

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, October 1, 1969.

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

PETITIONS: ABORTION LEGISLATION

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE presented a petition signed by 465 persons from the Catholic Parish of Dulwich-Burnside stating that the signatories, being 16 years of age or older, 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 current practice.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER presented a similar petition signed by 140 persons.

Mr. GILES presented a similar petition signed by 102 persons.

Petitions received.

QUESTIONS

FESTIVAL HALL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the questions I asked during the Loan Estimates debate on August 28 concerning the festival hall?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I have prepared a comprehensive reply to the Leader's questions, some of which were of a general nature while others were more specific. The main features and facilities used as a basis in basic design and estimating were as follows:

A multi-purpose theatre of 2,000-seat capacity. "Continental" type seating

with gallery and side boxes. Auditorium providing 300 cub. ft. a person. Foyer area—8.5 sq. ft. a person. Small refreshment area and small administrative offices. Dressing rooms and assembly areas for performers. Storage area for scenery and properties and workshop area. Broadcasting and tele-casting facilities. 11,000 sq. ft. stage area, 80ft. height from stage floor to roof underside. Provision for equipment for the stage and auditorium to the value of \$600,000.

It will be recalled that in Mr. DeGaetani's report he proposed that the theatre, with about 2,000 capacity, would not be used for a resident drama company performing intimate drama. A decision concerning the type of theatre was made by the Government on the basis that it would provide facilities for touring opera, ballet, symphony, musical comedy and other suitable presentations with an ancillary use for motion pictures, conferences and conventions. Site allocation has been made for an extension to include other facilities required for a performing arts centre, as referred to by Mr. DeGaetani, should a decision be made in the future for these facilities to be provided in this area. The theatre is not being designed for intimate drama. Thrust stage facilities are usually found in the smaller theatres designed principally for drama.

The Town Clerk states that as regards stage workings, electronic devices, etc., it can be said that no theatrical producers have approached the council with any complaints regarding what has been planned at this stage, and if they had done so their comments would have been welcomed. In fact, the council and the architects for the project have gone out of their way to seek comments from all potential users of the theatre. These potential users have expressed the view that they are happy with the facilities being planned. Nevertheless, they have offered a number of constructive criticisms that have been taken into account. It would be appropriate to point out that Messrs. Tom Brown and Associates, a firm of theatre consultants, of Sydney, have been appointed as Australian consultants to the architects as regards matters of design that would affect the users of the theatre, principally within the stage area. In addition, views are being obtained from technical officers of the principal users such as the Australian opera and ballet companies and the Australian Broadcasting Commission, as well as leading entrepreneurs who bring overseas performers to Australia.

The estimated cost at the time of estimating the demolition of the City Baths was about \$32,000. The cost is included in the overall estimate of the theatre proposal. Plans were in hand to progressively replace the Railways Institute facilities before the investigation of the proposal to locate the theatre at Elder Park. Investigations are almost complete into means of providing long-term replacement accommodation. Consideration is being given to the erection of a permanent building on the river bank near the Morphett Street bridge. It is expected that funds for the erection of this building will be made available from those allotted for railway purposes and will not be a charge against the theatre project.

The migrant hostel at Elder Park was in need of replacement whether or not the festival theatre was located there. It is proposed to relocate the hostel, using buildings occupied by the Young Women's Christian Association, at Woodville. Modifications to that building will be required and any expenditure will be subject to a 50 per cent subsidy by the Commonwealth Government and will not be a charge against the theatre project. It is envisaged that the development of the plaza will take place after the proposed demolition of the Government Printing Office. That section of the plaza which must be constructed to provide entrances to the theatre foyer is included in the estimated cost of the project. The remainder of the plaza construction is considered to be development of the printing office site and of Parliament House environs and should not be charged to the theatre project.

KANGAROO CREEK RESERVOIR

Mr. GILES: As work on the Kangaroo Creek reservoir is nearing completion, and as I believe it is starting to collect water, can the Minister of Works say how much water is in the reservoir at this stage and when he intends to hold the official opening?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: The latest figures I saw concerning this reservoir indicate that there is about 200,000,000 gallons in the dam at this stage, and it is covering the Batchelor Creek bridge on the upstream side of the dam. Although I cannot get any indication regarding what additional water is likely to be impounded, I think this would be an extra quantity, because some water is still running. The reservoir will be opened by the Premier on December 5, on a Friday afternoon, and all honourable members will in due course receive invitations to attend.

SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked some time ago about the Government's proposals regarding the discontinuance of scholarships, bursaries and exhibitions?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The award of 733 exhibitions, scholarships and bursaries has been discontinued, following the recent amendment to the regulations. In fact, no Leaving or Leaving Honours bursaries have been awarded since 1966, following Ministerial approval which was given, because the Leaving certificate was at that time discontinued as the Matriculation entrance requirement of the university. No annual saving in money will accrue to the Education Department as the result of this decision, as the money saved will be used to pay the recently increased book allowance for fourth-year and fifth-year secondary students. In fact, some finance additional to the savings on scholarships will have to be made available to enable the book allowances to be paid.

We considered that, with the elimination of the Intermediate Public Examinations Board examinations and the entry of the Commonwealth into the field of secondary scholarship, it was an opportune time for the State to vacate this field. Of course, holders of exhibitions and scholarships already awarded will continue to benefit from them until they expire. In reply to the other part of the honourable member's original question, no means test is applied to any Commonwealth or State Government scholarships awarded to children to continue with their secondary education. Commonwealth scholarships for tertiary education have a means test provision in respect of any living allowance for which the scholarship holder may apply.

SCHOOL BUILDINGS

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week when, referring to a project of the New South Wales Education Department to encourage people to use school buildings after school hours and during vacations, I requested to know what was the policy of the South Australian Education Department in this regard?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Technical colleges, the South Australian School of Art and adult education centres by their very nature operate both day and night. In order to provide the widest possible spread of adult education facilities over the whole State, it has been recognized policy for many years that all

buildings, equipment and facilities of schools must be made available, as required, for the conduct of adult classes. In the metropolitan area the organization of adult education has been centred in the technical high schools which, like the technical colleges, are a blaze of lights on every week night. More and more use is being made of high school buildings in the metropolitan area particularly for specialist subjects, and in some cases primary schools are also used as centres for teaching English to migrants. In the country, full use is made of accommodation available in secondary schools, both high schools and area schools.

In 1968, more than 58,000 individual students attended classes at technical colleges and adult education centres, and some of these were enrolled for more than one subject or attended on more than one occasion each week. Of the total subject enrolments of nearly 69,000, it is estimated that about 37,000 would have been in some 250 school buildings other than those of technical colleges and adult education centres. In these an estimated 1,750 rooms would have been used on a regular basis. It is of particular importance to note that art and craft rooms and science laboratories, which all contain costly equipment, are in heavy demand for evening classes. It is estimated that 75 per cent of the art and craft rooms in Education Department secondary schools are used for both day and evening classes. Many of them are used for two or more evenings a week, and those equipped to teach pottery are frequently used up to four evenings a week.

SOFT DRINKS

Mr. HURST: Has the Treasurer a reply to my recent question about the increase in soft drink prices?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Prices Commissioner reports that, although prices of soft drinks are not controlled under the Prices Act, there is an arrangement whereby soft drink manufacturers lodge prior advice before raising prices. It was proposed by the industry that from September 1 all sizes be increased by 1c retail, with the exception of 32 oz., which was to be increased by 2c each. An examination of the position revealed that: (a) some relief was found to be justified to offset cost increases incurred in respect of wages, bottles, raw materials and overheads; (b) the large sizes (24, 26 and 32 oz.) had been increased by 1c each, twice within the previous 12 months; and (c) small sizes had remained unaltered since September, 1967. As

a result of a discussion with the industry representatives, it was agreed that further consideration of the increases proposed for the large sizes be deferred pending the outcome of the present wage case.

PORT PIRIE SEWERAGE

Mr. McKEE: The Minister of Works will recall that I recently asked him a question regarding Government finance being made available to councils for effluent disposal schemes on a similar basis to sewerage grants. Can the Minister say whether this matter has been considered and when the Public Works Committee will visit Port Pirie to inspect the sewerage proposal there?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I cannot give the honourable member a date for the Public Works Committee's visit to Port Pirie. I told him last week that I had referred the question of effluent disposal schemes to my Ministerial colleagues for their consideration. The honourable member may recall (or he may not have been present at the time I was dealing with this matter) that I suggested to the Town Clerk at Port Pirie that he immediately write to the Minister of Health setting out the details of the proposal so that it could proceed to a further stage. Last week I told the honourable member that I would pursue the matter; I have done this, and I will now take it further for him.

POTATOES

Mr. EVANS: At a Tariff Board inquiry held in Victoria on August 11 and 12 into the imports of potatoes, representatives of most States were present. However, the South Australian Potato Board sent only a statement that was read by the Chief Executive Officer of the Australian Primary Producers Union (Dr. Dawson). I believe that the sending of only a statement was not in the best interests of this State and that we should have sent representatives from growers' organizations and processors. Nevertheless, will the Minister of Lands obtain from the Minister of Agriculture a report on the Tariff Board inquiry?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes. I think members should be reminded that the Potato Board works under an Act of this Parliament and that it has deliberately been made independent by Parliament; therefore, its actions or lack of actions are not directly the responsibility of the Government. I have no doubt that my colleague can get the information requested, as he has certain powers under

the Act. However, the board, which has been given the specific task of organizing the industry, has on it representatives from all branches of the industry and is autonomous in its action.

ROAD SAFETY COMMITTEE

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the membership of the South Australian Government Committee of Inquiry into Road Safety?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The members are as follows: Mr. P. G. Pak Poy (Chairman), Professor A. T. Welford, Professor J. S. Robertson, Professor R. B. Potts, Mr. S. J. Jacobs, Q.C., Mr. R. L. Youds, Mr. R. E. Theel, and Mr. B. J. Kalbfell.

Mrs. BYRNE: On Saturday, September 6, an advertisement appeared in the *Advertiser* as follows:

Committee of Inquiry into Road Safety. Request for public submissions. The South Australian Government has set up a Committee of Inquiry into Road Safety in South Australia. The members of the committee are drawn from a wide range of disciplines and interests and a full inquiry into all aspects of road safety is envisaged.

The advertisement concludes:

The submissions should reach the committee no later than the end of September, 1969.

Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether similar advertisements were inserted in the *Advertiser* or other newspapers, or whether any other publicity was given to this matter on the radio or television?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

WHEAT STORAGE

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked last week about wheat silos in the State?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: My colleague reports that the silo storage being constructed during 1970 should be completed for receivals from the 1970-71 harvest. The funds being used for the permanent concrete vertical silos are not part of the \$10,000,000 grant recently announced by the Commonwealth Government for New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. HUGHES: Yesterday's *Advertiser* contains the following report:

A standard gauge rail link between Adelaide and Port Pirie to connect with the Sydney-Perth uniform gauge line was top priority in

South Australia, the Premier (Mr. Hall) said yesterday . . . Unless the system is integrated, there will be junctions with three gauges which will impair general efficiency, increase running costs and interfere with the efficient handling of grain and fertilizer traffic.

I entirely agree with that statement. In view of the quantity of grain carried by rail into Wallaroo and the quantity of superphosphate taken out of Wallaroo on the same line, can the Premier say whether, in his discussions with the Prime Minister, he has put forward this important aspect in connection with the feasibility study in an endeavour to have this line to Wallaroo connected at the same time as the Port Pirie to Adelaide section of the rail is standardized?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The connection to Wallaroo has been one of the principal matters repeatedly raised with the Commonwealth Government during discussions on the standardization of the line between Port Pirie and Adelaide. From his representation of the area, the honourable member will know that on this connection are carried grain and superphosphate, which are vitally important, as well as other goods. Also, of course, this is the northern link through to the port of Wallaroo. Therefore, the honourable member can rest assured that this connection has been foremost in the representations made to the Commonwealth Government about this standard gauge line.

DOG POISONING

Mr. BURDON: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about dog poisoning?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: There is a difference in the conditions of sale of strychnine between the metropolitan area and country areas, in that regulation 132 of the poisons regulations requires the retail sale of strychnine and of preparations containing more than 10 per cent of the poison in the metropolitan area to be witnessed by a police officer. This provision does not apply to wholesale sales or sales in country areas to *bona fide* primary producers for the destruction of vermin; the poison must be signed for by such purchaser.

The reasons for these different conditions of sale are so that strychnine will be available to primary producers for the destruction of vermin with a minimum of restrictions. Strychnine has gone out of use to a large extent, but there was this year a considerable demand for the preparation of poisoned wheat to deal with the mouse plague. Restrictions that are too onerous may tend to discourage the use of effective poisons in dealing with vermin infestation.

It must also be borne in mind that lethal dog baits can be prepared with other agricultural and home garden pesticides which are readily available, such as poisoned wheat, mercurial sprays and even Metaldehyde slug killer. With arsenic preparations there is no distinction between city and country areas; they are available as agricultural chemicals for many purposes, *e.g.*, arsenate of lead and sheep dips. The liquid arsenical weedkiller is not available either in the city or the country to home gardeners; purchasers must hold a permit from the Public Health Department.

In the case of cyanides, with the exception of calcium cyanide for rabbit fumigation, these are not available either in the city or the country except to the holder of a permit to purchase or, in the case of small quantities, in the presence of a police officer who must sign the poisons register. The honourable member's representations will be referred to the advisory committee appointed in terms of the Food and Drugs Act for consideration regarding whether or not further restrictions should be applied to the sale of strychnine.

GAS

Mr. WARDLE: I appreciated the reply that the Minister of Works gave me recently to my question on the piping of natural gas to the lower Murray River area for use primarily in industry and also for household use, at the conclusion of which he said:

The first consideration is to complete the pipeline to Adelaide, and further extensions will depend on demands from consumers in the various areas.

I believe the Electricity Trust has accepted it as part of its policy and responsibility to carry out surveys of areas prior to the decision being taken to install electricity. Can the Minister of Works therefore inform me whether the relevant Government department or the gas distribution centre will make such inquiries to see whether there is a demand for gas to be supplied in certain areas, or will this sort of survey have to be carried out by public-minded groups in those areas?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: I cannot speak for the South Australian Gas Company in this instance but, as I understand its policy, it would be keen to carry out surveys when the amount of business warranted such a survey being undertaken or if considerable expansion in an area were likely. I shall be happy to refer the honourable member's suggestion to the company.

I point out, of course, that during the interim period many industries as well as private and commercial undertakings are enjoying the facilities offered by liquid petroleum gas. Although I will seek clarification of the point that the honourable member has raised, I imagine the company would be interested in undertaking such a survey.

WEST LAKES SCHEME

Mr. BROOMHILL: Last week I asked the Premier a question regarding conferences that had been held between Government authorities and representatives of the Port Adelaide and Woodville councils in relation to drainage work being carried out on the West Lakes scheme. I also asked whether the Henley and Grange and Hindmarsh councils were similarly involved and, if they were, whether they, too, should have been included in discussions of that nature. Has he now a reply?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Henley and Grange council was not invited to this meeting because it was not in any way involved in the drains where Port Adelaide was concerned. Drainage proposals involving the Henley and Grange council had previously been discussed with it at a meeting attended by the developers, the consulting engineers and Mr. Holliday. The indenture does not include Hindmarsh in any of the drainage obligations although its drains do discharge into the Port Road drain at a higher level.

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Premier an answer to the question I asked last week about foot and mouth disease being brought into South Australia by means of certain canned meats?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The importation of pig meats and pig meat products is controlled by the Commonwealth Department of Health under the animal quarantine regulations. Quarantine proclamation 80A is the current one. Pig meats cannot be exported to Australia unless stringent requirements are met. The details of requirements are set out in a publication issued to interested exporters or importers entitled *Export of Canned Pig Meat to Australia*. These provisions are administered by the Department of Agriculture on behalf of the Commonwealth Department of Health.

SALISBURY NORTH SCHOOL

Mr. CLARK: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week about the possible replacement of the Salisbury North Primary School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: It is true that all classroom accommodation at the Salisbury North Primary School is provided in timber frame buildings. Because of the flat nature of the site, difficulties have been experienced with drainage. The large number of timber frame classrooms has made it necessary to provide more than the usual sealed areas surrounding the buildings. Over a period of many years, the Education Department has set out to replace either the infants section or the primary section of schools such as Salisbury North with some of the accommodation in solid construction. In the case of Salisbury North, an infants school in brick construction has been erected.

Owing to the demand for schools in rapidly developing areas, it has not been possible for the Education Department to include very many schools in a replacement programme. Those schools that have been replaced have been in areas where expansion of the site is not possible and where redevelopment became urgently necessary to make the best use of the area available, in addition to replacing very old buildings. The situation at Salisbury North is fully appreciated and from time to time consideration has been given to the replacement of the school. A schedule of requirements has been submitted to the Public Buildings Department and initial planning has taken place. Unless there is a significant change in demand for new schools in the immediate future, it is hoped that Salisbury North can be included in a programme in the near future.

SIREX WASP

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked last week about the Sirex wasp?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Conservator of Forests reports that from time to time imported softwood packing cases, on arrival in Australian ports, have been found to contain Sirex—occasionally alive. It is the practice of the Commonwealth Quarantine Department to advise all State quarantine authorities of these finds, and particularly to alert the inspectors at any subsequent ports of call of the infested ship.

No alert has been given to Port Adelaide in the case quoted by the honourable member and presumably the ship will not be calling here. Sirex is present in some areas of pine plantation in Tasmania and all exports of softwood are carefully inspected before leaving that State. In addition, any imports into

South Australia of timber liable to infestation are thoroughly examined by the quarantine authorities here. Regular aerial and ground inspections are also carried out in departmental plantations to ensure that, if there should be an outbreak of Sirex, it would be quickly detected and controlled.

COMPASSIONATE LEAVE

Mr. VIRGO: I direct a question to the Minister of Labour and Industry, and perhaps I should preface it by indicating that the Minister may desire to confer with other Ministers, or another Minister, on this matter, although I think it comes within his ambit. My question relates to a provision initiated by the previous Government relating to compassionate leave for Government employees in the daily-paid or weekly-paid category. The basis, I understand, for any leave of that nature is two days for the death of a wife, mother, son, daughter, or husband, provided that the leave is taken prior to the day of the funeral or on the day of the funeral and prior to it. Provision for a brother, sister, step-brother, or step-sister is one day. However, apparently another category was not considered at the time, although I think that it is a rather rare one; that is, a half-brother. I am informed by the authorities in the Parliamentary Library that a rather fine distinction is drawn between a step-brother and a half-brother; it would seem that what would apply to a step-brother should also apply to a half-brother, but apparently, through some omission in drafting, this special leave does not apply on the death of a half-brother. Will the Minister consider rectifying this anomaly so that in future the death of a half-brother will be covered in the same way as is the death of a step-brother?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Frankly, this category is one that has not been drawn to my attention, but now that the honourable member has so eloquently addressed himself to me, I shall be pleased to look at the matter for him.

RELIEVING TEACHERS

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of September 24 regarding departmental practice with respect to providing relieving teachers when teachers at any school are ill and absent from work?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: As the honourable member has specifically mentioned science and mathematics lessons, I assume that his question relates to secondary teachers. In any case, I shall today be replying to a question by the honourable member for Gumeracha

on relieving staff for primary schools. The need for relieving staff is recognized. Provision of such staff is bound up with the provision of staff generally. An arrangement for one or two relief teachers for secondary schools was made in the 1940's, but the best that has been managed for many years in secondary schools is to make use of temporary relievers, usually married women who were former teachers, when these have responded to requests to make themselves available. Heads understand the value of building up panels of temporary relievers in limited localities, but many more are needed.

Consideration is being given to the appointment of mobile teachers to act as permanent relieving staff for the secondary division next year. The extent to which this can be done will depend upon the suitability of applicants and the ability to staff schools generally. The honourable member mentioned children missing particular lessons on days when teachers are ill. The changes that have occurred in the secondary curriculum over the past two or three years are all in the direction of more flexibility of time table and school organization, and of children being given responsibility for pursuing study independently under guidance, rather than in a formal teacher-class situation. As schools become more accustomed to organizing their instruction in this way, the difficulty occasioned by even short absence of teachers should be much reduced.

Mr. GILES: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the provision of relieving teachers in primary schools?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The Primary Division of the Education Department employs relieving teachers of two types, namely, permanent and temporary. There are 11 permanent relieving teachers who are employed full-time and about 400 temporary relieving teachers who are employed for short periods of time to take the classes of teachers temporarily absent from duty. Relieving teachers of both types are available for country schools as well as for schools in the metropolitan area. The honourable member has suggested that approval be given for the employment of a relieving teacher to cover the absence of a permanent teacher without waiting until this absence exceeds three days. Heads of schools already have approval to employ relieving teachers in the way suggested if more than one permanent teacher is absent

at the same time, or if it is not possible to reorganize the school to cover one absence. Other special circumstances are also considered when permission is sought for the employment of a relieving teacher.

MEALS ON WHEELS

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Has the Premier information further to that which he gave me during the Estimates debate, when I drew attention to the reduction of \$13,000 in the maintenance provision for Meals on Wheels?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Government decided in 1966 (and the honourable member would be well aware of that, because he was a member of the Government then) to grant to Meals on Wheels Incorporated an annual maintenance grant of \$18,000 in each of the three years 1966-67, 1967-68, and 1968-69. The financial statements of the organization showed at the time a grant of \$5,000 was recommended that the organization expected an accumulation of cash funds of \$42,347 at June 30, 1969. In fact, the actual cash funds at June 30, 1969, were \$50,128, which is \$7,781 better than was expected at the time this grant was recommended. Compared with the cash balance of \$21,704 at the commencement of the three-year period, the organization has increased its cash funds by \$28,424. The cash holdings at June 30, 1969, could not be completely ignored in assessing the cash needs of the organization for 1969-70. Therefore, it was considered reasonable that the maintenance grant for 1969-70 be \$5,000.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE

Mr. VIRGO: My attention has been drawn to a problem which we have had for a long time but which we hope we will not have for much longer.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Are you talking about yourself?

Mr. VIRGO: No, and I am not talking about the Government: I am referring to a more serious matter. Building workers rarely qualify for long service leave, because of the nature of their employment. I think it is uncommon rather than common, even in Government departments, for a building worker to qualify for this leave. I understand that both the Victorian and the Tasmanian Parliaments are taking action to rectify the position in those States so that building workers can be granted long service leave, although obviously, because of the non-qualifying period involved, it will be called service leave, to distinguish it from long service leave. Can the Minister of

Labour and Industry say whether the Government intends to deal with this important problem and whether, if it does not, he will investigate the matter to find out whether the difficulty can be overcome?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will look into the matter.

PETROL PRICE

Mr. CASEY: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on September 25 concerning the price of petrol, which may or may not be relevant now?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The cost increases which will be incurred by the oil companies as from the end of the year arise from prices fixed by the Commonwealth Government for the sale of Bass Strait crude oil and the changing circumstances which will result from its use. The price fixed, up to September 17, 1970, is between \$2.44 and \$2.47 a barrel, and for five years from September 18, 1970, it is \$2.06 a barrel. There are 35 gallons in a barrel.

The price of \$2.06 a barrel was based on what was considered to be the average landed cost to the industry for imported crude as at October, 1968, plus 26c for higher quality, less 9c to provide for coastal freight costs to refineries. Prices a barrel fixed for other indigenous crude are as follows:

| | Up to 17/9/70 | Five years from 18/9/70 |
|-------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|
| | \$ | \$ |
| Moonie crude | 3.14 | 2.15 |
| Barrow Island crude . . | 3.24 | 2.21 |

Until September, 1980, oil companies are required to take maximum possible quantities of indigenous crude and to provide whatever additional plant facilities may be necessary to achieve maximum absorption. The main effect of the above decisions is to allow the incentive payment of 67c a barrel to all local producers except Bass Strait to continue until September 17, 1970, when it ceases, but at the same time safeguard the interests of local producers by ensuring the maximum absorption of their output for a period of 10 years. The oil industry has submitted some details of the cost increases which will result from having to take indigenous crude, the production of which will increase rapidly. These include:

- The higher cost of indigenous crude up to September 17, 1970;
- The coastal freight costs over and above the allowance in the price of crude;

- The inability to fully recover the 26c quality allowance added to the price of Bass Strait crude.

No specific price increase has been sought as yet and further information has been requested to enable the position to be fully investigated.

SEAT BELTS

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to my recent question concerning the wearing of seat belts by members of the Police Force?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Commissioner of Police has furnished the following report on the wearing of seat belts by members of the Police Force:

Seat belts are fitted to the front seat of each police vehicle and some vehicles have seat belts fitted in the rear seat. General Order No. 345 states:

Seat belts: members travelling in police vehicles and occupying a position for which a seat belt is supplied must wear that seat belt. This instruction does not apply to instances where the wearing of a seat belt might impede a member in preventing the escape of a prisoner who is also travelling in the vehicle. However, the prisoner should be instructed to fasten his seat belt in such cases.

Police personnel adhere to this instruction and have done so since it was issued on July 20, 1966. With the lap-sash belt it was found that personnel could not operate the radio set, as they were unable to reach the set owing to the restriction of the shoulder sash: therefore, lap belts are used in most police vehicles. An unobservant person may jump to the conclusion that police are not using safety belts, simply because there is no sash.

SNUGGERY CROSSING

Mr. BURDON: On behalf of the member for Millicent, I ask whether the Attorney-General has obtained a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to his recent question concerning the Snuggery crossing.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No, I have not got a reply.

Mr. BURDON: I am asking this question on behalf of my colleague. Has the Attorney-General the reply from his colleague?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I should apologize to the honourable member. In the first instance, I did not hear him say that he was asking the question on behalf of his colleague, and I should thank him to speak up.

Members interjecting:

Mr. Hudson: You weren't listening.

The SPEAKER: Order! We will adjourn this discussion until next week.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that I did not reply to the interjections.

Mr. Broomhill: How could you?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: To date, only brief discussion has taken place between members of the inter-departmental committee, which investigates the need for warning signals at railway crossings, with regard to warning lights at Snuggery crossing, because the programme for level crossing protection for 1969-70 has already been determined and is fully committed. The Snuggery crossing is not included. The level crossing in question permits the standing of a train 1,200ft. long between it and the facing points at Snuggery, and this distance is considered adequate. However, in order to ensure that the crossing is not fouled, instructions have been issued that trains shall not be permitted to stand over the crossing in any circumstances. Should the programme of installation of warning devices be extended this financial year, this crossing will be further considered.

CALLINGTON COPPER

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Premier obtained a reply from the Minister of Mines to my recent question about copper mining at Callington?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Mines Exploration Proprietary Limited, a subsidiary of Broken Hill, South Limited, is continuing to explore in this area, and results are sufficiently encouraging to justify the expectation that a mining project will be developed in the area. The company has not completed feasibility studies, but a decision is expected soon.

NORTHFIELD WORKSHOPS

Mr. HURST: Last Friday, with other members, I had the privilege of visiting the Northfield workshops of the Highways Department, and members were loud in their praise of the manner in which the officers of that department had constructed and laid out the workshops, laboratories and other facilities. I would appreciate it if my thanks were conveyed to those officers for the magnificent job they have done. In order to achieve the utmost efficiency in departments such as this, will the Minister of Works persuade his Cabinet colleagues to use Government workshops fully in order to avoid having to let contracts to outside firms, particularly for work for which the facilities in these modern and well laid-out workshops can be used?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The honourable member is speaking of workshops under the control of the Minister of Roads and Transport. The policy concerning the extensive workshops under my control has been to carry out work with the highest possible efficiency. The honourable member is aware that a fine workshop is being developed at Ottoway, which was the old Sassafras depot, and that the Public Works Committee investigated replacing the old foundry at Glanville, which was laid out about 80 years ago by my grandfather, with a more modern foundry. No doubt the honourable member realizes that the Engineering and Water Supply Department is upgrading its workshops to the fullest extent in order to create the best possible working conditions for its employees and obtain the highest efficiency. Concerning the work undertaken by the department and the number of contracts let to private enterprise, obviously at times work cannot be undertaken by the department, and this type of work will continue to be let out to private contract. However, the points raised by the honourable member will be considered.

HOPE VALLEY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Part of the area between Grand Junction, Reservoir, and Pompoota Roads and Tolley's vineyard, Hope Valley, has been omitted from previous sewerage schemes. I can give the Minister of Works details of the streets, but if I give him a map of this area can he say whether the Engineering and Water Supply Department has plans to sewer it soon?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: As I always like to co-operate with the honourable member, if she will give me the plan I shall have this matter investigated immediately.

AIR POLLUTION

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Premier obtained a reply from the Minister of Health to the question I asked last week about progress in this State towards the provision of clean air?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I apologize to the honourable member for not being able to give him an immediate reply, but as I was able to obtain a reply within a week I am sure that he will appreciate that. The number of meetings of the Clean Air Committee should not be regarded as a measure of the actual work being done in relation to the control of air pollution.

The activities of the Public Health Department over some years have had an appreciable effect on reducing sources of air pollution in

South Australia. Officers of the department have serviced and monitored fall-out deposit gauges located in various areas of the metropolitan area and in some country towns, and much valuable information to assist remedial action has been obtained from this source. All complaints relating to nuisances or health hazards resulting from sources of air pollution are investigated by officers of the department, and appropriate action is taken to reduce, and if possible eliminate, the sources that are the cause of the complaint. An increased awareness of the problems associated with air pollution through the activities of the department has resulted in representatives of industry seeking advice in relation to appropriate action to be taken to reduce sources of pollution.

The activities of the department, together with the wide representation of the Clean Air Committee of the major consumers of fuel, has resulted in an increased awareness of the need for all reasonable steps to be taken to reduce sources of air pollution in this State, and much has been achieved by voluntary action in industry generally. To support these activities, regulations have been prepared for the control of dark smoke, and these have been sent to the Crown Solicitor for settlement. Further regulations to control the emission of particulate and gaseous matter are under consideration by the committee.

DARTMOUTH DAM

Mr. HUDSON: I understand that certain difficulties have been experienced by the New South Wales, Victorian, South Australian and Commonwealth Governments in reaching agreement on details of legislation to be ratified by these Governments in relation to the Dartmouth dam. Will the Minister of Works say whether or not these difficulties have occurred? If they have occurred, will he say who has been responsible and to what they refer?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: The main difficulties are in the wording: various States have various ideas about wording. Only this week the Premier is to receive advice from the Prime Minister on the way this matter will be set out, and it is hoped that the whole question will be resolved in one or two weeks.

MURRAY MUDGE HOME

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Treasurer (who, I hope, is feeling better today) a reply to a question I asked about the Murray Mudge Old Folks Home, Glenelg, during the debate on the Estimates?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I thank the honourable member for his good wishes. A sum of \$25,000 was provided on the Estimates for 1968-69 to cover expected subsidy requirements of the home. At that time a claim for subsidy towards furnishings, fittings and equipment for the home was under review by the Deputy Auditor-General and the items eligible for subsidy had not been finalized. Following this review numerous adjustments had to be made, as the home had been accepted for service by the Government Group Laundry since the original list had been submitted. This resulted in elimination of linen requirements and laundry equipment. Certain other items qualified for subsidy from the Commonwealth Government and were, therefore, deducted. Adjustments had also to be made for items not subject to subsidy or subject to a maximum price or quantity. Subsidy was finally recommended on items costing \$14,900 on a \$2 for \$1 basis, which involved the Government in a total subsidy of \$9,933, the amount currently provided. Subsidy approvals for furnishing extensions to Karingal Nursing Home amounted to \$6,704. However, when claiming the \$6,375 the organization advised that some items included in the original list were not provided during this project. It was therefore not necessary to carry forward any balance as the project is complete.

MANNUM INDUSTRY

Mr. HUDSON: Last week I raised with the Premier the position of David Shearer Limited, at Mannum, and he said that certain measures had been taken to provide employment for at least some of the people who had been put out of work. However, I understood from the Minister of Labour and Industry at that time and in his reply to a later question that the matter was still under negotiation and that no concrete proposals had been arrived at. Can the Minister give any further information on this matter, and can he say whether any additional employment opportunities have been provided by the Government for those employees who are not in work?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: It was found on investigation that many of those who were no longer working with the company were either women (married in many cases) or men over 65 years of age. The Government has received an offer from a busy company engaged in the same type of business in the metropolitan area to take, under the same conditions as had applied at Mannum, any tradesmen retrenched by David Shearer,

and that offer still stands. Yesterday morning, at the request of the Secretary of the Sheet Metal Workers' Union and the Amalgamated Engineering Union, together with a representative of the work force at David Shearer, I received a deputation at which this matter was discussed at length. Apparently, the purpose of the deputation was to see whether the Government could assist Mannum by encouraging other industry to go there. I readily agreed to the request. I have already started investigations through the Industrial Development Branch to see whether another industry can be encouraged to go to Mannum. As I understand it, the whole problem in this industry has been caused by wheat quotas. The outcome of this matter relating to retrenched employees could be successful, and I hope that the problem will be solved.

HOSPITAL EQUIPMENT

Mr. McKEE: This morning's *Advertiser* contains a report stating that the Chief Secretary is leaving for Japan today and that, while he is in that country, he will inspect medical equipment that could be of benefit to the people of South Australia. Has the Premier any knowledge of the type of equipment that the Chief Secretary will be investigating in Japan?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Chief Secretary discussed with me some of the broad concepts of the things he wanted to examine in Japan but, as this discussion was in technical and medical terms, I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

CRIME DETECTION

Mr. BROOMHILL: Page 8 of the report of the Commissioner of Police for 1967-68 shows that members of the Police Force dealt with 128,583 offences during that year, which was over 19,000 more than in the previous year. On page 7 of the report the point is made that the percentage of more serious cleared up cases was disappointing, compared with the previous year. This indicates an increase in crime and a decrease in detection and, while I do not wish to be critical of the Police Force, I wonder whether, as there have been complaints by members of the Police Force about a shortage of police officers, this has something to do with the lower rate of crime detection. Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary how many police officers are currently employed in the force and whether the recruitment position is satisfactory enough

to keep abreast of the increase in population and the resultant increase in crime?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As Premier, I will refer the question to myself as Acting Chief Secretary, and bring down a report.

EDUCATION ACT REGULATIONS

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I move:

That regulations No. 1 and No. 2 of the regulations in respect of bursaries, scholarships and studentships, made under the Education Act, September 4, 1969, and laid on the table of this House on September 16, be disallowed.

This matter relates to only portion of a set of regulations gazetted by the Government. The regulations that I propose should be disallowed are Nos. 1 and 2, which terminate all scholarships, exhibitions and studentships currently provided by the State Government and which would mean the complete end of the State scholarships scheme. The third part of this group of regulations relates to secondary book allowances for fourth and fifth-year students and provides an increase in those allowances. I do not know why these regulations should have been lumped together; I suppose it was done this way, taking the view that if they were all put together it would be more difficult to disallow that part dealing with the termination of the State scholarships scheme.

The explanation given by the Minister this afternoon and by the department to the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation suggests that there was a financial reason for incorporating these two separate matters in the one set of regulations. However, I do not accept that point of view. I think it is just a way of putting it across to the public, and of misrepresenting the position to the public, to suggest that, in order to help pay an increase in the secondary book allowance for fourth-year and fifth-year students, the whole State scholarships scheme must be terminated. This is simply not the case. The Minister of Education does not have revenue made available to her with separate tags on it. The revenue made available comes from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and she could equally as well say it was necessary to terminate the State scholarships scheme in order to pay for ancillary staff, window cleaners, more relieving teachers, or to pay for an increase in the number of teachers or for anything she wished. It is simply not the case, where the expenditure of her department is voted generally by appropriation in this House and is provided generally

out of Consolidated Revenue, that this expenditure is financed by part of the revenue received by the department. I take objection to the fact that these two matters have been incorporated in the one set of regulations. I think it is double talk by the Government to suggest that, in order to increase the secondary book allowance for fourth-year and fifth-year students, it has been necessary to cut out the scholarships scheme.

We are not dealing with a minor number of scholarships: the Minister indicated, in reply to a question this afternoon, that 733 exhibitions, scholarships and bursaries had been discontinued, following the recent amendment to the education regulations; this is a substantial number. I admit that the problem exists of finding a satisfactory way to make these awards, but I have a suggestion to make on that which I should like the Minister to examine. It seems to me that the criticism that can be made of the State scholarships scheme, and of the Commonwealth scholarships scheme, so far as it applies to secondary school students, is that they make no attempt to distinguish the means of parents of the children concerned. Because of the particular type of test conducted for Commonwealth secondary scholarships, probably a higher proportion of scholarships goes to students from better-off families.

It has always seemed to me that the real case for scholarships of this kind, which are designed to encourage students to continue their secondary schooling to the Matriculation level, involves providing additional financial assistance for parents of bright children who are in difficult economic circumstances. After all, more and more children these days are staying at school to the Matriculation level and some way must be found of encouraging those students who are intelligent to go on to Matriculation, whereas they might otherwise leave school because their parents are in difficult circumstances.

For that reason, I have considered that the fact that the Commonwealth made no means test provisions in relation to granting its scholarships represented a weakness in the scheme, and for a long time I have wanted to see additional scholarships made available on the basis of third-year work (additional to those made available without means tests), involving some means test provisions. It therefore seems to me that this is a suitable occasion for the State Government to continue the 733 scholarships and awards of various kinds and to make appropriate arrangements

with the Commonwealth Government for the award of these scholarships to be additional to the Commonwealth's own scheme but with means test provisions applicable to them and devised by the State Government.

This would solve two problems. It would solve the problem of the discontinuance of the Intermediate examination, because there is no suggestion that the special tests instituted by the Commonwealth Government, in order to establish the basis for the award of its secondary scholarships, will be discontinued. Those special tests, which are held at about the mid-point of the students' third-year, will continue. The tests do not put any significant extra pressure on students, because they are the kind of tests which in general involve the students' intelligence and are not the sort of thing requiring much learning work to be done. They are tests involving the students' understanding rather than their ability to memorize.

We know that, in South Australia at least, the number of students who enter for these Commonwealth secondary scholarships is many times greater than the number of awards made. In the high schools in my area, I think over 50 per cent of the third-year students enter for these Commonwealth secondary scholarships. The fact that the awards made are therefore considered desirable and important is clearly indicated by the number of students who enter for these scholarships.

Mr. Clark: There are some good students who cannot make the grade.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. The special problems of technical high school students are now partly catered for by the Commonwealth Government, but what is not catered for is the parental set-up. The Commonwealth Government has made no attempt to recognize the means of parents in making these awards, and awards are made to many students whose families have no real need of additional assistance. The application for the scholarship is made only for the honour and glory of the award. That is a fairly natural thing to do and I am not complaining about it. However, what an ideal opportunity this is for the State Government to give additional assistance to students who specially need it!

I would not have objected if the State Government had said, "We will provide these additional scholarships to assist country students to come to the city to matriculate." This would have been very sensible, because some country students still have to transfer to a different school to matriculate. Assistance

should be granted to encourage students who have parents in difficult economic circumstances who would normally be putting pressure on their children to leave school in order to bring additional finance into the home as a result of employment.

I realize that some of these students are catered for to some extent by the award of teacher-training scholarships, but such assistance ties the student to a particular career and, in general, we should not do that. It is important that schoolchildren should not be tied down: their options should be as wide open as possible. The kind of assistance I have advocated would enable the students to complete their formal education.

While we have taken tremendous steps in encouraging students to matriculate, still a percentage of students who could matriculate leave school prior to the Matriculation year, partly because we do not have a completely selective system for entry of students into high schools and technical high schools. Many students at technical high schools, in the metropolitan area particularly, could well benefit from the Matriculation course. Consequently, most of our technical high schools have had to introduce Matriculation courses. Nevertheless, some academically bright students are shunted off into the wrong type of course.

If the regulations providing for the award of these scholarships are not repealed the Education Department will have time to work out a suitable scheme that effectively complements the Commonwealth Government's scheme. The State Government has taken the easy way out. It was committed to certain increases in secondary book allowances, and in many cases these increases will be welcome. We must, however, recognize that this type of assistance does not bring about as much improvement in standards of education as do other types of assistance.

As I have said, the Government was committed to an increase in the secondary book allowance and saw the discontinuance of the Intermediate examination and the development of the Commonwealth secondary scholarships scheme as convenient excuses to cancel the State Government scholarships scheme altogether and thereby save some money. I have no doubt that the Minister was under some pressure from her Cabinet colleagues to find some way of departmental financing for an increase in secondary book allowances, but her problem in respect of her Cabinet colleagues is not sufficient excuse for this House to approve the Government's actions. This House should be

concerned to judge the Government's actions in terms of the priorities it has determined, and I believe the priorities within our education system are not receiving adequate attention at present.

I suggest that, where monetary assistance is given directly to parents instead of being spent directly on improving standards within our education system, we must recognize that to some extent we are slowing down the rate of improvement in standards in our State Government schools. I do not suggest that that assistance should not be given, but it seems that the first priority at present within our education system is to ensure that we have an adequate supply of teachers and that we reduce class sizes as much as possible.

In an ideal State one would like to see as much assistance as possible given to parents but, in establishing priorities, we must see that we give the maximum assistance to those groups within the community that most need it. The department has a scheme whereby secondary school books are made available free of charge if the parents can meet a means test, but its provisions are so stringent that a man would virtually have to be earning the living wage and have four or five children to qualify. The ordinary wage-earner simply does not qualify for the issue of free secondary school books by the Education Department.

In establishing priorities for assistance to parents, we must have clearly in our minds the objects we wish to achieve with our limited funds. Is the purpose of providing book allowances or scholarships in place of book allowances just to provide more money to parents or is the purpose of scholarships to provide an award for the honour and glory of the students? Is that the purpose of the Commonwealth secondary scholarships scheme, for example, or has that been the purpose of our own scholarships scheme? I do not think so. I believe the real purpose in any scholarships scheme should always be to provide an encouragement for the furtherance of the student's education when that student's education might otherwise be discontinued. Certainly it is true that the Education Department scholarships scheme has been directed in that way in the past, but that is no reason why it should be directed in that way from now on.

I do not believe that the Minister even bothered to check with the Commonwealth Government to see whether it would be willing for the State to be provided with the results of the Commonwealth Government's own test carried out in mid-year for third-year students

for the award of Commonwealth continuation scholarships, so that the State Government could provide additional scholarships for those who missed out on Commonwealth awards and who could demonstrate through some sort of means test that they needed additional assistance or that additional assistance was likely to encourage them to stay longer at school. For that kind of reason, I have moved this motion. I do not accept for one moment the following answer given by the Minister today:

No annual saving in money will accrue to the Education Department as the result of this decision, as the money which will be saved will be used to pay the recently increased book allowance for fourth and fifth-year secondary students.

Mr. Clark: What relationship is there between these two subjects?

Mr. HUDSON: There should not be any relationship at all. The Treasurer does not have little tins, into one of which he puts money saved as a result of no scholarships being awarded to pay secondary book allowances. It is simply gobbledegook on the Government's part to suggest that its scholarships have to be terminated in order to finance the increase in the secondary book allowance, but that was the suggestion and official explanation given to the Subordinate Legislation Committee by the Director-General of Education, as follows:

To compensate for the discontinuance of the State scholarships scheme and to put to wider use the moneys previously expended on the scheme, regulation 3 of Part 20 has been amended to provide for an increase in book allowances by \$6 a year for secondary students at the fourth and fifth-year levels so as to have a book allowance of \$24 for the fourth year, and \$26 a student for the fifth year.

I think that statement is also gobbledegook. What I think has happened is that other Cabinet members have said to the Minister of Education, "If you want to increase the secondary book allowance you must find some other way of financing it, because you are not getting any money from the Treasury to increase it."

The other thing that has happened is that no-one has bothered to think out appropriate ways of continuing the scholarships previously awarded on the basis of the Intermediate examination. No-one has thought to ask whether such awards could be made on the basis of the Commonwealth Government's test carried out in the third year and whether such additional awards (additional to the Commonwealth Government's awards), if made, would serve a useful purpose within our educa-

tion system. I believe that they would serve a useful purpose and that they could be used to encourage students, who might otherwise have left school earlier, to complete Matriculation. The retention ratio of students after the Intermediate level is still not high enough to justify the department's saying that there is now no need for the Intermediate scholarship. It is not good enough for the Minister, the department or the Director-General to say that the Commonwealth Government's scheme now meets the situation. However, the Minister's reply to me today also states:

In reply to the other part of the honourable member's original question, there is no means test applied to any Commonwealth or State Government scholarships awarded to children to continue with their secondary education. Commonwealth scholarships for tertiary education have a means test provision in respect of any living allowance for which the scholarship holder may apply.

Every Commonwealth tertiary scholarship winner has his fees paid by the Commonwealth Government. In addition, if the award holder qualifies under a means test a living allowance is paid. Why could not something like that be done by the State in respect to the State scholarships as a supplement to the existing Commonwealth secondary scholarships scheme? In order to try to get the Government to work out some suitable way of doing this, I have moved my motion.

Mr. CLARK seconded the motion.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE secured the adjournment of the debate.

MURRAY RIVER STORAGE

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. D. A. Dunstan:

That in the opinion of this House any Bill introduced for an amendment to the River Murray Waters Act, 1935-1963, should provide that any contract let for the building of a major storage on the Murray River system should not precede the letting of a contract for the building of a storage at Chowilla, but may provide for the simultaneous letting of such contracts.

(Continued from September 24. Page 1735.)

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): The reason for this motion's being before the House is extremely interesting. If the Leader had no intention of accepting the findings of the study into the Chowilla and Dartmouth proposals, why was that study ever agreed to in 1967 when he was Premier? Had Sir Thomas Playford continued as Premier, I have no doubt that Chowilla dam would now be half built, because Sir Thomas would never have agreed to a study on Dartmouth and Chowilla taking

place. Although some people are bitterly disappointed about what has happened, most are realistic, recognizing that, without increased water supplies, the State generally and the Upper Murray districts in particular, will stagnate and that there must be controlled expansion in the irrigation areas to enable wineries, canneries and other industries to continue to develop. We are all well aware that, if industry is forced to stagnate, it must go backwards. The assets and future of people in the river districts will be seriously jeopardized if they have not got additional water to enable them to expand. On February 4 this year (*Hansard*, page 3376), I said:

I truly agree with the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) that the ultimate would be to see both projects being built simultaneously. The member for Edwardstown then interjected, saying that I wanted it both ways. What an amazing interjection that was in the light of the motion before the House today. The honourable member was perfectly correct: I do want it both ways.

Mr. Hudson: You are going to support this motion, are you?

Mr. ARNOLD: If the honourable member listens he will learn something. I want every form of water conservation possible, and I certainly will not agree to South Australia's finishing up without an increased allocation. On February 5, I was asked by a prominent person in my district whether I would support a motion (which was to be moved by the member for Glenelg) to have both dams built. I readily agreed to this request, as it was in keeping with what I had said the night before when the honourable member for Edwardstown tried to rubbish my attitude. However, nothing happened: the member for Glenelg obviously realized that the member for Stirling and I had already spoken along those lines on the preceding day and that the Opposition could gain no political capital from such a motion. This incident is well known in the Upper Murray, and I hope the Leader will ensure that my comments are well publicized in that area.

In the main, people such as the Leader and the member for Glenelg who say that the study is wrong and that the engineers do not know what they are talking about are basically laymen. Since the findings of the study, which was allowed to proceed in 1967, have become known, it has been impossible for the Premier and the Minister of Works to get the other three States involved to agree to the building of Chowilla dam or, alternatively, to the build-

ing of both dams simultaneously. If the motion is carried, it will be a direction to the Government that, if Chowilla dam is not built first, no dam at all should be built.

If the motion is carried, members opposite must accept the responsibility for no dam being built and for South Australia's being forced to make do with the same allocation of water as it had in 1915. Chowilla can provide vast quantities of water in most areas for annual cropping of sorghum, cotton and fodder, but it will not allow permanent development in the planning of country industries or of the metropolitan area.

Mr. Hudson: That is not true. How did you come to that conclusion?

Mr. ARNOLD: This information can be gleaned by members if they study the report with the help of someone who is capable of explaining it to them.

Mr. Broomhill: Who explained it to you—the Premier?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ARNOLD: If they accept legal and technical advice, members have available to them advice that South Australia cannot secure Chowilla at this stage by going to arbitration. If the 1,500,000 acre feet of water cannot be secured for South Australia, how can water be made available for Chowilla? In this respect there is nothing to stop Victoria and New South Wales from damming all the tributaries outside the control of the River Murray Commission. Because of prolonged dry periods, it may be necessary later to redesign Chowilla as a short-term storage. During such periods it would be necessary, if the present type of construction proposed for the dam were proceeded with, to maintain not less than 400,000 acre feet of water in the dam to stop it from falling apart.

The member for Frome said, and rightly so, that we must provide for the future. Perhaps that is why the Labor Government agreed to the comparison of Chowilla dam with Dartmouth dam.

Mr. Hudson: What was the alternative?

Mr. ARNOLD: If the honourable member would listen, I might be able to tell him something. Sir Thomas Playford took out a writ in respect of the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Authority to obtain agreement on Chowilla, yet the Labor Government saw fit to throw away all his gains by agreeing to the 1967 study. What was Sir Thomas Playford's reaction to this? Did he say that this move by the then Government was a good

idea and that South Australia should agree to a further study in respect of the construction of the dam?

Mr. Hudson: Do you think we should have taken out another writ?

Mr. ARNOLD: I have heard the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Glenelg frequently quoting Sir Thomas in the last few months, but did Sir Thomas agree that the study was a good move?

Mr. Broomhill: What is he saying now?

Mr. ARNOLD: Perhaps the member for West Torrens has forgotten—

Mr. Hudson: Phoney assumptions!

Mr. ARNOLD: That is the honourable member's band waggon: he says that the report is based on phoney assumptions, but does he honestly believe that the Engineer-in-Chief and the other engineers involved had no professional integrity and that they would deliberately have used false data?

Mr. Hudson: If that is so, why were the assumptions altered?

Mr. ARNOLD: The honourable member has not answered my question. Does he think that our Engineer-in-Chief and the other engineers involved had no professional integrity and that they would deliberately have used data which they knew to be false? The technical data is not secret.

Mr. Hudson: Why were the assumptions changed?

Mr. ARNOLD: The information is available from the Engineering and Water Supply Department, yet I have not heard of any independent engineers who have claimed that the data or the assumptions on which—

Mr. Hudson: Assumptions are not the same as data.

Mr. ARNOLD: Be quiet a minute! Can the honourable member name any independent engineer who has claimed that the assumptions or the data on which the report is based are false? Can he name any engineers who are claiming that?

Mr. Hudson: Yes—that the estimates made of evaporation are grossly exaggerated.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections. If the honourable member would ignore the interjections, we might get on a little better.

Mr. ARNOLD: It is no use screaming about fundamental rights. The State forfeited those advantages when in 1967 the Labor Government agreed that the study should take place—

Mr. Hudson: What was the alternative?

Mr. ARNOLD: —and Sir Thomas Playford's hard-won agreement was virtually thrown out of the window then. No matter how bitterly disappointed the people are, they will never forgive those people responsible if South Australia finishes up without additional water. The Minister of Works has assured me and those who have come to him in deputations that he will immediately reassess the irrigation position the minute additional water is assured, and I can guarantee that I shall keep the Minister to his assurance.

This motion has only one object: to entangle the Government and the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott) so that they cannot move at a time when the situation is continually changing. If the Leader of the Opposition had any potential statesmanship in him, he would be out and about doing all he could to assist the Government to salvage the maximum benefits for South Australia from what was let go down the drain in 1967. The implications of allowing the study to be instigated in 1967 were fully realized only when the report was presented to this House last February.

Mr. Hudson: What would you have done in 1967?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order.

Mr. Hudson: The Deputy Speaker is protecting the member for Chaffey.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order, and he will be dealt with if he persists.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What would you have done in 1967?

Mr. ARNOLD: The Leader would do better if he went to Victoria and New South Wales and did some agitating over there, for they are the ones to be convinced of the need for Chowilla—not the people of South Australia. To stand up in this Chamber or to have meetings around the countryside in South Australia is only a gimmick. Why did the Leader ever agree to the study in 1967?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: To get the evidence.

Mr. Hudson: What was the alternative?

Mr. ARNOLD: If the Leader is not capable of going to Victoria and New South Wales and convincing the people of those States that they should impress on their Governments the need for Chowilla dam, I suggest that he keep quiet and let the Government get on with the job.

Mr. HUDSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

RIGHT OF PRIVACY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 17. Page 1572.)

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): I do not want to spend much time speaking to this Bill this afternoon. The Attorney-General, having had this Bill studied and studied it himself, has concluded that it is badly drafted but is worth amending, and that certain lengthy amendments to it may get it into a form that will be acceptable to the House. On the other hand, I understand there is (or there could well be) some dissension between him and the Leader on one or two aspects of the Bill. I understand that this afternoon the Leader is to make an impassioned statement about the member for Mitcham (Hon. R. R. Millhouse). I have it on good authority that a telegram was sent to the news media yesterday in the following terms:

1984 is closer than you think. Attorney-General's amendments to my Right of Privacy Bill turn him into Big Brother. I invite you to find out why tomorrow at 3 p.m. in my office at Parliament House. Regards, Don Dunstan.

Mr. Virgo: What is the point you are trying to make?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have made no point yet, but I am pleased that the member for Edwardstown is hanging on my words. If this charge has been made as has been indicated and I am to keep faith with the telegram-reading public, if the Leader has sent a telegram on those lines, and if this point has been made, I utterly reject it, because the Attorney-General has indicated that he wants to make this a workable Bill. On reading the Leader's explanation, I was interested to see that he appeared to be expert at describing the devices used. He stated in his second reading explanation:

Sophisticated devices make it possible for people not at the time intruding on the property to see and to hear what goes on behind closed doors on private property. Some of these devices are readily available in Australia . . . It is in consequence quite possible to obtain devices by which one business concern can get complete information as to decisions made in the boardrooms of another,

and so on, indicating that he had no real regard for the need to preserve the rights of privacy—and the Bill has as its title "An Act to establish rights of privacy", etc. In so many words, the intention is commendable in itself and I believe that no-one in the House would deny the need for people on their own premises and within their own private areas to be able to operate without fear of being

spied upon or having their documents copied or having their business taken out of their own private knowledge by means of the various devices so skilfully enumerated by the Leader.

However, if this charge has been made that the Attorney-General is Big Brother, I regret it. On what basis is it made? Who is Big Brother in this? We had a circumstance here that raised grave doubts in my mind about the motives behind the introduction of this Bill, or its propriety. We had in this House a few short weeks ago a copy of a confidential document from the Railways Department brandished by the Leader of the Opposition. It was a private study document with restricted circulation within the department, and members of the Opposition have at no time said where they got it. The Leader, the very person who ostensibly upholds the right of privacy, brandishes someone else's property without the permission of the management of that property, and makes a fuss about it.

Mr. Hudson: That is different.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes, that happens to be different!

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Do you know the meaning of the word "blandish"?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I know the words put in the Bill.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What does "blandish" mean?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Let me give my interpretation. In his Bill the Leader defines a "visual intrusion device" as follows:

. . . 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.

Yet we have had in this House, apparently circulated amongst members opposite, a private document from the Railways Department, copied—

Mr. Virgo: That is completely untrue, and you know it!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I repeat portion of the quotation: "to see, record or transmit". I do not know where the Leader got the document: he did not tell us. It was obtained by doubtful means in an unauthorized manner; it certainly was not authorized by the Railways Commissioner; nor was it authorized by the Minister, because he did not know it existed. Members opposite took it and founded a debate upon it.

Mr. Clark: Yet the Minister talked about that document according to a report in the *Advertiser* that very morning.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: That makes the position even stranger. Clause 7 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.

The Opposition does not want evidence that is surreptitiously obtained to be used in a court of law, but apparently it is good enough to use such evidence here! Who, then, is Big Brother? Who is acting as Big Brother? Is it the Attorney-General, who makes sensible drafting amendments and suggests one or two important new provisions to the Bill? Is he Big Brother? Or is it the Party that sponsors the Bill in this House and apparently (unless it can explain otherwise) is using some sort of underhand method to obtain information from private sources? This needs explaining to the House.

Mr. Clark: I have no doubt that it will be explained.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: No explanation has been given yet, and I shall be pleased to hear it explained.

Mr. Clark: You would not understand it, nor would you believe it.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I would never have drawn this comparison had it not been for the comparison between the Attorney-General and Big Brother made by the Leader. It is amazing that the Leader can put this proposition to the public of South Australia after his part in a recent debate in this House. As the debate on this Bill progresses I look forward to some explanation of this dual attitude, because, if the Leader is going to call the Attorney-General a name like this, I believe he owes the House an explanation of his behaviour. I look forward with much interest to the Attorney's suggested amendments, and I have no doubt that the attitude of members to the Bill will depend on how many of these amendments are acceptable to the House.

Mr. EDWARDS (Eyre): I wish to refer to the listening devices that the Leader has said are available in Australia, such as a bugging olive in a martini glass. If this sort of thing goes on, our motto should be "Don't have an olive in your martini, if you must drink one." In fact, do not drink anything at a cocktail party.

These listening devices need some form of control to safeguard the general public from the people who wish to use such devices for unlawful purposes. However, I do not agree with the Leader when he complains about the

police having them: if anyone should be able to use these devices, surely it is those people who have to keep law and order and who try to the best of their ability to keep the peace. There are other types of person who are always out to break the law at any cost to their fellow man and to take advantage of him in any way that they can to gain their own ends. Therefore, these devices need to be banned altogether or at least strictly controlled and allowed to be used only by people who have a lawful right to use them.

I do not think for a moment that these bugging devices should be made available to everyone who wishes to buy one, if they are as readily available as we are led to believe. Their use should be limited to those with authority to use them. I suggest that it should be unlawful for an ordinary person to own such a device. If these devices are as dangerous as the Leader would have us believe, we might just as well ban them for all time. Before these bugging devices become available on a wholesale basis let us nip them in the bud and impose a penalty of \$2,000 or 12 months' imprisonment in respect of anyone wanting to buy one for unlawful purposes. This will make most people think twice before trying to buy such a device to take advantage of their fellow man.

After all, it would be a very low-down trick to use such a device and take advantage of people by doing so. I know there are some people who are low enough to do that sort of thing. We should ban these bugging devices before such people have a chance to buy them freely. In saying this I have in mind that some of these devices are freely available, some small recorders being extremely efficient. If we are not careful, we will not be able to speak privately anywhere. A person who was not deaf could use a dummy hearing aid to listen to a conversation, and who would know that the hearing aid was a dummy? Such hearing aids are extremely effective in enabling a person to hear what is said. If we do not nip this kind of thing in the bud, people will be able to use these bugging devices in shiny knobs on walking sticks or in umbrellas to get information that they should not be getting. There is no end to the type of concoction that can be used for this purpose. A person could conceal such a device in the top of his hat. That eliminates me, because I do not wear a hat. Although some members opposite wear hats, what I have said is not a reflection on them.

I am merely pointing out what can happen if we do not clamp down on the undesirable practice of permitting the use of any form of bugging device. If we do not take action, we will have no privacy anywhere and, if we lose our right of privacy, we will never get it back. We must not take this Bill lightly: we must deal with this serious problem before it gets out of control.

Mr. EVANS (Onkaparinga): I consider that one or two comments that have been made should be answered. The member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill) has said that the Attorney-General supported the Bill in principle grudgingly. This is not true: the Attorney willingly accepted the principle of the Bill, but said that there were faults in the drafting and that he would move amendments. I understand that those amendments are now on the file. I think all members support the principle of the Bill. As the member for West Torrens has said, most of us listen to the radio each morning to hear whether any new industry is being established in the State. Because these industries are being established every day, it is only natural to listen to the radio to hear about them, and I congratulate the honourable member for listening in.

The honourable member said that a hearing aid would not be covered by this Bill; in other words, that to use a hearing aid would not be an offence. I do not consider that the Bill exempts the type of hearing aid used by a person who has defective hearing, although the intention may be to make such an exemption. The honourable member also said that hearing aids that are sold to children can be used to hear something said in any part of a house. Any person who had good hearing could use a hearing aid to pick up sound, to the disadvantage of someone carrying on a conversation nearby. I consider that the Bill does not exempt this type of hearing aid.

Facilities should be made available to private investigators under certain conditions. Some persons bludge on insurance companies by claiming to have been involved in accidents, such as motor car accidents, or by claiming entitlement to workmen's compensation, and the only way in which the companies can check these claims is by engaging private investigators. People who make such claims place a bigger burden on their workmates in the long run by taking money under false pretences.

Mr. Broomhill: What's this got to do with the Bill?

Mr. EVANS: The honourable member has spoken about the right of a person to gain

information against someone who is taking money under false pretences. Another thing to which I object is that, although the penalty suggested for most offences is a maximum fine of \$2,000 or imprisonment for six months, members of the Police Force are given special permission to use hearing aids or seeing aids and if a member of the Police Force, who is in a position of trust, uses the information outside his normal duties or for some purpose not connected with his normal duties he is liable to a penalty of only a fine of \$500 or imprisonment for one month. I consider that the maximum penalty for an offence by a person in a position of trust who is allowed to use these devices to carry out investigations should be more severe.

Mr. Clark: Of course, he would lose his position, too.

Mr. EVANS: That does not matter.

Mr. Clark: But it is something.

Mr. EVANS: The person to whom permission to use the device was given would be in a position of trust. On the other hand, although we do not agree with the activities of persons whose whole way of life is crime, such persons are not in a position of trust, yet the maximum penalty provided for them is a fine of \$2,000 or imprisonment for six months. A person's son or daughter might use such a device in fun and yet be subject to a penalty of four times the fine and six times the gaol sentence applicable to an offence by a person in a position of trust. I object to this. I understand that the Attorney has a suggested amendment and, if he has, I hope he considers what I have said before he moves the amendment. A person who is occupying a position of trust and who is given the right to use these devices should not be treated more lightly if he commits an offence, even though he may be dismissed from his job. Indeed, there is no guarantee that such a person would lose his job.

I consider that the existing law covers the point raised by the member for West Torrens about the case of a person who records information in another person's bathroom and makes use of it over a radio programme. The honourable member will find that his Leader, in his opening remarks, said that this aspect, which involves trespass on private property, is covered by law. Therefore, there is no need to be concerned about that particular aspect. I consider that the right of the individual, especially within his own home, should be protected as much as possible. I know that hearing devices that generate their own power can

be fired for a distance of up to one mile into a tree, where they can record conversations by people within 50 yards of the tree. I also know that it is possible to swallow a pill that carries a transistor type of impulse that can be traced for a distance of half a mile.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You had better tell the Premier all about it.

Mr. EVANS: I know that this is possible and that it should be covered by law, but we must be sure that the law is just and that it will be interpreted in accordance with our intention. There is no need for the member for West Torrens to say that the Attorney accepted the Bill grudgingly just because he objected to certain facets of its drafting. The Attorney has the interest of the community and the individual at heart as much as has the Leader of the Opposition. I support the Bill in principle and, as it is mainly a Committee one, look forward to the debate in Committee.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I will not deal at length with the Premier's activity this afternoon. It was certainly embarrassing to anyone who watched him. I noticed the Attorney-General's embarrassment at the Premier's pronouncement. In the Attorney-General's second reading speech on the Bill he suggested that I had changed my position from the one I had taken before the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General when this matter was originally raised before that committee by the Attorney-General of New South Wales (Mr. McCaw). I have not changed my position. Mr. McCaw's position was that, as devices of this kind were available, he was concerned to empower the police in New South Wales to use them for the detection of crime and, therefore, he wanted legislation that would enable the Commissioner of Police to make use of bugging and intrusion devices. I was bitterly opposed to having such enabling legislation; my view then (and it remains so) was that the only way in which devices of this kind should be used is in those exceptional circumstances where, under close judicial surveillance, it would be thought proper in the interests of the community and for its protection to use them.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: That is not the case in Mr. McCaw's Bill.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: His Bill is similar to the one the Attorney-General has put down here re-writing the whole of this Bill. That is not maintaining the right of privacy: it is allowing the right of snooping by the Executive Government. It is essential

that we maintain in the community the physical rights of privacy that have previously existed simply because there have been physical restrictions on people's power to intrude on others. Now, because of the devices mentioned in the debate, it is not possible to maintain privacy unless we restrict those devices. The Premier, in his usual supercilious fashion, questioned the existence of devices of this kind, although they have been deposed to by his own members who evidently have no better liaison with him than Ministers have had on frequent occasions. I suggest to him and to others who may agree with the Premier's contentious remarks about bugging devices that they read the survey by Alan F. Westin of devices currently available. This is the standard work on the subject, and it was supplied to me by the Chicago Law School. Professor Norval Morris sent it, together with other material, to me, and I will give it to the Attorney-General if he is interested in it.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I should be delighted to see it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In order to ensure that these devices are not used, their possession must be prohibited and they must be prohibited in general. In my view, the only way in which they should be allowed either to be held or used is under judicial authority. It is not sufficient to prohibit, as the Victorian Act does, the mere use of the devices, because if their possession is allowed their use cannot be detected. The very nature of the devices is such that one cannot find out whether or not they have been used.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: You forgot to include prohibition against usage.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will come to that for the Attorney-General's benefit in due course. We must prohibit the possession of the devices. The prohibition of the possession of the devices in this Bill was taken from the Federal law of the United States of America, and I can provide the originals to the Attorney-General if he is interested in looking at them. However, evidently he is not, because he has not based his own drafting on the Federal law of the U.S.A. If, however, we provide that the Executive Government may simply license any person to possess these devices and to use them, we place in the hands of the Executive Government the very right to intrude on people's private lives, and this is something the Bill seeks to prevent.

I believe that people's private lives should be free from intrusion, not only by their neighbours but also by the Executive. After

all, freedom from intrusion by one's neighbours is important but freedom from intrusion by the Government is just as important, if not more so. Yet, what is proposed by the New South Wales Government, and now by the Attorney-General, is that the Executive Government will have a free hand in its own discretion to intrude on the private life of any citizen by the use of these devices.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: That is just not accurate.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is accurate.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: It's not accurate; you haven't read my amendments.

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

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney-General and the Leader cannot discuss the amendments at this stage.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It would be wrong to allow to the Attorney-General the right to authorize a person to use an intrusion device because he thought it would be in the public interest and in the interest of the prevention of crime to do so, because in those circumstances he would be acting not subject to judicial authority but entirely according to his executive opinion.

Mr. Broomhill: His personal judgment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. That is not sufficient. I do not propose that that sort of power should be put in the hands of the present Attorney-General or of any future Attorney-General. The Government has not so far shown itself to be so concerned with the private rights of citizens that it has always seen to it that their rights to private activity were maintained. That was evident enough in the scientology legislation that was passed in the last session. The right of people to have in their own houses and to carry on in their own houses activities which were suitable to them and which involved no direct harm to anyone else is not something that this Government saw fit to maintain. How are we to know that the Attorney-General, if power of this kind were given to him, would not authorize police officers to use bugging devices to find out whether scientology was being carried on somewhere in a private house?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader should realize that he cannot discuss amendments.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Speaker, I am referring to this only because the Attorney-General chided me at the opening of his speech with having changed my position on this matter by introducing this Bill. I have not changed my position: I opposed provisions

of that kind when they were first mooted before the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General, and I remain opposed to them because they are completely opposed to the principles of this Bill, which maintain the rights of privacy and the denial of the rights of the Executive to snoop. I certainly will never be a party to any action of this House that puts in the hands of Executive Government of any complexion the right to use these devices at its whim and in its discretion.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Not even subject to Parliamentary control?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No; indeed, the Parliamentary control that is proposed is ludicrous. I cannot discuss it in detail now, but it is completely absurd.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader had better leave this point until we are in Committee.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, and I will deal with it at some length then.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: So will I.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I turn now to the specific points made by the Attorney-General. He criticized the definition of "visual intrusion device", and quoted the section as follows:

"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.

The Attorney said he thought the syntax was poor and that the phrase "surreptitiously and without the subject's knowledge" should be at the end of the definition. Apparently, the Attorney is not aware that it is normal syntax to use a phrase qualifying an infinitive immediately before the infinitive, rather than to split it.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Not when it causes confusion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It does not cause confusion, because it is obvious that the phrase qualifies the infinitive, and it would be extraordinary to put it at the end of the sentence, because it would then read:

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

I am afraid that does not add up at all well.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: In your opinion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The original sentence is perfectly proper. The Attorney-General continued and said, "My more serious objection to the definition is the phrase 'primarily designed'." He also said that there could be confusion between the intention of the designer and the inherent qualities of the device, because it could mean either. The phrase as used in the United States of America was obviously used to qualify the device itself, and from the very nature of the device the court is able to conclude what its primary purpose and design is for.

Mr. Broomhill: They have had no trouble in America with it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: None at all. Indeed, there is no trouble, because all the court has to do with most devices is to examine the device. If an olive, which is put in a martini glass, has been carefully constructed to contain a bugging device, there would not be much doubt in the court's mind that the design of the device was primarily to overhear or record conversations surreptitiously and without the knowledge of the person whose conversation was being overheard or recorded.

Mr. Clark: And not to flavour the drink.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, a person would not find it pleasant to munch on the olive. Where is the difficulty for the Attorney-General here? The drafters of the Bill in the United States of America who used this phrase did not find any difficulty in it. The Attorney-General is merely dredging up objections to no purpose whatever. However, he raised a real and proper objection when he said that the word "private" had been left out before "conversation". That is correct: it was wrongly left out and it should be included.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Full marks to you.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I thank the Attorney for drawing my attention to this fact. Unfortunately, when we copied the Victorian section that word was omitted. The Attorney-General then said:

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.

He said that I left out phrases in the Victorian Act that gave certain rights of publication of conversations listened to by one of the parties to a private conversation and recorded by the use of a listening device. I find the phrase in the Victorian Act too wide. Simply to say

that anyone can make use of devices in the public interest seems to me to be an extremely wide provision, for it is not capable of close judicial interpretation in these circumstances. I see no reason why it should not be confined to the circumstances to which I confined it in my draft, and the Attorney-General has not put up a case for altering that. The record of the Attorney-General's speech on August 27 in *Hansard* is as follows:

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.

Unfortunately, the Attorney-General did not read the rest of clause 5, because there the prohibition of possession relates to a certain class of listening device. There are other listening devices than those prohibited in clause 5 that are dealt with in the Bill. There are several listening devices whose possession is not prohibited but whose use improperly is prohibited, but the only prohibition of possession in relation to listening devices is for those that are primarily designed for bugging purposes. The only visual intrusion devices the Bill deals with are those that are also primarily designed for surreptitious surveillance purposes. Other visual devices are not dealt with in the Bill, simply because there would be no way of dealing with them. How can we prohibit the possession of a long-range camera? It would be impossible to do this; therefore, what has happened in the Bill (and the Attorney-General should have read it more carefully) is that we have used the Victorian provisions prohibiting the improper use of listening devices in general. We have prohibited the possession of certain kinds of listening device, namely, those primarily designed for bugging and snooping purposes, and we have prohibited the possession, sale or advertisement of, or dealing with, visual intrusion devices that are defined to be those primarily designed for surreptitious snooping; so there is a difference between listening devices (and the way they are dealt with in the Bill) and visual devices.

The Victorian legislation does not deal with visual devices at all; nor, as a matter of fact, does the United States legislation; it is only this Bill that does. It is quite clear from the

work that Westin has prepared that there are visual intrusion devices that need to be dealt with in addition to the oral intrusion devices. While they have not been dealt with in legislation elsewhere, we ought to deal with them here, and that is why the extra provision in relation to visual intrusion devices was included. But there is no effective way of prohibiting the use of visual devices that are not primarily designed in the way described, because the result then would be to prohibit the very sort of investigation about which the member for Onkaparinga was speaking a moment ago. The kind of visual devices that it would still be possible to use would be those which do not see through walls and which do not, in fact, intrude.

There is a difference in technique between visual intrusion devices and listening devices of such a nature that one can differentiate in the way that is provided in the Bill. This measure was prepared by us after months of investigation of the kind of devices involved, including the study of a whole series of propositions as to how to get around this particular situation.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I think my suggestion was probably easier and better.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I do not agree with that, because I believe a general prohibition of this kind is necessary, and I do not think it is sufficient merely to make a proclamation from time to time, because in many cases what we will be doing is to close the stable door after the horse has bolted. If we are going to make a proclamation relating to a particular device, we are going to have to be able to specify it with particularity, and in many cases the devices will be obtainable from overseas and in the possession of people here before we know what they are. It is better to have a general prohibition, and that is what we have provided here, just as it was provided in the United States.

Let me turn to the next criticism the Attorney makes, namely, that we will not be able to prohibit these articles because of the provisions of section 92 of the Constitution. With great respect to him, I suggest that in a section 92 case it must be shown that the trade concerned is in its nature interstate trade. The mere fact that we have prohibited something here does not necessarily mean that we are then faced with difficulties under section 92. This is a matter that I have faced in defences under section 92 before the courts. What would have to be shown is that the trade being dealt with is essentially interstate

in character, and I do not think this particular prohibition goes to that at all. Interestingly enough, of course, by what is foreshadowed in Committee, the Attorney-General disposes of his own objection in this particular matter.

Let me turn now to the next objection, namely, the objection to introducing into the court material obtained from an improper use of the devices. The Attorney-General is saying that this is altering the course of British law and following the course of American law. The American law, of course, is consequent on the provisions of the United States Federal Constitution, under which the Supreme Court has found that it is improper to use in a court evidence that has been improperly obtained and that the courts cannot be used to condone a breach of the law in the obtaining of evidence. True, our courts have not ruled in that way in this country, because there is no similar constitutional provision here; but that does not mean to say that it is wrong of us to make that provision in the law and to say to the courts, "You ought not to condone a breach of provisions such as this by accepting evidence which ought never to be obtained and which we say it is a crime to obtain."

I cannot believe that it is proper to say to police officers, or to anyone else, "Well, you are not allowed to obtain evidence in a certain fashion, but if you do obtain it in that way we will make use of it, because the evidence is there." I think that encourages breaches of the law on the part of law enforcement officers. I believe we should say that evidence should not be admissible if it has been improperly obtained. For instance, a police officer might break into a house, and when people ask him for a warrant he says he has one and he turns out not to have one, so he gets in unlawfully. He might obtain some evidence in the house, and that evidence might then be admitted. I do not believe it is proper for us to allow that, but that is the position before our courts today and I believe it is wrong. The courts cannot rule on it, because of the present decisions of superior courts. There has been no legislation to direct them in the matter, but I believe there should be. That position should be maintained here, so that we do not allow people to proceed to adduce evidence which they have obtained by a breach of the law. The Attorney-General said, "Well, why haven't you prohibited the use of visual intrusion devices when you have prohibited the use of listening devices?"

Of course, the usage sections in relation to listening devices went beyond the listening devices whose possession was prohibited, but this is not the case with visual intrusion devices. In fact, of course, it would be an offence to have in one's possession a visual intrusion device within the meaning of the Bill; and, in consequence, its use would be unlawful by the mere fact of its possession. Therefore, it was not necessary to put in a provision to this effect, but if the Attorney-General considers that it would be better to spell it out, I am happy to do so, although I do not think it adds anything.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: The argument you are now advancing is quite contrary to the one you put half an hour ago.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, it is not.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: You have a look.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: How is it?

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: You said that it was useless—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I fear that the Attorney has not appreciated what I said earlier, namely, that it is useless simply to prohibit the use of a device if one allows its possession widely, because, where these are bugging devices (that is, devices other than the normal apparatuses available to anyone in the way of a tape recorder, or something of this kind, or a camera with a long-range lens: in short, sophisticated bugging devices designed to be used surreptitiously), then one cannot find out whether people use them or not.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: My impression was that you put it the other way.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What must be done is to prohibit possession of devices of that kind. Once their possession has been prohibited, their use has been made unlawful. An additional provision makes the use of any ordinary device like a tape recorder unlawful in certain circumstances, but that goes beyond more sophisticated bugging devices. I hope the Attorney-General has appreciated the distinctions involved here because, unless the legislation goes specifically to the kinds of device with which we are dealing, it will fail.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: I am amazed that all this comes out of the Bill before the House, but I can see the intentions of the Leader.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Attorney-General is being his usual supercilious self.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: No; I am never supercilious.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Attorney-General is being supercilious, because nothing done by anyone else is ever any good, according to him. The Attorney-General then said that a police officer who went off duty but who stowed an authorized listening device in his drawer was committing an offence under the clause because he was not then actually on duty. Of course, the Attorney-General seems to forget that in the law of this State police officers are always on duty, whether in the office or not. The provision in the clause is similar to provisions enacted elsewhere that restrict the use of certain materials or activities to their use in the performance of duty. Stowing the thing away in a drawer is really acting in the performance of a police officer's duty when he is going home, so I really do not think that the Attorney-General, however much he would like to, could lay a complaint under the clause and get a conviction in the court, and I do not believe he thinks he could, either.

The Attorney-General then turned to the harassment clause of the Bill. He said that he found it difficult to know whether the clause, in saying "to annoy", was directed to intention or effect. Actually, it is directed to both. I think this is quite obvious from the clause, and I do not think it is necessary for us to spell out both; the use of an infinitive in these circumstances is perfectly in accordance with current drafting practice.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Do you fancy yourself as a draftsman?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, not particularly. I have always considered myself a somewhat rough draftsman but I am not above making the attempt, and it is an attempt that on occasions has received approval from those whose judgment I respect. There is not much else to answer in what has been said by members opposite, except that we had a comic episode from the Premier this afternoon in which he said I had "blandished" some document in this House. I am afraid I have not been guilty of doing any such thing (whatever he intended to suggest that I had done). I presume he was suggesting that I had produced in this House a copy of a document circulated by the Railways Commissioner to certain railway officers.

The Premier suggested that this was somehow an intrusion on the privacy of his Government—that by a visual intrusion device I had gained possession of a document that was a secret document that I ought not to have had.

That was not the case, and I have no qualms whatever in telling members opposite how the document came into my hands. It was circulated by the Railways Commissioner to a number of railway officers who were involved in a study. The officers became so alarmed at the contents of the document that they sent a copy of it to their union, which gave it to me. I do not know what all this nonsense was on the Premier's part—his waving his arms, posturing, and turning around to his supporters with a great big grin. No-one has been guilty of an intrusion of privacy: officers employed by this Government were concerned about their future employment and communicated to their union (which is there for their protection) what was being done in connection with matters affecting their future employment. Consequently, they communicated with members representing them in this House.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Did they do the same thing during the Labor Government's term of office?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: All I can say is that members opposite often claimed to have information from "inside" Government sources while they were in Opposition.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Answer the question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They did, didn't they?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have no knowledge on this subject, but at that time I did not accuse the Attorney-General of having a device, and I can assure him that I did not have a device, either. The point is that the matter was utterly irrelevant to the debate before the House, and it is the usual kind of nonsense that the Premier brings up whenever he wants to get out of something that is unfortunate for him. Otherwise, the Premier did not have much to say about this Bill because he did not know what was in it, he did not know what was in the Attorney-General's amendments, he had not read the Bill, and he had not read or listened to the speeches of his own members about it.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Who is being supercilious now?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Attorney wants me to catalogue a few remarks by the Premier I will do so, but we will not go into that: we will leave him alone. It is vital, if this measure is to have any effect at all in protecting the public, that we maintain people's rights to be free of the intrusion of

devices of this kind. This means that they should be free of their neighbours and free of snoopers, whether they be official or unofficial. The only way in which a man's home should be intruded upon is the way that the British common law has always maintained it can be intruded upon—by judicial warrant issued upon proper evidence, and on no other basis at all. Anything else is to put into the hands of those who would then have control of devices of this kind a discretion to snoop upon others on the ground that something may be happening that they may be able to prevent. That is not good enough.

Many people are eager on the subject of law enforcement, believing that law enforcement would be much easier and better if they knew what a great many private conversations consisted of. I saw this when I was a Minister of the Crown, and I am certain that Ministers opposite have seen it, too. It is not good enough. Not all Ministers of the Crown of any Party have ever been so concerned with private interests that they are not prepared to allow officers to do that sort of thing on occasion. This is what this Legislature and this State should set its face against. This is what I have set out to do in the Bill, which says that we are out to maintain the rights of privacy and not the rights of snooping. I ask members to support the Bill and to maintain that principle throughout its remaining stages.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Commencement."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): As some members have further amendments that they want to get drafted to put on the file, I ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ELIZABETH TRANSPORT

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. D. A. Dunstan:

That, in the opinion of this House, feeder bus services in Elizabeth and any direct service to Adelaide should be undertaken by the Municipal Tramways Trust.

(Continued from September 24. Page 1737.)

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): On reading through *Hansard*, I find that I have made the points I set out to make. Although I did not require it, I thank the House for giving me leave to continue my remarks. I conclude by saying that I completely support the motion.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I do not intend to make a lengthy speech on the Leader of the

Opposition's motion. I think all members know precisely what lies behind its wording. If the motion were passed it would mean that, in effect, the private company that now operates a bus service from Elizabeth to Adelaide would be dismissed and the Tramways Trust would take over the service. All this would happen despite the fact that Transway Services Proprietary Limited has pioneered the intra-Elizabeth service over many years. Beginning this service in 1957, it has provided most excellent transport to the public at Elizabeth. The member for Gawler admitted this. While he was speaking, I think he had a touch of conscience about Transway in that his Party was forcing him to support a motion that would, in effect, destroy the assets Transway had built up and cause its employees to be dismissed.

The whole motion is based on the political thinking of the Party opposite, whose policy is based on Socialism. To members opposite, providing a good transport service for the people of Elizabeth is merely secondary to providing a service based on some public transport system. It matters not to members opposite whether the people of Elizabeth really get a service, so long as any service provided is provided by some Government authority. We do not have to think very deeply to realize that employees of the Tramways Trust would, in all probability, be members of a trade union that made compulsory levies to the Labor Party. The proprietors and employees of Transway would not be trade unionists and, quite possibly, they might contribute, although not compulsorily but voluntarily, to the Liberal and Country League. We see that the motive that lies behind the motion is purely political and is not concerned at all with providing an improved service to the people of Elizabeth.

I commend the Minister of Roads and Transport for giving the people of Elizabeth a road bus service to Adelaide. I believe he has done the right thing by offering the service, which has been accepted by Transway, to the company that has served the people of Elizabeth so well over the 12 years its service has operated. I turn now to the speech of the member for Gawler last week. I have great respect for the honourable member, whose speeches are usually constructive and practical, but in this case he was struggling to make out a valid case for the substitution of a Tramways Trust service for the service provided by Transway.

Mr. Rodda: Perhaps he had his eye on the future.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: That could be so, because he knows that the people of Elizabeth really want a road transport service. I fully agreed with the member for Gawler when he said:

I believe that a bus service to Elizabeth, and indeed farther than Elizabeth, has been justified and necessary for many years.

In other words, the member for Gawler is implying that the bus service should be extended to Gawler and, if he is, I wholeheartedly support him because if there is one policy that I will put forward to the people at the next election it will be that there should be a proper road service between Gawler and Adelaide. I think the people of Gawler will support that policy, and I can see that in his own mind the honourable member is developing such a policy. I support the honourable member's advocacy for the extension of the bus service as far as Gawler, but I do not know what the railways union will think about it.

Mr. Hudson: You are a very clever member, aren't you?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: No, I am not; I am merely a simple farmer who brings his farming skills and experience to this House. I trust that honourable members opposite want me to bring my business skills to this House. Apparently no member opposite has such skills, because not one of them has demonstrated that he can run his own business properly, let alone the affairs of the State. We all know the mess that the Labor Government made of the State finances during the three years it was in office.

The member for Gawler said (at page 1735 of *Hansard*) that it was estimated that the Railways Department would lose at least \$100,000 a year in revenue as a result of the bus service to Elizabeth. I do not criticize him alone for saying that, because his Leader also mentioned that figure. However, the Leader did not offer any evidence in support of his claim, and neither did the member for Gawler.

Let us think about the facts of this matter. Usually members opposite run hastily outside when I begin to speak but, as they are still in the Chamber, I would like to give them some information regarding railway finances. I should add that I did not introduce this subject: the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Gawler did. One can see how the Railways Department runs its affairs, an aspect that has an important bearing on any consideration of public transport services operating

between Elizabeth and Adelaide. I refer now to the 1966-67 Railways Commissioner's report, part of which states:

In general it could be said that revenue from freight and livestock traffic met its working expenditure, but that from passenger traffic did not. It is virtually impossible for the South Australian Railways to meet its costs while it is called upon to undertake so many unremunerative services which the community requires, but it is felt that appreciation of this fact is not wide spread.

These community services fall into two categories; passenger services, and certain of the freight services to remote areas. Over two-thirds of the suburban passengers are carried during the morning and evening peak periods with the result that the utilization factor of the equipment is correspondingly low. However, it is recognized that in the public interest the retention of these services is imperative.

In this respect I take issue with the Railways Commissioner. It is pointless for the railways to be running uneconomically when services can be operated by a road transport authority.

Mr. Hudson: You are going to make them even more uneconomic.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: No. If honourable members opposite, particularly the impractical member for Glenelg, would listen, I would tell him how the Railways Department could reduce its losses. The following appears on page 5 of the report:

Neither are the country passenger services attractive economically, while on certain branch lines the railways provide—and in most cases at an operating loss—the only regular transport service to these remote areas. In fact, it is significant that, since the virtual lifting of control over the transport of goods and livestock, not any other transport medium has sought to provide a regular service to those localities. On the other hand, when some reduction in the train service is contemplated, protestations inevitably follow. The continued operation of these socially necessary services is recognized, but it would appear to be not unreasonable if their costs were directly underwritten by the community. In this way, the viable operations of the railways would not be clouded by the inevitable losses sustained by the community services.

If members opposite, including the member for Edwardstown, share with me a burning desire to make the railways more efficient, they would appreciate that its losses would diminish if passenger services were reduced.

Mr. Virgo: But I will not juggle the report as you have.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The member for Edwardstown will have an opportunity to make his contribution to the debate later. I should like to hear how he will refute my statement that the reduction of passenger services will

reduce losses, because, if he tries to claim that, he will be refuting the Commissioner's report. I can see that the honourable member is becoming quite agitated; I feel sure I am inspiring him to make a good speech.

Let us examine the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report, which members opposite had some six or eight months before the last election, although they have not got the decency to admit it. I refer to page 58 of that report, where details of the passenger traffic between Elizabeth and Adelaide are given. We find here the base year figures of 1965, and I suppose that for all practical purposes railway patronage has not altered much since then. The daily in-bound railway passengers from Womma station totalled 666; from Elizabeth station they were 610, and from the Elizabeth South station they were 799, making a total figure of about 2,000 people using the service between the three Elizabeth stations and Adelaide daily.

Bearing in mind that every trip made on a suburban passenger service costs the taxpayer 25c, and bearing in mind that most of the people using the service between Elizabeth and Adelaide travel twice daily, it is costing the taxpayers of this State about \$1,000 a day to provide a rail service to Elizabeth. On the other hand, if the service were closed, which is something that members opposite could well consider, the taxpayers would be saved that \$1,000 a day. Of course, as I do not have the benefit of a detailed survey of the area, I cannot be dogmatic about the precise savings. I hope that members opposite think about this matter and do some research for themselves so that they will realize the enormous drag of the Railways Department on the State's finances.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must speak to the motion.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I point out that the bus service the Hall Administration has given the people of Elizabeth is costing the taxpayer nothing in direct subsidy. This point is worth stressing, and I hope the passenger services now being provided by Transway Services Pty. Ltd. will go on from strength to strength because, if the people of Elizabeth indicate that they have a preference for road transport, the taxpayer generally will be saved the heavy contributions that support the present railway service. Judging by the silence of members opposite, I have made a very telling case; even the member for Edwardstown has been silenced.

Mr. Virgo: Only out of deference to the Chair.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not see the name of the member for Edwardstown in the motion. The honourable member must return to the motion.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The member for Gawler accused the member for Mitcham of displaying an attitude that was out and out political. I could not understand his comment because I believe that the only reason for introducing the motion was political in its base. I believe that the reason the motion has been moved is to increase the number of Municipal Tramways Trust employees. I commend the M.T.T. for its efficient organization, and when I compare it with the Railways Department I realize what efficient management can accomplish in the field of transport. I suggest that the reason why the Australian Labor Party is opposed to Transway is that it is a private organization and as the Labor Party's philosophy is Socialism at any price it condemns Transway. I also suggest that as the principals of the organization are not likely to be captive trade union members, the reason for the Opposition's advocacy of M.T.T. expansion is to increase A.L.P. political political funds for election purposes.

I wish to commend the Minister of Roads and Transport for taking an active interest in the transport service for the people of Elizabeth, and I recall the favourable publicity he received when he travelled to Elizabeth by train one evening to see for himself the kind of facilities offered by the railways to the Elizabeth community. I was interested to see that the Leader, when making out a case for development of the train service to Elizabeth (and he got away from his M.T.T. advocacy), came up with the idea (and this will make the Opposition titter) of some sort of pick-a-back, I think, where the people of Elizabeth would be catered for by large numbers of little buses that would converge upon one of the Elizabeth railway stations. They would then be loaded on to flat top rail cars, and (the whole thing is ridiculous, of course) the whole train load of flat top railway waggons carrying the mini-buses would proceed to Adelaide. I presume the mini-buses would be disgorged at Mile End, if they were considered to be goods traffic, or at the Adelaide railway station, if they were considered to be passenger traffic: they would then radiate in various directions to distribute their loads.

I can see your expression of incredulity, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Leader would make out such a case. One can see how ridiculous the Leader's argument was. I have had many

mental pictures of people sitting in mini-buses mounted on top of flat top railcars, making their way from Elizabeth to the Adelaide railway station. We have not contemplated what would happen in the evening, with the same process in reverse, when the passengers would all mount their little mini-buses, the mini-buses would mount their flat top waggons, and home they would go from the Adelaide railway station to one of the stations at Elizabeth! I thought I should develop this theme to indicate how flights of fancy dominate the thinking of members opposite. I forget what the Leader called those flat tops.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Pallets.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes. That was the first time I had heard of palletized public transport. When they speak about moving into the airy-fairy field of capsules and pallets, we realize how members opposite think and how they bring their thinking to the enormous problem of transporting a large work force at a reasonable cost to and from Adelaide.

I do not want to embark on a long argument pointing out that members opposite had had the M.A.T.S. plan in their hands for some six months before the last State elections. I believe the Attorney-General went over this ground thoroughly. I have refrained from pointing out in detail that influential organizations in Elizabeth, including the sub-branch of the A.L.P. there, advocated some form of through bus service. I have noted with pleasure that the member for Gawler advocates an extension of the bus service beyond Elizabeth, and from that I presume he advocates an extension of the service from Adelaide through to Gawler. If he will come out and openly support such a service, it will be much appreciated by people living in the Gawler area.

Again, I say how disappointed I am that members opposite will follow their Socialist objects so far as to see a young company, Transway Proprietary Limited, destroyed. That is what the A.L.P. would like to do: it would like to destroy that company that has built up a fine service in recent years. Members opposite would like to see Transway employees dismissed, in the callous way that members opposite handle employees. I commend the Minister of Roads and Transport for giving the people of Elizabeth the road service for which they have asked for many years.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I fully support what the Attorney-General and the member for Light have said in such detail that I am left with little to say on this matter. The people of Elizabeth have been asking for this service for many years. Now, finally, they have it and the Opposition is saying, "We could not make this progress but somebody else has made it so we must criticize it somehow or other." So it advocates that the Municipal Tramways Trust should operate this service instead of this company, which has run an efficient service. Is it not the pattern right through the development of Adelaide, that the M.T.T. operates the old services in the inner part of the city and, as development has progressed, private bus operators have provided services in the newer areas, and they have made them pay in areas where fewer passengers a mile are carried than in the areas covered by the M.T.T.? This is despite the fact that the M.T.T. has been made into an efficient organization with Government support over recent years.

Mr. Freebairn: In past years more than recently.

Mr. McANANEY: Yes. In 1967-68, \$500,000 was written off the capital that the M.T.T. owed the Government. Its advances from the Government have been written down considerably, and last year it made a loss of only \$41,214.

Mr. Freebairn: And don't forget that the M.T.T. carries 80 per cent of the people in Adelaide using public transport.

Mr. McANANEY: This shows how efficiently private buses operate compared with M.T.T. buses.

Mr. Clark: Especially if they are subsidized.

Mr. McANANEY: The feeder bus service was subsidized, according to the Minister of Roads and Transport, who said that the loss had nearly disappeared in that area. The licensed buses that operate on the outskirts of Adelaide (correct me if I am wrong) are not subsidized, and I do not think the service in from Elizabeth will be subsidized.

Mr. Clark: The existing service is managing without a subsidy, but the new service will be subsidized.

Mr. McANANEY: I accept any corrections made.

Mr. Clark: I was modest: I said the loss would be \$100,000, but I think it will probably be about \$150,000.

Mr. McANANEY: I will check that to make sure. The honourable member is not talking about the loss to the railways?

Mr. Clark: No; that is the loss to the Government.

Mr. McANANEY: The licensed service carries an average number of 2.53 passengers a traffic mile, compared with the M.T.T. figure of 4.25, yet the service can pay its way on operations on the outskirts. I cannot see any reason why the other bus will not ultimately do as well. I do not consider that the M.T.T. should operate this service. Private services have shown that they can give reasonable service profitably. Although it has been said that old buses will be used, the Attorney-General has stated the years in which the buses were purchased by the trust, so it can be seen that they are fairly up to date. I am confident that this operator will provide a good service to the people of Elizabeth at a lower cost than that at which the railways could provide it. Therefore, I oppose the motion.

Mr. VIRGO (Edwardstown): The member for Light has told us why the Government really opposes this measure: because Transway contributes financially to the Liberal Party's funds.

Mr. Freebairn: That would be sufficient reason, anyway.

Mr. VIRGO: That is an admission by the Government of the worst malpractice of all time. The Government is using its position in this House to promote a firm for no other reason than that it contributes to Liberal Party funds. That is how this Government is running the affairs of this State.

Mr. McAnaney: Where do you get that from?

Mr. VIRGO: I get it from listening to the member for Light and, if the member for Stirling had his ears open, he would have heard it, too. The honourable member said that he and the Government were supporting Transway because Transway supported Liberal Party funds.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: He didn't say anything of the sort.

Mr. VIRGO: He did, and the Treasurer knows that. A check of *Hansard* will show that the honourable member said it. The Treasurer was not here. If he had been, he would have shuddered when he heard it. That was the reason the member for Light gave: he said that Transway financially supported the L.C.L.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: He didn't use those words in that context.

Mr. VIRGO: The Treasurer may say that, but he knows at the bottom of his heart that the member for Light did say it.

Mr. Hudson: The member for Light, by interjection, agreed with you.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes, the member for Light agrees that he said it but the Treasurer says that he did not say it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr. VIRGO: It is a disgrace that the business of the State is run for the benefit of a firm that contributes to Liberal Party funds.

Mr. Freebairn: It's a company, not a firm.

Mr. Hudson: What is the difference?

Mr. VIRGO: A rose by any other name is just as sweet. We ought to be clear about another aspect of the speech by the member for Light. I do not think he was too pleased last Thursday when he read the report of the Electoral Commission, and he has been trying to do some pre-electioneering. However, he is wasting time, because he will not be preselected.

Mr. Broomhill: I can tell you who will.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes, I can, too, but I will not do so.

Mr. Hudson: Whom do you think he will come up against?

Mr. VIRGO: I do not think I ought to put it in *Hansard*. I understand that the man's father has been prominent in the Army: I think he is a brigadier. The statements by the member for Light, with which the member for Stirling agrees, need clarification. The suggestion that, if the M.T.T. took over the service to Elizabeth, employees of Transway would be dismissed is utter rubbish and complete balderdash.

Mr. Hurst: It is a good job your pronunciation was correct.

Mr. VIRGO: It is. If the M.T.T. took over this service, does the member for Light think that it could be run with the same number of employees as were employed before?

Mr. Freebairn: No, because it is not going to run a service.

Mr. VIRGO: If the honourable member had his way, the railways and the M.T.T. would not run any services. He has made that plain this afternoon.

Mr. Freebairn: I would chop off the passenger services altogether.

Mr. VIRGO: This is the thin end of the wedge.

Mr. Venning: They wouldn't use the trains if they were free.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. VIRGO: That is the type of stupid interjection we get from a stupid member. The member for Light threw out some sort of challenge for us to disprove. He said that

cutting out the passenger services would reduce the railway loss. How stupid can one get! If we cut out services, of course we would cut out loss. If we cut out the service altogether we would not need to pay \$14,000,000 a year to the railways, and that is what the member for Light and his glorious Minister of Roads and Transport are trying to do. They have set as their target the smashing of the railways in their three years in office. Thank God they have only a little more than 12 months to go, and I do not think they will achieve their objective. The remnants of the South Australian Railways will be sufficient to enable the railways to be repaired and restored to their rightful place.

Mr. Hudson: By how much would you reduce the debt charges if you cut out the railways altogether?

Mr. VIRGO: That is where the losses are incurred.

Mr. McAnaney: You would take money from schools to do this, I suppose.

Mr. Clark: The Government is doing that already.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. VIRGO: I wish the member for Stirling would go back to sleep, because every time he open his mouth he puts his foot right in it, as the Premier did when replying to a question this afternoon. The honourable member has foot and mouth disease. As the member for Light has been kind enough to draw attention to the portion of the Railways Commissioner's report that suits his case, I think the House ought to be made aware of the whole report. The Commissioner has consistently drawn attention to the necessity to run railway services and has said that the cost of providing these services ought to be a general charge on the community. In fact, I seriously suggest that, if Government members considered the matter, they would immediately realize that country areas would never have been developed had it not been for the pioneering work of the railways, which were run at a loss and paid for by the taxpayers. I notice that the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) is leaving the Chamber: I am sorry that he cannot take any more. It is significant that he quoted only the following part of the Railways Commissioner's report:

Neither are the country passenger services attractive economically, while on certain branch lines the railways provide—and in most cases at an operating loss—the only regular transport service to these remote areas.

That is where the honourable member stopped, but the report continues:

In fact, it is significant that, since the virtual lifting of control over the transport of goods and livestock, not any other transport medium has sought to provide a regular service to those localities. On the other hand, when some reduction in the train service is contemplated, protestations inevitably follow.

To be fair, the honourable member ought to have quoted the following part of the Railways Commissioner's report for 1967-68:

Reference was made in the report for the year 1966-67 to the socially necessary services which the department is called upon to operate and which tend to obscure other viable operations. It was then suggested that it would appear to be not unreasonable if the costs of these community services were directly underwritten by it.

These are the facts.

Mr. Freebairn: That was a judgment, not a fact: it was the Commissioner's own opinion. Why don't you read the report properly?

Mr. VIRGO: I have read the whole report. I realize that the Commissioner gives his own opinion (after all, it is his report) but he also refers to the United Kingdom.

Mr. Freebairn: I am a "Doctor Beeching" man myself.

Mr. VIRGO: The honourable member ought to take some Beecham's pills—they may do his liver some good.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: What about your own liver?

Mr. VIRGO: The Premier may need some Beecham's pills, too.

Mr. Freebairn: Close the uneconomic lines, I say.

Mr. VIRGO: I realize that the view of the member for Light is shared by the Minister and the Premier, although the Premier has never had the guts to say so. However, they fail to acknowledge that the South Australian Railways—or any railways—has an added cost that is not borne by private buses.

Mr. Freebairn: If you were running a business, wouldn't you try to make it pay?

Mr. VIRGO: The honourable member should try to listen and learn. He has never accepted (I do not think he is capable of absorbing it) that the taxpayers provide the roads upon which private transport is operated, but the railways have to provide and maintain their own roads.

Mr. McAnaney: Rubbish!

Mr. VIRGO: I suppose the honourable member thinks that all one has to do is wave a magic wand and a road will appear and then trains can run on it. Is that what he is saying?

Mr. McAnaney: Who pays for the road?

Mr. VIRGO: The taxpayers pay for the road used by private bus operators. The proportion of the tax paid by the private bus operators is nowhere near enough to compensate for the cost of building the road. The member for Stirling knows that as well as I do.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Stirling can have a conversation after dinner.

Mr. VIRGO: It is appalling that whenever a matter comes before this House Government members attempt to justify their own mistakes by casting aspersions on the previous Labor Government for what occurred during its term of office, when they know full well that more progress was made in those three years than was made in the previous 30 years.

Mr. Venning: You were not even here.

Mr. VIRGO: That applies to the honourable member, too. However, I was probably much nearer the scene of operations and had more knowledge of what was going on than the honourable member had. Another aspect ignored by Government members is that over 12 months ago the Minister of Roads and Transport, in a blaze of glory, issued the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report. When the report was issued the Premier tried to outdo the Minister: they competed to obtain the glory, but when they discovered there was no glory in it they ran for cover. They said that the M.A.T.S. Report was a comprehensive transportation report and that no alteration was to be made to it.

Where in the report is there a reference to running this bus service? Have the Government's fingers been so badly burned that it is not going on with any part of this, because it is departing from it piece by piece? The motion moved in this House by the Premier so mutilated the original M.A.T.S. plan that there was virtually no plan left. He asked the House to endorse it, and the House was silly enough to do so. Now, another attitude is being expressed that is contrary to the report: Government members are saying, "This is all right." However, they cannot have it every way.

The other point that must be considered is the intention of Transway in relation to this bus service. I have nothing against Transway: I do not even know the company. However, do not let members try to convince me that the people of Elizabeth will be satisfied with a bus service run by a firm that has bought buses rejected by the Tramways Trust as being of no further use. Is this

the type of service that will be provided? Under these conditions, is it any wonder that private operators can provide a service at a rate cheaper than that at which the Tramways Trust can operate? In other words, we have a philosophy from Government members that, if a service is to be provided by the Tramways Trust, it must be a first-class service but, if a service is to be provided by private enterprise, all that is necessary is that a few chairs be stuck on the back of a lorry, and that is good enough. Is that the attitude of the Government?

Mr. Clark: They treat the people as inferior.

Mr. Edwards: You're going to the other extreme.

Mr. VIRGO: I am not. The honourable member knows as well as I do that Transway is purchasing from the Tramways Trust, at special rates, a fleet of discarded buses to run this service.

Mr. Edwards: It said it would not use them.

Mr. VIRGO: Of course it said that, but surely the honourable member is not gullible enough to believe that that is the position.

Mr. Edwards: I'm not as gullible as you are.

Mr. VIRGO: I will not debate that.

Mr. Edwards: Don't make insinuations.

Mr. VIRGO: It is not good enough to provide the people of Elizabeth with a second-rate service. The provision of a proper service is of paramount importance. If, as the member for Light insinuates, the Government has no better reason for supporting Transway's running this service than that the company contributes to the L.C.L. funds, I think it is time the Government was exposed.

Mr. GILES (Gumeracha): I oppose the motion, and ask leave to continue my remarks. Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[*Sitting suspended from 5.59 to 7.30 p.m.*]

THE ESTIMATES

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 30. Page 1864.)

MINISTER OF WORKS

Minister of Works Department, \$25,124; Engineering and Water Supply Department, \$13,415,678—passed.

Public Buildings Department, \$9,056,366.

Mr. HUDSON: This year the allocation for maintenance expenditure, etc., on Education Department buildings has been increased by \$294,232. What steps is the Minister of Works taking to improve the service his department

gives to other departments, particularly the Education Department, on maintenance? It has been my experience that when maintenance work is required, such as on the cracked walls of the Darlington Primary School, it takes ages and ages for a report to be made and action taken. This deficiency is not of recent origin: it is one of long standing. It considerably inconveniences people using the buildings, and considerably damages the reputation of the Public Buildings Department. As a private member, the Minister probably had such experiences. Can he say, therefore, what has been done to rectify the matter?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE (Minister of Works): Active steps have been taken recently to solve the problem to a large extent, and this is one reason why the allocation for maintenance of school and hospital buildings, which is an important aspect of the maintenance work of the Public Buildings Department, has been increased by more than \$800,000. The allocation for the maintenance of police and court buildings, as well as that of other Government buildings, has also been increased.

Earlier I found that a considerable backlog had developed in the works department of the Public Buildings Department and that delays had occurred on occasion. I thought the best way to solve the problem was to expand the works branch of the department, and I have therefore taken steps to effect that expansion. This is now in the process of being done, with the approval of the Public Service Board.

As the Minister of Education and I have received many complaints from country schools, the Public Buildings Department has speeded up the decentralization of its operations. Some senior inspectors have been appointed to country districts, working from local offices and depots. In one or two places we have even set up sub-depots, from which the necessary work can be carried out more expeditiously than from Adelaide.

Headmasters of country schools have been authorized to have urgent minor repairs carried out and to spend relatively small sums on that work, the amount involved depending on the size of the school. The headmaster can engage a local tradesman to do the work rather than wait for a man to come from the departmental depot. This practice is being examined to see whether it can be extended to other sectors of the Public Service. Representations have been made to me about Government houses occupied by country teachers, and this matter is at present being examined.

In this department great expansion has occurred, is occurring and, I hope, will continue to occur, because the recommendations made to me by the Public Service Board have been only partly implemented: it will take some time to carry out the whole programme of expansion. We have received approval, and I hope we shall get further approval, for additional tradesmen for this department. The figures on these four lines indicate the extra activities to be engaged in by this department over and above the natural increase, because each day we have more buildings to care for as more schools and hospitals are built.

Mr. BROOMHILL: The carrying out of minor works at schools is a joke among parents because, whenever a wire door or a window screen is wanted or an incinerator needs to be shifted, it involves months of red tape, letters and visits from departmental officers. We must overcome these delays. The work that the department eventually does is satisfactory but the red tape is frustrating. I gather from the Minister's remarks that this policy does not apply to metropolitan schools. How much is a country headmaster authorized to spend? It seems that liaison exercised by school committees, headmasters and parents is not satisfactory. We are told constantly that there is no direct link between the schools and the Public Buildings Department, that people can telephone only the relevant section and cannot speak to a specific officer, asking him to visit the school quickly to avoid any delay in carrying out minor works. I ask the Minister whether he can be more specific about the alterations relating to the Public Buildings Department and the Education Department that he is considering to overcome these difficulties.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: Officers of my department and of the Education Department are having discussions at present to get closer liaison on these matters. Until now many delays have occurred because headmasters have had to submit requests for minor repairs through the Education Department. The avenues of communication are being reviewed, with the complete co-operation of the Minister of Education. As far as I know, the authority of headmasters to authorize works applies throughout the State.

Further, in the last 12 months I have authorized the construction of two additional Public Buildings Department depots in the metropolitan area, one in the northern suburbs and one in the south. Most of the work in

the metropolitan area was previously done from the Netley depot, involving the cumbersome and time-consuming procedure of having employees travelling between Netley and the school to do the work. One of the depots is almost completed, and the other is well on the way to completion. This is a further instance of decentralizing this work in the metropolitan area. Three permanent gangs now operate, and the work can be done quickly.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you know what amount headmasters can authorize?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: No, but I can give that information to the honourable member tomorrow.

Mr. Jennings: It's \$1,000, isn't it?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: No. I do not know where the honourable member got that figure from, but he has mentioned it in the Chamber. I intend to make a statement in about 10 days' time on the authority given to headmasters and on matters connected with other departments. This statement, the result of a study by departmental officers, also deals with decentralization.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Can you say where the depots have been established?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I think one is in the Tea Tree Gully area and the other is in the District of Edwardstown, but I have no details with me. In the country they are located at Mount Gambier, Port Pirie, and at one of the river towns. There are sub-depots at Kadina, Port Lincoln, Whyalla, Nuriootpa and Murray Bridge. There may be one or two others. The location of these principal depots shows the pattern of decentralization. I am perfectly aware of what are sometimes called trivial complaints, but they may be very important to the schools concerned. If members refer any such complaint to me I will see whether I can expedite the repairs.

Mr. VENNING: I recently attended a meeting of teachers at Jamestown at which I heard about their problems. Parents of the school-children, particularly members of school committees, who have worked arduously for the well-being of the schools, will be pleased to know that this change is being made. I commend the Minister for eliminating the red tape that for generations has been associated with the procedures of the Public Buildings Department. I trust that when we consider this line next year the Minister will be able to report a significant improvement in this respect.

Mr. HURST: The decentralization of the department's functions will be greatly appreciated by members of school committees. One problem is that of incomplete liaison between the Public Buildings Department and the Education Department, particularly in respect of minor jobs. The Director of the Public Buildings Department should not have to be troubled with queries about minor jobs. Closer liaison would mean greater efficiency. Sometimes it takes two or three months to get a small job done, although some jobs may be done more promptly. Members of school committees, who raise much money by their voluntary efforts, are often not considered in respect of the prompt effecting of repairs. Officers of the Public Buildings Department should hold regular meetings with officers of the Education Department to effect closer liaison between the two departments. I am sure that school committees will co-operate with the officers concerned in solving the problems to which I have referred.

Mr. McANANEY: I commend the Government for increasing the sum available for spending on the maintenance of school buildings. On receiving a letter regarding the Goodwood Boys Technical High School, the member for Onkaparinga and I visited the school and looked at the things complained about in the letter. Apart from the general rebuilding of two school buildings to provide more space, the expenditure of a small sum would mean a great deal to this school.

One bookkeeping item in the Estimates could be improved. Sums to be spent on Education Department buildings appear in other places in the Estimates, and I believe a contra entry could be made and these sums transferred to the Education Department section. This would eliminate differences of opinion that have occurred between the South Australian Institute of Teachers and the Minister on the proportion of total expenditure spent on education in each State. As this type of thing has been done in some other instances in the Budget, I believe it should be done in this case.

Recently, with more money available for school building, schools are beginning to be replaced. As a member of the Public Works Committee, I have seen new toilets approved for a school only shortly before that school is replaced. A priority list for the replacement of schools should be compiled, and then we could avoid spending thousands of dollars in erecting a toilet block shortly before a school is replaced, or in erecting a toilet block in the wrong place at a school that is to be rebuilt

soon after. When I visited the Jervois school recently, I saw that it had the same desks as it had when it was opened. However, within a month of my raising the matter with the Public Buildings Department, new desks were provided in two rooms.

I commend the Government for the additional expenditure on this line. This Government has raised every item of school expenditure to a level greater than was reached in any of the three years before it took office.

Mr. Hudson: You know that is not true.

Mr. McANANEY: I have given up the member for Glenelg as a lost cause. I used to admire him because I thought he was always accurate in his figures. However, now that he is in Opposition he is not facing up to facts and figures. Perhaps it is because he despairs of being in anything but the Opposition for years. The honourable member is trying to mislead the public. The fact is that more money is being allotted for education. All members on this side hope that the position will be even further improved, but we cannot (as the Opposition suggests we should) make bigger losses on the railways and waterworks and then say that there must be more for education. We must get these things straight and not have money diverted into making up losses incurred by people who are not producing any useful service to the community. If we can do that, we will have more money for education.

We have had letters from teachers and from the Institute of Teachers saying that we must re-allocate our finances. Well, if we could save the money that is now being lost on public services and provide an alternative service for people to use, we would have enough money for education. We believe there must be more money for education, but it is necessary to get down to sound business principles in our budgeting and to see that we are not wasting money. We would be wasting money if we followed the Opposition's suggestions.

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Stirling claimed that the Government had increased expenditure on education on every line. He referred to the need for a planned programme of replacement of school buildings, yet what planning there has been in relation to this has had to be postponed because of the cut in this Government's expenditure on school buildings. That can be found from the Loan Estimates. In my district only one school has been replaced, namely, Glenelg. I badly need another school replaced, one that has been on the books since a fire occurred there in

1964. However, its replacement has had to be postponed, and the same is true in respect of the replacement of school buildings all over the State.

If the honourable member cares to examine the expenditure on new buildings and minor additions, which we discussed before, he will find that either it has been reduced or the Treasurer's figures are a deliberate misrepresentation of the position. I do not believe that there has been a misrepresentation by the Treasurer: I believe that his figures are correct and that they show what I have stated to be the position. I should like to ask the Minister just how much on the buildings line is for extra maintenance. We all know that we can never increase these sums to the extent that is necessary, particularly because the losses on the railways have increased by \$3,000,000 since this Government has been in power. This is the sound business practice referred to by the member for Stirling! Apart from that, although there is a significant increase in the grant for the maintenance, etc., of education buildings it is partly maintenance and partly minor additions, alterations, furniture, furnishings, etc. To some extent there is a capital item or semi-capital item mixed up with this, and it is not altogether clear whether the line necessarily implies an increase in maintenance expenditure.

I have raised with the Minister by way of question the position at the Brighton schools. The primary school has used the new building since it was erected some years ago, and one of the old buildings, which is still sound in structure and has many years of useful service to contribute, is used by the infants school. It is a two-storey building and currently houses the infants school in which the methods of teaching involve much activity work and, therefore, unless the floor coverings are fairly soundproof, the problem of noise being transmitted from one room to another is significantly increased.

Problems are also experienced at this school with dirty floors, and if some kind of thick linoleum could be placed on its floors it would be of great assistance. Problems are also experienced with lighting in the old rooms of this building, and improvements need to be effected in this respect. The parents believe that the building can serve usefully as an infants school so long as the necessary improvements are made to it, and any money spent in improving the building would greatly benefit the quality of the work that the teachers at the infants school perform.

I should also like to raise the matter of the planting of school ovals and the development of school grounds. It is now the policy of the Education Department (which policy was introduced by the Hon. Mr. Loveday during his term of office) that the provision of school ovals is made part of the contract for new schools. The idea of this is that the first children who go to a new school should not be penalized through the lack of adequate facilities, including ovals, grounds, libraries, etc., as has been the case in the past. One example is the Glengowrie High School, the building of which was commenced in 1967 and completed at the end of the second term last year. The playing fields were established, in part, over the last summer period, although the planting of seed by the contractor was done a little late in the summer.

As a result of certain problems that have arisen with the bore water that has been used, further arrangements have been made with the contractor to provide better drainage and to put further work into the development of this ground. As a consequence, the playing areas have not been handed over to the school, which has now occupied the new buildings for over a year. When the planting of ovals is made a part of the original contract for the building of a school, it is upsetting to find that, more than a year after the buildings have been completed and the school occupied, the playing areas are still not available for use. Some change in the department's policy in the letting of school contracts is necessary. Will the Minister examine this matter to see whether improvements can be made?

A further example is the Brighton Boys Technical High School, which was completed in 1967. The playing fields there were not part of the original contract, the school already being under construction when the new policy was adopted. Work on the playing fields started in 1967 but, because of delays, they are only now ready for use, and this is the third year of that school's existence. When new schools are built, it is important that their first students should, as far as possible, have the facilities available to them that they would have had if they had gone to an established school.

An improvement would result if more attention were paid to the time at which contracts were let for the sowing of grassed areas. Problems have been experienced at schools in my area where contracts have been let towards the end of the grassing season, when closer attention to administration would have

resulted in the letting of the contract some four to six weeks earlier. In the case of the Dover Gardens Girls Technical High School, there was considerable delay in the letting of the contract for the sowing of grass there. These delays are particularly aggravating to the school committees and the high school councils, and it places the children at a disadvantage.

What is the department now doing about the Samcon schools? I understand there has been a drastic change in policy, that the department now views Samcon schools a little less favourably than previously. While one or two improvements in design could be made, I think the general principles are excellent. We are reaching the stage when we shall see the consequences in particular years of different rates of population growth. This is noticeable in the Brighton area now where the number of children enrolling in the infants school is declining, and is expected to continue to decline.

Over a period of 20 years or more, as a new suburb is developed, young families move in and a new school is built. Enrolments can change considerably. If a permanent building is provided in the first instance to cater for enrolment at the time the suburb is established, before long the school is too big for the number of children attending. Then the department's only recourse is to try a zoning system to bring children from a wider area to the school. The flexibility of the Samcon construction is appealing, because it provides the ability to add to or subtract from a school and still leave it attractive and appealing to the eye. Governments have been loath to replace temporary classrooms because the department has not been sure about future enrolments. These temporary wooden classrooms are unsatisfactory and unsightly.

Mr. Broomhill: And they're not too comfortable for the teachers.

Mr. HUDSON: No. If they become overcrowded, a teacher cannot get to the back of the room. Whatever one says about good teachers being able to teach in any circumstances, these wooden buildings make the job of teachers more difficult and they are unsightly and take up too much space. At both Brighton High School and Seacombe High School temporary classrooms cover such a large area that no further classrooms can be built without encroaching on the playing areas. One reason for providing new wings at both schools is that they economize on space. I should like the Minister to comment on what the department is doing about Samcon construction

schools and what changes in design are being planned consequent on teachers' criticism of this type of school. Although these criticisms are not serious, they need attention.

I also ask the Minister what consultative procedures will be established to try to get a regular communication channel from teachers to the Public Buildings Department. This is particularly important regarding design and I know that it presents a difficulty because of administrative problems in both the Public Buildings Department and the Education Department. Nevertheless, it is important to the morale of teachers that they feel that their criticisms will be considered, and teachers want to have open to them a channel so that general criticisms on design problems can be considered, and adopted if the case is reasonable. This is one way in which the general morale of teachers can be improved.

Mr. FERGUSON: I was very pleased to hear the Minister say that provision would be made for headmasters to arrange for certain repairs to school buildings. Earlier this session I reluctantly criticized the Public Buildings Department, particularly in connection with repairs to school buildings and school residences. I did so only after making several inspections and receiving complaints from teachers living in certain residences in my district. During my inspections I was informed that no reply had been received to requests that had been made up to 18 months previously.

I hope that this procedure will be extended to enable headmasters to arrange for repairs to school residences. Members will realize that little things can go wrong in the home that must be fixed up quickly. School committees have taken much interest in seeing that repairs to school buildings are made, but they do not so often take such interest in repairs needed to school residences. Often the headmaster or the teacher living in the residence requests the Public Buildings Department to effect the repairs.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Through the Education Department.

Mr. FERGUSON: Yes. Although some of these repairs are only minor, they are nevertheless necessary. Local tradesmen would often welcome the opportunity to make these repairs.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: When I was Minister of Works I found that a greater degree of co-operation existed between the Public Buildings Department and the

Education Department than between any other departments in the Public Service. People who are critical should remember that we are spending public money. Each department must consider how it can spend its allocation as effectively as possible.

Mr. Venning: What about red tape?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member should not be too critical because one of these days he may have to sit in a Ministerial chair—accidents do happen! For 33 consecutive years I have served as a member of school committees and school councils. I have served on the executive of the South Australian Public Schools Committees Association, so I know something of what is required in schools. I know, for one thing, that the number of students to be catered for is growing. Because of this the Woodville Primary School has had to be patient. At that school the toilets are so far from the classrooms that, when a child asks for permission to leave the classroom to go to the toilet, the teacher always wonders whether the student is using this as an excuse to dodge a lesson, because it takes so long for a student to reach the toilet. The Minister of Education agrees that this is a problem school and I hope Woodville will not be forgotten when replacements are considered.

I am greatly pleased with the continuing decentralization in the Public Buildings Department. This programme was commenced while I was Minister, and some carpenters and plumbers in country towns thought they might lose work through the scheme. I hope the Minister will give an assurance that the department does not intend that this will happen but intends to put work in the hands of these people and see that the work is done promptly. A separate department within the department has been suggested, but I hope this will never eventuate, because it would be costly and ineffective, as it would result in much duplication of plant and so on. I believe the present system should be retained with improvements to continue to be made as they have been made over the years.

God forbid that teachers should be able to suggest alterations to plans after they have been finalized. I remember when we were trying to get a technical school at Croydon. After we had battled for years, the school was finally approved, but there were immediately complaints about the design, and the building was delayed for eight months while some alterations could be made to the design. When the first headmistress was replaced, the second

headmistress complained about the changes that had been made, saying that she would have preferred the school the way it had been planned originally. Headmasters and headmistresses change, but the school remains. At present schoolteachers, particularly headmasters, are encouraged to make recommendations, which are always considered at the highest level in both the Public Buildings Department and the Education Department. However, to ask for comments after the plan has been completed causes delays. Will the Minister of Works give an assurance that decentralization in his department will not prejudice local firms and tradesmen?

Mr. WARDLE: I assure the member for Hindmarsh that local builders and tradesmen are being used, at least in my district, to do these jobs to which he referred. I applaud this practice of decentralization with regard to jobs on public buildings. I think one important thing is that a headmaster has the ability to get jobs (annoying jobs, often) done without very much trouble. Recently, I visited one school in my district where the headmaster was doing just this. He had a couple of local tradesmen there, and these jobs were being measured up and planned.

I have visited the decentralized office of the Public Buildings Department in my own town, and what was obvious to me was that we must in the future spend more money on staffing these centres. In a district that goes to the Victorian border on the east and to the metropolitan area on the west and includes Kangaroo Island, it is obvious that with a staff of only about three men it is impossible to take care of the multiplicity of jobs that need to be done in that area.

Mr. Virgo: You are saying that there should be more money for education.

Mr. WARDLE: I have never said anything else. If the honourable member cares to check the speech I made here on this subject a couple of weeks ago, he will see that I appreciate the needs of education. It is obvious that we must expect to spend more money on these decentralized areas where these local jobs are being done.

The Minister of Works told us a short while ago that a report he was preparing on what has been done in these decentralized areas would be ready in about 10 days or a fortnight. Can he say whether any statistical information can be given regarding the jobs that have been carried out since the inception of this scheme of decentralization compared with those done during previous years when

the Public Buildings Department was one complete unit? I have gathered an impression about this that may be completely wrong. The headmasters of many of the schools have doubted whether they have got additional work done as a result of the scheme to provide local departmental workmen. Perhaps, also, it could be that there has been such an accumulation of these small jobs over the years that the decentralized group has been doing its utmost to catch up with this accumulation of work and has accomplished its task. Could the Minister make this clear in his report?

Mr. RYAN: I seek clarification of the line "Preliminary investigations on projects not proceeded with", in respect of which it appears that the Government has millions of dollars to throw away. In 1968-69, \$15,000 was allocated and \$19,223 was spent. This year the allocation is more than double the amount spent last year and, if we follow the pattern of the previous year, this year we will spend perhaps \$50,000, although only \$40,000 is allocated. It appears that Parliament is voting money to be spent on something that will never happen. I hope the Minister can give a satisfactory explanation.

Mrs. BYRNE: I refer to the line "Education buildings". In the Barossa District are the Modbury Primary School and the Modbury South Primary School, and another school, which was formerly called the Clovercrest school, is now named the Modbury West school. Even more recently, another school, to be named the Modbury North-West Primary School, is to be built.

I recently visited the Modbury Primary School, and while I was there a Public Buildings Department workman arrived, only to realize that he should have been at the Modbury South Primary School. Could consideration be given to calling these schools by different names which I could perhaps suggest to the Minister?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: What I do not comment on now will be taken into account and investigated. I admit that in some cases a better type of floor covering is needed. When I was overseas earlier this year, I examined new designs for small schools, the first of which are now coming off the production line. Many of those designs included floor coverings. This led not only to the cleaner operation of the building but also to a quieter and more comfortable and intimate atmosphere, particularly in the junior grades. This matter is now being examined closely to see whether it cannot be expanded.

The member for Glenelg's points about school ovals will be noted. As regards Samcon construction, rather than that programme diminishing, additional designs and layouts are now being investigated to see whether we can expand the idea into a more sophisticated and advanced type of building than we have at present. Samcon schools are being built in many parts of the State. About 12 months ago I issued a booklet explaining the design and principles of that type of school. We are now trying to provide Samcon schools with facilities other than primary classrooms, which have been provided so far. It is a logical and healthy development to use the Samcon principle for a better type of school.

Wooden classrooms are with us, have been with us for years and, I suppose, will be with us for many more years. In the last 12 months, greater use has been made of the transportable classroom, which has the advantage of being, in many cases, a better type of building; and it is fire-proof. Also, it can be easily removed when the peak enrolment at a school is passed, which cannot be done with some wooden classrooms. Also, portable schools require less maintenance than do wooden classrooms. I support the member for Hindmarsh (Hon. C. D. Hutchens) in his comments on the officers of the Public Buildings Department. Today, that department boasts a first-rate team of designers and planners, who have devised a system of close harmony and liaison with their opposite numbers in the Education Department. They work closely together. On capital works we have now evolved a five-year schedule, which enables us to plan, both financially and physically, with more certainty. I compliment the officers of both departments.

Whilst the Public Buildings Department must plan, design and construct for all Government departments, about half of this work is devoted to the Education Department. The evolution of this long-term planning is an important aspect of the close harmony between the two departments. It enables us more readily to get projects, particularly those that must be submitted to the Public Works Committee for investigation, to the planning stage.

The member for Yorke Peninsula has referred to schoolhouses: this matter is being investigated. I will try to get a report for the member for Murray on decentralization and the work that is being carried out. The member for Hindmarsh correctly commented on the effect on country towns of carrying out work departmentally. I emphasize that the departmental work is to supplement, not

to replace, the work of local tradesmen. We engage local tradesmen wherever possible.

Mr. Hughes: It's not always possible to get them.

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: No. In some trades there are shortages in the department. The provision for preliminary investigations to which the member for Port Adelaide has referred varies considerably from year to year, and I will get particulars of the projects involved in the variation this year. The honourable member, as a member of the Public Works Committee, would know that often alternative designs are prepared and worked on before one design is submitted to the committee and the other proposals are written off. Further, a design may be changed if, during construction of a project, a particular need ceases to be pressing.

The member for Barossa has referred to what she suggests is confusion because many schools have similar names. I know that this has occurred at Whyalla. I will refer the matter of nomenclature of schools to the Minister of Education, whose prerogative it is to name schools. Any other matters that I have not dealt with will be considered.

Mr. EDWARDS: It is desirable that headmasters be authorized to have works at country schools carried out without reference to the head office of the department. I should like to know whether this authority extends to work done on playground areas around schools. If it does, that will be a big help in my district. The member for Glenelg gives the impression that he is the only member who has schools in his district, but I think I have many more schools in my district. He referred to Samcon construction schools; people in my district would be pleased to have three schools of Samcon construction, but they cannot get even one at present. Can the Minister say whether the provision for hospitals includes the cost of taking over the Whyalla Hospital?

The Hon. J. W. H. Cumbe: It refers only to maintenance.

Mr. LANGLEY: The Goodwood and Parkside schools were built many years ago, and each has about 550 students. The playground at the Goodwood school occupies only three-quarters of an acre. I realize that land is not readily available in the area, but sometimes the Education Department helps residents near a school to move to other locations so that extra land can be acquired. Half the children at these schools are New Australians,

and they would be assimilated better if they had larger playgrounds. The Minister has said that something will be done about paving work at the Goodwood Primary School. I hope that progress will be made during this financial year in connection with the playgrounds and paving at these schools.

Mr. EVANS: Added expense is incurred because requests from the Mount Barker school have to be made to Murray Bridge. This is inconvenient for the headmaster. As the school is near the metropolitan area, perhaps it would be better if the work could be done by people from the metropolitan area. I hope that, when tenders are finally accepted, work at the Clarendon Primary School can be given top priority. Also, I should like the planning and design people to look at the school, because other work needs to be carried out there. Although it is only a small school, it is important, for no transport exists to take children to any other area. I agree with the member for Unley that work needs to be carried out at the Goodwood Boys Technical High School. Children from my area attend the school, and land needs to be acquired to overcome a shortage in playing fields. I congratulate the department and the Minister on the decentralization of the Public Buildings Department. However, I hope that it will become more efficient and not less efficient, and that we do not spend more money to achieve less.

Mr. GILES: One end of a building at the Oakbank Area School is affected by moisture seeping underneath the foundation. Part of the building is subsiding, as is evidenced by severe cracking. I understand that \$11,200 has been allocated towards overcoming this problem. As it is some time since the money was allocated, will the Minister raise this matter urgently, because I believe the main building is being adversely affected through this work not being carried out? Probably some major drainage work will have to be undertaken to get rid of the water seeping under the building and, as winter is now nearly over, I believe the work could be carried out without undue delay.

Line passed.

Public Stores Department, \$364,745—passed.
Miscellaneous, \$269,850.

Mr. BROOMHILL: I refer to the provision for "River Torrens improvement—subsidies for councils", for which a slight increase has been provided over the sum spent last year, although the sum provided is still less than the amount

allocated last year. Considerable improvements could be undertaken to the banks of the Torrens River. I refer particularly to the area between Tapley Hill Road and the outlet to the sea, this area lending itself to the planting of trees. Some planting has been undertaken. As horses are permitted to graze along the banks of the river in this area, during the summer months the horses trample up dust, and I should have thought more trees could be planted. Can the Minister say whether the council has applied for assistance to carry out this work?

The end of the river I have just spoken about normally contains water for most of the year. The banks of the river on either side are clearly defined, and as a result of this the water normally looks clean. However, through Lockleys the river is much wider and reeds cover its bed, with the result that pools of water tend to lie around and the area generally looks untidy. Also, it would result in breeding grounds for mosquitoes during some months of the year. Can the Minister say whose responsibility it is for keeping a proper route for the river itself and when dredging work ought to be carried out and whose responsibility this would be? The river is badly in need of dredging through the reeds in the Lockleys area.

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: I have a particular interest in this line because as a back-bencher I was the person largely responsible for this work being commenced. The Hon. Mr. Pearson introduced this scheme, when he was Minister of Works, after I had suggested the idea to him; the Hon. Mr. Hutchens continued the work when he was the Minister, and I have had the pleasure of continuing it further. Subsidies are given to local councils for improvements and beautification works within their own areas. The scheme is designed not for the formal beautification as, for instance, within that part of the Torrens that runs within the City of Adelaide but for beautifying the banks, clearing them up and making natural beauty spots of them.

I have inspected this work on several occasions and have regularly approved expenditure in respect of which councils have made applications to me. I intend to introduce into Parliament within the next month a Bill to amend the Act to enable more of this type of work to be undertaken and to enable councils to have power to acquire some of the properties right on the top of the banks which they cannot at present acquire, and as a result of which

they are restricted in the beautification work that otherwise they would be able to carry out.

I will look at the question the honourable member has raised regarding the planting of trees in the area between Tapley Hill bridge and the outlet to the sea. I will see whether this can be done and whether it agrees with the wishes of the local councils, because they are concerned in this cleaning out of the river. Speaking from memory, I think the landowners on either side, whether they be councils or private owners, have some responsibility in this connection. The Torrens River, incidentally, has a very quaint land holding, particularly along the part of the river above the Hackney bridge. Many of the original titles to the land, going back to the 1840's, were granted extending to what was then the centre of the river bed, which has changed often since then. I have seen many of these titles and I know that they are rather complicated. The committee set up following suggestions I made a few years ago has looked at this matter and has made suggestions to overcome the problem. I will try to get answers to the further matters the honourable member has raised.

Mr. HUDSON: I refer to the line "Expenses in connection with publication on Chowilla". I deplore the fact that certain things that were done last year are not to be done this year. Although I have seen better publications than the one that has been produced, it probably is better than nothing. I suspect that the Government will not repeat some of the things that were in it. A pamphlet entitled *Fourteen Facts about Chowilla* was issued, point 3 of which asks who would benefit from the dam, and in this respect the pamphlet states:

In addition to South Australia, New South Wales and Victoria would gain considerably from the yield benefits of the storage by an estimated amount of 589,000 acre feet per year. South Australia cannot further develop without Murray water. Indeed, without a guaranteed supply it cannot support the people and industries depending on over 9,000 miles of pipelines reticulating Murray water.

Point 4 asks whether it is practicable, and the pamphlet goes on to say that it is and that investigations carried out over seven years support its feasibility.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the honourable member will appreciate that these estimates do not open up a debate on Chowilla itself.

Mr. HUDSON: I am dealing with the publication and the details of it.

Mr. McANANEY: On that point of order, Sir, there is no vote in respect of Chowilla this year.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Mention is made of what was provided last year. The honourable member can refer to the fact that no provision is made this year, but he must limit his remarks to the expenses in connection with the publication of the document; he cannot discuss the merits or otherwise of Chowilla dam.

Mr. HUDSON: I would not have dreamt of disagreeing to your ruling in any way, Sir. This pamphlet makes certain statements, and about \$1,250 was spent on it last year. Why has that sum not been spent this year?

Mr. Evans: Are you accepting it now? Last year you rubbished it.

Mr. HUDSON: If I were to spend that much money on a pamphlet, I am sure I could do a better job than was done on this one. In remarking that nothing is provided this year, members should remember what was spent on the line last year. This pamphlet was produced by the South Australian Hall-Stott Government.

Mr. Evans: Does it say that?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, it says that anyone wishing to know more details should write to the Premier, and on the back it says, "Issued by the South Australian Government" which is, of course, the Hall-Stott Government, as the member for Onkaparinga would appreciate. Point 5 asks who says the scheme is practicable, to which it replies:

The Snowy Mountains Authority says so. Soil Mechanics Ltd. of London says so. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers says so. The Engineering and Water Supply Department of South Australia says so. The Governments of the Commonwealth, New South Wales and Victoria have always, and still do accept the practicability of a storage at Chowilla but have subsequently requested examination of the comparative benefits of Chowilla as against other storages.

Point 6 asks whether there would be much evaporation loss, to which the pamphlet replies:

Examinations of the annual evaporation losses from the Chowilla storage indicate that whilst it could reach 25 per cent of maximum capacity it could also be as low as 5 per cent of maximum capacity. It is considered that this would not contribute to a significant increase in salinity levels either in the dam or downstream of it.

The pamphlet goes on to ask why Chowilla is the best site, whether it has been agreed to and what is the position about salinity. It also asks what is now the difficulty with the project. I am sure the member for Chaffey will be interested in this statement:

The representatives of the Commonwealth, New South Wales, Victoria and the River Murray Commission have asked for an examination of an alternative storage to Chowilla, to provide an answer to the relative cost-yield benefits to be gained.

I do not know whether this statement last year is a correct account of what happened in 1967. The member for Chaffey could well ask himself, and try to give an honest answer: what alternative did we in South Australia have? He said nothing about it last year. It is only this year since he has been put in an impossible position by the Government that he has started to make wild statements.

This publication suggests that all sorts of experts were reporting in favour of Chowilla 12 months ago. That is the basic message given to us. Yet we are now told we must have another pamphlet saying that some other experts have reported in favour of Dartmouth and against Chowilla. This line is some indication of the Government's record in this matter. This time last year the Government was working in some sort of harmony with the Opposition trying to get Chowilla for South Australia. Now it has given it away; it is not prepared to do anything further about it. It has calmly succumbed to the attacks and snide remarks in Canberra about the experts—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is getting away from the subject matter of the pamphlet.

Mr. HUDSON: It was this pamphlet that was partly responsible for the attacks made on the Engineering and Water Supply Department, attacks that have come back to me via people in Canberra and are current gossip in Canberra; the basic point is that the Engineering and Water Supply Department was not competent to handle the project. That is what we hear when we go to Canberra; that is what the Minister for National Development virtually implied when he attacked the South Australian Government. This is one of the most disturbing things I have heard about this whole matter; it is part of the snide gossip that typifies Canberra, one of its characteristics being that everyone knows what one does in Canberra before one does it oneself. In this matter there is an inside story that circulates, which I think is grossly unfair and unjust. I take serious exception to it.

It is worthy of note that in a short space of time there has been a big change in the way in which this Government approaches our water supply problems. At one moment, this

pamphlet tells us that what certain experts say must be accepted; at another moment, we are told that the views of another lot of experts must be accepted. In a few weeks we will have different opinions from other experts. The opinion of experts cannot be taken as gospel. It must always be examined critically.

Mr. McAnaney: By the member for Glenelg.

Mr. HUDSON: I wish the honourable member would do some critical examination himself. If advice given to him when he was a simple-minded farmer conflicted with his own experience, he would examine that advice. He and other members opposite try to suggest that, because experts have said something that suits the Government but does not suit us, we must accept the advice blindly, as they accept it because they have been told by the Premier to do so.

Mr. RYAN: I seek clarification regarding the provision in the item "Control of Waters Act—expenses of administration". Last year we voted \$16,000, of which only a little more than \$11,000 was spent. This year the amount proposed is \$60,000, which seems to indicate terrific expansion. Can the Minister explain the reason for this increased provision?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The member for Glenelg, as usual, is living in the past. Not only is the provision to which he has referred not repeated (it was on last year and is finished with), but some of the views he has expressed this evening are in the past and he is not wide awake enough or progressive enough to realize the position. Later, when we deal with matters that you, Mr. Chairman, have said we cannot discuss this evening, we may have further instruction for the honourable member. The engineers in the Engineering and Water Supply Department are completely competent and are some of the most highly-regarded hydraulic engineers in Australia. They are extremely highly regarded particularly within the River Murray Commission, as I think the member for Hindmarsh will confirm.

Regarding the query by the member for Port Adelaide, the great amount of expansion in that line is tied up with administration of the Control of Waters Act, which in South Australia applies only on the Murray River. The Act was extended, I think about October, 1967, to the whole of the Murray River and under this legislation the programme of issuing annual licences for diversion and irrigation is carried out. We are having difficulties at present because we are grossly over-committed

in the number of licences which, on paper, are allocated on the Murray River, and which, in a dry year, would cover much more water than we could get out of the river in such a year and what Chowilla would give us. In other words, we are over-committed in relation to what is available from the river. This was the position from the time of the clamping down on the issue of licences in February, 1967. The great increase in expenditure on this line in the Estimates is connected with the metering system that I announced about six months ago.

The Government intends to introduce meters on all diversions on the Murray River in South Australia over a two-year period, and the first part of this programme will be carried out in this financial year. The meters are on order and the Government intends that the larger pipes will be metered first and that the acreage basis will gradually be changed to an annual gallonage basis. This has met with complete approval from irrigators because it is a far more exact way of allocating diversion water. In future a divertee will know how many thousand gallons he can put on his land, whereas previously he has been given a certain number of acres and an allocation of a certain number of inches. In future it will be up to him how he uses his allocation of water on his land.

From inquiries I have made I believe this system is being accepted as a great improvement on the previous system, and it has the distinct advantage of being completely fair. Having been given a meter, a person can operate as he wishes on the basis of his allocation, and he knows his mate down the river will not be exceeding his quota. The great increase in expenditure on this line is for the first part of the programme of providing and installing meters. The Government intends to provide and install the meters free, but a meter charge will be made annually to cover the maintenance and reading of the meter. The amount of this charge has not yet been determined, but it will be kept to a minimum. The charge is necessary not for amortization purposes but for the maintenance and reading of the meter.

Mr. Ryan: The cost of the meter has nothing to do with the administration.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The line is referred to as expenses of administering the Act. One of the means of administering the Act is installing meters.

Mr. HUDSON: I wish to speak again because there may be some misinterpretation

by members or by the press of what I said earlier. I did not reflect on the technical competence of the engineers in the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Mr. Nankivell: Not much!

Mr. HUDSON: The honourable member is doing just the sort of thing I am speaking about.

Mr. Nankivell: You do it all the time.

Mr. HUDSON: That is completely incorrect. The reason I related this matter was that at the time the pamphlet was produced adverse comments were made on it, and I have since heard adverse comments made by Canberra people (one was Stewart Cockburn) on technical competence regarding the design of the Chowilla dam. In each case I said, "I think that is rubbish. I think the dam is perfectly sound and competently designed." I pointed to this fact only because one of the things that has undermined Chowilla with the Commonwealth Government has been the snide rubbishing that has gone on in the background, and I was objecting to that. I do not want members opposite, as sometimes is their practice, to indulge in misrepresentation of the remarks made by members on this side. I think what was done in Canberra in relation to this matter is very poor indeed, and I believe that until that attitude is altered and the attitude of the Commonwealth Government alters we shall be lucky in this State ever to get Chowilla.

Mr. HUGHES: I am disappointed that the Government has seen fit to discontinue provision for publications on Chowilla. The publication put out last year drew fire from the Minister for National Development (Mr. Fairbairn). An article appeared in reply to a letter written by Mr. McLeay, who sought to clarify the official attitude to Chowilla. At that time the Premier was very taken with the idea of spending money on a publication about something that he and his Government really believed was for the benefit of South Australia. They should have continued in that way. Sir Henry Bolte and the Minister for National Development have apparently scared the Premier off, and there will be no further publications in connection with what the Government considered vital for the people only 12 months ago. If the Government did not mean what it said in its pamphlet, *Fourteen Facts about Chowilla*, it should not have spent the taxpayers' money on printing it. One question in the pamphlet asks, "Is it practicable?", and the pamphlet states:

Yes. Investigations carried out over seven years support its feasibility.

That is what the Government believed at that time, and it was prepared to spend the taxpayers' money to let people know that is what it believed. Another question in the pamphlet was, "Who says so?". This Government was prepared to tell the people at that time that it was the Snowy Mountains Authority, one of the greatest authorities on water conservation anywhere in the world, that said so. The Government was also prepared to accept the word of Soil Mechanics Limited of London, the United States Army Corps of Engineers, and the Engineering and Water Supply Department of South Australia. The Government was prepared to put more than \$1,000 on the line for this publication and to spend that money. Another question asked was, "Has Chowilla been agreed to?" The Premier's reply to this was as follows:

Yes. It was accepted by the River Murray Commission in September, 1961, and an agreement between the four Governments was ratified by their respective Parliaments in 1963.

It continues: "Is South Australia still committed to Chowilla?" The Premier again said, "Yes". In fact, he was prepared to go further and to say:

Yes, most definitely. The Government of South Australia believes firmly that Chowilla should proceed.

The Premier of South Australia received the support of all the members of the Opposition in issuing this publication, and we hoped that we could have supported him on one of the same type this year. We are disappointed about this. This publication does not concern only the people in the river towns: it concerns all the people of South Australia. Too much has been said at various times about how it concerns the river districts when in fact it concerns the whole of South Australia. The Premier made this pamphlet available not only to the people in the river districts but also to all the people of South Australia, and the people of this State are very disappointed that he has not done what he said he would do.

Mr. Arnold: Why didn't you hold a public meeting about it on Eyre Peninsula?

Mr. HUGHES: Members opposite have tried to draw a red herring across the trail in an effort to get us off this line, on which an additional sum should have been voted this year for the promotion of this very worthy work. The member for Chaffey supported this scheme 12 months ago. In fact, the very reason he is in this Chamber

today is that he supported the Chowilla proposal. The honourable member should have been the last one to interject regarding Eyre Peninsula.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member not to heed interjections.

Mr. HUGHES: Point 14 in this pamphlet is "The reason for this pamphlet". The answer given is as follows:

This information is supplied because (a) the South Australian Government still believes the Chowilla scheme is the best proposal.

Only 12 months ago this Government was saying all these things in this pamphlet. It goes on:

(b) In South Australia it is not just another irrigation scheme but is a lifeline for future development.

In less than 12 months we have had an about-turn because the Premier was scared off by the Premier of Victoria and he became afraid of the Minister for National Development (Mr. Fairbairn) because he was taken to task on the matter. Point 14 (c) of the pamphlet states that any comparison of an alternative must use Chowilla as a yardstick.

Mr. Evans: That is what they did.

Mr. HUGHES: They did not. That remark was intended to convey the impression that Chowilla should be built and that the other States should use it as a yardstick. I am disappointed that the Premier has backed down since making that comment and that there is no provision this year for a publication regarding this important project.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF EDUCATION

Minister of Education Department, \$19,788.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I rise on this line because of what has happened in the last few days. The South Australian Institute of Teachers is a body of professional people which has often been praised by members, opposite and, because of the inadequacy of the conditions under which its members are teaching in many cases, it decided—

The CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member dealing with the line "Minister of Education Department"?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am dealing with that line, and what I am saying deals with a matter of policy. The institute decided on a campaign for an improvement in the general position of education in South Australia, because the sums being devoted to

education nationally were insufficient. This was a campaign by the teachers relating not to their own conditions of employment but to the conditions under which they are able to carry out their work for the benefit of the children they teach, and it has been financed from their own pockets to endeavour to see that this nation makes a greater commitment of its gross national product to education. This is not a new cry: it has been advocated constantly in recent years, not only for our nation but also for others.

Any of the readers of the works of John Kenneth Galbraith must have known that most people who were concerned with the kind of policies he was advocating (the policies of liberalism with a small "l" and not with an initial "£" sign) would have required a greater public investment, particularly in the basic investment of the country, the education of its citizens.

The teachers have set out on a course of demanding a greater commitment to education. I believe their motives in doing so are wholly praiseworthy. Because of the attitude of the Commonwealth Government, no Government in South Australia has had sufficient money to devote to education. It has been impossible, given the sums of money that we have had, to meet the kind of demands that have been met in comparable countries (that is to say, demands in the last decade that have required an increase in the annual expenditures in education considerably in excess of the rate of increase in population) because the Commonwealth Government's policies have been specifically designed to see that we do not have money to spend in this and other service areas, a cry that has been repeated by every State Premier of whatever political complexion. The results, say the teachers, have been disastrous.

When I was asked to look at the physical condition of some schools, I went. I knew of the condition of many schools in the State, but what the South Australian Institute of Teachers tried to do was to show not the best or the worst of the schools but what they considered a typical, average set of schools; they were being perfectly fair in this. It was immediately evident, from the very physical nature of the classrooms in which the children were being taught in primary schools, that the new system of teaching, now so widely advocated for primary schools, could not be proceeded with in these classrooms because of their physical

limitations; children could not physically engage in the type of class participation that is now the basis of so much education advocacy for primary school teaching.

The teachers were able to demonstrate clearly to me the severe limitations placed upon them; they also showed me the figures for opportunity classes and the need for remedial teaching in many primary schools. Because of the physical limitations on the teaching in those schools, about 16 per cent of the pupils reaching Grade VII required remedial teaching. In this technological age, that that should be the case is disastrous for us. We are simply not meeting the requirements of further education, because in many circumstances the children are not qualifying in their basic ground work. Because we are constantly enlarging the boundaries of knowledge, the amount of learning that children, and students in later stages of education, are required to absorb is widening. We need to use the newer techniques to be able to keep up with the demands upon our population. We are not doing so. This is evident from the situation now facing us in Australian universities and other tertiary institutions. In many cases there is inadequate ground work, and teachers can point to the fact that standards are not improving; rather, because of the limitations upon teachers, the standards are decreasing.

In these circumstances, one would have thought that the State Government would combine with the teachers in this campaign, which is selfless and has been generated by the teachers because of their dissatisfaction with the possibility of achieving what they are aiming for in their own avocation. However, a series of attacks has been launched by the Government of this State on the campaign by the South Australian Institute of Teachers. Also, there have been personal attacks upon the institute's public relations officer, attacks bitterly resented by the teachers of whatever political complexion, because it is not a campaign of a public relations officer: it is a campaign of the institute.

The things that have been said by the two Parliamentary Under Secretaries in this Chamber and by the Premier are widely resented throughout the State. More than this, the Minister has rejected the teachers' campaign, instead of aligning herself with it, and the Premier, as recently as yesterday, attacked the institute, as well as the newspapers, and the television and radio stations which are the vehicles for sections of the campaign

and which are paid by the teachers. The Premier has seen fit to say that the teachers, in the course of their campaign, are denigrating their profession.

Mr. Jennings: He did it very ineffectually, though.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That may well be true. I am not so much concerned about the manner of his attack, because the people can judge that directly when they see it, as I am sure they did judge last evening: I am concerned about the matter of the attack. I do not consider that any politician in this State should be attacking the teachers for what they are doing: he should be with them. There is not the slightest reason why the Government of this State should not be demanding of the Commonwealth Government money for education. We have not enough money: we have been denied the money. There can be no question of that. No submission by any Premier in recent years has not pointed to the fact that this State has been denied the money necessary for its services.

Why has not the Government allied itself with the teachers to get, for the children of this State, the conditions in which the teachers can do their job for the children whom they seek to teach? If the Government had done that, no-one would blame it. It would have been doing the right thing, and I am surprised that it has not done that. However, on the contrary, it has denied the representations by the teachers, saying that conditions are better than they are, and it has denied that there are real difficulties in achieving the kind of standards that we need in education. Then, it has attacked the teachers and their motives.

I think that is extremely bad for the State and I thoroughly disagree with the Premier's statement that the teachers have been responsible, because of their campaign, for some decline in morale in South Australia. I am grateful that the teachers have seen fit to bring before the public a matter that should be important to every citizen in the State; that is, that we should have adequate money for education, which we certainly have not got. I hope that the Government will cease saying what it has been saying recently in attacks upon the South Australian Institute of Teachers and its campaign. I hope that the Government will take up, on behalf of the people and children of the State, what the teachers have been saying, because we should all be behind

that, not seeking to divide the people of the State about something on which we should all be united.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): It is remarkable to hear the Leader accusing us of dividing the public because of remarks that I or the Minister may have made recently. Last weekend I found out about the Leader's operation in this State. When I visited Port Lincoln I saw how the Leader had become involved in the campaign, to the detriment of education. I saw the same school and I saw its various inadequacies. In reply to the representations made, I said that it was fitting that the Leader should have gone through this school because his Government had prolonged the inadequacies there. I said that some of the conditions at the school needed improving and that the Government would improve them. As I left some teachers said, "Of course, Mr. Hall, we want you to know that we resent the label that this is the worst school in South Australia, because it is not the worst school."

The teachers who said this were proud members of an honoured profession, and they said they were teaching well at the Port Lincoln High School and training children to become competent members of our society. Senior students of the high school interviewed me on the Friday night when I had my meeting, and I have yet to see more competent people than those students. They were labouring, under the eyes of all South Australians, under the label of the worst school in South Australia. And who said this?—Mr. Dunstan, the Leader of the Opposition. They resented it.

The children of this State are being given a second-rate reputation by the Leader, who persistently uses people and causes for his own political advancement. I object to that label being given to any school. We know that it is necessary to improve facilities at this and other schools. The Government's record proves that we are doing exactly what the Leader says we should be doing—aligning ourselves with the profession and with the children. I stand behind the children in South Australia, behind the education they are getting, and behind the improvements being made to that education, and I will fight tooth and nail, as I have done up to the present, in my representations to the Commonwealth Government for more money for education. The Government does not need to fear this slogan, because it comes out honourably after

any comparison with previous Governments, and it has demonstrated that it has provided more money for education, and it will continue to do so.

Therefore, what has this Government fear from the campaign? Would I criticize some facets of the campaign if I was fearful of it? Our policy stands examination. The campaign is supported by many people who are genuinely interested in increasing the standard of educational facilities, by some people who have been coaxed into it, and by some people who glory in the politics of it. Who knows in what proportions these types of people are involved in the campaign? It is evident that anyone may wage a campaign for any cause in our society—this is one of the freedoms of a democracy.

The Leader has been outspoken in his support for several campaigns in the community. Therefore, this is a free community. However, I do not stand behind the type of propaganda that has been at the extremes of this campaign. I know that those organizing the campaign would dissociate themselves from the personal aspects that have been generated on the edges. However, many people involved in promoting the campaign, or at least on its periphery, have entered into personal criticism of the Minister, and I will not subscribe to this; I will criticize it wherever I find it.

The Minister can answer the matters raised regarding the details of the matter. I can only point out again the tremendous decrease in spending on education that occurred during the period of the Labor Government, which spent \$11,700,000 in its first year, \$10,700,000 in its second year, and \$8,600,000 in its third year. This Government spent from State funds \$11,670,000 in its first year and \$10,900,000 in its second year, and nothing the Leader can bring up and nothing the member for Glenelg can do when he confuses the figures directly will take away the strength of those published figures, which show that the previous Government let down the children of the State in the biggest let-down they have ever had.

The Leader went to a school that should have been replaced under his administration and said it is the worst school in South Australia. We have nothing to fear from the teachers' campaign. We welcome a demonstration of interest in education and will continue to receive at any time from teachers representations they may care to make. I was pleased today to sign about 100 letters in

reply to representations made to me since the campaign first began. I am only sorry I do not have a copy of that letter with me now so that I could read it, because it expressed clearly the Government's concern for education and the way in which it was considering it. The letter pointed to the future, when we will continue to meet our commitments.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will leave other speakers to deal with some of the flagrant inaccuracies in the Premier's outburst: I will deal immediately with one or two things within my knowledge. The Premier, as is his wont, has completely misrepresented what I said at Port Lincoln. He has a habit of misquoting me.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: You'd better let the teachers know, because they, too, have the wrong idea.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the teachers have the wrong idea, the Premier must have given it to them, because what I said about schools in their presence (and they agreed with me and I repeated it later) was that, regarding high schools, I considered that Port Lincoln had the worst facilities of any high school I had seen. The teaching at that school was going on under grave difficulties, which the teachers outlined to me in detail. We will soon find out whether the Premier's remarks on this subject are accurate, because I intend to send a report of this to the teachers at Port Lincoln, who thanked me for my interest and my appreciation of the difficulties, which they outlined to me in great detail. I will make public to this Chamber what they reply. It is untrue, as the Premier knows, that any building on that site was postponed by my Government.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: You ask the previous Minister of Works.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I know what the previous Minister of Works said. In 1961 a report was made by the Public Works Committee on a new high school for Port Lincoln with a projected completion date of June, 1963. That was at a time when a Liberal Government was in office, and the Minister of Works then was the present Treasurer, the member for Port Lincoln (Hon. G. G. Pearson). And was it built? Not a sod was turned nor a brick laid.

Mr. Clark: And we were responsible for that!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In 1965, a few weeks before the election, with no reference made to the Public Works Committee of

any new proposal, the then Minister announced to his district on the eve of the election that he proposed a totally new high school for Port Lincoln. There had been no reference to the Public Works Committee, there were no plans, and no moneys were allotted. When we took office (as was revealed in the first statement of the new Treasurer on Loan moneys) the Loan moneys for public works had been over-committed by the letting of contracts which were escalating at such a rate as to go beyond the amount of forecast Loan moneys available; and the projects were detailed in this place. No money was available to us for a new school at Port Lincoln, even if it had been planned and even if it had been referred to the Public Works Committee; and neither of those things had taken place. The Premier is putting his own story over in Port Lincoln, but the facts are getting over to the people there. When we got into office and examined the projects, the Port Lincoln High School was on the list of forward projects and its date for commencement was in the triennium commencing 1970-71. I have had a list supplied to me by the Minister of Works of forward works of the department, and that is the proposed commencement date. There has not yet been a further reference to the Public Works Committee by this Government.

Mr. Casey: It cannot proceed until the scheme is reported on by that committee.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course it cannot do so, so all this nonsense about the Labor Government's having held up a high school at Port Lincoln is complete my-eye. The Liberal Government of the day had a report of the Public Works Committee regarding a major new building with a completion date in June, 1963, two years before we took office, but it did not spend a cent. It announced three weeks before we took office that it was proposing a new high school there for which it had no plans and no money. Then it said that we postponed it. That is the story that this Government is prepared to try to put over to the people of South Australia. It is as credible as the rest of the record of this Government.

Mr. HUDSON: One of the problems that arises in discussions on education whenever the Premier or, indeed, many Government members are involved is that they are completely incapable and have always been incapable of recognizing the real merits of the case that is being put up, and all they ever do is respond in the worst kind of Party-political way. The evidence of this

in recent months has been absolutely glaring. This is not the first campaign that the Teachers Institute has conducted: in 1965-66 (although mainly in 1966) another campaign was conducted, during which I addressed a meeting at Minlaton that was attended by about 150 people. Both the member for Yorke Peninsula and I were invited to attend that meeting but the honourable member chose not to do so.

Mr. Casey: Why?

Mr. HUDSON: I do not know; I do not suppose he was interested or thought it important.

Mr. Rodda: You can play it nice and rough.

Mr. HUDSON: That is true. This meeting considered the basic needs of the education system and why basically there was a problem. This problem has been with us for a long time, and no real progress has been made in reaching a solution to it. In just about every year since the war we have had the highest rate of increase of attendances in Government schools in any State of Australia, and this increase, which occurs regularly every year and which is now occurring more through a higher retention ratio (with a higher percentage of students staying on for fourth and fifth-year grades in high schools), has resulted in a demand for even more teachers and buildings. The new buildings, if they are permanent ones, will last for 50 years or more, but we must have them when the increased numbers of children come along. An increase in expenditure is therefore required in order to get these new buildings immediately.

The new teachers probably give the department about 10 years' service, but when there is an increase in the numbers of children attending schools there must be an immediate increase in the number of teachers and, in turn, there must be an increase in the expenditure on teacher training. Therefore, the growth of numbers, apart from anything else, requires an increased expenditure on education every year. Together with the general rise in costs that has occurred throughout the whole post-war period, this means that each year we will need to increase our education expenditure by about 9 per cent or 10 per cent just to maintain our present standards. On average, the rate of increase in expenditure on education has been about 11 per cent a year.

Mr. Rodda: What are you going to deny the good people of Glenelg in order to do this?

Mr. HUDSON: One of the problems of the member for Victoria is that he has got the

disease which has beset the Premier: he, like the Premier, is incapable of understanding a problem any more and he just responds Party-politically in the worst possible way.

Mr. Rodda: And you are incapable of answering an intelligent question.

Mr. HUDSON: It was not an intelligent question and it was not relevant to the point I was making.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nankivell): Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. HUDSON: And silly interjections are even more out of order.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I shall be the judge of whether or not they are silly.

Mr. HUDSON: The average increase in expenditure on education has been about 11 per cent and, with the greater part of that increase committed because of larger numbers and rising costs, we can see that little improvement in real standards takes place each year. During the Labor Government's term of office, the average increase in expenditure on education was 11 per cent a year; in the first year of this Government the increase was 11 per cent, but in this financial year the proposed increase is only 9½ per cent. What the teachers are basically complaining about (and this is the message we must try to get into the heads of members opposite) is that the rate of improvement in real standards and in the quality of education has not been fast enough. Surely, in a problem of this importance we can for a moment forget past records of who has been the greatest sinner. That is not what the teachers are interested in; they are not interested in who was the greatest sinner—whether it was Sir Thomas Playford, anyone else or the present Government. They are interested in getting a faster rate of improvement in the quality of education than we have been getting. I support them in that, as I have always supported them. Party politics is irrelevant for 99 per cent of our teachers.

Mr. Venning: We all want a real improvement in education.

Mr. HUDSON: Then it is about time the member for Rocky River got on the band waggon. There is a crisis in education in South Australia because the morale of the teaching profession is at an all-time low. This is proved by the fact that teachers in school after school are submitting letters to the press and to members of Parliament signed by every member of the staff—and the comments of the member for Victoria have prompted some of those letters. The teachers

want a faster rate of improvement in the real standards and quality of education. Many things are involved in this. Our education system has tremendous potential. Many changes in curricula and methods of teaching have been made, together with the introduction of a better provision of teachers, the elimination of inequalities between male and female teachers and the gradual improvements that have been occurring in the teachers colleges and the teachers themselves, who are, basically, idealists. They know that their job could be performed so much better than it is being performed if improvements could be made more rapidly. One of the reasons for the crisis in morale and within education generally has been the frustration of so many teachers who have not been able to realize the potential that they visualize.

I do not blame the Minister of Education particularly on this matter. I think that she has been let down badly by her colleagues, because it is very much a Government responsibility. I dissociate myself from any personalities that have been brought into the matter, and I think other members on this side do likewise. We must recognize that the teachers, as a body, are frustrated and that that frustration has built up until it has exploded. Now the teachers are expressing themselves in ways that would not have been thought possible some years ago.

Mr. Broomhill: They've been expressing themselves to the member for Victoria.

Mr. HUDSON: I am aware of that. This position has occurred in a situation in which the Commonwealth Government has announced, not before time, large per capita grants to independent schools. I have always supported the view that the Commonwealth Government should make such grants to all types of schools, and if it made to Government schools the same kind of grant as it has made to independent schools, the Minister of Education would have about \$8,000,000 to \$10,000,000 a year available to improve standards and meet the priorities that are pressing on her department all the time.

This kind of assistance has been made available by the Federal Government in the United States of America since the Aid to Education Act was passed in 1965, yet our Commonwealth Government has announced, only in this year's Budget, that substantial aid will be given to independent schools but nothing will be given to Government schools. That has added fuel to the fire so far as South Australian teachers

are concerned. They resent the problems and difficulties of only one sector of education being recognized and they resent the action of members of the South Australian Government in applauding the proposed grants to independent schools and at the same time, by implication, refusing to press the Commonwealth Government to give Government schools the same kind of grant.

The problems in education are not peculiar to South Australia: they apply in all States. This is a national matter, and we are asking the Commonwealth Government to treat it as such. One of the complaints in the community at present is that the Government will not treat the matter in that way and that Government members have continued to say that education in Government schools should remain a State responsibility. Members of this Government have not brought to bear on their colleagues in Canberra the kind of pressure that is necessary. Because they have not done so openly they have made the teaching profession in South Australia believe that they really do not care. When the Hon. R. R. Loveday was Minister of Education he missed no opportunity in public and on all possible occasions to press the need for Commonwealth aid to Government schools. He was the best advocate that the South Australian education system has ever had. The present Government must bring home to the Commonwealth Government the needs of education throughout Australia.

Mr. Edwards: We are doing as much as you did—and more.

Mr. HUDSON: Members opposite completely confirm the point I have been making: that they respond in the crudest of Party political manners to any criticism raised. As a result, the teaching profession in South Australia is more united in its opposition to the Government than it has ever been. Considering the limits of the finance available to it, the previous Government's record was very fine. The previous Minister would say to the present Government that one of the frustrations of his job was that the Commonwealth Government did not make the necessary funds available to finance the job that needed to be done—and it is still not making the necessary funds available. The teachers want the Minister of Education, the Premier and other members of Cabinet to come out in public and say that the Commonwealth Government's record is not good enough.

Mr. Freebairn: There is only one Minister of Education.

Mr. HUDSON: We should not have to put up with interjections that can only be taken to mean that certain members are bordering on being *non compos mentis*.

Mr. Freebairn: Are you stimulating me to make a speech?

Mr. HUDSON: The honourable member's interjections are so puerile that they again demonstrate his complete lack of appreciation of the problem. The honourable member and the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) fit very well the term "Parliamentary blunder secretaries". The member for Victoria thinks that this is a huge joke—and a Party-political joke at that. Government members who are really interested in this matter should tell the honourable member what the score is. They had better try to tell the member for Light, too, although I suspect there is not much point in doing that.

Mr. Freebairn: Why do you hate church schools so much?

Mr. HUDSON: That is typical of the member for Light; he has not listened to anything I have said over the years in this place on the subject of State aid. In fact, I said it only a few minutes ago but, because of his poisoned mind, he deliberately misinterprets any remark by a member on this side.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nankivell): I remind the honourable member that there is no reference to this matter under this line.

Mr. HUDSON: I am referring to "Private schools—transport of students, boarding and book allowance".

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: We are dealing with the line "Minister of Education Department".

Mr. HUDSON: I was challenged on this particular matter.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I will allow the honourable member to reply, but he is out of order in doing so on this line.

Mr. HUDSON: I will make a comment about State aid on the next line.

Mr. McAnaney: Oh!

Mr. HUDSON: The honourable member had better tell the member for Light to listen to what I say and get it through his thick skull that there are many members on this side who have always supported State aid. I hope that Government members will understand the points I have been trying to make and will reform their ways in future, recognizing that the teachers and the Teachers Institute and its officers, including the public relations officer,

are responsible people acting responsibly in relation to the current campaign, as they have acted throughout. It is only because Government members resent criticism that they fail to see the genuine concern of teachers and the Teachers Institute. I exclude the Minister from that remark, because I think she recognizes that the institute and the teachers generally are concerned. This is a basic issue, and what the teachers of the State want is the support of Government members, an honest understanding of education problems, and an honest appreciation of the fact that until such time as we can increase our expenditure on education by about 15 per cent to about 20 per cent a year we will not achieve a real solution.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE (Minister of Education): I do not suppose there is any subject on which more has been said in this place, outside, and by means of the press, radio and television than on education. I believe this is a good thing, because education is a continuing process that must be progressive if it is to meet the demands which, in this present age, the advances in technology, science and society make on it. For this reason, it must be a controversial subject. The subject is not only being debated in South Australia: the present campaign, being waged ostensibly to improve education in this State, is part of an Australia-wide campaign, which started in the Eastern States long before we heard of it in South Australia. I know from discussing it with the Ministers of Education of the other States that they are facing the same kind of problems and pressures that I am facing here.

The member for Glenelg has referred in strong terms to the lack of approaches to the Commonwealth Government on this question of more money for education. Every Minister of Education in Australia is aware of the need for more money and that unless we get money from the Commonwealth Government we will not be able to make the improvements in education that we all desire. I resent very strongly the imputation of the Leader of the Opposition that I reject the campaign that the teachers have waged on education.

I also resent very strongly the fact that he impugned my sincerity on the question of education, because I am most sincere in my attitude to education and I have tried to the very limit of my ability, since I have been the Minister of Education, to forward the cause of education in this State. I can

say this also of the officers of the Education Department, for whom these times are trying, too. Their abilities and their handling of education are being just as much impugned as are mine in this regard. I am sure that most members of Parliament realize the magnificent job that those officers do in forwarding education. Those officers, too, are feeling and resenting the way in which their efforts are being impugned.

Regarding aid from the Commonwealth Government, perhaps members opposite have forgotten that earlier this year there was in Adelaide a meeting of the Australian Education Council, which is composed of Ministers of Education from all States of the Commonwealth, who meet to discuss their common problems and to see in which way they can meet them. Because the meeting was held in South Australia, I am currently the Chairman of the council. It met for two days, and one of the main topics of discussion was an approach to the Commonwealth Government for more money for education at a pre-tertiary level. We all know the extent to which the Commonwealth Government has come into the picture with regard to tertiary education. At the conclusion of the meeting it was announced publicly that the terms of reference for the conduct of a nation-wide survey of educational needs had been agreed upon, and I will read these terms because they are relevant to the question we are now debating.

Mr. Broomhill: We would rather hear what the Prime Minister said about your approach for more money.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: If the honourable member will wait he will hear about that. All the States and the Commonwealth will participate in the nation-wide survey, the first of its kind that has ever been conducted. The terms of reference are as follows:

In respect of all levels of education up to the completion of secondary schooling and in respect of teacher education, the surveys will:

(1) examine the needs of the State in such matters as—

(a) the administrative structure, organization and establishment required to achieve informed, progressive and efficient administration;

(b) 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;

(c) equipment and supplies;
(d) the recruitment and supply of teachers and professional supporting staff;
(e) the pre-service and in-service education of teachers;
(f) the provision of ancillary staff; and
(g) scholarships, allowances and bursaries.

(2) determine priorities for the fulfilment of these needs;

(3) establish a programme to meet these priorities; and

(4) provide estimates of the costs involved. The survey will have regard to standards of provision required for high quality education suited to modern education systems.

As was announced at the time, each State will conduct a survey of its own educational needs in these areas for a five-year period, and an interstate consultation at the level of Directors-General will ensure a reasonable degree of uniformity in aims and standards. Only last week a meeting of Directors-General was held in South Australia to consider further the conduct of this survey. It is hoped that a substantial report on the progress of the survey will be made at the next meeting of the Australian Education Council early in 1970, and at present we are trying to have these surveys in the hands of the secretariat of the council early in the new year so that this can be ready for collation and presentation to the next meeting of the council.

The Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science participates in these council meetings, and when we have collected these surveys they will be presented to him and, I imagine, to the Prime Minister and to the Commonwealth Treasurer. What is more, I believe the needs that will be substantiated and the information that will be collated will be used by the State Premiers when they negotiate with the Prime Minister and the Commonwealth Treasurer in coming to some arrangement about a new financial agreement between the Commonwealth Government and the States. Therefore, we are doing this on a Commonwealth-wide basis, but we are doing it in an orderly manner that will provide not only the States but also the Commonwealth with a true picture of the needs of education throughout the Commonwealth for a period of five years.

Mr. Hudson: Will we wait for five years?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The survey is to project the needs of education, based on these terms of reference, for a period of five years.

Mr. Clark: And in the meantime?

Mr. Ryan: We wait!

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Members will not have long to wait. A survey like this cannot be done overnight. The South Australian survey is almost ready now. Indeed, it will be presented next year.

Mr. Ryan: We will have a sympathetic Commonwealth Government early next year. If you read the paper you would see the new Commonwealth policy on education.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nankivell): Order!

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: We acknowledged, when I made a statement on behalf of the various Ministers of Education, that the financial resources at present available to the States were not sufficient to meet the needs that would be revealed by this survey and, therefore, a joint approach would be made to the Commonwealth Government for additional financial assistance for education. This is a much more proper and orderly way in which to make a submission to the Commonwealth Government than would be the suggestion of the Commonwealth Leader of the Australian Labor Party, who would have set up an Australian schools commission.

Mr. Ryan: Which he will be doing shortly.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: This is preferable to the Commonwealth Labor Leader's course of action or to that of any other body which might lead to a centralized education system dominated and controlled by the Commonwealth Government. All State Ministers of Education have subscribed to that. I hope what I have said in this regard will convince the honourable member for Glenelg and other members of his Party that this approach is in the process of being prepared for submission to the Commonwealth Government early next year. It is now October, so it is only a matter of two or three months before this is done.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: And this will achieve what the honourable member has asked for.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Exactly.

Mr. Hudson: Why wasn't a survey conducted for the independent schools?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I am glad the honourable member has raised that point. At the request of the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science, each State Minister has written to independent and Catholic schools inviting them to prepare their own survey using exactly the same terms of reference, because we believe they are better able to do

this than is any other body in the State. They will then be invited to make a joint submission to the Commonwealth Government.

To come nearer home, to this teachers' campaign, I make it clear, as I have publicly and in this place on other occasions made it clear, that I believe that most of the teachers are genuine in their concern for education. I certainly have not rejected it, but it has not been helped by being made political by the efforts of the Opposition in this Parliament. If the teachers had been allowed to continue their campaign and members opposite had not jumped on the political band waggon, as has been suggested, the campaign would have had a much more profound effect on the public of South Australia.

Mr. Hughes: You set this going because you asked the member for Light to ask a question about it.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I have never admitted, and never will admit, that there is a crisis in education in South Australia at present. If the word "crisis" has to be used, there was one some years ago, when we faced real problems in South Australia. The member for Glenelg has referred to this; it happened about 20 years ago, when we faced a greater problem than any other State faced. When the overall increase in enrolments in Australia was about 147 per cent, ours was about 216 per cent. I think the figure for New South Wales was about 102 per cent and for Queensland about 113 per cent. Those were the days when there was a crisis in education, but this so-called "crisis", strangely enough, dates from the time when we came into office last year. No mention had been made of it before then.

It is ridiculous to blame the present Government for the difficulties that we are experiencing and that I have admittedly frankly and openly. It is ridiculous to suggest that they were not apparent when the present Opposition was in Government. So I cannot and will not accept that there is a present crisis in education: I refute that publicly. Contrary to the expressed idea that we have a crisis on our hands, I believe we have a far-sighted and forward-moving Education Department. I will in a moment show why I believe this to be so. We have so much here of which we can be proud. The only unfortunate part of the teachers' campaign, as I see it, is that they have concentrated completely on the negative side of education. They have not given credit for one positive step forward made in education, whether in our time (which, after all, is

only 18 months) or in the time of the previous Government. The whole emphasis has been on the negative side of education, and I deplore this, because much that is positive has been done. Admittedly, our present problems are caused mostly by a teacher shortage of which we are well aware and which is perhaps worse this year than it ever has been. I was interested to read a speech by the member for Whyalla (Hon. R. R. Loveday), the former Minister of Education, in which he said that, not long before he had gone out of office, there was a surplus of teachers.

Therefore, this problem has arisen quickly. This year it has happened in some unpredictable way for which we cannot find a reason. I think it is partly because of a falling off in migration, and we must place the blame for this firmly at the door of the previous Government, which did everything it could to discourage migration to South Australia. Many of our off-the-street recruits to the department came to Australia as migrants from other countries, so the falling off in migration is one of the contributory causes of the shortage.

Mr. Clark: You would have had more children in the schools, too, if more migrants came.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: We have managed to cope. Of course, there are other reasons for the teacher shortage. One is the forward planning of the present Government, and I have given an undertaking that there will be minimum three-year courses in all branches of education in 1971. So that we can meet the difficulties that will be brought about by these three-year courses, we have retained in our teachers colleges 219 teachers last year and 250 teachers this year to prepare us for these courses in 1971. Another point is that always throughout the year (and this would have been happening for many years) about 400 teachers are on leave. That leave may be long service leave, study leave, leave granted to young men called up for national service, or *accouchement* leave. The position is further aggravated by the fact that we have taken many teachers out of the schools to be trained as teacher-librarians.

Then, we have had an inordinate number of resignations. This year, until May about 200 teachers resigned. On analysing these resignations we found that a big percentage involved women teachers who were retiring from the profession. Many of these women had met their obligations and wanted to retire to domestic life. We also found that many

teachers had resigned because they wanted to travel and I suggest that this indicates that we are living in an affluent society. Young people, having met the requirements of their bond after receiving three years of first-class training, which enables them to travel overseas and take a position in any country, have taken advantage of this training and resigned to travel. In fact, extremely few have resigned because they wanted to go to other jobs.

We provide for some students to do a degree course or an honours course, and these students are attractive to outside industry and commerce and other organizations. I have given some of the reasons for our present teacher shortage. This is one of the greatest problems, and it has been highlighted by the teachers themselves. Of course, there are other reasons. However, we recognize that this is our biggest problem, and this is why we have big classes at present. We are doing all we can to attract more teachers into the profession. As all members know, we are trying to attract better-qualified students into the teachers colleges. Because student allowances have recently been increased it will be interesting to see how many more students apply for entry into our teachers colleges next year.

Our colleges have the biggest ratio of student teachers to teachers in schools of any State in Australia. There are 4,000 student teachers in our five teachers colleges compared to 10,000 teachers in our schools, and we will improve on this ratio, because we are providing for more student teachers next year. Probably South Australia is better off in respect of teachers colleges than is any other State. We are certainly the envy of Western Australia, where there are two very old teachers colleges. Of course, we have problems here, but we have recently announced that, with the aid of Commonwealth funds, we are planning to build a new college to be known as the Eastern Teachers College; the Bedford Park Teachers College is nearly completed; the Salisbury Teachers College is now being constructed; and, with the acquisition of land in the near future, we shall be able to proceed with plans for a new Western Teachers College. So, we are in a considerably better position than is any other State in Australia.

We are also about to embark on a campaign to recruit teachers from overseas, particularly the United Kingdom. We are negotiating with other countries, too, to obtain

teachers who would be suited to South Australian conditions. Shortly, we will advertise for teachers who have previously served in the department and who would be prepared to return to a teaching career. We will give them a refresher course and pay them from the beginning of next year so that they will be ready to enter schools in the next school year. I am mentioning all these things because I believe that the teacher shortage is our basic problem; it contributes to some of the disabilities under which teachers are labouring at present.

Class sizes, of course, have decreased considerably in the last five or 10 years. One of the other main contentions of the campaign waged by the teachers is that teachers are engaged in duties not associated with teaching and, consequently, they have been pressing (as I have been pressing since I have been Minister of Education) for funds to employ ancillary staff. Provision has been made in these Estimates for the appointment of an additional 246 ancillary staff. I want to make it clear to the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson), who suggested that there was some doubt whether these were really additional appointments, that they are in fact additional to the clerks in the schools at present. This number of additional clerks comes very close to the number of ancillary staff that the Teachers Institute quoted as being necessary. For the first time we shall be making clerical assistance available in primary schools.

Not many days ago I gave the member for Glenelg the full particulars relating to the ancillary staff to be provided in schools. Although I will not go over this again entirely, it ranges from a school with an enrolment from 50 to 100 children, to which part-time assistance of four weeks annually will be granted (and this is the first time that such small schools have ever benefited) up to large schools with an enrolment between 1,601 and 1,900, to which four full-time clerical assistants will be appointed. Of course, this is a big step forward and is something that officers of the department have been pressing successive Education Ministers for. This year we were in a position to provide it for the first time. We will also provide an improved scale of clerical and library assistance in secondary schools and, in addition, ancillary staff is to be appointed to teachers colleges, technical colleges and adult education centres. I know this meets with the approval of the Teachers Institute, because I have heard from the President that

that is so. This will go a long way towards solving the problems that teachers saw as impeding the natural and desired progress of education in South Australia.

Returning for a moment to teachers and teacher appointments, we are making provision for a record salaries allocation this year of \$48,537,000. We are providing for an additional 550 appointments to the teaching, lecturing, specialist, advisory and guidance staff, all of which we realize will have a tremendous effect in relieving the pressure on the present teaching staff in schools and teachers colleges. We are also making provision for a record student intake of 1,550 students into teachers colleges this year. As honourable members know, we have also introduced a mature age allowance and a married allowance, and I believe these will have a big effect next year on the intake into teachers colleges. For the first time we will admit married women as students with allowances. It has been suggested that there is a vast untapped pool of potential teachers among married women. I said the other day that it would be interesting to see whether or not this pool existed. I doubt whether it does because I believe there are real impediments in the way of married women coming into the teaching profession.

I say this because I realize the difficulties associated with the home arrangements of married women. Also, if married women are given preference in appointments to schools in the metropolitan area or to schools near where they live, actually this will amount to discrimination against single women. I will be interested to see whether, in fact, there is a big potential source of women teachers who can come back to help us. I hope I will be proved wrong and that there will be many married women prepared either to come back into service (having been teachers in the past) or to train as students in our teachers colleges. In any case, we are well aware of the problems facing us regarding the teacher shortage and we are taking positive steps to try to meet the situation as we see it, so that we can provide the type of education that all of us (and I most sincerely) desire to be given to children in South Australia.

Much has been said about the amount of money devoted to education in South Australia. In fact, for some time we have been devoting nearly one-quarter of our revenue resources to education. It is rather interesting to hear what the previous Minister of Education (Hon.

R. R. Loveday) had to say about this, I think here in this place but certainly when he was addressing a meeting at, I think, Kapunda. He said:

About one-quarter of the State's revenues are being used for education, and it is unreasonable and impracticable to get more than about one-quarter of the State revenues for the purpose of education.

I think most people agree with this. Of course, education as a whole embraces all the tertiary

institutions, the Museum, the Art Gallery and the State Library, as well as the Education Department. I think everyone believes that the spending of one-quarter or a little more of our revenue on education is giving education a fair share of those resources.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.58 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 2, at 2 p.m.