in this experiment which will probably not be concluded until summer time. The honourable member can be assured that the lowering of the level is largely related directly to the problems he has referred to me in connection with Lake Bonney.

## DENTURES

Mr. BROOMHILL: I noted with interest that later this week a new wing at the Dental Hospital on North Terrace would be opened. As the waiting time for persons requiring the provision of dentures at the Dental Hospital is considerable, will the Premier ask the Minister of Health whether the provision of the new building will lessen this waiting time?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will get a report for the honourable member.

## PINE PLANTINGS

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question about planting pine trees between Two Wells and Port Wakefield?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Conservator of Forests reports that the area between Two Wells and Port Wakefield is quite unsuitable for the growth of commercial pine plantations. The rainfall is insufficient and the soil types are generally unsuitable.

## ABORIGINES

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Previously, Government policy was that persons on southern Aboriginal reserves in South Australia who were employable were required to have employment either on the reserve or off it. Unemployment benefit was not payable on the reserves, because the Labor Government and the previous Liberal Government considered the payment of such benefits to involve almost a repetition of the old handout system and the use of moneys that would reduce the general living standards that were sought to be established on the reserves. I am instructed that, following a change of policy by the Government, unemployment benefit is payable on southern reserves and that it is no longer a requirement that employable people on southern reserves be employed either on or off the reserves. I understand that, although the wages of Aborigines on southern reserves that were reduced below the basic wage for a period have been restored, this has been done by means of cutting the employed work force on the reserves and by payment of unemployment benefit, which is at a lower rate than that, to the people who are not employed. Can the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs say whether what I have alleged is correct? If it is not, can he explain what is the present position regarding employment on southern reserves?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The position is substantially as the Leader has said but,

if he would like me to, I suggest it would be wise for me to get a full report and give him a considered reply.

## GERANIUM AREA SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about drainage at the Geranium Area School?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Design work is proceeding, as a matter of urgency, for the extension of the existing stabilization lagoon to overcome the effluent disposal problem at the Geranium Area School. It is expected that private offers will be sought within two weeks for the work.

## STUDENT TEACHERS' BOOKS

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about student teachers' textbooks?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Following the announcements I made last year, teachers college students were given the opportunity to purchase textbooks from the teachers colleges at greatly reduced prices from the end of January onwards. On March 25, the college principals reported that sales to students and staff were almost complete. On April 18, the Director-General reported to me that sales had almost ceased and that, if the books were to be disposed of, they must be made accessible to a larger client population. Accordingly, approval was given late in May that the books could be sold to teachers, to *bona fide* university students, and to the libraries in Education Department schools, to the Kindergarten Teachers College, and to Adelaide Miethke House where teachers college students are in residence. Because the stocks were still not exhausted, the Adelaide Teachers College students were given extended time to make their purchases until the end of June. It can be seen that students at Adelaide Teachers College had ample opportunity to make their purchases of these textbooks. The extension of sales privileges to departmental schools and teachers was necessary in order to dispose of the stocks. The books now going to secondary school libraries are, by and large, volumes that are obsolete for teachers college courses, but could be valuable in school libraries.

## SIXTH CREEK

Mr. GILES: All rain falling in the area comprising Montacute, Ashton, Carey Gully, Basket Range, and Forest Range runs into Sixth Creek and then down the Torrens River into the Gorge weir, and I understand that

water from the weir discharges into Thorndon Park reservoir at the rate of 80 cusecs. Recently, the Minister of Works said that this weir was capable of handling all the water that normally flowed down the Torrens River, except when the river was in flood. As Sixth Creek is fed by such a large catchment area, will the Minister of Works consider building a weir somewhere along this creek, and then to construct a fluming or a tunnel into Kangaroo Creek so that the water from this large catchment area may be fed into the Kangaroo Creek reservoir in order to supply extra water for Adelaide?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: I thank the honourable member for this valuable suggestion, which, I am sure, has not gone unnoticed by engineers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. I shall be happy to consider it to see whether some use can be made of it.

#### CHANGE-ROOMS

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Works obtain a progress report on the planning and design of a new change-room and toilet block to be erected at certain schools, and will he ascertain when such blocks will be erected at the Tintinara and Pinnaroo Area Schools?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: Yes.

#### NORTHERN ROAD

Mr. VENNING: From time to time I have asked questions about the Booleroo Centre to Murray Town road, which has been under construction for about 10 years, although it covers only about seven miles. On a section of the road there has been a problem with Magna Hill, a hill that the Highways Department has had to cut through. Previously, the road by-passed this hill, but in the reconstruction of the road it was considered that the hill should be cut through and the materials there used for top-dressing the road. I understand that some time ago a contract was let for quarrying at Magna Hill, although it was known that there were problems with this work because of the hardness of the stone, etc. However, the contract has been let and I believe it is to conclude by October. It seems that this programme of roadworks is still much behind schedule, and I know that many constituents of mine in this area are concerned that the work should be completed before the coming harvest. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether the contract that

was let is running to schedule and, if it is not, what can be done to assist the contractor in this difficult situation?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

#### SOCIAL WELFARE

Mr. McKEE: The Minister of Social Welfare will recall that I recently asked a question about the adequacy of welfare payments made to wives whose husbands were in prison, and I referred mainly to wives who were, for various reasons, unable to work, and those who were unable to obtain employment. At that time the Minister agreed that \$9.50, which was being paid, was insufficient, and I consider that it is not enough on which to survive. Has the Minister considered this matter and, if he has, what is his decision?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: At this moment I have nothing to add to what I said in reply to the honourable member when he last asked the question.

#### TAILEM BEND TO SERVICETON RAILWAY

Mr. NANKIVELL: Because of the reflection on the standard of the main railway line between Tailem Bend and Serviceton which has been made during debates in this Chamber, and because I believe substantial work has been done during this calendar year on upgrading this line (running over it an electronic leveller, together with the Matisa packers), will the Attorney-General obtain from the Minister of Roads and Transport a full report on what work has taken place on this line since the committee on derailments undertook its inquiry?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

#### CAREY GULLY ROAD

Mr. GILES: Since I have been in the House I have frequently inquired about the possibility of the Highways Department's helping the East Torrens District Council straighten out the road at White Corner, at Carey Gully. I recently received a reply from the Minister stating that warning signs, which had been erected in place of "curve" or "winding road" signs, seemed to give adequate notice to motorists of the bend ahead. The reply also stated that the extremely high cost of the road realignment was not considered justified at this stage. Will the Attorney-General ask his colleague to reconsider this decision and point out that, if this project is left for any length of time, its cost will rise in accordance with other increases taking place within the general cost structure?

Further, will he ask his colleague to reconsider helping the East Torrens District Council so that this road in the Adelaide Hills can be made much safer than it is at present?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will speak to the Minister again about it.

### STATE BANK REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the annual report of the State Bank for the year ended June 30, 1969, together with balance sheets.

Ordered that report be printed.

### TAXI-CAB REGULATIONS: FEES

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): I move:

That the regulations under the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act, 1956-1963, in respect of prescribed fees, made on February 27, 1969, and laid on the table of this House on June 17, 1969, be disallowed.

At the outset, I point out that I am formally moving this motion to enable the matter to be debated in this Chamber. I am a member of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, which dealt with the regulation in question in July last and also earlier this month. Initially, on July 23, the committee recommended that no action be taken concerning the disallowance of this regulation. The committee was subsequently approached by members of the Hire Car Operators Association who desired to give evidence. Having heard that evidence on August 5, the committee decided that it should hear further evidence from the Chairman of the Metropolitan Taxi-cab Board. As members know, notice of motion for the disallowance of regulations must be given in this Chamber within 14 days of the regulations' being laid on the table of the House. The last day for giving such notice of motion was August 6.

As the committee was of the opinion that its rights for moving a motion for disallowance should be safeguarded, it became necessary for me to give notice in this Chamber on August 6. That notice was given not because the committee had decided to recommend disallowance but because giving the notice would safeguard the committee if, after hearing further evidence, the committee decided to move for disallowance. The committee heard the further evidence on August 12, that is, after the expiration of the 14 days within which notice of motion for disallowance should be given. After hearing that further evidence, the committee was unanimously of

the opinion that no action should be taken for the disallowance of these regulations. As a member of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, I believe that the motion actually should not be moved by me at all, and I make it clear that I am moving it merely to help the member for Glenelg, as I understand that he was of the opinion that the matter would be proceeded with by me as a member of the committee. He may have been lulled into a sense of false security on August 6, when this notice of motion was given, and he was unable himself, after August 6, to move any motion for disallowance.

However, I make it clear that it was pointed out in the report that I tabled on behalf of the committee on August 6 (and this report was not only tabled but also read) that the committee intended to take further evidence on the matter. In fairness to all concerned I believe I should set out the reasons given to the committee for the amendment of the regulations that were tabled. The report given to the committee by the Chairman of the Metropolitan Taxi-cab Board (Mr. L. M. Hargrave) gave the following reasons for the amendment to the regulations:

The schedule is converted to decimal currency and provides for an increase of licence fee of \$2 for taxi-cabs and \$15 for hire cars. It has been the board's policy as far as possible to fix from time to time such licence fees as will meet the current expenses of the board. The result of this policy has been successive reductions in taxi-cab licence fees from \$46 a year in 1958 to \$32 in 1965, since when they have not been altered. It has now been found that these fees are insufficient to meet the expenses of the board; for the last two years the board's income has not equalled its expenditure and the budget for the coming year based on present fees shows a deficit of \$2,313. The proposed new fees will amount to an additional \$2,160, thus almost allowing the board to balance its budget.

The increase in suggested hire car fees is considerable for two reasons:

- (a) Many of these provide a luxury service for which hirers are often prepared to pay special rates and, in recommending an amendment to regulation 76 (2) to allow them to come to an agreement with the hirer, the board feels their income should increase considerably.
- (b) That, whilst there are only about one-twentieth of the number of hire cars than there are taxi-cabs, in the nature of their work they need far more protection against the intrusion of unlicensed vehicles. This takes up a big proportion of the time of the board's inspectors and the board feels that there is no reason why the licence fees for hire cars should be less than that of taxi-cabs.



2. Regulation 42 (6) (a) provides that hire cars used as mourning coaches only should pay a licence fee of half of the hire car fee. The board considers that a substantial increase as recommended for ordinary hire cars is not warranted in the case of mourning coaches and consequently recommend the proportion should be one-third instead of one-half. This increase would amount to an increase of \$1.83.

In moving the motion, I reserve my right to vote against it because, as I said earlier, it is being moved to enable the member for Glenselg to have the matter ventilated in the House.

Mr. HUDSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

### RIGHT OF PRIVACY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 20. Page 1088.)

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): As far as I have been able to discover, discussion of legislation on bugging and the banning of devices to bug has been going on for a couple of years. The transcript of successive Attorneys-General Conferences shows that this was raised first of all by the Commonwealth at a meeting in Brisbane in July, 1967. Of course, I am speaking now only of Australian discussion on this; a wider discussion throughout the world has been going on for rather longer than that. I was interested to find that at that meeting in 1967 the then Attorney-General, who is now Leader of the Opposition, was non-committal on the matter. At the following meeting in February, 1968, which the then Attorney-General did not attend as he was engaged on what he undoubtedly thought was a more important matter (campaigning for the general election held in March of that year), Mr. Andrew Wells, Q.C., who was then an Assistant Crown Solicitor, who attended as the representative of South Australia, and who presumably was given his instructions on matters of policy before he went to the meeting, said that he felt that South Australia would be hesitant to get into the matter of legislation on this topic.

The next meeting, in Canberra in the middle of 1968, was the first meeting I attended. On that occasion I expressed a somewhat similar view, saying that I was hesitant about legislation on the matter, believing that in any case it would be difficult to achieve uniformity. This view was accepted by the Attorneys at the meeting in Perth in October or December of 1968. Since then, the Victorian Government has introduced legislation, which is now law, entitled the Listening Devices Act, 1969, which came into operation, I think, in June this year.

New South Wales has announced that it intends to introduce legislation on this topic, but so far I have not been able to get hold of a copy of the New South Wales Bill or—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That State has not introduced it yet.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No. I have not been able to get a copy of the press release made on the topic, either. I understand that, as the Leader says, that State will introduce a Bill on the matter. I think that the discussions that have taken place (and I have outlined the fact that Victoria has moved and New South Wales intends to move) illustrate the general unease throughout the community about the use of bugging devices and the general feeling that something should be done about this, but it is difficult to define the limits of action that should be taken. One of the first difficulties (indeed, the main reason for the difficulties) arises because the right of privacy we are aiming to protect in such legislation as this has not itself been exactly defined. I notice that the Leader does not attempt to define a right of privacy, nor does he say under what circumstances it should be abrogated, nor does he impose any penalty for its abrogation. This is one of the important aspects in a consideration of the Bill. In South Australia there is, apparently, no unqualified right of privacy. Section 17 of the Police Offences Act creates the offence of being unlawfully on premises: there is no absolute prohibition of being on premises; it is only when one is on premises for an unlawful purpose or without lawful excuse. I mention this merely to illustrate the difficulties of the whole matter.

I think that the best short discussion I have seen on privacy and the right of privacy is in the *Bulletin of the International Commission of Jurists* for September, 1967. The paragraph "Nature of the Right to Privacy" in the article headed "The Right to Privacy" states:

The right to privacy, being of paramount importance to human happiness, should be recognized as a fundamental right of mankind. It protects the individual against public authorities, the public in general and other individuals. The right of privacy is the right to be let alone to live one's own life with the minimum degree of interference. In expanded form, this means: The right of the individual to lead his own life protected against:

- (a) interference with his private, family and home life;
- (b) interference with his physical or mental integrity or his moral or intellectual freedom;
- (c) attacks on his honour and reputation;
- (d) being placed in a false light;
- (e) the disclosure of irrelevant embarrassing facts relating to his private life;
- (f) the use of his name, identity

or likeness; (g) spying, prying, watching, and besetting; (h) interference with his correspondence; (i) misuse of his private communications, written or oral; (j) disclosure of information given or received by him in circumstances of professional confidence. For practical purposes, the above definition is intended to cover (among other matters) the following.

Then follow 12 headings, of which the seventh is the "use of electronic surveillance or other bugging devices", and the twelfth is "harassing a person (for example, watching and besetting him or subjecting him to nuisance calls on the telephone)". It may be that, since the Leader went out of office, he has seen this article and that it, or some other writing, has caused him to change his mind on this matter.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What do you mean?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: If the Leader had been here when I started to speak, he would know that I pointed out that his representative at the 1968 Attorneys-General Conference said that South Australia would be unwilling to get into this field, and one presumes that he said that on instructions from the then Attorney-General.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That was an entirely different field.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It was not.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It was the matter of allowing police use of these things.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It was not. If the Leader wishes to refresh his memory by looking at the transcript of the conference, I will make it available to him.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I was present at the previous discussions on this matter, and that was the issue raised.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Before the Leader came into the Chamber, I said he was non-committal about this matter. Does the Leader want to look at the Brisbane transcript as well?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I know what is in it.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have read it, too. The Leader was non-committal about it, too; but this is a sterile argument.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I agree with that!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Well then, I think the less I say for the Leader's comfort about his previous attitude the better.

Mr. Corcoran: You haven't done very well up to date.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Leader has now introduced his Bill and I

have said what I have said because I agree that this is an area that requires legislation but, because of the difficulties of definition—

Mr. Broomhill: You say that about every Bill, though!

Mr. Corcoran: You're putting him off.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am being put off only to the extent that I am trying to understand the meaning of the extraordinary interjection by the member for West Torrens.

Mr. Broomhill: You're always saying that legislation should be uniform or that the Commonwealth should do something about it.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: We had already agreed at the Attorneys-General Conference that there was need for uniformity in this matter. Why does the member for West Torrens not listen before interjecting? This is an area that is appropriate for legislation but, because the right of privacy so far has been ill defined, it is extremely difficult to know precisely which legislative path we should take and whether it is worth while legislating on the matter. The honourable member will therefore see he was entirely wrong in what he thought I was going to say. The Government welcomes the Leader's Bill, but there are one or two defects in it that I wish to point out. I suggest that we should not get through the second reading stage of the Bill today but that the debate be adjourned so that I might prepare amendments (which I have not yet had an opportunity to do), in the hope that in Committee the Bill may be improved because, as it stands at the moment, I could not support its detailed provisions, although I broadly support the objectives the Leader has incorporated in the Bill.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I am always open to a reasonable suggestion.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Good! In that case, the Leader will accept what suggestions I will put up. I will justify the criticisms I have made of the Bill. There are several defects in the drafting: the Bill goes rather too far in some areas; it imposes unwarranted restrictions on law enforcement agencies; and the Leader has confused the purposes for which such devices are manufactured with the purposes for which such devices may be used. Those are the general points I make.

Looking at the Bill in detail, I point out that this legislation is something the Leader has taken from the Victorian Act and that the definition of listening devices is wide enough to include an ordinary hearing aid. The result

is that, if my interpretation of the definition is correct, I think the Bill creates an offence for a deaf person but not for one with good hearing.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That's not so.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It is so. The definition of "listening device" in the Bill states:

... any electronic or mechanical instrument apparatus equipment or other device capable of being used to overhear record monitor or listen to a private conversation or words spoken to or by any person in private conversation.

Clearly, therefore, "listening device" means "any device capable of being used to listen to a private conversation", which includes a hearing aid, obviously. Clause 4 (1) provides:

A person shall not—

(a) use any listening device to overhear record monitor or listen to any conversation to which he is not a party;

Obviously, the effect of that is that if I, because I do not use a hearing aid, happen to eavesdrop a conversation, I am not committing an offence but, if a deaf person who uses a hearing aid does the same thing, he commits an offence. This is just a small point, and I do not really blame the Leader for this.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Look at the definition of "private conversation".

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will do that. As I say, I do not blame the Leader for this one, because he has lifted the definition directly out of the Victorian Act, but that is the effect of it.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No, the Victorian Act lifted it from the American Act, and—

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Leader will be able to reply in due course to my criticism. Let us now look at the definition, because that was only an incidental anomaly that I discovered. The Leader's definition of "visual intrusion device", which is where the Bill goes much further than the Victorian Act goes, provides:

"Visual intrusion device" means any electronic photographic or mechanical instrument apparatus equipment or other device primarily designed surreptitiously and without the subject's knowledge to see record or transmit visual information concerning the private acts of any person.

I think the syntax there is poor. Obviously, the phrase "surreptitiously and without the subject's knowledge" should be at the end of the definition, because it does not qualify the verb "designed". My more serious objection to the definition is the phrase "primarily designed". I ask the Leader whether he will

make clear that these two words import the intention of the designer or the inherent qualities of the device, because it could mean either: it could be that it was designed and built with the primary intention of surreptitiously and without the subject's knowledge seeing, recording, etc., or it may be that, having been made for another purpose, this is the use to which it can be put.

We must clear up that ambiguity, because it is certainly not clear whether he is striking at the intention of the designer, which may be quite unknown to the person in possession of the article, or at the nature of the design, which may be different from the use that the person in possession intends to make of it. Perhaps I can give a couple of examples to help the Leader understand the point I am making. The device may be designed for the observation of bird life by bird watchers but it may be the best thing in the world to use to bug someone's house.

On the other hand, a device may be designed for the purpose of "visual intrusion" (the phrase that the Leader has used) but it may be quite a failure for that purpose and may be most useful for research, say, by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization into the movement of wombats underground. One definition certainly requires a little tightening up. I have already referred to clause 4 (1), which provides:

A person shall not—

(a) use any listening device to overhear record monitor or listen to any conversation to which he is not a party;

That is similar to the provision in the Victorian Act, with one difference: the Leader has left out, for some reason which is best known to him but which I cannot understand, the word "private" before "conversation". He has widened it to any conversation to which a person is not a party, having gone to the trouble of inserting a definition of "private conversation" in the preceding clause. I do not know why the Leader has done that. In my view, he should not have done it, but he may have a rational explanation.

The Leader has defined a private conversation and then has not used the phrase where he should have used it. The other alteration he has made to the provision in the Victorian measure is in clause 4 (2), where he has left out the words "in the public interest or in the course of his duty", which is a significant alteration and which restricts one who may be permitted to use these devices. Clause 4 (2) provides:

Notwithstanding anything in paragraph (b) of subsection (1) of this section it is not an offence for a person who was a party to a private conversation—

he has used "private conversation" there but did not use it earlier—

has recorded by means of a listening device if the communication or publication is no more than is reasonably necessary—

here he omits the phrase I have mentioned— for the protection of his lawful interests.

Presumably that is for the protection of the lawful interests of the person who has the information in his possession, but I do not know why the Leader has seen fit to omit the phrases in the Victorian Act, and he has not explained that. Clause 5 prohibits the possession, manufacture, assembly, and so on, of certain listening devices, and clause 6 has the similar objective for visual intrusion devices. Incidentally, I cannot find in the Bill an outright prohibition of the use of visual intrusion devices. In clause 4 the Leader prohibits the use of listening devices. Clause 5 provides:

Except as otherwise provided by this Act, a person shall not manufacture, assemble, possess, have in his possession, sell or offer for sale, or print or publish any advertisement for the sale or distribution of any listening device— Having previously prohibited the use of them, he goes on to make those prohibitions as well. That applies only to listening devices. There is no straight-out prohibition of the use of visual intrusion devices, but there is merely this provision in clause 6:

Except as otherwise provided in this Act, a person shall not manufacture, assemble, possess or have in his possession, sell or offer for sale, or print or publish any advertisement for the sale or distribution of any visual intrusion device.

I do not know the reason for the inconsistency between listening devices and visual intrusion devices, and this, at first sight and in the absence of some explanation, seems to be a weakness in the Bill.

I have another objection to these clauses as they stand: that there is a very good chance, as the Leader should know from the officers' paper (which, doubtless, he studied during his time in office), that provisions such as these contravene section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution. Perhaps I could refer the Leader to the case, with which I am sure he is familiar: it is *Chapman v. Suttie*, reported in 110 Commonwealth Law Reports, at page 321. I will read only the headnote to show the difficulty that arises from this provision. The headnote states:

The appellants carried on business in Victoria as licensed gun dealers and as part of their business sold guns to persons living in other States: in seven transactions guns were ordered by persons who lived in other States (in six cases by mail and in one case personally in the appellants' shop) and directions were given by the purchasers that the guns were to be forwarded interstate by post or by rail (in one case delivery was, as it turned out, by one of the appellants' employees who chanced to travel to the State concerned). Firearm certificates were not obtained as it was considered that because of section 92 of the Constitution they were not here necessary. In four informations breaches of section 24 (1) of the Firearms Act 1958 (Vict.) were alleged and in nine informations breaches of section 17 (1) (d). There were convictions in each case. The defendants appealed therefrom to the High Court.

Sir Owen Dixon (His Honour the Chief Justice) was a dissident in that case, as it was held by Taylor, Menzies, Windeyer and Owen JJ. that, each sale being made *bona fide* in the course of interstate trade, section 92 of the Constitution rendered inoperative the requirements of section 17 (1) (d) and section 24 (1) in relation thereto and accordingly the appeals should be allowed.

What we may well find, if we leave these two clauses in the state in which they now are, is that manufacturers or assemblers in South Australia may say, "I am manufacturing them to sell them in Sydney" (or Melbourne or Brisbane), and we could not then touch them.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No: there are many other cases contra on that section.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Then I shall be glad to hear the Leader in reply, because that was the tenor of the officers' paper, of which the Leader must be aware, and that is clearly the consequence that would flow if *Chapman v. Suttie* was followed. I cannot see any reason why it would not be followed because, as far as I know, it has not been overruled. Leaving that aside, I am sure that members know enough about section 92 to realize the force of what I have just said and that, if a manufacturer here is selling to markets in other States, obviously section 92 will apply and these provisions will be ineffective. However, we can argue this later if the Leader considers he can justify the way in which he has drawn the provision. Clause 7 is, I think, quite undesirable, as it provides:

The substance or meaning of information obtained by the unlawful use of a listening device or a visual intrusion device shall be inadmissible in evidence in any court of law.

I think the Leader has followed the American outlook on the law in this matter, but I remind him—if he needs any reminding, and I guess he must because of the way he has drawn this—that that is quite contrary to the view expressed in British courts. I remind him of the decision in *Karooma v. The Queen*, a Privy Council decision, in which the Privy Council decided that the way in which evidence had been obtained, whether it was a proper or an improper way for getting evidence, did not affect its admissibility.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That doesn't mean to say that we cannot do it.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No, but if we do we are flying in the face of the settled law in this country up to the present.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I think that is wrong. We should not give law enforcement officers a licence to breach the law to obtain evidence that they should not obtain.

Mr. Corcoran: Are you always right?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Deputy Leader comes to the aid of his boss and tries to show that I have done something wrong at some stage and that, therefore, the Leader should be allowed to do the same. However, that is the settled law at present, and while it is perfectly competent for us to do this, we would be reversing the direction of the law in this country, and I think that is undesirable. That is my main objection to clause 7, but I ask the Leader whether he can clarify "the substance or meaning of information obtained by the unlawful use". What does that phrase mean? Does the Leader mean to say that, if a police officer or someone else gets information by the use of these devices and uses that to obtain some other piece of evidence, that other piece of evidence will not be admissible? Is that what he means? It was the use of the device that merely gave him a lead to the evidence he wanted to use. Will the Leader cut that out?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That's not what it says.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I see. What does it say?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Read it.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have read it many times but I cannot make sense of it: "The substance or meaning of information . . ."

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The drafters of the Federal law of the United States can understand it, because it is taken straight from their Statute.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Is it in the Omnibus Crime Detection Act?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Yes.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Has this been decided judicially yet?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Of course it has not. The Leader is so confident that it is correct, but it has not yet undergone judicial scrutiny. I invite the Leader to explain to me the meaning of "information obtained by the unlawful use of a listening device". What does "information" mean? Either it is information or it is not. However, that does not matter; I will leave it.

Mr. Virgo: Why bring it up?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Because I think it is an extreme weakness in draftsmanship. I turn now to clause 8 and, leaving aside the question of the partial exemption from the provisions of the Bill allowed to police, I will deal with what I regard as a serious deficiency in draftsmanship and one about which I asked the Leader last week and about which he did not satisfy me: that is, what he means by the phrase "serious crime". Apparently, under this provision a police officer can go to a judge and say, "Sir, a serious crime is about to be committed and I want to have your permission to use a visual intrusion device." What on earth is a "serious crime"?

Mr. Corcoran: The Leader told you last week.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: What did the Leader say about this? If the member for Millicent can show me the passage I will quote it, but my recollection of the substance of what the Leader said was that it was not a road traffic offence.

Mr. Corcoran: Do you want it?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, I should like it. The honourable member will get no marks from his Leader for giving it to me.

Mr. Corcoran: That doesn't matter; you will probably make a mess of it.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: *Hansard* reported the incident as follows:

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: What do you mean by a "serious crime"?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A serious crime is one which is more heavily punishable under the Police Offences Act or one coming under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act.

If the Leader means an offence other than one under the provisions of the Road Traffic Act or the Motor Vehicles Act, he should say so. If he means an indictable offence

or one under the provisions of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, he should say so. What he means by using the vague phrase "more heavily punishable under the Police Offences Act", I do not know. I know that if the Leader is in a fair-minded mood he will agree that the phrase "serious crime" would have to be redefined, because it is unsatisfactory to leave it in that condition. I do not know what a judge would do if someone presented himself in Chambers and said, "A serious crime is about to be committed. May I use one of these devices?"

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: How precisely are you going to get a compendious definition if you want (as I imagine you do) to include penalties under the kidnapping legislation?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: We will have to enumerate them.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Then you will have a list from here to Kamchatka.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: That would be better than this, because this does not get us any distance at all. The Leader had the gall to go on to say, incidentally, that this phrase is used in many Statutes in Australia. Well, I have not found any. I ask the Leader whether he can direct my attention to some of these many other Statutes in Australia in which the phrase "serious crime" is used. I have two more criticisms to make of the drafting. In clause 9, the Leader provides:

Possession of a listening device of the kind described by section 5 or of a visual intrusion device shall not be an offence for a police officer authorized to possess such a device by writing signed by the Attorney-General and while the police officer is acting in the performance of his duty.

What does the officer do with the device immediately he goes off shift: for example, if he slings it in his drawer when he is still, I think in law, in possession of it? He is presumably committing an offence. I know the Leader does not want to admit his mistakes now and that it is embarrassing for him to have to do so, but I think we should look at the draftsmanship of that clause. I have no comment on clauses 10 and 11; they come, I think, from the Victorian Act, and I think they are all right. Clause 12, though, provides another extension or another departure from the Victorian Act and constitutes an attempt to prevent personal harassment.

I think this is a good objective and something that we should provide for, although I do not know whether or not it will work. I can see some difficulties regarding it as it stands at the moment. For example, if the police were

keeping under observation a house in which it was believed there were stolen goods (which was being used as a repository for stolen goods) it might be embarrassing for the police officers concerned to have to come along to defend their actions by telling a court that they were keeping a place under observation, but this is something I think we can get over.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Don't you think it likely that in those circumstances the person under surveillance would issue a peace complaint?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: One never knows. I think the Leader has made it difficult for himself, or for everyone, by saying that the defendant has "habitually acted to annoy or distress the complainant by a series of acts, whether lawful or unlawful". I do not think we need the word "habitually" there. I think the Leader wanted to import a course of conduct, but to say "habitually" makes it difficult, and I think that is a word we can simply leave out. But what does the Leader mean by the verb "annoy"? Does he mean "so as to annoy", that being the object of the exercise, or does he mean "in order to annoy"? Is he referring to the effect the conduct may have, or is he referring to the intention of the person?

Mr. Virgo: Your carrying on like this is annoying.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not think that helps us with this definition, which I think is one of great importance. What does the Leader mean here? Does he mean the intention or the effect of the conduct? I point out one dangerous aspect of clause 12, although, as I say, I broadly support it; that is, that we are making unlawful a series of actions which in themselves are lawful. We are making unlawful, by this clause, a series of acts which if done on their own, I think, are perfectly lawful, and the provision has some dangers in it.

However, those are just a few of the tentative criticisms which I have of the content of the Bill as it has been drawn by the Leader. I know that the Leader has over the years resented my suggestion that he is not an AI draftsman, and I hope he will not mind my having gone fairly carefully through the Bill as he has drawn it. I support the second reading, on the understanding which I have suggested to him; but I think the Bill needs much amendment and improvement if it is to be workable and if it is to have any chance of achieving the objects which the Leader has put before us.

I have dealt with the Bill itself, but there are one or two other important matters which have not been included in the Bill and which I suggest should be in the Bill. I refer to the field of exemptions, to which I referred briefly a moment ago. I notice that the Leader has not in this Bill, in contrast to the Victorian Act, put in any exemptions regarding Commonwealth officers. I strongly believe that we should make exemptions for Commonwealth officers in the interests of national security. The Victorians have done that, whereas the Leader has not.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It is surplusage.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It is not surplusage because, to the best of my knowledge, there is no Commonwealth legislation on the matter. If that is the only objection the Leader has to this matter, perhaps he will not object to its being included, just *ex abundante cautela*. I do not know whether he has any other objection to it. However, I believe that we should include exemptions for officers of the Australian Security Intelligence Organization. I think there is a good case for including such an exemption in the case of customs officers who are detecting offences, and so on. I notice this was one of the matters set out by the Nordic Conference on the Right to Privacy, as follows:

The circumstances in which a public authority may be granted such powers—

that is, of exemption—

have been laid down in the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms as those in which interference in the private sphere is necessary in a democratic society:

In the interests of national security, public safety or the economic well-being of the country, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.

I think the Bill as at present drafted is deficient in regard to the exemptions which have been included. In fact, the only exemption is a limited one in the case of the police. Therefore, I intend to have drafted provisions that will grant exemptions in the interests of security and customs, and perhaps of the postal service and others, because I think we have to cover this in the absence of Commonwealth legislation's specifically doing so. Now, we come to our own police powers. My view is that the exemption which the Leader has given in clause 8 is too narrow; it is much narrower than the provision in the Victorian Act. I suggest these devices may be used by the police only on the authority

of the Attorney-General. I do not think it is desirable to cause the delay which will be necessary in going before a judge.

But the Attorney-General is a Minister of the Crown and is answerable for his decisions here in the House. I think this is the most satisfactory protection which we could give for the use of these devices. I know the Leader will not like this. He does not, I think, like to help the police much in the discovery and prevention of crime, and he does everything he can whenever he can to hamper them. That, of course, is what he has done in respect of clause 8.

Mr. Corcoran: That's not true.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It is true. He has gone even further on this point than the Victorians have gone. The Victorians at least only have to go to a stipendiary magistrate. The Leader says it has to be a judge, and that means a judge of the Supreme Court. I believe this is a responsibility that can well be given to a Minister of the Crown, who is answerable in Parliament. That is what I propose, because I do not think in this day and age, when we are all perturbed and alarmed at the increase in crime, we should unduly hamper the police in the detention of offences, and that is what we will do if the Bill is allowed to stand as it stands at present.

I am also tossing up about whether I should suggest any amendments (and this is a case where perhaps it could be by permission of a court) to allow other persons to use these devices in any circumstances. This matter has been canvassed from time to time. We know, for example, that private inquiry agents use these devices. In most cases perhaps it is not desirable that they should, but in some cases it may be desirable that they should. The member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) is shaking his head as though in disagreement. Let me give one example of cases in which moving photographs are taken now and in which I think it is desirable that they should be taken. In many actions for compensation, either for injuries that have been sustained in an accident or for workmen's compensation, it is the practice to check on the party—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: This does not prevent anything that is going on now.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, it does, because of the definition to which I have referred of "private act", which the Leader has inserted in the Bill. It does prevent that happening at present, and it is altogether desirable that the facts should be established. As I say, I am tossing.

up on this one because I can see arguments for and against allowing other people in certain circumstances to use these devices. I can see there are arguments in favour of doing this and I do not think that, when we are going into a new area of law for the first time, we should ignore the arguments pro and con on that point, and that is why I raise this today. I have not made up my mind, but I think all members should be aware of the fact that there is an argument in favour of allowing other people to use these things.

I have gone into this matter in detail because I thought it only fair to the Leader that I should comment in detail on the provisions of the Bill. I hope that, in a spirit of goodwill and co-operation, which we can exhibit one toward the other, we will get somewhere with the Bill. It will take a good deal of work. I will certainly do my part, and I hope that by next week I will have amendments on the file to cover the matters to which I have referred and perhaps a few others that may be discovered in the course of a closer scrutiny than I have been able to give.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I support the Bill and congratulate the Leader on introducing it and the Attorney-General on so generously supporting it. I was reminded by the Attorney of the good old days long since gone of Sir Thomas Playford who, when he introduced a Bill drafted by Sir Edgar Bean, always said when he got into difficulties, "Well, we have here the best Parliamentary Draftsman in Australia."

Mr. Clark: In the Southern Hemisphere.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, or anywhere else. Of course, Sir Edgar Bean was not just the Draftsman for the Government but also the Draftsman for the Parliament. When an Opposition member got the same Sir Edgar Bean to draft legislation and Sir Thomas Playford got into difficulties, Sir Thomas always said, "Well, there are a great many drafting mistakes in this legislation." That is similar to what the Attorney-General has been saying on this occasion.

Mr. Clark: Are you suggesting that the main thing wrong with the Bill is that it has been introduced and prepared by the wrong chap?

Mr. JENNINGS: I think the only thing wrong with the Bill is that it has been introduced by the Leader instead of the Attorney-General, who, we know, has a tremendous inferiority complex, regarding legal matters, when he compares himself with the Leader.

Mr. Clark: With some reason, too.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes. In fact, they tell me that psychologists and psychiatrists these days do not refer to such things as an inferiority complex: they talk about inferiority consciousness. I believe the Attorney-General is suffering not from an inferiority complex but from a genuine inferiority consciousness in this context. I am certainly not going to get involved in all this legal argument that has gone on, for I would be incapable of taking it any further. However, I did notice that the Attorney at one stage said that the syntax was wrong, and I began to wonder whether this was something that the present Government was not going to tax, because it had taxed just about everything else. For a moment I thought it might be having a go at a tax on sin, but apparently I got my syntax wrong as well.

The Attorney talked about section 92 during his speech. He just happened to say that the whole thing could be shot out of the water by section 92 of the Constitution. If he really believed this why did he not just get up and say at the beginning. "Well, this is just not constitutional?"

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I didn't say that; I was referring to only two clauses.

Mr. JENNINGS: The Attorney said that two very important clauses would not stand up to section 92. Obviously he was not prepared to hang his hat on section 92, otherwise he would have said straight away, "This Bill is not constitutional; let's vote it out immediately." He was not prepared to do that. Indeed, the argument he gave about gun manufacturers, or whatever they were, selling shot guns over the boarder might probably explain to some of us laymen what shot-gun marriages are in the context of intercourse between the States.

The Attorney also said that an omission of the Bill was that it failed to provide for the Commonwealth security organization and such things, but he knows as well as I know and as well as every other member of the House knows that this is not necessary at all. If it wants to, the Commonwealth can act under its own constitutional powers without being burdened or inhibited in the least by the legislation of any of the States in regard to the protection of its own organizations. Towards the end of his speech, the Attorney-General became mollified and then suddenly reverted again to his antipathetic approach to the Leader of the Opposition. The Attorney referred to clause 8 of the Bill. He seems to think that the Leader



has some implacable hatred of the Police Force in this State but, whatever gives him this impression, I do not know.

Mr. Broomhill: A disgusting suggestion!

Mr. JENNINGS: Well, it is. After going along smoothly and pouring much oil on troubled waters, the Attorney-General suddenly snarled and barked again about the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition to the Police Force of this State.

Mr. Broomhill: Where was the Attorney-General on Monday?

Mr. JENNINGS: I do not think that he received an invitation to that very successful meeting at the police club on Monday. I did not see him there, although I noticed some distinguished gentlemen there who seemed to be well accepted by the police in this State.

Mr. Broomhill: I wonder whether the Secretary of that association agrees with what the Minister had to say?

Mr. JENNINGS: I can guarantee that he does not. I fully expected the Attorney-General to endorse the remarks made by the Leader in introducing this legislation: that an Englishman's home is his castle, and that a castle is a fortress (but I will not go into the battlements or anything of that nature). During the times we were saying that an Englishman's home was his castle, there was also a saying that the members of a family could live in peace without trespass, provided that they did not trespass on the privacy of others. The time-honoured tradition that applies to the old school-tie boys such as the Attorney and me is typified in the equally time-honoured phrase that an Englishman's word is his bond. I realize that the Attorney-General never played for Eton; nor did I—I was the second reserve, or whatever it was.

Mr. Clark: That was a weak year, was it?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, a wet year. They did not even know I was there. It is rather surprising that this gentleman should be splitting hairs the way he has been doing for some reason or other. Gentlemen nowadays are not gentlemen in the way that they were.

Mr. Clark: They are not like the crusaders of old.

Mr. JENNINGS: I agree; a gentleman no longer protects the virtue of his lady at all—certainly not to the extent that he did in the good old days when a man would go away to the farthest parts of the Empire.

Mr. Clark: On a Crusade, leaving his wife in a chastity belt.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, but he would often make the mistake of leaving the key with his best friend. Things have changed nowadays:

these electronic devices allow no privacy whatever—politics, businesses, trade unions and even politics under the bed are today no longer private, and we should by passing this Bill do our best to keep what we have held dear for so long. The Attorney-General said that he thought it was rather sterile legislation.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I said that it was a sterile argument.

Mr. JENNINGS: The Attorney-General's argument today was rather sterile. If this is to be his attitude to this legislation, let him inject into the argument and into his attitude some virility, rather than the sterility he has shown today.

Mr. Clark: Did he read it?

Mr. JENNINGS: He read it all right and he had extreme difficulty in understanding it. He suffered the disability he always suffers when he follows the Leader of the Opposition on a legal question: he suffered from inferiority consciousness. If he wants to come back next week with his amendments, let him put them on members' files so that we can consider them. I am sure that, if he comes back with amendments, the Leader will amend the amendments so that it will be acceptable to the whole House; in this way a worthwhile Bill will result.

Mr. RODDA secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### POTATO BOARD

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. McAnaney:

(For wording of motion, see page 904.)

(Continued from August 13. Page 905.)

Mr. EVANS (Onkaparinga): In speaking to this motion I have some doubts concerning what is the right action that should be taken on this matter. The member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) has moved for the disallowance of regulations in connection with the Potato Board, and two legal opinions have been given raising doubts about the validity of these regulations. The Chief Horticulturist (Mr. Miller) is Chairman of the board, and in the primary-producing world he is thought of as the holder of this latter office rather than as an efficient and capable member of the Public Service. Over the years there has been discontent caused by Mr. Miller's holding the position of Chairman. It has been suggested that, if these regulations are disallowed, the board may cease to function; however, if it did so, I would be disappointed with the board members and with the industry as a whole.

Accusations were made to the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation about some of the board's actions. Mr. Meissner, of Meadows, gave evidence that 1,027 tons of potatoes had not been accounted for and that a secret society was working within the board. I am not convinced of this but I believe that, if there are any doubts, a full investigation should be made into the board for the sake of the board and all concerned with the industry. The main reason why these regulations are now being considered is that one of the grower members, Mr. McEwin, who represents the district of Southern Hills, has caused much concern within the board. It is no good hiding this, because everyone is aware of it.

If these regulations are disciplinary, I believe they are wrong. There is enough power in the hands of the Chairman to control a meeting, and these regulations deal mainly with controlling meetings. Clauses 3 and 4 have caused most concern to those interested in this matter. The main point is that it is possible for the Chairman or a majority of the board to stop any member from gaining information or looking at any papers that are retained by or are the property of the board.

It has been suggested that the reason for this provision is that some things belonging to the board should not be made public; we would all agree to this suggestion, but why should any board member be denied a right that others have? If the majority of board members can rule that six members can look at certain papers and the others cannot, who is to know that the six members will not make the information public? If the Chairman says that he is the only one who can view the papers, who is to say that he will not make the information public? This does not really prevent any person from making it public, because someone has to look at the board's papers.

I consider that we need regulations to control the functions of a board but not to control the functions of a meeting within the board. If eight persons voted one way and one person voted another way, that decision should be binding. The one who was voted against could complain if he wished, but the vote should settle the matter once and for all. Because these doubts have been cast on the regulations, we should have an investigation into the board, and I would be disappointed if the board failed because its regulations were disallowed. I would also be disappointed if the regulations were not disallowed and we

found that every other board established by this House in the past or in the future had the same sort of regulation just because one member, perhaps, would not toe the line.

We must realize that the member of the Potato Board concerned has been elected by the people in the southern hills district, and he has put his point of view as being that he will investigate the whole functions of the board. I understand that he said that at the time of his appointment. He is eligible to stand for re-election in one or two years and, if he is re-elected, the House must accept that the growers in that area are satisfied with this person's representation of them.

I was thankful to the Fruitgrowers and Market Gardeners Association for inviting some of us to its meeting at which this regulation was discussed. What puts doubt in my mind about how I should act is that three of the areas voted for the regulations, subject to their being valid. Only one area was more or less against the regulations, but I understood that that area would accept all but a certain part of a regulation. If there is doubt about the validity of the regulations and if there is any sign of a secret society within the board, now is the time to stop the trouble and examine the operation and functions of the board.

The distribution centre conducted by the board is, I understand, actually owned by Wholesale Fruit, which firm is mostly owned by merchants. That distribution centre should be controlled by the growers, not by the merchants. The large amount of money paid out each year to this organization for the distribution of potatoes should go to the growers, not to the merchants, because the difficulty of growers at present to even exist is bad enough. I will not support the regulations unless the Minister can show some cause why I should do so.

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent): I support the motion. As the member for Onkaparinga has said, this is a difficult matter, and I think the member for Stirling also realizes the difficulties involved. I believe that something has been achieved as a result of these regulations coming before the House. It has highlighted some of the inadequacies of the present board and its functions, and this is important to the industry and to the State. I have heard both sides of the story on this matter, and I have some sympathy with the members of the board who support the introduction of these regulations.

I understand that the Chairman (Mr. Miller) has had great difficulty for the last two years or so in conducting board meetings, etc., and I know that he has had the sympathy of the majority of his board members. However, I do not agree that any board can function properly if its members are denied the right to view documents that should be available to them. I consider it the right of every board member to see any document that he may wish to peruse in the course of deliberation of the board's business. Regulation 4 prohibits a member from perusing the board's documents or taking copies of them without first obtaining the permission of the chairman or of the whole board by resolution. This is the point I have made. I do not think that any board can function properly if members are denied the right to see documents that concern the board. Regulation 5 prohibits members from using information obtained by them, as members, for purposes inconsistent with the interests of the board. This seems to contradict regulation 4, to some extent. If this regulation applies, I do not understand why there should be any objection to any member seeing a document at any time.

I am inclined to agree with the member for Onkaparinga (and I think the member for Stirling also has this view) that it is necessary that some sort of inquiry into this board and its activities and composition be conducted. Surely such an inquiry could be held rationally and the difficulties at present involved in the operation of the board could possibly be overcome. Most of the regulations may be acceptable but, as members know, we cannot accept a regulation in part: if we want to reject one part of a regulation, the whole regulation must be rejected; if it is amended in the form that the House desires and is reconsidered, the House can accept it.

I and other members on this side have considered this matter. I have personally discussed it with the Chairman and a member of the board, and I have much sympathy for their point of view. However, on the other hand, the principle involved, namely, that we do not consider that the board can function properly if it or the chairman can deny a board member the right of access to a document, is more important than the difficulties that the board is having at present, and it is on that ground that we are objecting. As I have said, I support the suggestion that an inquiry be conducted to examine the constitution of the board and its activities. If that is done, at least the

presentation of these regulations will have highlighted a situation that is highly undesirable and should be remedied by some other course.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): The motion highlights the problem in one of our important industries. As the member for Onkaparinga and the member for Millicent have said, I think every member desires that the board function in terms of its charter. It is the policy of this Government that an industry should conduct its own affairs. The motion draws attention to regulations 3 and 4, which state:

No person shall peruse any document the property of or in the possession of the board without having first obtained permission so to do of the chairman or by a resolution of the board.

No person shall make any copy of any document the property of or in possession of the board without having first obtained permission so to do of the chairman or by a resolution of the board.

The members for Onkaparinga and Millicent have informed the House of the need for these regulations. This is a domestic matter that concerns all members, and growers in my district, through their representative, Mr. Cox, have asked me to support the upholding of these regulations. However, I know that this matter has been given much consideration by Government members and that it has been considered by the Subordinate Legislation Committee. It encroaches on a principle that I think all members of this House hold dear, for it relates to members of a board or association being denied the right to peruse any document. When one examines the facts of this matter it is obvious that the board's domestic problem seems to centre around the board member, Mr. McEwin. Although Mr. McEwin may have the best reason in the world for wanting to look at these documents, the witness Mr. Meissner had some strong things to say, and his accusations should be carefully considered.

The member for Onkaparinga said that Mr. Meissner made the accusation that there was a discrepancy of 1,000 tons of potatoes and that about \$10,000 was involved. I believe that there is an answer to these alleged discrepancies. Mr. McEwin was elected by growers as a board member for the Hills district, and I believe that, when he was elected, he said that he would investigate the board's functions. Therefore, he must have had some reason for saying this. If an elected board member, acting within his functions, seeks to investigate, for one or more reasons, what is happening to the board, I believe that he

has the right to do so. However, in this case this action has resulted in the board's not functioning correctly, and this is the real reason for the introduction of the regulations. They are designed to discipline the member McEwin. No good purpose would be served by not referring to names, because potato growing is an important industry to this State. It is not in the best interests of the community if a precedent is set by denying a board member the right to peruse any document in his service as an elected member of a board.

Mr. Hurst: They could not do their job properly if they could not look at the documents.

Mr. RODDA: I agree. This House should not be asked to interfere in a domestic issue of the board. It has been given a charter, and its members should put their own house in order. If they cannot do that, then Parliament should see that the necessary investigation is made. These alleged accusations, whether correct or not, must be considered. Obviously, there has been dissatisfaction within the board, and it has not been functioning as it should. On July 15, Mr. Cox, the South-Eastern representative, moved a vote of no confidence in Mr. McEwin, and this highlights the difficulties within the board. These are matters that should be investigated. I understand that the Potato Board has functioned well in the past and there is no reason why it should not continue to do so in the future in order to control the distribution of this important commodity in the best interests of the community and the industry.

I believe that we have a duty as members of Parliament to see that this problem is solved, and I am sure that that can be done. Mr. McEwin may have grave doubts about the functioning of the board, but there are eight other members who disagree with him and they, too, have their rights. I am sure that those members are fairminded and that a solution can be found to the present problem. With the members for Onkaparinga and Milliecent, I hope that when the Minister considers this problem he will have an investigation made into the reasons why this House has had to consider disallowing two regulations that would set a precedent in denying members of any board the right to peruse a document. I do not think that this country has come to that state of affairs. However, as there are domestic problems within the board, it is the duty of this House to ensure that they are solved.

Mr. GILES (Gumeracha): The Potato Marketing Act introduced in 1948 constituted the board with five grower members, two merchant members, a representative elected by the Minister as Chairman, and a representative of the retailing trade. Since 1948 the board has sailed on troubled waters but it has been able to function reasonably well. I believe that the very fact that the board is made up of members from three different groups of people has contributed to the cause of the trouble. The board comprises representatives of producers, merchants, and retailers. These men, while not actually opposing one another, are in competition with one another, and this creates a rather difficult situation in which the board has to function. However, the board has served the potato industry reasonably well since 1948 until about two years ago, and the economic needs of the industry require that it should continue to function.

The present price received by the grower is not an economic one: he cannot produce potatoes for the return he is receiving. The fact that the South Australian price is governed, to a large degree, by the quantity of potatoes grown in Victoria is another reason why the board should continue to operate. The regulations before the House were presented some time ago, and now the member for Stirling has moved that they be disallowed. The very fact that they have been introduced means that there is a need to correct a defect within the board.

Three out of four of the districts in South Australia (the Mount Gambier district, the Hills district and the plains district) want these regulations upheld. The fourth district (the southern district) has stated that it does not wish them to be approved and has asked that they be disallowed. However, the people from that district add that the Act should have some amendment that recognizes the fact that they, too, believe there is some need for further control. Because the board is constituted in the way it is, it needs a special set of regulations under which to work.

In my opinion, these proposed regulations do not set out to withhold information from the board members: their purpose is to control what the members do between the meetings. I believe the Chairman has already written to the staff of the Potato Board stating that all the material that comes to the board through him as Chairman must be dealt with when it arrives. These regulations are not designed to prevent members of the board from getting information, other than between

the meetings. At a meeting, if a member requires this information, all he has to do is ask for it and he can get it, either by permission of the Chairman or by resolution of the board.

I do not think a position has arisen where any member has been refused information at a meeting of the board. The member who has been called a disruptive member was, in one particular case, refused permission by the Chairman to go into the board office between meetings and obtain some documents; but, when at a regular meeting he asked whether he could have that information, it was supplied to him. It is obvious that, if all the members of the board were allowed to go into the board office between meetings to try to get some information that they wanted, it would create a mess in the operations of the board: half the staff could be rushing around at the beck and call of members and getting information for them because they demanded it. Those members would have the right to say, "We are allowed to have this information and we want it. Therefore, it is your job to go and get it!" That could disrupt the workings of the board and adversely affect its operation. To use a word that is sometimes bandied about in this day and age, there could well be a crisis in the potato industry.

At this point of time we need some control regarding the information given or the actions of the members between meetings in relation to board matters. If members of the board were allowed to act independently, they could disrupt the workings of the board between meetings, and that should not be allowed. The fact that we have this situation now under our Potato Marketing Act indicates that something is wrong. If this Act was capable of controlling the members so that the board could function effectively, we would not have this trouble that has now arisen. If we do not amend the Act or bring in something else, and the present member for the southern district is removed and replaced by somebody else, some other member of the board could act in exactly the same way and disrupt the board again. Therefore, we should make some alteration, either to the Act or to the regulations—

Mr. Casey: What do you suggest?

Mr. GILES: —to ensure that the Chairman of the board was better able to control the members. I suggest that these regulations could lead to a better operating of the board. An improvement could be effected by inserting something in the Act—

Mr. Casey: Inserting what?

Mr. GILES: —instead of using the regulations, but I believe that, unless something is done smartly, the operations of the board will not be effective. These regulations could help it in its operations.

*Members interjecting:*

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Gumeracha.

Mr. GILES: I have already said that I do not believe that members of the board will be denied information. However, I consider that certain information should not be given to the members between meetings: in other words, all the members should get the information at the same time at the meetings.

Mr. Corcoran: Why do you think they should not have it between meetings? I am not trying to trick you: I just want to know.

Mr. GILES: At this stage, the very fact that one member has been using his privilege has disrupted the operations of the board.

Mr. Corcoran: How?

Mr. GILES: He has gone into the board room and disrupted operations by asking for information, and so on; he has spent days at a time in there collecting this information. I believe that this person is acting in good faith and thinks he is doing a good job for the Potato Board, but it is obvious that his operations are not assisting the potato growers in any way.

Mr. Corcoran: But, apart from the nuisance aspect, is there any other reason why a member should be denied information?

Mr. GILES: There are certain documents that it would be disadvantageous for certain members of the board to get in between meetings.

Mr. Corcoran: Doesn't that mean, really, that there should be a reconstitution of the board?

Mr. GILES: I do not think that a reconstitution of the board would have a desirable effect.

Mr. Broomhill: Then what is the argument?

Mr. GILES: The very fact that from 1948 until two years ago there were these three groups of people working effectively on the board to try to stabilize the potato industry illustrates that we do not need to reconstitute this board. Even though it has been in troubled waters, at least it has managed to stabilize the potato industry reasonably well. A better control by the Chairman of members getting information between meetings would assist the board to operate much more effectively.

Mr. Corcoran: No member of the board is allowed to divulge certain information.

Mr. GILES: The very fact that this is in the Act does not necessarily mean that members do not take advantage of it. Questions asked in the House have illustrated that some members of the board have not acted in the best of faith, even though they are supposed to keep to themselves any information that would adversely affect the board if it was divulged.

Mr. Casey: You are implying that they are crook.

Mr. GILES: I did not say they were crook. I am saying that some information was used indiscreetly and against the interests of the board. I believe that we badly need some alteration to the Potato Marketing Act. If these regulations had been legal, they could have helped greatly. As has been pointed out, two lawyers have already given opinions to the South Australian Fruitgrowers' and Market Gardeners' Association, both casting doubts on the validity of the regulations, but obviously the regulations would not have come before us in the first place had the Crown Solicitor's Department not considered them valid.

Mr. Freebairn: Of how many boards are you a member?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GILES: I believe that the regulations could help to overcome the situation and that they should not be disallowed.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): Although I was initially of the opinion that these regulations should be upheld, I have since had reason to change my opinion. I believe every individual, if he is representing a group of people, should have access to any documents that may be required for the consideration of members of that group. This should not be confined to the situation that exists when a meeting is being conducted and when a certain document may be called for. I believe that, as a representative of a group, the person concerned should have access to the relevant documents at any particular time. I believe that the Potato Marketing Act, which came into force in 1948, has been of service to growers. Having personally had some marketing experience through the Potato Board in the early days, I know that there has been considerable difficulty and controversy and that one or two things have happened in the past as a result of which the board could almost have been disbanded. However, the board has weathered the various storms through

which it has passed, and I believe that it has benefited potato growers in South Australia. I think it would be a tragedy if, as a result of having these regulations, the board were to be phased out of the industry.

I believe that the board should be allowed to continue in the interests of the growers. While it represents three groups (the producer, the merchant and the retailer), there is bound to be friction at times but, by and large, I believe that these three organizations have combined reasonably well over the years. No-one claims that the board is perfect, but it has nevertheless at times been viewed favourably by growers in other States. Although the Victorian Potato Board has ceased to function I believe that in latter years growers in that State have been wishing that their produce was controlled by a board. However, the point at issue today is whether these regulations, which are desired by the board, should be upheld or disallowed. It would be a tragedy if the board were to be disbanded, and I believe it would also be a tragedy in respect of the principle of marketing if these regulations were not disallowed, because otherwise representatives on the board would be denied access to certain information.

If the information is not used in the best interests of the growers, then I believe they must ensure that they appoint to the board representatives who will act in their interests. If an individual is causing disruption on the board at present, it may be necessary to amend the Act in order to ensure good conduct on the part of board members. However, if one individual is denied access to information, through the regulations, it means that every member of that board is also denied access to information that may be required in the period between meetings. I believe that this would be completely wrong, for it would result in an injustice to members' representatives. I support the motion for the disallowance of the regulations.

Mr. HURST (Semaphore): I, too, support the motion for the disallowance of these regulations. I personally observe a question of principle and do not indulge in personalities. Throughout this debate we have heard honourable members opposite saying either that they do not want the regulations or that they do want them. I maintain that the principle behind the regulations is an undesirable one. As we seek to uphold democratic principles, we should not do anything other than disallow the regulations in question. First, the board is set up to do a job and, if it is doing its job, its members ought to have access to any

material that is required in order that they can give that material mature consideration at board meetings. If, as it would seem, the regulations concerned are designed to prevent this, how can the board make a proper decision on any matter?

I have been on many committees and boards, but never at any time have I encountered a situation in which the member of any committee or board has been denied access to any relevant material. If a person acts contrary to the principles of the body of which he is a member, a specific case arises for amending the legislation controlling that body and for setting out the correct procedure. If Parliament has to legislate for personalities, we will not get very far. Apparently these regulations deal with personalities, but we must let the matter be dealt with on a question of principle. It is a good thing that these regulations have come before the House, because members' attention has now been directed to a quite apparent need for amendment to the Act to ensure that the interests of all within the industry, not merely the interests of one or two individuals, are being looked after. The duties and functions of all sections of the board should be clearly set out. Personal gain should not be involved. The Minister would be wise to look into this matter carefully to see whether provision could be made so that the board could act in the best interests of the industry as a whole.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands): Speaking for the Minister of Agriculture, I can say that there is no objection to the motion and some of the reasons have already been stated. I will make a few comments that I think will put the Government's point of view fairly accurately. By disallowing these regulations, we are not telling the board how to run its business. If the board has decided, by resolution, that members may see or copy documents only by resolution of the board or with the Chairman's permission, we are not saying here that members shall not do so: we are simply disallowing that regulation. I understand that the board has already agreed, by resolution, to certain rules, and that these rules are being challenged elsewhere. However, that matter does not directly concern the House today: we are simply discussing whether the board can bring in a series of regulations dealing with the conduct of meetings and certain other matters.

The Subordinate Legislation Committee has given notice of a motion to disallow certain regulations. On discussing the matter with

members of that committee, I find that there is virtually no difference between the motion put forward by the committee and the motion of the member for Stirling. The member for Stirling is moving to disallow all the regulations, whereas the committee has given notice of motion to disallow only regulations 3 and 4 of the proceedings of the board. If regulations 3 and 4 are taken away, practically nothing controversial is left. Most of the other regulations are simply rules dealing with the conduct of the board, and I think they are logical anyway. Therefore, I am saying that the motions of the committee and the member for Stirling are substantially the same. In this case, as well as the advice of a private member (and private members' advice is frequently taken), members have the advice of the committee, through the inference that can be drawn from this notice of motion. Therefore, there seems to be no argument why the regulations should not be disallowed.

Although the Government has no objection to the motion, some important principles may have to be looked at. As I understand it, the whole argument in this case goes back to the right of a board member to study, and perhaps to copy, documents held and owned by the board. No board member is under any oath of secrecy under any Act, so that what he does with information received depends entirely on his judgment and integrity. This is a problem which could become real and which might have to be looked at.

Several speakers in the debate have referred to unsatisfactory features in the legislation. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition said that some form of inquiry should be set up concerning the constitution of the board and its activities. Parliament is responsible for the constitution of the board. The legislation, which was introduced in 1948 and became effective on a poll of the growers of the day, although it has been considerably amended, has never been altered drastically. It includes machinery whereby it can be repealed or rendered ineffective by a vote of the growers. If a certain procedure of presenting petitions is followed, a vote can be held abolishing the operation of the Act. To my knowledge, the Act has been challenged at least once, possibly more, and the growers have supported the existence of the board.

Another feature of the Act is that it provides for a grower majority on the board. As was explained earlier, the board consists of a chairman, appointed by the Governor; a retailers' representative; two merchants; and

five growers. Therefore, there is a grower majority on the board. Another feature is that the board has power to fix prices. In those circumstances, one would say that it was fairly favourable towards the producer: I do not know what more could be done to see that producers received a fair voice in its control. One could not reasonably remove from the board all other sections of the industry. The growers have a majority and they have the right to fix prices. If the constitution is to be altered, as some members have suggested, I should like to know in what way it should be altered. To be realistic, I believe it is not likely to be altered so that it is more in favour of the growers than it is at present.

I hope the board will be able to work effectively in the future. It has done a good job in the past and has had a stabilizing influence on the potato industry, but it has worked under enormous difficulties, which we should acknowledge. The board operates within the State but has no control over interstate trading. In the circumstances, I think it has done a very good job for the growers, and the growers evidently have thought so, because most of them have always supported its existence. I do not know whether a majority would support the proposed regulations: certainly the evidence indicates that they would support them, as the South-East growers do. It does not appear that the growers will get these regulations, because members are agreeing here that they should be disallowed.

We should remember what the board means to the majority of the growers and we should do our best not to embarrass it. There was a slight amount of criticism of the Chairman, but it was not personal criticism. The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Evans) said that the Chairman was not regarded as he should be regarded. From personal experience, I can say that the Chairman (the Chief Horticulturist) is an outstanding public servant. As a horticulturist he is certainly outstanding, and as an administrator of the board he has a reputation for complete integrity. I supported him when he was first appointed, and I am pleased that he is still Chairman of the board. He deserves much of the credit that is due to the board for doing a good job despite tremendous difficulties.

One or two matters that were dealt with should not have been mentioned during this debate, which is a debate on the regulations, not on the activities of the board in general. Several members have demanded an inquiry into the board's activities. Members of Parlia-

ment, however, should be careful before they ask for inquiries into organizations of this nature. If they make such a request, they should bring to the Minister's attention material evidence so that he can decide whether an inquiry should be held.

In the legislation is a provision whereby anyone dissatisfied with any of the board's activities may appeal to the Minister, and I know that the Minister has nothing to cover up. Disallowing these regulations does not necessarily mean that the board will not have the power to run its own business. The board may still decide, as do other organizations, what it should do about access to documents. The potato industry has particular complications: the board is made up of interests of all kinds—merchants, producers and retailers. Much private business can be ascertained from board documents and much of this private business would have no particular relevance in normal circumstances. One should be careful before making this information available, particularly to people not bound by any oath of secrecy.

The following is a hypothetical situation that has not occurred but could occur: a member could sue the board in the courts (I am not referring particularly to the court case in progress at present). A member could demand to see the legal advice that the board had received to guide it in its conduct of the case. Is that not a rather extraordinary situation? The board should have another look at this matter, and Parliament should perhaps consider whether the board's constitution is satisfactory. The constitution, however, has stood the test of 21 difficult years and has come through with a good record of service to the industry. I repeat that the Minister has no objection to an inquiry, but he must have material evidence placed before him, not vague hearsay evidence picked up from conversations with other people. I support the motion.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I moved this motion for disallowance because it was in similar terms to the recommendation of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. Without regulations 3 and 4, there are only provisions about how a meeting can be conducted. I consider that any good chairman can conduct a meeting without having such rules as these. The Potato Board has done a good job for growers over the years.

The Minister of Lands has spoken in support of the job that Mr. Miller has done, but I agree with the member for Onkaparinga (Mr.



Evans) that it is not good for the head of a department to be also Chairman of the board, and I have said that many times. My only objection to the Chairman of the Potato Board is that, at many growers' meetings that I have attended, when he has been asked questions he has evaded them, whereas I think that he, as Chairman of the board, should have given the information sought. I think this characteristic of the Chairman in not wanting to discuss what is involved in a matter has caused the difficulty about getting information, even before Mr. McEwin became a member, and I have not supported Mr. McEwin in any way in the action he has taken.

There is a clash of personalities, but I think every member of the board has a job to do and the whole board should discuss matters like grown-up civilized people do and resolve matters reasonably. Perhaps in this House we do not always show that characteristic, but we do our best. I have a letter written by a former member of the board to the Chairman asking why more information was not given to members. This letter was written just before Mr. McEwin became a member, and the writer said that, as new members were coming on the board, surely more information could be given to them.

I do not think we should inhibit the ability of a member of the board to get information. It seems absurd that, before one can get information from the board, one has to get the permission of the Chairman or of a majority of members. How could the majority vote on such a matter without having all the facts about whether another member should see the information? I ask all members of the board to overcome their ill feeling and to get on with the job that I know they can do.

Motion carried.

#### DOG RACING

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. McAnaney:

(For wording of motion, see page 905.)

(Continued from August 20. Page 1095.)

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): When I secured the adjournment of this debate last week, I felt like adopting the attitude of letting the dead go bury their dead. However, because of events since, I am inclined to adopt an entirely different attitude. I am disappointed at the tactics adopted by some people on this motion. The member for Light (Mr.

Freebairn) said by interjection during the debate that the member speaking was opposed to the worker, suggesting that those who were sponsoring this motion and had engineered it were members of the working class. We have had more urgers around this place since this matter has been before the House than at any other time that I can remember. Last week, when I went out into the corridor and saw them after the debate had been adjourned, I could not help thinking of this writing in scripture:

Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin.

These people who have been urging here are alleged to be workers, yet they can leave their places of employment and spend all the time that they want to spend here urging.

Mr. Evans: By "these people" do you mean all of them?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Well, a great proportion and, I would say, the brains of them were here. They have a perfect right to do that, but no member is justified in saying that these are the workers, because they are not. I did not object to a fair approach being made to Parliament. Members of Parliament should be open to receive the people who come to see them, but every member has the right to oppose a proposition freely, without being harassed. I recall the time about three years ago when I took an attitude against a move of the kind now being made.

I received two filthy letters threatening me. One writer said he would expose me, but I did not know what he would expose me about. He also said that he had influence in the Australian Labor Party and would get me kicked out of the Party. I concluded that the writer was a crank. However, on several occasions I received telephone calls in the early hours of the morning and, when I answered, no-one replied but I could hear a person breathing at the other end of the line. I went back to sleep after 2 p.m. and an hour later the telephone rang again. I believe that when my constituents are in distress they have the right to telephone me and, as an honest politician, I answer every telephone call. This person continued for about a fortnight with these telephone calls until I took action, and they stopped immediately.

Mr. McKee: Did you take a sleeping draught?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: No; some of our members do not need to take them. I was convinced that a crank had been telephoning me, but the letters I had received had the

same association with my opposition to a motion similar to the one we are considering now. Last week a member spoke opposing this move, and then received a letter in handwriting similar to that in the letter addressed to me. It was a filthy letter threatening him.

A member outside the House has had a word or two to say and he received a letter in similar handwriting, containing the filthiest terms, and telling him to shut his so-and-so mouth or it would be shut for him. He is also receiving telephone calls similar to those I received. If this is not gangster tactics, I do not know what is. These are tactics of the filthiest principle of gangsterism. These people have treated Parliament with contempt, and members should be sincere in their endeavours to retain the dignity of this Parliament and its authority.

A Select Committee was appointed in 1967 to inquire into dog-racing. When I voted for that proposal I was told what this Select Committee was told. I had some doubts, but I believe in giving people the benefit of any doubts I may have. I was told that no application would be made for betting facilities.

Mr. Hughes: I was told that, too.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I was assured of that. I did not get it in writing, but I think that it is in writing now, because I draw the House's attention to page 19 of the evidence given to that committee, as follows:

THE HON. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Is the club satisfied with the non-provision in the Bill for betting facilities?—Yes; two separate issues are involved. One relates to training and running our dogs respectively, and the other is a social issue involving people other than those associated with greyhound racing. It does not concern us greatly whether one or 10,000 are present at a meeting.

They were not concerned then as long as they had a permit to race, and they told me they would not ask for betting facilities. On page 8 of the evidence, the Hon. L. R. Hart asked the following question and received the following reply:

Do you believe that South Australia could conduct mechanical lure coursing without betting?—Yes.

Later he asked the following question, and the witness replied as appears later:

Do you really believe that mechanical lure coursing could succeed in South Australia without betting? . . . (Mr. Kustermann) It depends on whether you mean, by "successful", that the club involved is making large profits or whether a large number of people attend. I do not think the clubs would make great profits, but the people running the clubs will receive the benefit of facilities which they

should have had for a long time. It is a matter of whether we are able to use the mechanical lure or not.

The implication was that betting was out. The House, having received the committee's report, passed the Bill in the belief that these people could carry out coursing successfully without betting facilities. That is what they said, and I submit that this move shows a degree of contempt for Parliament. Parliament cannot afford to be lured into doing things that are not in the best interests of the Parliament. The purpose of the present exercise is to stampede the Government and Parliament into passing a Bill.

Mr. McKee: Any other reason for opposing it?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have always opposed any increase in gambling facilities, and I have never made any secret of my attitude during the 20 years I have been a member. A brochure prepared by the Greyhound Racing Committee contains the following statement:

The opinion of the General Manager of the South Australia T.A.B. (Mr. Hatton), is that betting on greyhound races will not detract from betting on galloping and trotting. From his experience in Victoria he feels that a new customer will follow greyhound racing.

This is a definite admission that if this motion is carried it will lead to an extension of gambling facilities. I have never believed that this would be good for the people of the State, and I oppose it on that ground. However, I oppose it more forcibly today, because of the tactics used last week.

One man has had to seek police protection. He has received several letters in addition to the one to which I have referred, threatening him in many ways. There is no doubt when the letters were written, because the postmark is clearly shown on the letter. It is in similar handwriting to that in the letter received by a member, and in similar handwriting to those I received about three years ago. I am prepared to adopt a reasonable attitude, but what has happened indicates the character of the people who indulge in this type of amusement: I cannot call it a sport.

I have a booklet referring to matters that were heard before a Royal Commission in New South Wales, dealing with the tactics adopted by certain people who tried to do there what people are trying to do with this Parliament today. The Royal Commissioner (Mr. Justice Rogers) referred to a certain person as follows:

. . . a schemer and deviser of crooked stratagems, a man of personality but unprincipled and unscrupulous, a sinister figure

in any community, receiving money or money's worth to get legislation passed.

When people come up with these types of tactics, it is un-Australian and American gangsterism of the first order. The motion should be rejected.

Mr. FERGUSON (Yorke Peninsula): I do not intend to delay the House very long but I oppose the motion. I opposed the dog-racing legislation introduced into this House in 1966, I think it was, and I do not think any member would imagine that I would support this motion. Unlike the member for Hindmarsh, I have not had urgers on my back.

Mr. Jennings: You were too far away.

Mr. FERGUSON: It is evident that they presumed I was dead wood, so it did not matter. To me, it is amazing how members' attitudes and thinking can change so much in such a short time. Several arguments have been put forward why members supported legislation for the introduction of dog-racing, while other arguments have been adduced why we should not support this motion. When the legislation for dog-racing was introduced, the people connected with dog-racing assured members of this House that no gambling would attach to the sport. I cannot imagine that any member of this House would believe or could accept such an assurance. At least, if there was not to be any legal gambling, it would provide another opportunity for illegal gambling. Therefore, I could not acknowledge or accept at the time that no gambling would attach to tin-hare racing in South Australia.

Again, the argument was advanced by some members that they supported the introduction of dog-racing into South Australia because it would prevent people and families from leaving the State. At that time many families were leaving South Australia, but for other reasons—not because of dog-racing; they were leaving the State then because they wanted suitable employment. Not very much was done then to prevent families from leaving this State but, when it came to dog-racing, it was a different matter. It was important that dog-racing be permitted in South Australia because it would prevent families from going to another State.

Mr. McKee: Some had already gone.

Mr. FERGUSON: Cruelty has been mentioned. If there is cruelty in bleeding greyhounds for racing, this must increase if dog-racing in South Australia is to have T.A.B. connected with it. I have received a booklet, as have many other members of this House.

Mr. Rodda: Not the Richardson report?

Mr. FERGUSON: Yes; and there were things in it that no-one would have dared to print if they were not true. We were told that there were clauses in the Bill that would allow dog-racing in South Australia and prevent the bleeding of greyhounds, but they did not prevent the bleeding of greyhounds. There were clauses that provided for certain convictions for bleeding, but the Bill did not prevent it.

I want now to quote something that our learned Attorney-General said, during the Committee stage of the Bill in 1966, in respect of cruelty attaching to the bleeding of greyhounds. At page 2235 of *Hansard* he said:

When I spoke in the second reading debate I said there were two reasons why I opposed the Bill and that either one of them standing on its own would be sufficient reason for me to oppose it. The second of the reasons given was that the Bill would encourage cruelty. As I understood the drift of the remarks by supporters of the measure, it was that there was no trouble about cruelty, that the Bill covered the situation, and that we need not worry. I cannot see anything in the Bill which forbids cruelty, which regulates it, or which takes any step to prevent it.

That is the opinion of our learned Attorney-General, an opinion that can be accepted by this House. Another argument advanced is that, if horse-racing in South Australia is to have T.A.B., why not apply it to dog-racing also? If we are going to apply this principle, why do we not have T.A.B. for every kind of sport in South Australia—football, cricket, tennis, or, for that matter, billiards or snooker?

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Or racing pigeons.

Mr. FERGUSON: I do not think that argument has very much depth. I oppose the motion.

Mr. VIRGO (Edwardstown): I move:

To strike out "by means of a totalizator, operated by the Totalizator Agency Board". I was interested to hear the statement by the member for Yorke Peninsula to the effect that the existing provisions for greyhound-racing permitted the bleeding of greyhounds. I think most people would agree with his view and would be totally opposed to bleeding, but why are not moves being made to remedy this defect in the right quarters?

This motion deals with one thing, and one thing only—the extension of betting facilities to an existing provision that this House has approved of. I am not unsympathetic to the views that have been expressed about the diabolical atrocities alleged to be occurring.

Mr. Hudson: Do you mean "diabolical"?

Mr. VIRGO: That is what I said. I cannot see how the carrying of this motion will affect the position one way or the other because, if atrocities can occur at this stage, then the measure at fault is the existing one and not the measure providing for an extension of betting facilities. With other members, I have received the booklet put out by the Anti Tin Hare Racing League. Although the league calls it a cruel and diabolical sport, it nevertheless designates dog-racing as a sport. I have no reason to doubt the information advanced by this league, but I strongly suggest that the defeat of this motion will not achieve what either the member for Yorke Peninsula or the member for Enfield seeks to achieve in opposing the motion.

At least the member for Hindmarsh has a different reason for opposing the motion, as has the member for Yorke Peninsula to a certain extent. They are opposed to the extension of betting, and I hope that all members of this House respect them for those views. In turn, I think we can expect those members to respect the views of people who desire an extension of betting. Personally, I could not care less whether or not people bet, and I never waste my money on betting.

Mr. Burdon: You haven't backed a winner this time, either.

Mr. VIRGO: I do not necessarily set out to pick winners. I set out to express my point of view and, whether I am on the winning or the losing side, I have my conscience and I live with it.

Mr. Lawn: What's going to happen to Souths on Saturday?

Mr. VIRGO: If there are any West Adelaide supporters in the House who will offer the odds and the goals in, I will consult my turf adviser to see whether I can accept a bet.

The SPEAKER: Order! That has nothing to do with the motion.

Mr. VIRGO: I think no-one could have tried to defeat the motion more effectively than the member for Stirling did during his opening remarks. I am not the least bit impressed by any effort to convert a sport, whether it be dog-racing, horse-racing, or any other type of sport, into a means of filling the coffers of the State Government.

Mr. McAnaney: I didn't say that at all.

Mr. VIRGO: Perhaps the honourable member would care to look at page 907 of *Hansard*, where he said:

I point out that the Government will receive considerable revenue from T.A.B. betting on dog-racing.

On the previous page, he went to considerable lengths to tell us what sums of money the Governments were receiving and what prize-money, etc., was available in other States. If this is one of the prime objectives of the member for Stirling, I assure him that, if he has ever had my vote, he has lost it now, anyhow. I am not prepared to support an effort that may be designed to promote a certain sport if the ulterior motive behind it is to provide another source of revenue for a money-hungry State Liberal Government. As I said earlier, I am not concerned whether people want to bet on horse-racing, trots, football, dog-racing, or flies crawling up a window. Betting is inherent in the Australian way of life, although whether it is good or bad for us, I am not sure.

Mr. Hurst: Would you consider including knuckle-bones?

Mr. VIRGO: I think we ought to be serious about this. I do not think the matter concerns knuckle-bones or marbles, etc. We are considering a request from an organization which gained the blessing of this Parliament and was permitted to conduct meetings, although whether or not it was done by subterfuge is another matter entirely. I admire and sympathize with the member for Hindmarsh and other members who believe they have had the wool pulled over their eyes. I am not prepared to support a motion that seeks to establish, as a monopoly, betting on dog-racing which is to be limited strictly to T.A.B. I think the mover of the motion (as well as other members opposite) is completely out of touch with the attitude of the people when he makes such statements as the one appearing on page 907 of *Hansard*, as follows:

Indeed, the more quickly we dispense with bookmakers in connection with horse-racing in South Australia, the better it will be for the industry.

I refer the honourable member to what happened on December 7, 1968, an occurrence which I suggest was aided and abetted by the Premier, when a race meeting was held at the Victoria Park Racecourse without any bookmakers. It is commonly now referred to as the "Tote-only meeting". If members will cast their minds back to this meeting they will remember that the attendance was the lowest of all time, despite the gimmicks put out by the Adelaide Racing Club, such as marching girls, brass bands, Miss Australia, and so on, to attract people. The only thing the club did not offer the people was free bets, and yet it

had the smallest attendance on record. In fact, in my humble opinion, this meeting was engineered to try out what effect all-totalizator meetings would have on the racing public, and I think the A.R.C. got its answer in a fairly clear and concise way.

Mr. Ryan: There aren't any bookmakers in New Zealand.

Mr. VIRGO: That may be so, and I suggest the honourable member go there and try to find out how racing operates.

Mr. McKee: There are no bookmakers in Europe.

Mr. VIRGO: I know that and perhaps the honourable member might care to go to Europe or America, where I understand bookmakers also do not operate. We are not dealing with racing in New Zealand, Europe or America or in any other State in this country: we are dealing with the situation as it applies in Adelaide. It was shown quite clearly on Saturday, December 7, that the racing public of Adelaide would not patronize a meeting that did not have bookmakers. The mover of the motion said that people interested in dog-racing were entitled to have similar facilities to those existing for people interested in horse-racing.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you think the mover was right in all he said?

Mr. VIRGO: I am not concerned with whether the mover was right or wrong. I am moving an amendment which I believe will be in keeping with the wishes of most people and which certainly is in line with the support afforded the racing interests at present.

Mr. Ryan: This will give the Government more revenue, and you said that you were against that.

Mr. VIRGO: I greatly appreciate the assistance some of my colleagues are giving me in making this speech, but quite frankly I think I am capable of making the points I desire to make. I want to remind the member for Stirling and other members of the House of something that occurred earlier this year. Members will recall that at that stage we had before us the Lottery and Gaming Act Amendment Bill and, as a result of the farce on Saturday, December 7, at the Victoria Park Racecourse, I moved an amendment to that Bill to provide that the fees to be charged bookmakers should be subject to arbitration. That amendment was unanimously adopted by this House. It went to the Legislative Council (and I want the member for Stirling to remember what happened) which rejected it and sent it back to this House saying it had

rejected it because the controlling body for horse-racing in this State was opposed to any Government interference by legislation in a domestic racing matter.

Yet now we have a member of the Government moving a motion that, without any shadow of doubt at all, will dictate the terms of what can be described only as a domestic matter associated with dog-racing. This motion is saying that there can be betting, provided it is by means of a totalizator conducted by the T.A.B. I do not believe this House has a right to lay down rigid terms of this nature. I believe members have a right to say whether or not they believe there ought to be betting, and this is exactly what my amendment proposes we should do. If this motion is carried and if a subsequent Bill is introduced and carried by both Houses, the organization responsible for the conduct of the meeting will be allowed to decide whether it wants T.A.B. alone, bookmakers alone, or a combination or both, as exists in the present circumstances in the racing industry.

If the member for Stirling is genuine when he says that the people interested in dog-racing are entitled to similar facilities to those that exist for people interested in horse-racing, then he has to support my amendment because it provides similar facilities. However, the honourable member's motion is not providing similar facilities. This is the crux of the whole matter. I do not know why it is that the member for Stirling (and I think I am not being unfair when I say this applies also to one or two other members from his side) appears to be not favourably disposed towards bookmakers. I seek leave to continue my remarks.  
Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### RAILWAYS STANDARDIZATION AGREEMENT (COCKBURN TO BROKEN HILL) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

#### LOAN ESTIMATES

In Committee.

(Continued from August 26. Page 1228.)

Public Buildings, \$27,800,000.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That the item "School Buildings" (\$13,800,000) be reduced by \$200.

I take this course because it is the formal means by which the Opposition may express

its dissatisfaction with the provision in the Loan Estimates for school buildings. It is not that we want less money spent on school buildings (we want more spent) but this is the formal way in which disapproval of Estimates before this Committee is expressed.

In recent times the teachers in the Education Department in South Australia have made many demands on members for improvements in the school system, and they have done so with every justification. We have received letters, as Government members also have, from schools throughout the State in which staffs have made demands on Government for a re-allocation of budget priorities. I do intend to read all the letters I have received. I am sure Government members have received similar letters, but I intend to refer to a few to indicate the sort of thing teachers are saying. Teachers at the Mansfield Park Primary school have stated:

We, therefore, call on the Government to strain its resources to the utmost in an endeavour to meet what the Minister refers to as the increasing needs of education.

Teachers at the Parafield Gardens East Primary School have stated:

We also demand that the State Government should recognize the importance of education by nothing short of a re-allocation of its own Budget priorities. We call upon the Government to strain its resources to the utmost in an endeavour to meet what the Minister refers to as the increasing needs of education.

The letter from the Woomera Primary School states:

We call upon the Government of the State of South Australia to re-allocate its Budget priorities for this coming fiscal year.

Teachers at the Mount Gambier Technical High School have stated:

There are urgent building needs, especially for shelter and eating facilities. More than half the school buildings are wooden pre-fabricated structures. There is an absence of comfort and civilizing influences throughout the school; floor boards are bare; paintwork is drab; pupils shelter against walls to eat their lunch; furniture is uncomfortable and unattractive.

The letter from the Gilles Street Primary School states:

Buildings and grounds: Rapid improvement in the condition of many of our older buildings is an urgent necessity. More modern buildings, planned to facilitate the process of educating citizens, and the provision of equipment, teaching aids and playground facilities, are urgent and pressing immediate needs.

Teachers at the East Adelaide Infants School have stated:

That all old schools be provided with the basic accommodation facilities for implementing the school curriculum effectively.

Members of the staff of the Kensington and Norwood Girls Technical High School have stated:

We call on the Government to strain its resources to the utmost in an endeavour to meet what the Minister refers to as the increasing needs of education.

The letters go on and on, and I am extremely pleased that the teachers in South Australia have become militant over this issue of education, because it is more than time that they did. As every Government member knows well, the Commonwealth Government has kept every State in Australia gruesomely short of funds for education. It has financed its expansion and expenditure in several directions at the expense of State services, and it has done so by scaling down the kind of money that every State in Australia needed to spend on education. No single State in Australia has had enough money for education, either for buildings or for revenue needs to meet all current services.

In comparable countries expansion in education expenditure has taken place at a greater rate than the increase in population, yet our grants from the Commonwealth Government have been restricted to a formula that has been largely based on increases in population and changes in wage rates. In no case has the State been provided with the money it needs in this sphere, and this situation, to which members of the Education Department's staff testify feelingly, is the result of that trend of the policy on the part of the Commonwealth Government.

In the last few days I visited several schools outside my district. I have regularly visited schools in my district and know the situation within my area reasonably well, but I visited the Treasurer's district at the end of last week and found that the Port Lincoln High School is shocking. I was asked to see the Grade 1 school in the centre of his town by teachers who were utterly up in arms at the situation in which they were forced to teach in primary conditions, where it was impossible for them to put into effect the training that they had received for modern primary education, because classrooms and facilities would not allow it. As the Treasurer well knows the Grade 1 centre in Port Lincoln, unlike his other school at Kirton Point, is badly lacking in adequate accommodation and is a conglomeration of temporary and unsatisfactory buildings. This is not an isolated position.

Yesterday, I was taken by members of the South Australian Institute of Teachers not to the worst schools in the metropolitan area (they could have taken me to several worst schools that I know), but to what they considered were average schools, and they were being entirely honest in this matter.

Mr. Broomhill: They invited the Premier, too.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They asked him to go, but his position was that he was advised by his Minister and, consequently, he did not intend to accept an invitation to visit these schools on the same date with members of the institute.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: When was that given?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know: this is as it was reported to me. I understood that the Premier had been asked at the same time as I was asked. When I was first asked I said, "Yes, certainly I will come, and if there is anything you want to show me I am happy to come." I did go. I visited a primary school in the district of the Minister of Education and a high school and a technical high school in the District of Enfield. At the primary school particularly, although there was a new building built in 1963 and reasonable playing facilities, it was clear that the size of classes and the shape and design of classrooms completely prevented the kind of primary education that is now recommended throughout the primary system—the direct involvement of the children in the activity of education. Group work is impossible in most of these classrooms, and the teachers are confined to chalk-and-talk methods in respect of a class which cannot be moved, which cannot be divided into groups, and in which group activity is impossible. I saw the classes where they were trying to give remedial teaching to between 16 per cent and 20 per cent of the children. As a result of this system, to which they are bound by present accommodation, it is clear they will need remedial teaching if they are to undertake any sort of adequate further education beyond the primary stage.

What we are doing at present is to bind children to an education system ill adapted because of its facilities, its lack of teachers and the size of classes. It is a system that in these circumstances cannot cope with the demands of an increasingly technological society on the children themselves. To say all of this is bad enough (if any Government is straining its resources to the utmost, as is asked of it by these teachers, it cannot be blamed for a

situation that the Commonwealth Government has forced on it and on its predecessors) but the extraordinary situation that now faces South Australia is that with inadequate moneys for education this Government refuses to spend what it has. It is on this basis that this motion is moved. No member can blame this Government merely because the Commonwealth Government has taken the attitude that education in Australia has to be scaled down: it is not this Government's fault, and it was not its predecessor's fault, either.

But, if money is available immediately in more generous terms than is being provided in these Loan Estimates and is not being used, this Government is to blame. It proposes in these Loan Estimates to reduce expenditure on new schools and on major additions to existing schools by \$1,400,000, even though an additional \$4,000,000 is being added to the surplus on Loan Account. The \$4,000,000 is in excess of any moneys that this Government has funded from Loan against accumulated deficits. As I said at the outset of the debate in Committee, the moneys funded from Loan Account, apart from this \$4,000,000, it was not necessary to fund from Loan. What the Government has done is to take out of Loan in total \$12,000,000, but the excuse for just on \$8,000,000 of that was that this was against accumulated Revenue deficits.

As I pointed out previously, the Treasurer well knows that the Treasury is sufficiently buoyant in cash resources not to need that money to be put into the Treasury, which could meet any calls upon it. So that money did not need to be put there. However, laying aside that argument about the \$8,000,000 that I believe should have been used, in the Treasurer's own terms of the things he had mentioned in this Chamber previously, for constructional expenditure in this State, we come to the \$4,000,000, about which there can be no argument at all. That is money taken from Loan, during the course of this financial year to which these Loan Estimates refer, and put into the Treasury as against projected possible deficits on running account.

On the Treasurer's own statements made throughout the State previously, this is completely contrary to the principles that he believes this State should espouse. It is taking \$4,000,000, borrowed for the purpose of constructional expenditure, and putting it away as against any deficit on running expenses. It is taking money that we have borrowed for one purpose and using it entirely for another (and not for basic development).

The overall provision for school buildings, technical and teachers colleges is \$13,800,000, as against \$13,700,000 last year. However, this year \$2,900,000 is being provided through Commonwealth Government aid for teacher and technical colleges, science laboratories and libraries, as against assistance of \$1,600,000 last year. In order to attract this extra Commonwealth Government aid, \$1,250,000 extra is provided for teachers colleges. However, with a similar overall provision (because that money is being taken out of the total—only \$100,000 more for schools and teachers colleges this year than last year) the Commonwealth grant can be obtained only by reducing expenditure on new schools and on major additions to existing schools.

Of the \$13,800,000 provided for the current financial year, \$2,900,000 comes from the Commonwealth, while \$430,000 is a carryover from last year. As a result, only \$10,470,000 of new money is being made available from State Government sources this year. In view of the problems of Government schools and the widespread discontent of the teaching profession, it is scandalous that the Government should run a still larger surplus on Loan Account partly at the expense of capital expenditure on schools. In current circumstances, the Government is making it clear that it does not intend to keep faith with the teaching profession and its representatives or with the children of this State. It is incomprehensible to me that, given the demands and the known needs of education in this State, the Government should take action of this kind. If it had spent to the limit of what was available to it, no-one could blame it; no-one could say, "This Government has produced the situation about which the teachers are protesting." But when the Government refuses to spend what it has got, it is saying to the teachers and their representatives, to the parents and to the children, "It is not necessary to spend money to the limit on these things to which the teachers depose. It is not necessary to spend money on what is a vital and urgent need for the children of this State in the basic investment that we can make—the education of the children."

Mr. Clark: What happens in the meantime?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The secondary effect of this decision of Government is that it makes it much harder to say to the Commonwealth Government, "We need more for school construction in South Australia," when the

Commonwealth Government can come back and say, "You haven't spent what you've got." As the Treasurer (and, by now, the Premier) will know very well, the Commonwealth Treasurer is keen to say that whenever he can. He is wont to misrepresent the case of the States and to make just that sort of remark at Loan Council. If we do not spend what we have, we are not doing our job, and that is the position under these Estimates at the moment.

Mr. CORCORAN: I wholeheartedly support the motion, which was moved by the Leader only after this course had been seriously considered by all members on this side. We decided to take this course only after it had become apparent to us that the Government was not putting its best foot forward on the construction of new schools in this State. As the Leader said, this situation has not appeared over night but has some history attached to it; we were aware of it when we were in Government, and at that time we did not carry a surplus of \$12,000,000 on Loan Account as this Government is doing currently. As the Leader said, it is this situation that has caused us to take the step we have taken this evening. As an Opposition, we feel it incumbent on us to draw this matter to the attention of the Government as well as drawing to the attention of the people of this State what is apparently the Government's attitude to a serious situation. It is interesting to note the following statement that appeared in this morning's *Advertiser* in a report headed "Big Shortage of Teachers, Survey Finds":

The survey shows that 54.5 per cent of all classrooms were of solid construction and in reasonable or good condition, 1.5 per cent were in poor condition and 44 per cent were wooden temporary structures.

This in itself is an indication of the situation existing in this State. During the course of the discussion on another line in the Loan Estimates last evening, we heard the Treasurer say that, because of a report given to the Government regarding the condition of railway lines in this State, he was able, at an advanced stage of consideration of the Loan Estimates, to make an alteration to provide \$600,000 towards the rectification of the problems that had been pointed out in the report.

However, obviously no regard has been given to the representations made and objections raised by teachers throughout the length and breadth of the State recently. Only recently have teachers seen the need to press the



Government in the way they are pressing it at present. Surely if the Treasurer could make an alteration to the Loan Estimates at a late stage to cater for another urgent need, he could have taken notice of the teachers, who are an extremely important part of education and are so concerned about the situation, and taken another look at the Loan Estimates in this regard. I believe he could have done this had he dared, particularly as \$12,000,000 is salted away for other purposes. Of course, \$8,000,000 is set aside to offset the current deficit on the Revenue Budget, but \$4,000,000 is put aside for some reason about which we do not know much at this stage.

Mr. Lawn: Perhaps it is in anticipation of a Budget deficit.

Mr. CORCORAN: It may be, but surely a better effort could be made to show the people of the State and the teaching fraternity that the Government genuinely desires to do something to rectify the situation.

Mr. Casey: It isn't concerned at all.

Mr. CORCORAN: If it is, it is not showing it to members or to the people of the State. As the Leader has pointed out, only roughly 10 per cent of the money involved in these Loan Estimates is being spent by this Government on school-building construction. Is it any wonder, therefore, that the Commonwealth Government is not prepared to give us more in Loan funds for the construction of schools? The Commonwealth Government can rightly turn round in the present circumstances and say to this State Government, "You are not doing your bit," because in fact that is the case.

Mr. McKee: That is exactly what it will do.

Mr. CORCORAN: Obviously. I am certain that the situation will be even worse next year and, if and when the Premier goes to the Premiers' Conference with his Treasurer next year and points out these things and the need for additional money from the Commonwealth Government, the Commonwealth Treasurer's answer will be just as I have given it: "You allocated only about 10 per cent of the total amount that you had last year." On that basis, and particularly because this Government has put away this \$12,000,000 (\$4,000,000 of which we do not know very much about), can it expect the Commonwealth Treasurer or the Prime Minister to say, "Yes, I think you deserve more"? This will not be the case.

The Leader has pointed out the moves that have been made by teachers from various parts of this State. Indeed, every member here has received representations from schools or

from teachers from various schools all over this State, pointing out the inadequacies not only of their own conditions and of the staffing situation but also of the buildings in which they are supposed to work. The Leader has set out clearly to this Chamber the situation in regard to the sum to be spent on school buildings this year, the sum that will actually come from our Loan Estimates, and the sum this Government will have to spend on teachers colleges and other things in order to attract the additional finance from the Commonwealth Government. Not sufficient has been devoted to the construction of school buildings in this State, particularly in view of the fact that this Government has put this money aside for other purposes.

I repeat that, if at a late stage of consideration of the Loan Estimates the Treasurer could see fit to vote \$600,000 for another purpose, surely, in the light of the protests that have been registered by very responsible and intelligent people from all over the State, the Government should have been looking at this situation also and devoting more funds to the building of schools. The Government stands condemned on this issue.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): This promises to be an interesting debate, because in Committee members may speak as often as they like. It is one of those interesting facets of the debate that no-one need be concerned lest he does not have the last word, so goodness knows what time we will finish tonight.

A very important subject has been raised as a result of the presentation of the Treasurer's Loan Estimates to this Chamber. The subject of education in this State has received over the years a continuing emphasis of Government attention and Government funds, resulting in real progress in establishing an efficient education system. But, Mr. Chairman, the Opposition, in framing its attitude to this question, is again consistent in the number of inconsistencies it brings into its argument. It is interesting to hear this evening the argument that if we can find money for railways we should be able to find money for schools. However, I have been told that the Leader of the Opposition was saying publicly last night that people were foolish to travel on railways that were so depleted in their maintenance. I am told that this was the Leader's attitude when he spoke on television last night.

*Members interjecting:*

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I can yell as loudly as other members, but I do not think the argument should be developed in that atmosphere this evening. We were berated last evening for not spending enough money on railways. In fact, we were roundly berated by the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo).

Mr. Virgo: With justification.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: We have been soundly berated for increasing taxation. Where is the consistency in this attitude? Why does not the Opposition say that we should raise taxation? Of course, no-one can simply say, "We demand a reallocation of your Loan Fund resources", because direct and proper attention to these funds shows that one must have an alternative and no-one during the course of discussion of this issue or in the many letters that I have read has yet stated what line should be depleted to make up for education. What other service have they said should be run down, or what other taxation imposts should be put on the people of South Australia? This has not yet been stated this evening by Opposition speakers.

Mr. Corcoran: You're getting Loan Funds mixed up with the Budget.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will deal with Loan funds. This subject is of interest and I have taken note of the letters I have received. Most of the letters are couched in respectful and proper terms, and I appreciate the interest that the teachers have shown. However, a few letters have been somewhat insulting to the Minister of Education, and I regret and repudiate this, because this argument should not be conducted on this basis. We should get this matter into proper perspective.

This is an organized campaign, as all members know. The literature distributed to the schools contains a form headed, "School meetings", which members would know about. The literature goes into detail about the reply by the Minister of Education to submissions by the institute, and I know that the Minister later will explain anything that involved her. On the back page reference is made to the campaign to raise \$25,000 from the teaching profession to conduct this campaign. It is well-known that the Public Relations Officer for the South Australian Institute of Teachers was an Australian Labor Party candidate in the district of Alexandra against the Minister of Lands.

Mr. McKee: That is not right.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I consider that, if there is any political excess, it should not be put into the education question.

Mr. Virgo: You couldn't get lower.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Any political exercise in this regard will be futile, because I know that the majority of teachers do not want this issue made a political dog fight.

Mr. Casey: Don't you believe that.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: If the honourable member wants to make it one, he had better look at his Government's performance.

Mr. Casey: You're making the accusations.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I consider that parents would serve their own case and that of their children extremely well if they took stock of the situation and did not become involved in the political manoeuvrings of the Opposition regarding education. It is not accidental that the Leader is attacking the Commonwealth Government before the Commonwealth election on October 25, yet we know that in the last financial year this State has been treated well by the Commonwealth Government regarding special allocations. The very source of the funds that we are now discussing is \$2,000,000 greater because of the special allocation by the Commonwealth Government to South Australia's budgetary requirement. The figures are there if members want to read them.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Where did you get \$2,000,000 on this?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Leader knows that, if the \$2,000,000 had not been forthcoming, we would have had a deficit. It would have to be covered by funds in the hands of the Government this year. Surely the Leader is aware that the Commonwealth provided a special \$2,000,000 grant to South Australia, above anything else it did for other States, in a special move. I say categorically that it resulted in Loan funds being available this year to an extent of an increase of \$2,000,000.

Mr. Hudson: Is that an extra \$2,000,000 on Loan?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member understands what I said. If Opposition members cannot follow my arguments it is indeed an exercise in futility. If that special grant had not been forthcoming we would have had a deficit of \$2,000,000, and Opposition members know that that deficit would have to be covered by Government funds.

Mr. Corcoran: Is it Budget or Loan?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Surely the member for Millicent is not returning to the particular attitude of finance that applied when he was in Government.

Mr. Corcoran: Are you talking about Loan, Budget or what?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Two previous speakers were heard in silence, and I ask honourable members to pay the same courtesy to the honourable Premier.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It was interesting to see what the previous Minister of Education said in his speech on July 22, when he made a long speech about education in South Australia. I shall quote two parts of his speech, because that would be a good start to this debate. I venture to say—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Is the Premier referring to another debate in the same session?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: The Premier is out of order in referring to that.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will refer only to the honourable member's attitude, which I cannot read from *Hansard*, but he stated that the State Government had dealt effectively with teachers' training allowances, which had been received satisfactorily by teachers. He went on to say that—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Premier is supposed to be dealing with the line on the Loan Estimates relating to school buildings, and he will have to refer to that particular line and not deal with other matters relating to revenue.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Thank you, Sir. I shall refer to this line, although, in passing, the reference the Opposition speakers have made to the \$12,000,000 that they mentioned has an important bearing on both Loan and Budget accounts. The progress in schooling in South Australia has been continuous and one that I think successive Governments have been proud of, as it has resulted in this State having an increased availability of teachers and teaching facilities. It is interesting, in relation to this line and to the facilities needed to train teachers, to consider the number of teachers that have been working in our schools and the number of teachers college students who have been in training. In 1967 there were 9,525 teachers and 3,349 teachers college students, representing—

Mr. CORCORAN: I do not like to do this, Mr. Chairman, but I take a point of order at this stage, because the Leader and I confined our remarks to Loan funds and to the construction of school buildings. The Premier is now talking about training and the number of teachers. We did not refer to this matter—we could have but we did not—but confined our remarks to the construction of school

buildings. I take the point that the Premier is out of order in speaking about these other matters.

The CHAIRMAN: As I pointed out earlier to the Premier, we are dealing with the line in the Loan Estimates "School buildings, \$13,800,000" and the Committee must deal with that particular item of school buildings. It goes a bit further in details of furniture, equipment, minor alterations, flexible units and so forth.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: With respect, I referred to the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition in regard to teachers training colleges.

The CHAIRMAN: Teachers training colleges are in order.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I want to give the Committee the number of teachers in training, pertaining to the Loan Estimates we are discussing.

The CHAIRMAN: A reference to that can be made but it would be out of order to deal *in extenso* with that particular matter. A passing reference I shall not take exception to.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The passing reference I wish to make is that in 1967 the number of teachers in training, with the facilities that these Loan funds provide, was 35 per cent of the total number of teachers employed, which stood at 9,525. Today, those teachers number 10,569, and the number of teachers in training is 37 per cent. That is only one aspect of a continuous improvement in teaching ability and facilities in South Australia. Only in recent weeks the Minister of Education has been able to bring to Cabinet proposals to replace old and inefficient schools in South Australia. At one particular meeting, Cabinet approved at least two, and it may well have been three, schools as replacements of existing schools. I believe this was a break-through in the sense that we were now not merely going into new schools but also beginning to replace the old schools.

Mr. Langley: Where?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Minister of Education will have the details for the member for Unley when she speaks later on these lines. The Opposition has taken this position in this Chamber and outside, too, in regard to these facilities. What was its position when it was in office? I do not intend to speak at length—the Treasurer will bring detailed arguments to the Opposition members to remind them again of their involvement at that time in 1965-66, when the Labor Government

of the late Mr. Frank Walsh came to power inheriting a stable financial position from the Playford Government.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is not so.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It was a Treasury in better than balance, with surplus funds of about \$1,000,000—the exact figure escapes me. In its first year in office the Labor Government devoted \$11,759,000 to the construction of the facilities we are now discussing—school buildings and associated facilities. In 1966-67, this amount had fallen to \$10,757,000—not perhaps a dramatic fall but a movement downwards. These are actual expenditures, not the sums voted. In 1967-68 this had fallen to \$8,678,000, a fall of 26.2 per cent from the Labor Government's first year in office.

What is the performance of the present Government, which has been so harshly criticized both in this debate and outside the Chamber? On coming to office, having inherited a disastrous financial position from our predecessors with over \$8,000,000 in deficit in Government accounts, we spent in our first year \$11,670,000. In this year we are contemplating providing \$10,900,000, which, even though it is a reduction of State Government funds as such, is still 26.7 per cent above the last year on record of the previous Government, 16 or 17 months ago. The previous Government's financial administration (or maladministration) meant that it bit deeply into school funds. If it did not do that, why did it not provide the money and spend it? It bit deeply into funds otherwise available for school facilities.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You said we bit deeply into school funds.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Now the Leader tries to get out of the deficiency. When we consider that, 16 or 17 months later there is a rise in expenditure of 26 per cent, the Opposition says it is inadequate. If one cares to set a target for the future, anything is inadequate. We hope the standards will increase and that as the years go by targets will be met and better facilities provided. That is the aim of any Government worth its salt. But is it right to be so bitterly critical of that basis of operation? It seems that the Opposition's criticism is based on the \$12,000,000 that the Treasurer is alleged to have put aside. What has happened to that \$12,000,000? Why would the Treasurer, a politician of long standing in this Chamber, not want to spend funds at his disposal? Despite the many needs pressing on his budgetary calculations,

would he not spend what he could? What motive would he have to keep funds out of circulation? As much as members may not like to admit it, they left the accounts of this State over \$8,000,000 in deficit. Where did they make it up? How did they spend this? They got the money from trust funds.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That's not true, either.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It is rather funny that we had to put the money back. Perhaps if the previous Treasurer did not take it out, someone else did. Today, the trust funds stand fully intact.

Mr. Corcoran: You are discussing something you don't know very much about.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The deficit is matched by an equal sum of Loan funds, and that money has been spent. It is not standing as fresh money; it is backing what has already been spent, and that money is not spent twice. In an uncertain budgetary situation following the Commonwealth conference, the Treasurer has had to provide for expected rises in costs under awards, and he has done this responsibly with \$4,000,000 of Loan funds which he has had to put aside. There is not the slightest doubt that it had to be met from somewhere to carry on the Budget Account of this State, and members opposite know why the \$4,000,000 has been so provided. It is simply not available unless we run, again, deficits in the trust funds of the State.

Mr. Hudson: You know very well that you can run a deficit without touching trust funds.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member knows it is this penalty in respect of trust funds that is being incurred as a result of his type of financial administration. What is the record of the previous Government in relation to backing up recommendations of the Australian Universities Commission? Without going into the partial acceptance of the recommendations, and dealing only with funds, the recent announced programme of this Government in regard to matching grants of the A.U.C. represent a substantial increase indeed on what was provided by the previous Government. I do not intend to incur your disciplinary action, Mr. Chairman, by giving details, but those who wish to study the figures will see there is an extremely large increase which, in relation to universities and advanced education, for this coming triennium is about 55

per cent above what was provided by the previous Government for this triennium. Therefore, this Government has met its responsibilities and is providing for the future on a scale the previous Government was not able to provide.

I believe the Government is the first to acknowledge that further needs have to be met, and standards set and matched as time goes by. However, it would be foolish for anyone to demand a reallocation of expenditure without showing whence that money can come. The very basis of the Opposition's argument about the \$12,000,000 lies in its attitude to the administration of finance, as it displayed in office. The Treasurer will deal with this matter at some length later in the debate, and the Minister of Education will show the real advances that have occurred under her administration, with the support of the Treasurer and Cabinet. There is not the slightest need for members opposite to claim from their position that the Government is doing anything other than a good job in carrying out sound practices regarding education in this State.

Mr. HUDSON: The Premier has completely failed to answer the main point raised in the Opposition's motion which is that this financial year the Commonwealth Government, despite what we say about it, is providing, on the Treasurer's own figure, an additional \$1,300,000 of aid for capital projects in relation to school buildings for science laboratories and libraries and for teachers colleges and technical colleges. The provision this year is \$2,900,000 as against \$1,600,000 last financial year. To accept that additional Commonwealth aid but to increase expenditure under this line by only \$100,000 is a form of cheating. It is not keeping faith even with the Commonwealth Government and it is certainly not keeping faith with the people generally and the teaching profession particularly in South Australia.

Members on the front bench know full well that a further consequence has arisen as a result of the procedure adopted in the Loan Estimates. Compared with last year, an additional \$100,000 has been provided but, in order to get the \$1,300,000 extra from the Commonwealth, more has to be spent out of that overall provision on teachers colleges. Therefore, the Government can keep only roughly the same overall provision under this line by reducing expenditure on new schools and on major additions. Let us be quite clear that any replacement comes under the heading of "Major Additions": that is where

replacement would be noticed in the detailed Estimates. Let us look at the precise figures. In 1968-69 a sum of \$6,454,000 was provided for new schools and major additions in the primary, infants, area, technical high and high schools. This year, on the Treasurer's own figures in the statement he has provided, that sum has been reduced to \$5,040,000. That is the consequence of the Government's moral cheating on the Commonwealth Government in using the additional aid not to increase the total school buildings line and teachers colleges line by at least \$1,300,000 but to use that money elsewhere in the Loan Estimates.

Mr. Corcoran: To salt away.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, or to put it as part of the surplus. That is the thing to which we are taking exception. I have said before in speaking to the first line on these Estimates that I do not blame the Minister of Education, for I think she is being badly done by by the Treasurer and by her Cabinet colleagues. I am convinced that this was a Cabinet decision, and if I know anything about the kind of arguments that would go on the Minister of Education certainly wanted more and probably pointed out at the Cabinet meeting that if this policy was adopted she would have to reduce her planned expenditure on new schools and major additions; and in fact that is what is proposed.

In the primary and infants section, \$2,508,000 was provided last year for new schools and major additions, whereas this year only \$1,960,000 is provided—a reduction of \$548,000. Last year \$405,000 was provided for new area schools and major additions to those schools, but this year only \$155,000 is provided—a reduction of \$250,000. In the technical high schools section, \$1,380,000 was provided last year for new schools and major additions, but this year only \$1,070,000 has been allocated—a reduction of \$310,000. In the high schools section, \$2,161,000 was provided last year for new schools and major additions, whereas this year \$1,855,000 is provided—a reduction of \$306,000.

This is the thing to which we object, and this is the kernel of our argument that has led to this no-confidence motion. I believe the Government could remove the basis for this motion by giving a guarantee here and now that it would increase this school-building programme during this current financial year by at least \$1,250,000. It may (not as the Premier suggests) have to use trust funds for that purpose or deposits at the Treasury. The

Treasurer has no doubt already explained to the Premier that the bulk of money held at the Treasury is in the form of deposits, many of them working accounts of other Government departments and Government instrumentalities.

Do honourable members really mean to suggest that working accounts of other Government instrumentalities held at the Treasury should not be available for the use of the State when the need arises? If that is the view that they take, then I say they are talking nonsense and living in the past. The Treasurer knows that the previous Government did not touch trust funds. The total of trust and deposit funds kept at the Treasury varies from time to time, but it is generally of the order of \$27,000,000 to \$30,000,000, and that sets an absolute limit to any deficit that this State can run overall on both Loan and Budget together. However, at no stage has our total deficit been greater than \$9,000,000: the margin has been extremely healthy.

I also tell the Premier that at the end of the last financial year of the Labor Government's term of office, which was effectively June 30, 1968 (only 2½ months after the present Government came to office and when there had been insufficient time for any substantial economies to take effect) there was a deficit of over \$8,000,000 on the Budget account and a surplus of \$5,500,000 on Loan Account. When the Treasurer prepared his first Budget and his first Loan Estimates, the combined deficit on Loan Account and Revenue Account was about \$2,750,000.

Mr. Casey: Even the Premier was surprised to hear that.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, he asked the Treasurer whether it was correct. According to the Treasurer, he now has a deficit of about \$8,365,000.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: No, it is a little less than that. We reduced it last year.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, I am quoting the wrong figure. The deficit on Budget is \$7,905,000. The Treasurer proposes to hold, by the end of June, 1970, about \$11,927,000 as a surplus on Loan Account. He says that that is an offset to the current deficit, and I assume it is an offset to possible prospective deficits. We say that, in present circumstances, it is wrong to hold that additional surplus. It was not the Treasurer's policy last year and it should not have been this year. It is wrong morally and ethically to do it in circumstances in which the State is using aid from the Commonwealth Government to

reduce the amount of finance that the State must provide for particular purposes.

That is the kind of tactic that will lead the Commonwealth Government to make matching grants rather than outright grants, and the Treasurer knows the objection to \$1 for \$1 grants. If we continue the kind of practice introduced in the Loan Estimates this year, whereby we use Commonwealth aid for teachers colleges as a means of reducing our own financial commitment, we will not get outright grants in future. Commonwealth administrators and members of Parliament will exert more and more pressure, saying that the only way they can get this State to do what they wish on particular projects is by making matching grants.

Mr. Venning: You found that out?

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Rocky River would know that the Commonwealth Government makes only matching grants on capital expenditure to our universities, whereas, on current expenditure the Commonwealth grant is \$1 for every \$1.85 provided from State revenue or from the fees of students. That sort of matching procedure can make heavy inroads into the financial position of the Government if it applies right across the board. We are already confronted with the \$1 for \$1 grants in relation to Commonwealth aid road grants, and I believe that it is not in our interests to adopt a scheme of financing in relation to our Loan Estimates that is likely to induce the Commonwealth Government to go in still more for \$1 for \$1 grants in future.

The second general point I make is that it involves, I believe, double dealings with the teaching profession. We are confined in our discussion to school buildings, but we know that we need more teachers. The Premier said that there are more students going through the teachers colleges and that the Commonwealth Government is providing more money for building teachers colleges. We all know that the existing classrooms are inadequate in many respects, that over 40 per cent of them in the metropolitan area are wooden temporary classrooms. Some temporary classrooms have been erected for 15 years or more but they are still treated as temporary, although they are getting a permanent ring about them now.

Anyone who has had anything to do with these classrooms knows that they overheat in the summer and become excessively cold in winter; consequently the temperature variation in the rooms over the year and even for one day or for one week is much greater than

that in permanent structures. Everyone knows that they occupy excessive space in school-grounds, that they take up ground that could be used for other purposes and that, in some schools, they encroach on playing areas. Anyone who has looked at these rooms when they are used by a class of, say, 45 to 50 children will discover that the rooms become crowded and, in some cases, they have become so crowded that the teacher in charge of the class cannot get to the back of the classroom or cannot reach all the students to look at their work.

We need (and this has been a growing need for years and years) a programme of replacement of these old classrooms as well as a programme to provide additional classrooms for the extra student teachers we are putting through teachers colleges. We need the normal increment in school buildings to meet the increase in our school population that we are getting each year, and there is no sign that the pill will have any effect on that situation because, as members know, in recent years the number of children attending independent schools in South Australia has tended to decrease, so that all of the increment in the school population has gone to Government schools. For these reasons (to get rid of temporary classrooms, to provide for normal expansion, and to reduce class sizes) we need extra school buildings. The Government is not keeping faith with the public and the teaching profession when it reduces its provision for school buildings in these circumstances.

I refer now to the Premier's somewhat peculiar use of figures when he quoted the figures of actual spending. I quote the remarks of the previous Labor Minister of Education when, as a member of the Opposition, he dealt with this matter in the Loan Estimates debate last year. This is what the Hon. Mr. Loveday said (at page 917 of *Hansard*) last year. He was concerned at the fact that in the financial year 1967-68 there had been an under-spending on school buildings of \$1,971,000—almost \$2,000,000. This matter was thrashed out last year, when the Hon. Mr. Loveday said:

In March of this year—

while the Labor Government was still in office—

the Under Treasurer reported to Cabinet that the estimated under-spending was about \$300,000. In the explanation given me, the Treasurer said that the inclement weather had delayed building work and that some contractors had not proceeded with their work as fast as had been expected, but I cannot accept

this as the full explanation of the under-spending of nearly \$2,000,000.

In making a proper comparison year by year, we need to take the provision for the year, adjust for the under-spending or over-spending from the previous year, and adjust again for any recoveries made from the Commonwealth Government in order to find the correct estimate of the new provision of money made by the State Government. That is the correct way in which a comparison should be made year by year. If that is done, the Premier's remarks about the Labor Government turn out to be incorrect.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They are sheer nonsense and he knew it.

Mr. HUDSON: I do not believe that this sort of Party-political haggling about what occurred in the past or in the last years of the Playford régime does us any good now, because the present issue is clear: the Government, from these Loan Estimates, looks as though it has made a slightly increased provision under the general line "School buildings, technical colleges, teachers colleges", and the like; whereas, in fact, when we examine the position we find that the Commonwealth Government is providing an additional \$1,300,000, the bulk of it to teachers colleges, and that consequently, given that overall provision, there is more for teachers colleges and less for school buildings. In our view, the Government has not played fair with the Commonwealth Government, the public of South Australia, or the teaching profession. If the Government was now prepared to say, "All right; your point is well taken. We will increase our proposed expenditure on school buildings this year by \$1,250,000; we will provide the necessary extra funds, even at the risk of having a small overall deficit and of having to use, for balancing purposes, departmental accounts or the working accounts of semi-government instrumentalities; we will keep faith with the Commonwealth Government, the public of South Australia and the teaching profession", we would not have a case for continuing with this no-confidence motion.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE (Minister of Education): I support the Premier in rejecting this ill-founded criticism that we have heard from the Opposition this evening and the suggested lack of confidence inherent in the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition and supported by the Deputy Leader and the member for Glenelg. I believe that the purpose of this motion is to derive the greatest possible political advantage from the campaign

that has been mounted by a professional body—The South Australian Institute of Teachers. Further, it implies that there is a disastrous state of affairs in the field of education in South Australia, a situation that literally does not exist. I will refer to this later as I develop my reply on the motion. Naturally, in any body as large as the teaching profession, there are bound to be those who are moderate in their attitude and outlook while others are not so oriented. I have not at any time, as has been suggested by some people and in letters I have received from staffs of schools, ignored the concern of teachers, the sincerity with which they approach their professional duties, or the way they accept their professional responsibilities, because I believe that in the main they are genuine.

In fact, I have seen evidence of this: dedicated young teachers go into the remote areas of the State and have a real concern for the children in their care. I have expressed to these people my appreciation, and I have previously asked the Director-General to publish a message in the *Education Gazette* in respect of the teachers whose work I appreciate so much. But at present the public, the Government, and the department alike are being subjected to a campaign, which has been used this evening to develop an argument in support of the vote of no confidence.

The Leader of the Opposition has quoted from some of the letters which he has received from staffs of schools and which are no doubt replicas of letters which I, as Minister of Education, have received. He has quoted from those letters, in which the statements made have been engendered by the campaign that has been developed by the South Australian Institute of Teachers. I believe I would be in order in referring to a certain letter, because it has already been used by the Leader. I should like to put the record straight, because there seems to be much misunderstanding about this letter, which has been used as the basis of the campaign directed against me (and there is no doubt about the fact that a campaign has been directed against me by statements made in letters to the newspaper and in letters that I have received). I believe the facts of the matter should be exposed. I wish to deal with the sequence of events that led to the writing of this letter.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Which letter is this?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The one which the teachers circulated to the schools and which led to letters being written to me.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I didn't quote from it.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I said the Leader quoted from replicas of letters which I have received and which followed the receipt of this letter by teachers. In the letter circulated to staffs of schools, teachers were encouraged to write to the Minister. Members will know that the institute wrote a letter asking the Premier and me jointly to receive a deputation. That deputation was received on the day before the Premier left to go overseas and I came back in the middle of my leave so that I could receive the deputation with the Premier. We were met, as we knew we would be, with a number of points, which have now become rather famous and known as the 12 points. The Premier promised that we would give a considered reply to the letter. I did this at the Premier's request, and it was an extensive explanation in respect of the 12 points and of what the Education Department and the Government were doing about the matters raised.

Not very long after that, I received a letter from Mr. White asking that I should inform the Premier and the Government that the teachers were not satisfied with the reply to the 12 points made to us. Mr. White asked me whether he could come in and discuss the matter with me. As he was to have a meeting of his executive the very next evening, I said I would see him. I conveyed to him in fairly detailed measure the result of my discussion with the Premier and other members of Cabinet. The next day my secretary received a telephone call from Mr. White to the effect that he wondered whether the Minister would let him have the points discussed with her the previous day so that he might pass them on to his executive. I wish to read this letter, which is the same as that circulated to the teachers. Referring to the 12 points and dated June 27, it states:

As requested in the final paragraph of your letter and following a telephone request from you I arranged an appointment with you so that I could communicate to you personally the outcome of the discussions with members of Cabinet which you had asked for. However, as you have told my secretary that you wish to have the points I made confirmed in writing, I now do this.

And the points were as follows:

(1) Government resources are limited.

The CHAIRMAN: I assume this is linked up with the line for school buildings.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Yes, it is. With respect, I am suggesting that I should be able to develop this, because the letters that have come in from the teachers are



associated with the Opposition's vote of no confidence and have been quoted in this House.

Mr. Corcoran: They haven't.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The Leader of the Opposition has quoted letters in this Chamber.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: He started off quoting them.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They referred to school buildings.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister must connect her remarks to the line relating to school buildings. She referred to that line earlier, and I assumed that she was going to refer to school buildings.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I am coming to school buildings. The point I am making is that there is no doubt in my mind or in the Government's mind that the Opposition is relating its vote of no confidence to the campaign presently being waged by the teachers. I do not think there is any doubt about it whatever.

Mr. Corcoran: There is.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I do not see that there is.

Mr. Hudson: You reduced the provision. What about the figures on this matter?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: By the time I have finished, I will have given plenty of figures for members opposite to think about.

Mr. Hudson: We'll give some, too.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The point I want to develop is that when Mr. White came to see me on that morning and we discussed this matter in great detail, there was no suggestion that this information, which he asked me to put into a letter the next day, would be used in the way it has been used, and I feel this is a misuse of a confidence. Anyway, the point I want members to see, and I have no doubt they all have copies of this letter, which has been circulated—

Mr. Hudson: No, we haven't.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: That surprises me.

*Members interjecting:*

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I told the President of the institute that the Government's resources were limited. Members of the institute knew perfectly well that our resources were limited; they knew the discussions we had had with the Commonwealth Government, and they knew, too, that education was one of the arguments we would have used with the Commonwealth Treasurer and

the Prime Minister in trying to attract greater funds in the grant that was made to South Australia.

That is the answer to the first point. Regarding the second point, I then went on to say what the Commonwealth Government's grant of \$2,000,000 had meant to the finances of South Australia. I think the Premier has dealt pretty clearly with that tonight. They knew quite well, too, that that grant enabled the Treasurer to balance the Budget. The third point, the most controversial one of all, concerned what share of the Government's resources was being used for education. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this is a play on words. The teachers know, for it has been stated over and over again, that we spend nearly one-quarter of our revenue on education. In fact, the former Minister of Education said this more than once: he said that about one-quarter was being used for education and that it was unreasonable and impracticable to get more than about one-quarter of the State revenue.

Mr. Corcoran: It is not revenue.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Just wait a moment.

Mr. Hudson: We want to get the debate in order.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: We will in just a moment.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind the Minister that we are dealing with the item "School buildings".

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Very well, Mr. Chairman. I believe that the public of South Australia is entitled to know some of these things, and if I am not allowed to develop this point fully now I certainly will do that when we are debating the Revenue Estimates in a few weeks' time.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We will have a lot more to say then, too.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Much has been said about there being a crisis in education. I hope members opposite will realize that school buildings must come within the orbit of "a crisis in education in South Australia", if they want to use the argument they have used tonight. However, at the risk of bringing down a further storm of protest on my head, I must continue strenuously to resist the notion that there is a crisis in education in this State. The phrase has taken on slogan-like proportions, and the misuse of the word "crisis" has, I believe, been mischievous. It is emotively used, and it is being bandied about by people with an axe to grind, including some who

should know much better. In our current situation it has been deliberately calculated to distort the picture and to arouse alarm and confusion amongst parents and other members of the public. That is exactly what this campaign is designed to do. Every local mishap now in the field of education is called a crisis, and by definition of the word an education system in crisis must be in imminent danger of collapse whereas in fact ours, despite the difficulties which we have freely admitted and acknowledged, continues to function powerfully and well in this State.

I agree that there was a crisis following the Second World War, and other States were experiencing a crisis too, although not to the same extent. The magnitude of the problem that has confronted South Australia and the Education Department in this State is shown by the fact that in the period between 1945 and 1968 the increase in the number of children enrolled in State schools in this State was 219 per cent, compared with 147 per cent for the whole of Australia during the same period. Enrolments in New South Wales increased by 114.2 per cent and in Queensland by 102.3 per cent. Naturally, this unprecedented increase in that period required emergency measures in South Australia in accommodation and teaching staff and led to the introduction of temporary classrooms. The member for Glenelg has said that these are now taking on the aspect of being permanent classrooms, and we admit that, but they are increasingly being replaced by transportable classrooms.

I have seen many of these temporary classrooms that the honourable member says are now about 15 years old. Certainly, some are old, but many new classrooms are quite attractive and teachers say that they are comfortable to work in. They are airy and let in light, they are kept in good repair, and they meet the requirements in many schools where we have to provide classrooms because of sudden increases in enrolments.

Because of the great emergency in that period (and it has now been superseded by a period in which we are moving forward and are able to cope adequately with the situation), I think it appropriate to pay a tribute to the Director-General of Education and his senior executives—the Deputy Director-General, Directors, Superintendents and Inspectors—who were charged with meeting what was in those years a real crisis. To suggest that the Education Department is doing less now (in fact, we are doing much more) is to deny the almost super-human efforts of the top

administrators whose onerous task is to run one of the most difficult and complex departments, if not the most difficult.

Ministers of Education can correctly be regarded as being transitory, but the permanent heads have heavy responsibility and work hard and long to see that the department is run effectively and well. We know that the present campaign directs attention to the deficiencies in education as a whole, not only to the school buildings with which the motion deals.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nankivell): Order! I remind the Minister that this debate is restricted to school buildings.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The Opposition never mentions the fine school buildings now being built or the first-class facilities being provided within the schools. One of the first things I did when I became Minister of Education was close the old Flinders Street Primary School. I know that this school could have been closed years earlier but for the opposition of the member for Adelaide, for various reasons, to closing it. The school has been providing accommodation for few children and the building was inadequate and was housing special senior classes of boys. Members will know what such classes are for. These children have been removed to secondary schools, which is their rightful place among boys of their age group, and the Flinders Street building is being converted to be used as the first Adult Education Centre to teach commerce. In the last 16 months approval has been given to build two technical colleges, one at Elizabeth and one at O'Halloran Hill. They will provide education for technicians in industry, and those colleges will be as good as can be found anywhere in Australia. In addition, we now have plans before the Public Works Committee to build the Eastern Teachers College, and land is being acquired compulsorily to build a new Western Teachers College.

When the previous Labor Government came into power it made a tremendous song and dance about what it would do to replace Western Teachers College. It was to provide the site of the Adelaide Gaol as the place for the new college, but after a great burst of publicity nothing happened. It was not until we came into office 16 months ago that any positive action was taken to plan for the new Western Teachers College. Immediate action was taken to ensure that conditions at Western were improved. All these things could have

been done while the previous Government was in office, but no action was taken in this regard.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That's not correct, either. On the other hand, what has this got to do with the motion? How are you justifying your under-spending on school buildings?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: If the Leader waits a minute he will be told. He criticized the lack of progress and initiative in erecting school buildings.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I was criticizing the lack of spending.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I am telling the Leader what is being done, but apparently Opposition members do not like it. I am giving some idea of the number of buildings we are erecting at present, and those that have been occupied. The Glengowrie High School, occupied late last year, was the first of a new design of high school buildings. It is just as well that people should know the number of buildings we are erecting at present, because it seems that the whole feature of the criticism is to emphasize what is negative in education and in school buildings and not to give any praise for the positive steps that have been taken. I referred to the Glengowrie High School, because we are incorporating in schools of this kind many innovations: a large enclosed shelter that is suitable for many physical education activities; a private study area extension to the library; a large typing room; and a canteen shell. These are typical features of buildings that are being provided for education at present.

All these additional features have been included and the total capacity of the school increased without adding to the overall cost of the school. In most of the new high and technical high school buildings there is a higher percentage of teaching space than was provided in the past. Science is being catered for much more adequately; art and craft rooms have been provided to teach a variety of arts and crafts for boys and girls; and the new secondary schools have had commercial rooms equipped for modern teaching. These features are important in the type of accommodation provided in schools.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is nothing new: we did that when we were in office.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I am justified in stating to Parliament the kind of building being provided, because buildings are being criticized, and I am pointing out what is being done at present. The Opposition members are talking about under-spending; I am talking

about some of the positive things that are being done in the field of education in South Australia. These are implicit in the things that are being criticized.

Only this week we announced an assembly hall that will cost \$115,000, to be built at the LeFevre Boys Technical High School. As also announced this week, we are to build a new adult education centre at Renmark. Are not these positive steps in the field of accommodation being provided for education? In 1969, school buildings being planned are: 37 new buildings and 35 major additions, as well as a large amount of maintenance and alteration. Are not those positive steps in the field of education?

Mr. Hudson: How will you get the money from the Treasurer?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The Treasurer will be capable of speaking for himself later. I may tell members of the Opposition that, in forward planning, sites for new school buildings have been arranged up to 1985. It may be of interest to some members (and I am sure the Director-General would be happy to show it to them) to see the master map showing the planning being provided for expansion in education for the next 15 years. I ask members of the Opposition: why, when they were in office, did they not rectify all the things of which they were critical earlier in this debate? They had plenty of time in which to rectify the things to which they now take exception. They have little cause to point the bone, for that very reason.

I want to refer to the figures given by the Premier earlier in the evening so that we can see exactly what is the position regarding Loan expenditures on school buildings. It is interesting to see that the average annual expenditure on school buildings for the three years in which the present Opposition was in office was \$10,398,000. For the 16 months that we have been in office, the average annual expenditure is \$11,285,000, which I think speaks for itself. If members care to study the annual expenditure from State Loan funds on school buildings in the last three years of the previous Liberal Government, they will see that it was \$10,368,000. The average annual figure for the three years of the previous Government was about the same, so how on earth did the Opposition improve on the amount of money spent when it was in office on school buildings? Again, the figures speak for themselves. One of the many positive things in which there has been progress during the time we had been in office is—

Mr. Ryan: The cleaning of windows.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: We shall not spend money on cleaning windows. One of the many positive things that have been achieved in the last 16 months is the introduction of flexible school buildings into South Australia. This was quite a significant development, and it is something in which we are leading the other States.

During most of last year a special committee of Education Department and Public Buildings Department officers worked together with consultant architects who had come out from England. As a result, the Government decided it would build eight new schools known as flexible units, in which areas can be used for open teaching, accommodating about 70 children and two teachers. The first of these schools is just about completed and others of this kind are to be erected at Cowandilla, Blackwood, Kirton Point, Airedale, Loxton South, and at the Nicholson Avenue school.

This experiment is being watched with much interest, and it will introduce teaching methods which have been proved to be successful overseas. I suggest that members on both sides study the kind of units being built under this new scheme. For instance, there will be a withdrawal area with an auditory separation from open teaching areas. The enclosed section will open off the covered court areas, and furniture suitable for this kind of teaching will be provided. In addition, we are introducing the same kind of flexibility of teaching in some of our existing primary and secondary schools, using the kind of furniture which is to be developed for the first of this type of school to be opened shortly.

The member for Unley was trying to jump the gun a little when he asked what was happening about the replacement of certain schools. He referred to how few of these there were. I have recently written to the President of the institute telling him of the number of these new replacement schools and saying where they are to be erected.

Mr. Lawn: What about Thebarton?

Mr. Hudson: And Paringa Park!

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I think the honourable members whose districts will have replacement schools will be interested to know about them. Schools which are either in the process of being built or are in an advanced stage of planning will be situated at Bordertown, Kadina, Virginia, Glenelg, Mount Gambier, Gladstone, Moonta, Karoonda, Lamerook, Streaky Bay, Swan Reach, Morphett Vale,

Clare, Murray Bridge, Marree, Port Augusta West, Tea Tree Gully and Tumby Bay. This relates to primary, high and area schools respectively. School residences will be replaced at the Gawler, Jamestown, Kalangadoo, Mallala, Riverton and Two Wells Primary Schools and at the Quorn and Streaky Bay Area Schools. Towns where school residences are being replaced include Kulpara, Millicent, Penola and Pinnaroo. New houses in other country towns have already been occupied by teachers.

For Snowtown an order has been placed by the Housing Trust for a new one and at Willowie renovations are well in hand. It is as well for honourable members to realize how many residences are being replaced, for residences came under criticism by Opposition members. Also, we are taking further steps to provide units for single teachers. I saw a number of these when I was recently in the Far North.

They are being provided by World Wide Camps Proprietary Limited and the Segel firm, are most attractive, and have drawn much favourable comment from the people who live in them. As we have been severely criticized for not providing good housing accommodation for some of our teachers in country towns, it might be interesting for members to know what is happening in Queensland, where they are a jolly sight worse off than we are. Some accommodation there is between 50 and 100 years old, many houses are in poor condition and a number of them have been condemned. Teachers in Queensland believe that many of the houses are substandard.

Mr. Clark: Queensland has the worst education system in Australia, and always has.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: At the time of the Premiers' Conference, Premiers and Treasurers spent some time in Canberra. At the last Premiers' Conference the Deputy Premier of Victoria was accompanied by his Minister of Education (Mr. Thompson). To help honourable members understand conditions in other States, I will read the following report that appeared in the *Australian* of an interview with Sir Arthur Rylah about school buildings in Canberra:

In Canberra the average primary school being built costs two and a half times more than the same school being built in Victoria, he said "One primary school visited by Mr. Thompson had accommodation for a school dentist, a sick room, a doctor's room, and a janitor's room." In Victoria, State authorities estimated the cost of a secondary school library at from \$17,000 to \$20,000 and the Commonwealth Libraries Advisory Committee recommend an average cost of \$70,000. Meanwhile

Victoria had 25,000 pupils in temporary accommodation and 21 secondary schools without a permanent home. The Victorian Education Department spent more than \$150,000 on rent for temporary accommodation.

We do not have unlimited resources, but the standard of our schools and of the schools we are building and the accommodation we have is more than adequate. We do not have accommodation for use as doctors' rooms, as the Commonwealth has, but I do not believe anyone can complain at the kind of buildings being built in South Australia. New school buildings are being provided and replacement buildings built in areas where the schools are old and where we believe there should be new ones. We are certainly not as badly off as they are in Victoria.

When I was travelling in the Northern Territory not long ago I saw some craft blocks that would cost probably as much as an infants school down here. As I said earlier, no attempt has been made in South Australia by me, by the department, or by the Government to hide or cover up the shortcomings that we know exist in education. I have openly admitted them, and honourable members, I know, are quite aware of the fact that I have done so.

I mentioned earlier that I accepted the very sincere concern of the many teachers who are teaching in our schools today. There have been personal attacks on me, as I said, in the press and in letters that have come in. I want to quote some figures that I believe will show that I have not been idle since I have been the Minister of Education. I have been going around examining conditions of schools, and I have been talking to members of school committees and trying to get the things for them which they want in order to improve their schools and their school buildings. I think it might be of interest to honourable members to know that in the 16 months I have been the Minister of Education I have visited 70 schools. I am, therefore, not really unacquainted with the conditions that apply in South Australian schools, and I am sincerely trying to do my best to see that these are improved.

In the course of visiting those 70 schools I have travelled 30,000 miles. I have met personally and spoken to nearly 1,200 members of staff, and I have spoken in assembly to nearly 30,000 children. Now if that shows lack of concern in the interests of education, in the quality of the schools, in the type of accommodation that is provided, and in the kind of facilities that are provided within

schools, then I do not know what more one could be expected to do.

The position in this State is not peculiar to South Australia, for every State in the Commonwealth is facing the kind of problems in education that we are facing here. In fact, many of them are in a worse position than we are. As the Leader of the Opposition has said, and as we know ourselves, all States are suffering from a shortage of finance to put into effect the innovations which are necessary to meet the changing face of education, and, because we are aware of this, all the States, at the time of the last meeting of the Australian Education Council, decided that they would engage in a nation-wide survey of educational needs. Might I add that in this the Commonwealth Government itself is joining because of its interest in the Northern Territory and Australian Capital Territory schools. One of the terms of reference of that survey is as follows:

Acquisition of land for the establishment of educational facilities; the development of appropriate building designs; the erection of new school buildings, and the improvement of existing ones.

We all know where our problems lie. We are all facing up to these things, and these are some of the things that we want to standardize if we possibly can; and on the basis of the results of that nation-wide investigation into education we will then make a joint approach to the Commonwealth Government. I have said before—and I say it now—that we hope that as a result of this the Commonwealth Government will perhaps come, on a more general scale, into the field of primary and secondary education.

I want to use again some comments that were made by the previous Minister of Education, who has been quite outspoken regarding the share of resources made over to education. When speaking in this Chamber some time ago, he said that South Australia had done as well as (if not better than) other States. In fact, he said that some of the other States had problems that we do not have, and for that, of course, we should all be very grateful indeed.

May I also quote the comments made by the New Zealand Director-General of Primary Education, Mr. Pinder, who was here last week for the Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science Conference. Mr. Pinder praised publicly in the Bonython Hall the lively and forward-looking Education Department in South Australia, and he made

some most complimentary remarks on the type of accommodation and the quality of the schools he had observed in this State. I heard that many in the large audience of teachers were getting rather restless towards the end of his eulogy. To prove our problems in education and to show that we are not alone regarding these, I shall quote from a report in the *Melbourne Age* of August 16.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nankivell): The honourable Minister will have to relate this to school buildings.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: It is all connected with school buildings, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Virgo: Why will she? Nothing else was.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: This report comes from Canada, which was referred to recently as being the earthly paradise for teachers. My comments will prove that Canada has the same kind of problem as we have. The statement is from *Living and Learning*, the report of the Provincial Committee on Aims and Objectives of Education in the Schools of Ontario. It states:

Today, on every side, there is heard a growing demand for a fresh look at education . . . The committee was told of inflexible programmes, outdated curricula, unrealistic regulations, regimented organization, and mistaken aims of education. We heard from alienated students.

Mr. Lawn: What's this got to do with school buildings?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Members opposite referred to the same kind of thing in letters from teachers in supporting the Leader's motion.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I draw the honourable Minister's attention to the fact that we are dealing with school buildings. I have allowed the Minister some latitude.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I have quoted that report to show that other places have the same kind of problem as we have. The whole world is facing the situation. One comment by the writer of the report from Canada is that education is essentially a non-political exercise. In conclusion, I consider the basic aim of education to be to develop manhood not manpower, to turn out from our schools students whose personalities and skills have been fully developed to their advantage and to the advantage of the community. To do this we want not only quality in our teachers but the physical environment brought about

by adequate school buildings and equipment, and I say that we are providing these things in South Australia.

Mr. CLARK: The two Government speakers have forced me to rise in this debate. I do not think I have ever known worse tactics to be adopted by a Government in Parliament than have been adopted in this debate. The Government has not tried to answer questions. The Premier talked about almost everything except the subject of the debate. Although I agree completely with those last few beautiful lines so well prepared and spoken by the Minister of Education, I cannot agree with much else she has said. When the Minister of Education was battling against hopeless odds I felt sorry for her, although previously I did not think I would ever feel sorry for a Liberal Minister of Education.

Mr. Casey: That's because she is a woman.

Mr. CLARK: That has nothing to do with it. The Minister detailed a long list of things that had been done, but she did not say that most of them had been planned by a Labor Government. Glengowrie High School was one school about which the Minister had much to say, but its construction was planned and mostly executed by the Labor Government. However, that point does not matter much. Many things have been done, but the Minister did not say anything about the things that need doing and did not give even one reason (nor did the Premier) for under-spending on education when money is available to be used for this purpose.

I have been to Canberra and seen the magnificent schools there, but the Minister did not say that, if the Government continued its present practice in the Loan Estimates, we would get less from Canberra than we have got hitherto. Although I do not claim to be an expert on finance, I have some knowledge of the way that buildings and other facilities are provided in the Education Department and I claim to have some knowledge of the way that teachers in South Australia tick. I was one of them for more than 20 years, and I still have many friends and close associates in the upper bracket of the Education Department, because many of these people were my contemporaries. The Premier more than implied (and this had been implied by other members by interjection) that, to some extent, we of the Labor Opposition are behind the campaign of teachers for better buildings and other facilities. I say categorically that this is completely untrue. The suggestion was made that, because Mr. Bob Harris now holds an official position in the

institute, he is shaping the institute along Labor lines, because he was a Labor candidate. I need go no further into that, because I am sure the Premier, when he thinks about it, will realize that that suggestion is nonsense. Mr. Harris, a teacher for many years, is now an officer of the institute.

Mr. Hudson: He does as he is told.

Mr. CLARK: Of course, or as is suggested to him. This evening the Minister said she refused to acknowledge that there was a crisis in education or that there was a disastrous situation. Well, all I can say is that teachers think there is, and I agree with them. This is not a new thing: I believe it is an accumulation of events that has been working up for many years.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: What did you do about it?

Mr. CLARK: If the Minister will give me the opportunity to tell him, I will. I was a teacher for many years and had much practice in replying to childish questions, so I am sure that I can reply to the interjection. There is no question that this situation has been accumulating for a long time. For nearly 20 years (in fact, I was one of the first but I am not boasting about it, because almost everyone is doing it now) I have been advocating that we should get more money from the Commonwealth Government for the State Government specifically for education, with no strings attached. This Government is killing its chances of getting that, because it is messing around with the funds it gets. What it will get next year will not be as much as it has got this year if it continues to use the money in this fashion.

We all know that the teachers are unhappy about the school buildings and conditions generally. I am not saying that we have not built enough school buildings in the last few years. As a member of the Public Works Committee, I know about these things, but teachers are unhappy about school buildings and many other things about which I cannot speak in this debate. I remember the time when teachers would not have been game enough to raise issues and make statements of the kind they have raised and made in the last few months. The reason why they are doing it now is that they are deeply disturbed about so many aspects of education that seem to be in danger.

Before I left the Education Department, there was a move in this direction—and it is a good move. I remember that in 1952, when I gained preselection for the seat of Gawler,

the first telegram of congratulation was from my district inspector, the late Jack Whitburn. That was a sign that even at that time the old hard and fast feeling about teachers was on its way out.

I stress two things. There is nothing whatever in the story that this movement by the teachers has been stirred up by the Labor Party; that is untrue. It has been brought to a head by events of the past few years, but it is something that has been working up for a long time. This motion is not moved merely because the teachers are concerned about these things, although we were no doubt influenced to some extent by that because we received so many letters about school buildings and many other things. We realize that the Commonwealth Government is granting money and that we are spending less money and putting the rest away for a rainy day. That rainy day is here right now.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): This motion has been carefully designed to make sure that this debate follows a certain course. It has been arranged in such a way (and I am not complaining about this) that the ambit of debate will be closely proscribed. That is the purpose, that is the tactic. I have not known for a long time in this Chamber of a situation in which the Chairman of Committees has dealt so effectively with matters arising during debate. We have, if I may say so, a first-class Chairman and a first-class Acting Chairman. The purpose of this debate is to point to one line on the Estimates (the Public Buildings Department) but, further, to point to one item under that line and to apply the whole argument to education buildings and to set it against a back-drop of a campaign that has been developed for reasons that do not matter much at this stage of my remarks.

I give the Opposition full marks for the way it has tried to develop the campaign, but it does not deceive anyone. It does not deceive the Government and it does not deceive the public. When the member for Gawler rather piously affirms that no political motive is involved in this, he does not deceive anyone, least of all the public. I suppose it would not be the first time in political history that an Opposition had sought to get on a band wagon that was rolling by and to enjoy the music. I am not complaining about that, except that I say deliberately that the kind of statement that we have heard here this evening (namely, that there is no connection

between the motion that we are debating now and the situation as it exists outside) is just too ridiculous.

The motion suggests that there is an emergency and that we should be digging into any funds that we can lay our hands on for the purpose of trying to overcome the emergency. On both points, the argument has no foundation. When the Loan Estimates were introduced, the first criticism I heard was when the Leader of the Opposition rushed on to television on the Thursday evening (he was fully reported in the *Advertiser* on the following day) and said that the Government had proceeded to salt away in the Treasury \$12,000,000 of Loan money. This is important, because it is the basis of the whole of the Opposition's motion.

Mr. Hudson: It is not.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It is. The Opposition is alleging that we have funds in store which we should be using for school buildings, and the Leader knows that that is the whole basis of his motion, because the facts were clearly and frankly set out in my explanation of the Loan Estimates. I hid no point in the matter; I said frankly what we were doing and why we were doing it. The Leader knows that what he said is not true, and that must be obvious to him, if he has read the statement I made.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I have read the explanation and my comment is true.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Leader has made two charges: first, that I have mismanaged the finances; and secondly, that we have salted funds away. With great respect, I suggest neither of those will stand up. The Leader knows (and this has been acknowledged by the member for Glenelg in the debate) that \$7,900,000 of that money has already been spent. It was largely spent in the year before the present Leader of the Opposition became Treasurer in the Labor Government. This is the cause of our present problem.

Mr. Hudson: You're not going over that again!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: It's rather embarrassing for them.

Mr. Hudson: What about the Legislative Council knocking us back for \$2,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Hudson: You make up your own fables.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: If the honourable member does not like it he can lump it. I sat here and listened to him in silence, and he was just as provocative in what he said about me. Although he named me directly across the floor and accused me directly, I did not say a word. I am having my say now, as the Standing Orders permit.

Mr. Hudson: Your point is taken.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I say again that the root cause of this problem is summarized in the statement I made on September 5 last year when explaining the Budget. To prove this I intend to quote a few things that I said, as follows:

During the period immediately prior to June 30, 1964, surpluses aggregating \$3,844,000 had been built up. During 1964-65 a current deficit of \$2,621,000 left a balance of \$1,223,000 in hand. During 1965-66 there was a current deficit of \$6,834,000 so that Revenue Account was \$5,611,000 overdrawn at June 30, 1966. During 1966-67 a surplus of \$106,000 was recorded but only after debiting to Loan Account a net \$6,902,000 of expenditures which it had been customary to debit to Revenue Account. During 1967-68 a deficit of \$2,860,000 was recorded but again some \$5,015,000 of expenditure normally charged to revenue was in that year charged against Loan Account. Without these changes in accounting procedures the last three years would have shown deficits on Revenue Account of \$6,834,000, \$6,796,000 and \$7,875,000, or an aggregate of \$21,505,000.

Since those three years commenced with money in hand, the actual net deficit in the three years was \$20,200,000. The \$11,917,000 difference was actually paid for out of Loan funds. In addition to that draw on Loan funds, there was on hand at June 30, 1968 (about eight weeks after we came into office) moneys unspent to the order of \$5,600,000. The honourable member is aware of this figure because he referred to it and tried to explain it away by using a statement that was attributed to the previous Minister of Education. He said that the former Minister said that he could not accept the situation that this \$5,600,000 had been the result of slower spending by the departments, the inference clearly being that we had immediately set out to cut down Loan expenditure in the seven or eight weeks we had been in office. That is palpably ridiculous, as the honourable member well knows, but nevertheless that is what he said.

The basic reason why we have had to husband our Loan funds is that the previous Government far overspent its Revenue Account and had to use Loan funds. This left us in a situation from which we could not extricate



ourselves other than by following the Labor Party's procedures. This was despite a pretty tough Budget last year which the Leader set out to exploit to the full: he rushed around the countryside and went on television saying what dreadful people we were because we had faced the real situation and tried to recover the State from the mess he had left it in.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What nonsense!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It is not nonsense. The Leader cannot deny that he rushed out of this Chamber, discourteously, when I was explaining the Budget last year—indeed, when I was only one-third of the way through the explanation. I do not know why he did that; it may have been genuine; I do not know. However, he was on television or making statements shortly afterwards. However, that is all right: if the Leader likes to do it that way he can. He seized upon the statement and ran out to begin to exploit it as fast as he could. Well, that is all right; he is the Leader of the Opposition, and I do not have any real objection to his doing that. But, Mr. Chairman, I want to put the facts on the record so that at least the public (I hope) will try to get some sort of an idea of the situation in which we stand.

The Leader said this evening that some schools around the countryside were in dire need of replacement. He mentioned, incidentally (and I am glad he did), that he had been to Port Lincoln recently and that he had seen the town school there. However, he knows that we are building a new school at Lincoln South which will be ready for occupation in February next year and which will draw off much of the pressure from the town school and enable us then to start to replace that school; but he did not bother to tell us that.

The Leader also mentioned the Port Lincoln High School, and again I am glad that he did. In late 1964 I obtained Cabinet approval to build a new high school at Port Lincoln. I went across to Port Lincoln and, at the Headmaster's invitation, I had morning tea with the staff. I announced to the staff then that the Government had approved a new high school for Port Lincoln, and I went so far as to say that it was a firm proposal and that nothing could stop it. Well, Sir, I missed out, for we had an election in between and that stopped it. Further than that, I went down to the office of the Port Lincoln *Times* and told the people there that this proposal was a firm one. If members care to search the columns of that newspaper of about that date, they will

see that it was a firm announcement—a contract made by the Government. But what happened about it? The moment after the election it went as dead as a door nail. Only now have I been able to restore it to the drawing boards for reference in the present planning year.

*Members interjecting:*

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Opposition does not like this sort of thing, but it has to take it, because the situation in respect of these matters is precisely as I have expressed it. The Leader also went on to say that during the life of his Government he had no Loan balances. Well, Sir, he did in the last year: he had \$5,600,000. However, apart from that, the reason why in the two previous years he did not have any Loan balances was because he spent them all (over \$11,000,000 of them) on revenue items. It seems to me that that sort of thing ought to be said.

We had another interesting comment tonight from the Deputy Leader, who said in passing that it was rather remarkable that at a late stage in the preparation of the Loan Estimates I was able, because of an emergency situation in the Railways Department, to pull \$600,000 out of the hat to back up that department. I take full responsibility for that sensible financing. The genius of Sir Thomas Playford, who is probably the best Treasurer any State in the Commonwealth has had, enabled him always to have available money to meet an emergency, and I have been following that policy. Who knows what sort of emergency we may have during this year?

Mr. Ryan: You may even have an election.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: A Government member asked the Opposition tonight, by interjection, "Why didn't you do better?" and I think I have given the answer. The Labor Government could not do better, because it spent its money on other things. If it thought that desirable, that was its judgment. However, the Labor Party should not blame us for exercising our judgment.

Mr. Hudson: We spent more money on school buildings in each of our three years than you are proposing.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: That's nonsense.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: No, you did not. I have the figures from the Treasury.

Mr. Hudson: Have you the adjustments of underspending?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will give the average. The honourable members wants the unders and overs.

Mr. Clark: That's not what he said.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: If we take the unders and overs, we must get the average. I know the member for Gawler is a genius.

Mr. Clark: You can claim that if you like, but I have never claimed it.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have the figures for the last two years of the Playford Government and the first year of the Hall Government. In the last two years of the Playford Government the average annual expenditure of State funds on school buildings was \$10,516,000. If we add to that the expenditure in the first year of the Hall Government, we get an average for the three years of \$10,901,000. That is the actual expenditure for the three years. If we take the three years of the Walsh Government and the Dunstan Government, we get \$10,398,000. We know that the Budget and Loan Accounts were much lower in the earlier years. That comparison shows an expenditure in the three years of Liberal and Country League Government of \$600,000 more than in the only three years of office that a Labor Government has had for a long time and will have for a long time.

The Premier mentioned the downward progression in the three years of Labor Government. I will repeat the figures. The Labor Government ran down from \$11,759,000 in 1965-66 to \$10,757,000 in 1966-67 and down to \$8,678,000 in 1967-68. In the first year of our Administration we actually spent \$11,670,000. This is State money, not Commonwealth money.

Mr. Hudson: That includes \$2,000,000 underspent in the previous year.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: That's actual expenditure.

Mr. Hudson: I'm talking to an intelligent man, not to a dill.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am pleased the honourable member credits me with having intelligence, because this enables me to confirm the error of his calculation. When the Premier and the Minister were speaking the Deputy Leader of the Opposition suggested that the expenditure on some aspects of education had nothing to do with the Loan Estimates. I have established that it does have much to do with the Loan Estimates, but the Opposition has deliberately chosen to avoid this area, because it does not suit its purpose. The member for Glenelg spoke about the Commonwealth in passing, and in passing I claim privilege to comment on his remarks.

He said we were morally deceitful toward the Commonwealth: that is not a term he may justifiably use, but I did not take exception to it at the time and let it pass. He said we were rattling on the Commonwealth, or words to that effect.

I point out to the honourable member that for every dollar the Commonwealth provides, apart from some relatively minor direct grants, the State has to match dollar for dollar or more, but for capital expenditure it is dollar for dollar. Here again, in the three years of the triennium we are now concluding, funds were contracted to be matched by the previous Administration, and for the three years under the contract which the Labor Government made the amount was \$13,633,000. We have contracted in the last few weeks to spend in the present triennium \$19,867,000, and of that amount we will provide a dollar for each dollar that the Commonwealth has provided. For the previous years that I quoted the State Government did not provide dollar for dollar, because it received \$900,000 as a straight-out grant for Roseworthy College, and that was not matched. In dealing with recurrent expenditure we find not quite the same pattern, but we have made contracts much higher than the previous Government was able to do. I am not objecting on the ground of what the previous Government did or contracted to do, because probably in the conditions under which it was in office it could not afford to do better. But Labor members should not condemn us against the background of what they did, when we are doing so much better.

This matter really boils down to a question of financial management. The member for Glenelg said that we should be dipping into our finances at this time, even at the risk of running into deficit. In all fairness, I put to the Committee that the problem of providing school accommodation is as old as at least 10 years after the last war, because that is when it started. I was Minister of Works for seven years, and I think we had the worst problems concerning school buildings that we have ever had.

The wave of children entering primary schools began about the time I took office, and it progressed through to secondary and tertiary education as the ages of the children increased, and the peak of student enrolments followed that pattern. We were in real trouble over the provision for school buildings at that time. The then Minister of Education (Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson) and I did not always get along on friendly terms, because I had to say

to him on one occasion, "Look, Baden, you have only got to build schools on paper; I have to build them in bricks, and that is different." And it is different. So I know something about the problem of providing accommodation for schools, because I had seven years of it, at probably the worst time of all.

In those days, we could not even contemplate replacing an existing school. The situation, particularly to the north of the metropolitan area and, to an extent, in other suburbs (for instance, the member for Glenelg district was starting to develop, and did develop), in those years in particular was that we were in desperate straits for school accommodation. It was a situation with which we coped (I think most people will admit now) as well as was humanly possible. The Government got out of that situation and, if ever there was a crisis in the provision of school accommodation, it was in those years.

We were up against the situation where we could not get good tendering for our buildings, so overtaxed was the building industry. We would want, possibly, a tender for a \$500,000 building, and the tenders would range between \$600,000 and \$1,000,000—that sort of thing. The situation was indeed serious. However, we have nothing like that problem to face now. I know that some teachers are unhappy with the present situation. They feel, sincerely, that their classes are too big, that they have to do their best with them, that the surroundings in which they are called upon to work are not ideal, and that possibly some of the houses in which teachers in the country have to live are sub-standard. However, if we had a teaching profession that was entirely happy with its present level of achievement, I should be sorry because I believe that in teaching as in every other profession one always sets a goal beyond the present level of achievement. There is a healthy discontent. If we do not have it, we are not trying to improve the position. On the score of professional ability and results, I would not want to see the teaching profession entirely satisfied; nor would I want to be a member of a Government that was entirely complacent about or satisfied with the *status quo*, for that would not be a good thing. I make this point merely to show that I recognize there is room for improvement and that within proper limits and proper codes of financing we ought to be able to meet the situation.

I maintain that we are meeting the circumstances adequately with the proposals that we

have submitted to this Committee. Now is not a time when we should be running financial risks. Those funds that are in the Government's hands, for whatever purpose they may be placed there, are to be used in case of real emergency, not an imaginary one. When I say "real emergency", I mean just that.

Mr. Hudson: Are you sure you will not be indulging in window-dressing in the Loan Estimates next year?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: What we shall do next year will depend entirely on the circumstances of the time. The Loan Estimates next year will be presented honestly, just as these were presented recently.

Mr. Hudson: Are we going to get a deficit of \$4,000,000 on Budget Account?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will be introducing the Budget into this Chamber, I hope, tomorrow week, and I hope that the honourable member's curiosity will then be satisfied. I do not intend to talk about it this evening, because I would not be permitted to do that, Mr. Chairman, and quite properly so. I previously said that I have at present held in reserve about \$4,000,000 to meet expenditures which will almost inevitably arise, which I cannot foresee and which, therefore, I cannot estimate in the Budget. In spite of the fact that we have in our Loan programme this year an increased expenditure of about 16 per cent, generally speaking, and despite the fact that the ability of the building industry, and of other industries involved in the whole Loan programme, to take up a further effort is limited, and, indeed, in some sectors at present even strained, if at the mid-year stage or after the Christmas period the way looks a little clearer, and if we get some satisfaction from the Commonwealth concerning—

Mr. McKee: You said the Commonwealth was doing a very good job for South Australia. Which is correct?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is wrong in interjecting.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Mr. Chairman, I invite the honourable member, if he cares to apply himself to this extent, to read the document which is the subject of the Loan Estimates, and there he will see exactly what I am referring to. I said that at present we could not get from the Commonwealth Government any clear indication of what its attitude will be to our budgetary situation next year. For that reason, I have considered it prudent to ensure that at the end of the financial year I can meet my commitments. The Prime Minister has promised to examine these matters

in February, and I assume therefore that we shall thrash out some of these problems then. If the industry is able to take up the further effort we shall be prepared to expand somewhat our programme as listed this year. I can do that without any problem, provided industry can do it and provided we have the planning in reserve and in advance to do it. On that matter, I leave some comment to be made by my colleague the Minister of Works, for that is his particular responsibility.

The member for Glenelg said that we are living in the past, that our methods of financing are far outdated, and that we ought to be running into deficits if necessary or risking (I think that was the word he used) a deficit in order to upgrade and expand our programme for this sector of our Loan works. If I may take as an example of modern financing what happened during the period of his Government, then I consider that the member for Glenelg is no judge. I will not run this State into the situation in which it was.

Going back into history, those who are perhaps as old as I am will know that proper financing is a matter of maintaining a steady programme of work to try to maintain the economy at a steady level and on an upward plane. I am going to try (and I think every sensible person in this State, after what we have seen, will agree with me) to make sure there is something in the kitty to meet what is a real emergency, such as a drought, a bush fire or a serious epidemic, or to meet some special project that might be necessary and might come up without notice.

Perhaps I will be pardoned, Sir, for referring to the fact that, in 1959, Eyre Peninsula looked like losing 500,000 sheep because of lack of water. I went to Tom Playford and said, "Whatever way I do the sum we are going to be 400,000,000 gallons short on Eyre Peninsula. What can you do about it?" He said, "If you can divert half of the necessary money I will find the other half," and we had the water flowing through the main from the Poldia Basin in about 17 weeks. To me, that is an example of what can be done when there has been sound financing and proper management of money, and this motion is all about the management of money. I make no apology for managing the affairs of this State in a prudent and proper way. If I can, I will speed up the programme later on, but at this time the Government and I are not prepared to make a contract that we know cannot be fulfilled.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have sat here and listened to Government speakers for some time, and until the last phrases of the Treasurer's speech we got no answer from the Government to the case put by the Opposition. What happened over a considerable period was that everything else conceivable was talked about other than the matter before the Chair. I think some of the things are worth replying to simply because, although members opposite know what the record is, it is probably wise to set it straight for the public. First, we had from the Premier a series of statements about contrasting expenditures under the Labor Government from Loan moneys on school buildings as against expenditures by the Liberal and Country League Government. The actual expenditures, the contrast in expenditures, the percentages he arrived at, and the averages quoted by the Premier, the Minister of Education and the Treasurer were arrived at by carefully deducting the sums provided for school buildings in the last year of the Labor Government, putting the remarkable under-spending in that year on to the next year's spending, and crediting it to the L.C.L. Government. That is what happened. The total provision in the Loan Estimates in the last year of the Labor Government, during which year the present Government came into office, was \$10,650,000.

Mr. Hudson: From State sources.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: And the under-spending was \$1,971,000. That was extraordinary because, in March of that year, four weeks before the present Government took office, the Under Treasurer had reported to our Cabinet and we had his minute to the effect that projected under-spending, because some contracts would not come to account in the year, would be about \$300,000.

Mr. Hudson: The explanation given was that they ran into much wet weather in the last month or so of the financial year.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government took credit for breaking the drought as well. It then took the fact that there was a most remarkable under-spending in that year, although the work had been committed and commenced, and credited the whole of that work to the next year, and it is on that basis it has averaged out the figures it has produced in this Chamber. Government members know how dishonest that is.

Mr. Broomhill: 'Tis false.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On the score of finance (although most of the other

members did not talk too much about finance), the Treasurer tried to justify the course he has followed in taking large sums of Loan money and putting them away as against accumulated revenue deficits. He turned to our procedures under the Loan Account and said extraordinary things about them. He bitterly charged me with spending from Loan Account moneys for school buildings, hospitals and tertiary institutions, the very things that we are arguing about now. He said I should not have spent it from Loan money and that by spending it from Loan money I was spending it on revenue! Now, what he intends the public to infer from that is that I was spending it on current services. However, that is not true, and he knows it. He knows that some Loan works are charged to Loan funds in every other Budget in Australia: indeed, he has done it himself. Not only has he done it himself but he has also added a few other items that used previously to be charged to Revenue Account.

Having done that, he says in relation to the \$8,000,000 that he put in the Treasury, "Oh, well, that money was all spent." Well, Sir, it was not spent from the Loan Fund. Money had been spent from the State's working accounts, and this is not the only State that has spent State money from its working accounts: numbers of other States have done so, too. The Treasurer knows perfectly well that at the time he came into office the balances on Revenue Account at the Treasury were higher in total than they were when we took office.

Mr. McKee: How would he miss that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He did not miss it; he knows it. He knows perfectly well that the Revenue Account was fully able to meet every call made on it. It is just not true to say that this money from Loan Account has been spent. What he has done is to take it and put it against a book debt in the Treasury when the Treasury is sufficiently buoyant to meet the calls made on it.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: The Auditor-General has a different story.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On the contrary, Mr. Chairman; I know the view that has been taken by other people who have been involved in the Treasury previously. I invite the Treasurer to take cognizance of the views expressed by Sir Fred Drew on this matter and of the announcements that have been made on the necessity for putting money away like this in the Treasury.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Are you criticizing the Treasury now?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am criticizing the action of the Treasurer at the moment in doing this.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Well, don't involve the Treasury.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Under Treasurer does what he is directed to do by the Treasurer.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I accept that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not saying that Mr. Seaman is in any way to blame for this. He may well have made submissions to the Treasurer, but the policy decisions are the Treasurer's. I want to make it clear that I was not saying anything about Mr. Seaman. Mr. Seaman is a valuable officer who gave me valued and loyal service and took the directions which I made on policy and for which I took full responsibility, and I expect the Treasurer to do the same in respect of this. I blame the Treasurer for what is happening here.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Thank you very much; I accept that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Treasurer did not specifically reply to the allegation (it is one that he could not gainsay, really) that he is running down the amount that we are spending from State sources on school buildings. Let me give the Treasurer's own figures to show what is happening. In 1968-69, the amount for primary and infants schools was \$2,508,000, for area schools \$405,000, for technical high schools \$1,380,000, and for high schools \$2,161,000, giving a total of \$6,454,000. The provision for 1969-70 is as follows: primary and infants schools, \$1,960,000; area schools, \$155,000; technical high schools \$1,070,000; and high schools \$1,855,000, giving a total of \$5,040,000.

The difference between the total amount for 1968-69 and the provision for 1969-70 is \$1,414,000. This is the \$1,414,000 reduction as a result of the Treasurer's putting money into tertiary education buildings to attract a Commonwealth grant, and doing it out of an overall amount only \$100,000 more than last year. The effect of doing that is to reduce expenditure on primary and infants schools, area schools, technical high schools, and high schools. There cannot be any doubt that this is being done.

We complain that the Treasurer is doing this at the same time as he chooses to put \$4,000,000 away in surplus. He talks about

putting money aside for a rainy day and being careful about finances but I point out to him (although he knows it well) that in the last year of office of the Government of which he was a member, when that Government was facing a difficulty in education provision (it was still facing it then), it budgeted for a deficit. The Premier and Treasurer at that time made gloomy prognostications about what would happen to State finances. The Treasurer also knows that at that time the Government had let a number of contracts for Government buildings the cost of which would escalate to an amount beyond the projected return of Loan moneys to this State. The present Treasurer could then go to Port Lincoln and say, "I have a school for you," when he knew perfectly well that money was not provided ahead of time in the Loan Estimates.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: We've never set a programme that we couldn't meet and I've never made a contract that I couldn't stand up to. You can't point to one.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I listened to the Treasurer in silence. He knows well that, under the Playford Government, public works were constantly being recommended by the Public Works Committee but were not being provided for in the Loan Estimates, because it was not possible for the Government to make such provision.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: My point is that I have never made a contract that I could not and did not fulfil.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not suggesting the Treasurer has, but he knows well that, when we took office, the Loan Fund was so tight that there was no movement in it, and this was outlined in detail in this Parliament when we took office because of the escalation in contract costs, particularly for Government and hospital buildings. The situation was difficult but we tried throughout to spend all the money we could lay our hands on to provide facilities in this State.

I make no apology for having done that and I am complaining about what the Premier says now: that, although his Treasury balances are buoyant, he has plenty of flexibility in his working account. Even if he puts \$8,000,000 aside, he has so much flexibility in his working account now that, if he had to, he could face a deficit without difficulty. Indeed, he could do it without touching the \$4,000,000 now put away that we borrowed to pay for construction expenditure. I remember that, day after day when we were in Government and the Treasurer was sitting on this

side, he would get up and say, "What you are doing is not to spend moneys for development of this State in basic construction expenditure." How often was his cry, "You are not spending for development." I know of no better development for the State than the provision of Education Department buildings in the present state of need for those buildings. I do not agree with the Treasurer that this money needs to be put away in the way he has chosen to do, as he says, for a rainy day and as a result of prudent financing. He has sufficient flexibility in his accounts to face any difficulties he may have to meet without doing that and, in these circumstances, I believe that it is wrong to take the action he has taken, and that he is not doing what this Government needs to do to provide adequate school buildings.

The Committee divided on the motion of the Leader of the Opposition:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan (teller), Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, McKee, Ryan, and Virgo.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Coumbe, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson (teller), and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott and Venning.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Loveday and Riches. Noes—Messrs. Giles and Wardle.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my vote in favour of the Noes. The question therefore passes in the negative.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. FERGUSON: I refer to the line "Police and courthouse buildings, \$800,000." I am pleased that the Treasurer has provided for these buildings this year because many of the police stations and courthouse buildings throughout the countryside are in dire need of being bulldozed down and rebuilt. We listened with great interest to the story that the Treasurer told us about the Port Lincoln High School.

The CHAIRMAN: We have passed the line concerned with school buildings.

Mr. FERGUSON: Yes, but I shall be linking this up with the line with which we are now dealing. This was not the only item that was omitted from the 1965 Loan Estimates, because in the 1964 Loan Estimates provision was made for a police station and courthouse building to be built at Snowtown, but what happened? In 1965 that building went down

the slippery dip and did not reappear on the Loan Estimates. However, I am pleased to note that it is back on these Loan Estimates, as that is an important building. Provision is being made for the replacement of perhaps some of the oldest buildings in the State, in which police officers, magistrates and justices have to work. Provision is made for new police and courthouse buildings at Burra and at Port Wakefield, both of which towns had common interests in the early days, because I understand that the first copper mined at Burra was shipped from Port Wakefield. People using these buildings come under two categories: members of the Police Force, and magistrates and justices of the peace, the latter coming from various avocations.

Unfortunately, I understand that some justices of the peace have not been working under the most congenial conditions in certain country courthouses. I suggest that this situation exists also at Maitland, and I am pleased to note that, after many years of requesting that a new police station and courthouse be provided there, the Government has acknowledged this necessity and has provided accordingly. People using the new buildings at Maitland will be able to enjoy the standards that most people expect to enjoy nowadays.

Mr. GILES: I am pleased to see that \$60,000 is provided for the Loxton Research Centre. I hope this project will be completed as soon as possible, because the horticultural industry needs the facilities, which I believe will be provided at this centre, in order to undertake urgent additional research work.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Dealing with police stations and courthouse buildings I am happy to see that the Meningie police station has been included as a definite project. This was one of the early police stations, and it was hoped that work on the new building would have commenced last year. As the present building is in a bad state of repair, the replacement will be well received. I understand that the various authorities, including officers of the Housing Trust, have discussed the procedure to follow with respect to the new Lameroo police station. The present building, which is situated on Railway Terrace, faces the railway line. I understand that it had been originally proposed that a new police station would be built around the old police station. Then a much better site in the centre of the town and on the main road through the town was con-

sidered and apparently rejected in favour of another proposal which, I understand, involves the demolition of the existing station before the new station can be built.

I think it most unfortunate that the station is to be demolished before a new one can be built, as this means that the police officer in charge will have no permanent residence and that there will be no police facilities in the town during the period of demolition and reconstruction. Will the Minister raise this matter with the departments concerned to see whether or not at this stage it would be advisable to reconsider the site? The site in the middle of the town to which I have referred is immediately opposite the hospital. It is a strategic site on a large allotment that would be a proper place on which to build new police premises in Lameroo. Will the Minister ascertain whether this block has been investigated (as I believe it was by the Housing Trust, which I understand recommended it as a site) and, if it has, why it has been rejected in favour of the present proposal? Also, is it considered advisable to leave the town without a permanent residence for its police officer and without a police station while the new premises are being erected?

Regarding the line "Minor alterations and additions to police and courthouse buildings", I refer to the Keith courthouse, which I have raised with the Minister concerned. The position is that, with the shifting of the Highways Department's weighbridge from Bordertown to Keith, many traffic cases are now heard at the Keith court. The new police station at Keith was built with only minor provision for courthouse facilities. The court is held in the police station, and the justices complain (and I think rightly) that it is most difficult to hear a case while the telephone is ringing in the office, as the court proceedings suffer interference. Therefore, I ask the Minister whether provision can be made for additions to the existing police and courthouse building at Keith to provide for an extra office so that the courtroom can be cleared completely of other activity while the court is in session.

Mr. JENNINGS: As a matter of principle, I am very interested in the rehabilitation of women. We know that plans have already been made for a most generous and expansive rehabilitation centre at Northfield. I see that this year \$150,000 is provided. Can the Minister tell me anything about this

organization and particularly how it is progressing? If he cannot do so now, will he arrange to let me have the information as soon as possible?

Mr. EDWARDS: I am very pleased to see that the Elliston police station has got on to the line of police stations to be erected. This station is one of the many old police stations on Eyre Peninsula, and as it has no proper damp course it is fretting away at the bottom. It costs a good deal of money to keep buildings such as this in good repair. This police station is in a very bad state of repair at present. Also, the cell block at the back is only a few feet from the police residence and, with the type of conduct and language of drunks when they are in the cell for a night, it is not very nice for the wife of the police officer to be so close to the cell block. Therefore, I am very pleased to see that Elliston police station is to be altered and that it is to have a new cell block a considerable distance from the main building.

However, I am very disappointed to see that provision for the building of a police station, courthouse and cell block at Ceduna has been dropped from the Estimates. This building is far too small for the operations that have to be carried out in it, particularly the courthouse proceedings. The policeman there is trying to carry out police business in the same room as the one in which the court sits, and it is extremely difficult to run a police station in these circumstances. I have seen for myself how unsatisfactory this situation is. I am indeed disappointed to see that this project has been taken off the Loan Estimates, and I trust that it will be back again next year.

Mr. VENNING: I am very pleased to see that Gladstone is to have the benefit of a new police building as the existing one is fairly old. Gladstone is a very important centre, for the northern gaol is situated there, and it is most necessary that appropriate buildings be provided. I ask the Minister to note my request that old buildings, such as this, when they are replaced by new ones, should where possible be left standing, because they provide excellent accommodation for our rural youth organizations in country towns. This organization has taken over the old courthouse at Georgetown. I compliment the Minister for including Gladstone in the Loan Estimates for the coming year.

Mr. HUGHES: When speaking to the first line I told Government members that representations had been made to me by justices at

Moonta in connection with the acoustics in the courthouse there. Since then I have noticed in the local press that the Moonta corporation is to contact me by letter to ask me to make representations through the Chief Secretary's Department for the erection of a new courthouse at Moonta. Although I have not yet received this letter, I expect to receive it within the next few days. I ask that the Minister do not proceed with investigations into the acoustics of the old courthouse until he has had the representations that I expect to be made by the Moonta corporation in the next few days.

Mr. FREEBAIN: The sum of \$220,000 is provided for the establishment of dental clinics at various country centres. Although the Minister may not have the information now, will he find out for me the centres at which these clinics will be established?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE (Minister of Works): I have seen a schedule of the centres at which dental clinics will be established and I will try to give the information to the honourable member tomorrow. It is pleasing when an honourable member asks me not to go on with a project, and I will accede to the request made by the member for Wallaroo. I have noted the remarks made by the member for Rocky River about Gladstone.

I have visited both the Elliston and Ceduna police stations, which have been referred to by the member for Eyre. Provision is not made on these Estimates for the Ceduna police station because extra work required on account of the climate at Ceduna has put the cost of the project above the statutory limit of \$200,000 and provision cannot be made for it here until it has been reported on by the Public Works Committee. The reference to the committee is being prepared and I hope provision will be made next year. I understand that work on the Northfield Women's Prison is almost complete, and I will find out for the member for Enfield the date for transfer and the opening date. I will get a report for the member for Albert on the matters he has raised about Lameroo and Keith.

Line passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 11.5 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 28, at 2 p.m.