

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, October 22, 1969.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S FUNCTION**

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: In view of the number of Bills on the Notice Paper that have been initiated in this place, is the Chief Secretary still of the opinion that this Chamber is purely and simply a House of Review?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have never expressed the opinion that this Chamber is purely and simply a House of Review. It does act as a House of Review and it does act as a House of initiation.

MEAT PRICES

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture who, after giving it due consideration, may wish to refer it to the Treasurer. The question concerns the margins which exist between primary producers' net returns and the retail prices charged by butchers for meat, particularly pork and lamb. From time to time the margins which exist appear to be excessive. Everyone knows that the butcher must have a margin, but I believe that when the returns for lambs are very low (which, fortunately, has not obtained this year) the price to the consumer should be reasonable. However, this has not always happened. The same applies to pork, because the net prices to pig producers at present, I understand, average around 29c a pound whereas I believe that the average price in the shops is at present of the order of 69c. Will the Minister look into the matter and see what can be done to bring the price to consumers more into line with that received by producers?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I certainly will look at the matter raised by the honourable member, and I will ask the Treasurer whether he would be good enough to obtain from the Prices Commissioner some details of the costs incurred by butchers in the metropolitan area in respect of the services they render to the public. I know that this matter has given

some concern to primary producers, not only in the two fields referred to but also in a number of others.

CATTLE DISEASES

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I ask leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: During a recent visit to Queensland I was concerned to learn that the disease known as vibriosis in cattle still causes much concern there. Since many cattle are being brought from Queensland to South Australia, can the Minister say whether any tests are conducted for vibriosis, in addition to the routine tests conducted for tuberculosis and brucellosis?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes; there would be a special test for that disease, but it is far more complicated than the test for brucellosis. It would be necessary for a veterinary surgeon to attend the cattle to do the test. I think that the stock to which the honourable member has referred would be used mainly for breeding purposes; this is probably why he is concerned about the matter. I will certainly take up the matter and, if the honourable member wants more information, I will see that the Deputy Director of Agriculture (Mr. Marshall Irving) contacts him about it.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It has come to this Council from another place in a somewhat different form from the form in which it was first introduced there by a private member. It sets up a committee to inquire into Government expenditure. The financial aspects of Government activity are not very well known to many members of the public, and the finer details are not always known even to members of Parliament. There are three main instrumentalities concerned with the administration of public finance: first, the Treasury, which has to safeguard the volume of expenditure to which departments wish to commit the Government; secondly, the Auditor-General, who is concerned with the honest expenditure of public funds and, particularly in recent years, with ensuring that funds are used only for the purposes for which they were voted; and, thirdly, the Public Service Board,

which is charged with the responsibility of ensuring that the various Government departments are so efficiently organized that the funds voted by Parliament may be economically expended and that full value is obtained in return.

In introducing this Bill on behalf of another member, I intend not to criticize the work done by these responsible authorities but rather to suggest that there is room for a supplementary oversight of the expenditure of public moneys. This proposal to set up such a committee is not new in Parliamentary history. It was first introduced into the House of Commons in 1861, and if one went back far enough into history one would find that the British Parliament was concerned in mediaeval times about the authority to spend money vested in the Crown and in the Government of the day, and that Parliament itself had little detailed knowledge of expenditure. The British committee was formed before an Auditor-General was appointed, but ultimately such an office was created. The system of having an Auditor-General and a Parliamentary Committee of Public Accounts has worked satisfactorily ever since, without any significant amendments to the legislation having since been passed.

We have such a system in our Commonwealth Parliament; it was first introduced in 1914 and remained in operation until 1932 when, for some reason, it was abandoned, but it was reconstituted in 1951. Since then it has been a very active committee. The Commonwealth Parliamentary committee comprises members of both Houses; it is a joint committee, whereas in the British Parliament members of the committee are confined to those of the House of Commons. Such a system also operates in three Australian States; Victoria introduced it in December, 1903, authority for it being contained in the Standing Orders of the Lower House of that State; in New South Wales such a committee, also comprising members of the Lower House only, was formed on January 25, 1902. We have the precedent of a Joint House Public Accounts Committee in the Commonwealth Parliament, and committees comprising members of the Lower Houses in New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania, as well as the precedent of the House of Commons. I understand that this situation exists because it is considered that, as financial measures can be introduced only in the Lower House, such a committee should comprise members of that House and report back to the House on matters concerning Government finance.

Such a committee is a valuable adjunct to the workings of Parliament for several reasons, the first of which is the oversight of the State's spending. This aspect causes much concern to many people both inside and outside of Parliament. True, in the South Australian Parliament we have a Parliamentary Public Works Standing Committee which investigates Government projects estimated to cost more than \$200,000. However, the terms of reference of that committee could very well be supplemented by another committee such as the one proposed to be formed for the purpose of examining expenditure and of following up the cost of projects after they have been completed.

Under its terms of reference, the Public Works Committee examines proposals to ascertain whether they are in the public interest, and it also examines their estimated costs. I believe a committee which can follow up the work of the Public Works Committee and match actual costs (and reasons for them) against estimated costs could be of considerable value. It would help to satisfy the misgivings of many members of the public who are concerned with what they consider to be visible deficiencies in the way in which the affairs of the State are conducted. I refer to the protests that we witness in our normal daily lives. One of the main reasons for unrest and dissatisfaction among the members of the public is the fact that many of them feel that, although they have a vote in the election of a member of Parliament, they have little control over what happens afterwards. There is a growing concern about centralization and the concentration of powers within the Executive. Such a committee as is proposed would allay some of the fears that members of the public have, if it was prepared to take evidence on matters of Government expenditure.

I believe, too, that it would have a valuable effect on the members of Parliament themselves. People are elected to Parliament from various occupations and with different backgrounds. One of the most valuable prerequisites for a member is perhaps a knowledge of local government, allied, if possible, with some association with hospitals, schools and other community projects. It is not always possible, of course, for a member of Parliament to have served in local government, but community experience of one form or another is a valuable asset. On entering Parliament, a member has to gain Parliamentary experience and learn more about the workings of Parliament and the Government at the practical

level. In that respect, committee work provides a valuable background and a member of Parliament can be elected to a position on the Executive ultimately without having had any of those other opportunities for gaining background experience. Therefore, a committee of this description would also educate members in the Parliamentary processes, and particularly finance, one of the most important processes.

Finally, there have been expressions of misgiving within the Public Service that such a committee would cause concern to its members but, in my experience of them, the men responsible for Government departments are conscientious and take a pride in their work and their department. I am sure they would welcome the opportunity of answering some of the criticisms sometimes levelled at them by members of the public, by ensuring that such criticisms were answered and explained fully. I may also remind honourable members that members of the Public Service, together with every man and woman in the street, have one thing in common: they are all taxpayers. Anything that can save money for the State is to their benefit. I also believe that, even if its investigations were only intermittent, into specific projects, the very fact that such a committee existed would have a beneficial and steadying effect on State expenditure. It is often said that justice should not only be done but should also be seen to be done. This should apply equally when accounting to the taxpayer for the expenditure of his money.

The main point of contention with this Bill as it comes from another place will probably be the fact that it is proposed that only members of the House of Assembly shall be on this committee. I explained earlier that in other States and in the British Parliament this was the situation because the Lower House introduces financial measures.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Should they not be reviewed by members of this Council, too?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I understand that when a report of that kind is laid on the table in the other House of Parliament it then becomes a public document, and so is available to any member of the public or of Parliament. The point raised by the Hon. Mr. Banfield is a good one. I believe that from a practical point of view the wider the choice of members of this committee the better will be the opportunity to use people with special talents on it, but I leave that decision to this Council.

I believe that the Bill is largely self-explanatory. Clause 3 deals with the constitution and appointment of the committee, which shall consist of five members of the House of Assembly, and provides that a Minister of the Crown shall not be a member. It also provides that when a committee is formed it shall be appointed for the term of a Parliament. Clause 4 deals with the term of office, while clause 5 contains general provisions to be followed when casual vacancies occur. Clause 6 deals with the appointment of a chairman and the election of a temporary chairman. Clause 8 specifies that the Governor may, on the recommendation of the Speaker of the House of Assembly, appoint from the staff of that House a secretary to the committee and such other officers of the committee as are required for the performance of its functions.

Clause 9 defines the duties of the committee, and this is probably the operative clause as well as the most important in the Bill. It provides that:

The duties of the Committee shall be—

- (a) to examine the accounts of the receipts and expenditure of the State and each statement and report transmitted to the Houses of Parliament by the Auditor-General, pursuant to the Audit Act, 1921-1966, as amended;
- (b) to report to the House of Assembly with such comments as it thinks fit, any items or matters in those accounts, statements and reports, or any circumstances connected with them, to which the Committee is of the opinion that the attention of the House should be directed;
- (c) to report to the House of Assembly any alteration which the Committee thinks desirable in the form of the public accounts or in the method of keeping them, or in the mode of receipt, control, issue or payment of public moneys;

and

- (d) to inquire into and report to the House of Assembly on any question in connection with the public accounts of the State—
 - (i) on its own initiative;
 - (ii) which is referred to it by a resolution of the House of Assembly;
 or
 - (iii) which is referred to it by the Governor or by a Minister of the Crown.

From that precise list of duties of the committee it is obvious that it may investigate any matter on its own initiative and, secondly, anything it is required to do by the House of Assembly or by a Minister of the Crown.

Clause 10 refers to the power of the committee to summon witnesses, while clause 11 gives power to the committee to sit during the sittings of Parliament as well as making provision for sittings when Parliament is not in session. Clause 12 enables the Governor to make regulations necessary or convenient to be prescribed for carrying out and giving effect to the measure. I believe that the Bill has much merit, and I ask members of the Council to consider it seriously.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 15. Page 2187.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I oppose this Bill, which seeks to amend section 31m (3) of the Act. That section prescribes that no agent, officer or servant of the Totalizator Agency Board shall pay out to any person any dividend in respect of a bet on an event held on that same day. In place of that subsection, this Bill seeks to provide:

No agent, officer or servant of the board shall pay out to any person who has made a bet at any office, branch or agency of the board . . . any dividend in respect of that bet before the conclusion of the race meeting or trotting meeting at which the event on which the bet was made was determined—

they are very important words, as I will explain later—

nor shall he pay out such dividend except in accordance with the directions of the board.

I oppose the Bill on three main grounds. First, when my Party was in Government and the legislation to establish the T.A.B. was sponsored and canvassed, it was clearly decided by the racing industry, the public, and everyone connected with the matter (and this was one of the decisions of the Government of the day) that no dividend would be paid out on the same day that the horse or trotting meeting was conducted.

This matter was debated both in this Council and in the other place, and it was decided that that should be one of the conditions on which the Bill would be accepted. I still think that condition should be honoured. I know that there may be some division of opinion on this matter, because there will always be a division of opinion on any matter. However, I suggest that on a social question such as this the decision should not be altered. This Chamber

particularly is constituted very little differently from what it was when the T.A.B. legislation was introduced. In the other place, of course, the personnel change much more and new members coming in could have an entirely different opinion on this matter.

The second ground on which I oppose the Bill is that I think that, if it is passed, Parliament will be passing the buck in this matter. I believe that in all social questions Parliament should specify the bounds within which a measure shall work. This amending Bill does not say that the T.A.B. shall pay out on the day of the meeting: it merely says that the board may direct that a certain thing shall be done. To my mind, Parliament in this matter is not making the decision on a social question that is of immense importance, and presently I will read to the Council what I said on this subject many years ago.

I consider that the sponsor of this Bill and the Government are having, to use a racing phrase, a couple of bob each way. If the Bill was passed and they were asked about it outside, they would say that the Government did not permit the T.A.B. to pay out after the last race; alternatively, perhaps to suit the Government's convenience, they could very well say, "We left the decision to the T.A.B." Likewise, people who did not approve paying out could say, "Well, we did not tell them to pay: we left the decision to them."

In my opinion, that is a grave departure by a Government and a Parliament elected to serve the people of the State. In almost all social questions Parliament has to take the blame. We tell the licensees of hotels and motels and the managers of clubs what times they shall serve liquor, and we tell people in the cinema world what time on Sundays they may open the cinemas. We tell people what time they can start playing sport on suburban ovals and elsewhere on Sundays. With regard to elections, Parliament specifies the times during which votes may be cast, and we even tell the people how they must cast their postal votes. Parliament and the Government of the day take the responsibility in all these things. To my mind, the Government has not shown itself to be prepared to say yea or nay on the question.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Hasn't local government got some say regarding Sunday sport?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Not to my knowledge. I am sure that we have laid it down somewhere that people shall not start playing

sport on Sunday before 1 p.m. I say that this is nothing but the thin edge of the wedge to go back to the old betting shops: this is the first step towards it. The Hon. Sir Norman Jude and the Chief Secretary can tell me if I am wrong on this matter, but I say that if this amendment is carried and the board decides to pay out on Saturday there will be some lucky punters at the T.A.B. premises waiting to collect in order to invest further. I do not want to be told that that cannot happen, because presently I will prove how it can happen. I spoke many years ago in another place on this very same subject when I was much younger, and I am pleased to say that I can read from *Hansard* (page 1085 of the 1945 session) regarding two of my main points. I said then:

At the outset I wish to make it quite clear that I am opposed to betting shops in the metropolitan area and will support their establishment in the country only if there is no other way to give country residents some form of legalized betting. The only portion of this Bill with which I agree is that which prohibits the re-opening of betting shops in the metropolitan area. I am opposed to the suggestion that Parliament should shift from its shoulders to those of country councils its duty to legislate for the people.

I say exactly the same thing in relation to this matter. I went on to say:

No-one likes to have responsibility forced upon him, and it would ill become those who have been elected to this place with the responsibility of legislating for the people to pass that responsibility on to bodies that are not paid to perform the duty.

Further on, talking about betting offences, I said:

In 1934, notwithstanding that those severe penalties had not stopped illegal betting, Parliament in its wisdom introduced the greatest curse ever inflicted on the people of this State, the betting shop. Let me say here that neither Parliament nor anyone else will ever stop Australians from gambling and, provided that it is conducted in such a way as not to cause a general nuisance, I see no harm in those who wish to enjoy themselves in that way indulging in it. I frequented betting shops and say without fear of contradiction that all of the bad things members have said of them in this debate are not bad enough.

Time has passed, but I am still of that opinion today. This Bill does two things that I opposed in 1945 and I oppose today: first, it is a definite step toward a return to betting shops and, secondly, it passes to the Totalizator Agency Board responsibility for saying whether it will pay out dividends after the last race.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The board has other areas of discretion.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: But it does not have discretion in subjects such as this. The principal Act definitely provides that there are to be no pay-outs for any meeting on the day on which bets are made. No discretion is given to the board in this matter.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: But the board is given discretion in other areas.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Maybe, but those areas of discretion are in accordance with the principal Act. In other areas, the board has no discretion. I am not criticizing the board, because I believe it has done a really good job in difficult circumstances. However, I am criticizing the Hon. Sir Norman Jude and the Government for wanting to place upon the board the responsibility for making a decision that no-one wants to be burdened with. If Parliament wants the board to pay dividends after the last race, it should say so, not leave it to the board's discretion. This is the core of my objection. If people think that this is not the thin end of the wedge they are hiding their heads in the sand. Proposed new section 31m (3) provides:

No agent, officer or servant of the board shall pay out to any person who has made a bet at any office, branch or agency of the board where off-course totalizator betting is conducted any dividend in respect of that bet before the conclusion of the race meeting or trotting meeting at which the event on which the bet was made was determined, nor shall he pay out such dividend except in accordance with the directions of the board.

In other words, if a punter bets on Melbourne and Sydney race meetings and those meetings conclude before the last Adelaide race or before the last two Adelaide races (which frequently happens), he can collect his dividends at the T.A.B. office and reinvest them on the last one or two races in Adelaide.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Isn't that where the board would have discretion? Wouldn't it see that this did not happen?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not think so. If the board can pay after "a meeting", it will pay after the last race has been run in another State, not after the conclusion of all meetings.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: There could be a race in Western Australia one and a half hours after the last Adelaide race.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. Last Saturday the last Caulfield race was at 4.25 p.m., and the second-to-last Adelaide race was at 4.20 p.m., so a punter could not collect from Caulfield and bet on the second-to-last

Adelaide race. The last Adelaide race was at 4.55 p.m., so a punter, under this Bill, could collect his dividends after the last Caulfield race, hang around the T.A.B. office, and then reinvest his winnings on the last race in Adelaide. Last Saturday the last Randwick race was at 4.35 p.m., so the punter could collect his dividends and reinvest them on the last Adelaide race.

Some honourable members say that this Bill is not the thin end of the wedge, but I say that this could and (in my opinion) would happen. Today, the last Geelong race is at 4 p.m. and the last Gawler race at 4.15 p.m., so the same situation could arise. The last Canterbury race is at 4.10 p.m., so a punter would not have time to make a bet on a Gawler race if he had dividends to collect from the Canterbury meeting.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I thought you were going to say that the punter would not have time to have a bet on a Geelong race.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: A punter would not have time to have a bet there. A punter cannot place a bet on a race later than a prescribed number of minutes before the starting time.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: The period is 30 minutes and 35 minutes at present.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I think the honourable member would agree that there have often been two Adelaide races after the last Melbourne race. I do not like this Bill. In case someone says that there is not much T.A.B. betting on races in other States, I point out that the board's last annual report says that, on a percentage basis, more bets are laid on Melbourne and Sydney races than are laid on Adelaide metropolitan races. For the South Australian metropolitan area, the figure is 21.22 per cent of the turnover; for South Australian country areas, it is 4.67 per cent; for the Victorian metropolitan area, 26.8 per cent; for Victorian country areas, 16.93 per cent; and for New South Wales country areas, 13.73 per cent. So, 56 per cent of the total turnover relates to meetings in other States. What I have outlined could and (in my opinion) would happen.

This is purely a social question, so I do not know what support I have in this Council on this matter. I believe I have one supporter at least—not a member of my Party. If I were the only person in this Council with these views, however, I would still vote against the Bill. I hope it is defeated.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Do you think it may lead to pay-outs after every race?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: There is nothing in the world more certain. One has only to look at the statements of sporting writers and of the punters club to realize that, once they achieve one objective, they pursue another.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Should we break the agreement in respect of the 1½ per cent?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have always said that the Government takes too much taxation from racing interests. How the Government should give more back to the sport is a financial question.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It would still break the previous agreement.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: But this is a social question. I have spoken to people from America. When more money is wanted there, the clubs are asked to conduct more meetings so that the Government can receive more revenue. I often go to the races, but not during the summer. If we had better horses and special races the Government would perhaps get back two or three times what is involved in the figure of 1½ per cent. One had only to go to the Invitation Stakes meeting on Labor Day to realize that special events attract big crowds. If the racing clubs had more money to attract people here, they would get bigger crowds, and the Government finally would be better off because of the increased turnover.

I oppose the Bill. I hope it is defeated but, if it is passed, I have a certain amount of faith in the personnel of the Totalizator Agency Board. I know most of them fairly well, and I hope that they would resist pressures that might be brought to bear on them to bring back anything like our old betting shops; otherwise, at some time in the future Parliament would have to look at the whole question of totalizator agency boards and perhaps ban them and have no provision for off-course punters.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 21. Page 2295.)

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (Southern): Each year the decreasing value of money affects the Budget of every nation, State, business house and individual. Whenever at

any level we overspend unwisely and apportion our money without discretion, a day of reckoning has to come sooner or later. The wise person seeks to rectify the imbalance as soon as possible. The longer the deficit continues, the more complicated the task of restoration becomes.

This State could not by any stretch of the imagination have been called solvent and financially sound at the end of the 1966-67 financial year. Assets had been used up, a credit balance in three years had been turned into a deficit, and the inevitable result was that confidence in the State had lessened. Immigration had slowed down and business enterprise had slackened. South Australia had taken for itself a low place on the table of State prosperity.

The 1968 Budget reflected the needs and position of the State. The parlous position required skilled and firm measures to restore confidence both in and by South Australia. Those measures were taken; they were not popular or universally considered ideal and satisfactory. Nevertheless, they were taken to achieve the objective of beginning to re-establish the State's financial equilibrium.

This year's financial statement by the Treasurer proves that the State is on the upgrade once again. Therefore, the Treasurer and the Government are to be commended and congratulated that South Australia can again begin to look the other States straight in the eye. The Hon. Mr. Rowe spoke yesterday concerning certain aspects of the Bill, and the Hon. Mr. Banfield gave his views on the education situation in this State. I cannot add to what the Hon. Mr. Rowe said, nor will I comment on what the Hon. Mr. Banfield said, beyond emphasizing that not one member of this Council or of another place, whatever our political complexion, would yield to any other colleague in his belief in and recognition of the importance of the needs of education to this Government, to this State and to this country.

Some of us have been educated in different parts of the world, but none of us can accept that any department can be given precedence from the Government's point of view beyond the financial means available comparable to the needs of the community as a whole.

It will not be surprising to honourable members that the part of the Estimates that caught my eye most vividly concerned medical services, most especially those designated "Public Health". Epidemiology is that section which

studies and protects against the outbreak of conditions which, if they became rampant in the community, could lead to the type of situation wherein the outbreaks of poliomyelitis of a few years back, for instance, could be but a mere bagatelle. General public health includes the guarding of our food, general hygiene and ensuring a standard of cleanliness, thereby enabling us to walk and live in freedom from the ravages that infested our forebears in the older parts of the world.

Another section of public health is school health. This service enables many a condition to be detected at a stage when treatment can be instituted to prevent permanent crippledness or handicap. Many a person with an impediment in or a defect of hearing or vision has reason to be grateful that his condition was discovered by the school medical health service before time allowed it to become gross and irreversible. Tuberculosis, once a dreaded ravager of society and spoken of with a degree of bated breath, is nowadays, thanks to modern therapy coupled with efficient public health measures, taken in our stride. Unfortunately, this is not so in some of the less fortunate parts of the world, where it is still a major killer.

We are fortunate in this country and we owe much to our public health services. Another more recent section of public health is occupational health. It was first recognized as a separate entity by Bernadini Ramazzini in 1700, but as part of our public health system it is a recent innovation.

All these public health measures to which I have referred take \$1,250,000 of the Budget. Without them, the money allocated for education, labour, agriculture and so on would yield much less to the development of the State than would be the case. I realize that other services such as engineering and water, social welfare and hospitals all play their part in securing a high standard of well-being for our people.

I should like to return briefly to occupational medicine and occupational health. Safety at work is not the prerogative of one department. In addition to the public health side, the Department of Labour and Industry plays a vital role. Indeed, no department which employs labour directly or which is responsible in any way for our industrial force is free from some degree of responsibility.

Not only are the statistics of absence from work an indication of loss of production, but they are also an indication of human well-being. The number of days lost each year by each employee makes startling reading economically.

They are to a degree an index of the economic health of the community. Many folk believe that occupational health is concerned only with the dramatic situations where dangerous components expose the worker to serious and deadly risk, but this is not so. The commonest causes of absence from work are the common cold, influenza, minor skeletal ailments, bronchitis, skin troubles and abdominal conditions. The time lost as a result of these varying causes differs from industry to industry, to a considerable degree. Absence from work is also affected in an important measure by the age of the worker. The older worker becomes immune to short-term infections and short spells of absence, whilst there is also a seasonal incidence of more sickness in winter. It is a statistical fact that women in industry tend, overall, to have a higher accident rate than do men. In all grades of industry there is a group of accident-prone workers. In some industries as much as two-thirds of the sickness is reported from only 16 per cent of the work force.

Administrative influences affect absence from work. When a man knows that his being sick and away from work can adversely affect his career prospects, he is more desperate to keep working, especially in times of under-employment. Today, however, in this country there is no such thing, and, as a result, it is the employer who has to be patient when grandmothers die in large numbers on football days! Family responsibilities and social background also influence the picture. Single men with no family burdens have a higher absence rate than men with family dependants. It is true that job satisfaction will keep a man at work long after the misfit has decided he is too ill to carry on.

To keep an active, live and keen work force is the purpose of occupational health. It is, therefore, concerned with the maintenance of properly constructed furniture and equipment, which allows of safe working practices in a relaxed and safe manner. It is concerned with the effects of temperature, lighting, ventilation, cleanliness and the overall environment of the employees. When all this, and much more, is done, we must come down to the human aspect of industrial accidents. They vary in frequency and severity—the welder with his eye, the carpenter with his hand, and so on through to the more sophisticated processes that have within them complicated physical, chemical and even biological risks that, without built-in safeguards, would be deadly in their effect.

Accidents at work are commonest at the beginning and end of an employee's working life. The early ones are the problems of the apprentice and the inexperienced: in other words, it is the result of teenage *gaucherie* and hamfistedness. It is the problem of being young, when liability to accidents of all types seems to be inbuilt. At the other end there is the employee with failing eyesight, who is a little harder of hearing, who suffers from unsteadiness of foot and is slower in his general movement. It has been estimated that the safest period of a man's working life is between 10 and 35 years after his apprenticeship. Training, or its lack, is the main factor concerned with the causing of accidents. Adequately trained for a job (and the emphasis is on "adequately") a human being can work satisfactorily within a wide range of emotional conditions. The so-called accident-prone group can thereby be reduced to a minimum.

Other facets of the Estimates, such as the water commitments and the way in which allocations and services will bear on the primary producer, whose back has been well bent under the load of overheads and costs, cannot but concern all members of this Council, especially those of us from the country. I support the Bill.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Central No. 1): Like my two colleagues who have already spoken, I support the second reading of this Bill with little enthusiasm. In fact, from what I hear, the Treasurer, when he introduced the measure in another place, was not very enthusiastic himself. I do not propose to touch on every phase of the Budget, but I should like to make one or two points.

Looking through the Estimates of Expenditure, I notice that the amount of money proposed for the Department of Labour and Industry has increased about 6 per cent over and above what was spent last year. However, the amount proposed for the Apprenticeship Commission, on the line referring to the Secretary of the Commission, inspectors and clerical staff, is a 22 per cent increase on what was actually paid last year. The payment for last year was nearly \$1,000 above the amount voted. Being very interested in apprenticeship matters, I am pleased to see the increase on this line for, although many employers do the right thing by their apprentices, there are still some who do not, because I am still getting reports from apprentices who have become completely disillusioned by being kept on repetitive work for long periods.

Although these reports to me have decreased to a great extent since the Apprenticeship Commission was set up during the term of the Labor Government, there is room for improvement, and the increase in this line gives me hope that some further work will be done in this regard.

It is encouraging to hear, on occasions, of such schemes as have been introduced into some industries where employers and unions have come together to provide better shop training techniques, such as the one recently introduced into the printing industry. This scheme, supplemented by a trade school training, ensures that properly skilled tradesmen are trained and then used in industry. This, in addition to benefiting the tradesmen, is of substantial benefit to the employers, too. I was interested to read in a trade journal recently a report about the systematic training of apprentices in the printing industry. It reads:

Successful conferences in Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide and Perth produce encouraging results for the development and implementation of new systematic training for the apprentices in the printing industry. Coinciding appropriately with the opening of Apprenticeship Week in New South Wales, the combined forces of the Printing Industry successfully launched what is considered to be the most progressive approach to apprenticeship training in any industry in Australia and, indeed, probably in any other country in the world. This new approach to apprenticeship training is embodied in "Workshop Training Programmes for Apprentices in the Printing Industry" formulated and fully endorsed by the Department of Labour and Industry, the Printing Employers, the Printing Unions, Government Printers and the Graphic Arts Schools. Development of Systematic Training: Looking to the 1970's and beyond for the needs of adequate training of the super-tradesmen of the future in the complexities of the Printing Industry with its ever-increasing tempo of technological change, the workshop training of apprentices in the industry has been programmed with the object of achieving basically the:

Development of systematic training programmes for apprentices as individuals, and

The dove-tailing of workshop training with that provided by the appropriate Graphic Arts School.

The production of the Workshop Training Booklet is the fourth and most important task performed by the working party of the National Conference on Employment and Technological Change in the Printing Industry. The National Conference, the first of its kind dealing with an Australian industry on a national basis, was set up in 1964 by the Department of Labour and National Service.

Such is the importance of the Workshop Training Booklet that it was decided that a

nation-wide campaign be launched to achieve its implementation by employers in all States. This campaign has been entered into with enthusiasm and co-operation by the major parties, the Printing Employers' Federation and the P.K.I.U., with the continuing interest and participation of the Department of Labour and National Service.

This combined approach, supported by other parties to the National Conference, set the theme for top-level conferences in capital cities during the first week in September to launch the Workshop Training Booklet on the widest possible level.

The top-level conferences in the capital cities brought encouraging results by the attendance of so many representatives of all sections of the industry and the willing acceptance of large numbers of employers to implement the workshop training programmes.

The document then contains a report on the Adelaide conference as follows:

The conference at Adelaide to launch the Workshop Training Programmes Booklet took place at the State Administrative Centre, Victoria Square, during the afternoon of 4th September. More than 80 representatives from all sections of the industry attended.

The Adelaide conference was under the chairmanship of Mr. K. C. McKenzie (Assistant Secretary, Department of Labour and National Service, and Chairman of the Working Party set up by the National Conference on Employment and Technological Change in the Printing Industry). In addition to the Chairman, the speakers at the Adelaide Conference were:

Mr. H. K. Frost (Past President of the Printing and Allied Trades Employers' Federation);

Mr. C. Colborne (Secretary of the Printing and Kindred Industries Union); and

Mr. M. H. Bone (Director of Technical Education in South Australia).

I think honourable members will agree that if all industries took the same interest in apprentices as apparently the printing industry has done, then we would have nothing to fear in future for the production of properly-skilled tradesmen and we would be able to retain the interest of the boys in their trade training. While on the subject of apprentices, I mention that following the amendment to the Apprentices Act a year or two ago the principle of daylight training of apprentices in trade schools was introduced. It was announced at the time that, owing to the need for facilities and staff, the introduction would of necessity have to be gradual, but there is now room for a speeding up of the process. It is not good enough that, after the time that has elapsed, many apprentices are still required to attend compulsory classes at night.

Turning now to that section of the Estimates of Expenditure under the title of "Minister of Roads and Transport and Minister of Local

Government", it will be found that whereas the Railways Department and the Motor Vehicles Department have increases of 6 per cent and 7 per cent respectively, the Highways Department Estimates provide for an increased expenditure of up to 12 per cent. In addition, the Minister's own office line, which includes the Secretary for Local Government, Administrative and Clerical Staff and Field Officers, has risen by about 15 per cent. Why those two lines should be increased so much more than the general range of increases is not immediately apparent. Perhaps we may hear some explanation from the Minister in reply.

Whilst speaking on the Highways Department, I refer to a published statement of the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport with regard to the Eyre Highway. Before the South Australian Minister of Roads and Transport, the Hon. C. M. Hill, left to attend the ceremony to celebrate the Western Australian Government's achievement in sealing the highway from Perth to the South Australian border, he said that the Commonwealth Government had rejected a request from this State for financial assistance for the completion of the 300-odd miles between Ceduna and the border. Yet a day or two after attending that ceremony the Commonwealth Minister, while at Broken Hill, was reported as having said that, with the completion of the standard gauge east-west railway next month, he would turn his attention to this highway. As far as South Australia is concerned, and as far as I am concerned, the standard gauge railway will not be completed until Adelaide is connected with it in a proper and viable manner. The Minister's statement has an ominous ring about it from the railways point of view in regard to the connection between Adelaide and Port Pirie.

If it is similar to the Prime Minister's statement that the standard gauge connection to Adelaide would be completed within two years (and he did not say which two years) then I believe both statements can be taken for what they are worth, with the addition of a liberal dressing of election salt.

Turning to the Railways Department Estimates of Expenditure in the Budget, I draw the Minister's attention to two main points on which I would like clarification. Under the Rolling Stock Branch subheading on page 92 (the line "Mechanics, labourers"), it is proposed to reduce expenditure from the actual payment last year of \$2,957,596 to \$2,878,187, being a reduction of \$79,409, which is close

to a 3 per cent drop on last year. With the general increase of 6 per cent, or thereabout, on most other lines, this would result in a final difference of 9 per cent between comparable lines. I would like to know whether that will result in a 9 per cent drop in employment in that section of the Railways Department.

The other matter on which I desire information also appears under the subheading of Rolling Stock Branch, under "Contingencies", and the line, as appearing on page 93, reads "Adjustment account Elizabeth Feeder Bus Service". In the 1968-69 Estimates of Expenditure an amount of \$3,000 was voted to this line, with an actual payment during that financial year of \$678. The amount provided in the current Estimates of Expenditure is only \$300. I am assuming that the line refers to a subsidy to be paid to the bus operator to meet any losses sustained by him in providing the feeder service. Recently the Minister of Roads and Transport informed my colleague, the Hon. Mr. Banfield, in answer to a question, that as a result of the Government's introduction of a bus service between Elizabeth and Adelaide he expected the railways to suffer a loss of patronage amounting to about \$70,000 a year. Is it not then reasonable to assume that the bus operator running the feeder service will also suffer a loss of patronage? Will it not then require a substantial increase in the line rather than a decrease of 50 per cent on the actual amounts spent last year?

It is apparent from a study of the figures in the Estimates for the Aboriginal Affairs Department that nothing spectacular is to take place in that department unless the Commonwealth Government initiates it. Recently I was told in a reply to a question that the Government is carefully studying the report of the Select Committee on the Welfare of Aboriginal Children. From these Estimates we can take it for granted that the study will be a long and careful one, lasting at least over the period covered by these Estimates. It is gratifying to me as a member of the committee that the Commonwealth Government is prepared to initiate something along the lines suggested in the report. Although the Estimates provide for a 6 per cent increase in the line for that department, this increase is more or less required to enable the *status quo* to continue. Yet the Social Welfare Department, under the same Minister, has received more than a 10 per cent increase, and that Minister's Miscellaneous line is increased by 17 per cent.

I compliment my colleague, the Hon. Mr. Banfield, on his excellent speech yesterday on the subject of education. He covered the field well and spoke on most aspects of the present controversy in regard to this important matter. The Hon. Mr. Rowe referred to the teachers' campaign as one made for Party-political purposes. Although he said this and criticized the campaign for this reason, he then went on himself to criticize the department, even to the extent that he maintained that a firm of consultants should be called in to investigate the department. To my knowledge, consultants do not come cheaply, and the cost to the Government of such an inquiry would be enormous.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Do you think a public accounts committee would do it?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: We have not got one yet. The policy of the Labor Party federally is for an education commission, along the lines of the Australian Universities Commission, to be set up. Such a commission would make sure that any financial help given by the commission would be spent to the best effect. I am pleased to see that the Hon. Mr. Rowe sees the need for this type of oversight of expenditure. The honourable member, in his attack on the teachers for their campaign, joins several other members of the Government Party who have made the same biased allegation regarding the campaign. However, I disagree with him in this regard, for I believe that the move was made in a genuine attempt to bring before the public the need for improvement in education matters and to impress Governments, both State and Commonwealth, of the need for more finance to be made available for education. In support of this contention I will now read reported remarks of the Minister of Education of this State, as follows:

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 other States that they are facing the same kind of problems and pressures that I am facing here.

There the Minister is saying that this is a campaign that is being waged all over Australia, yet we have the Hon. Mr. Rowe and several other members of the Government in another place, including the two Parliamentary Under Secretaries, accusing the South Australian Institute of Teachers of having a

Party-political purpose in its campaign. The Minister could have easily refuted the statements of those members. I am surprised that the Hon. Mr. Rowe jumped on the band wagon.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: There are a few band waggons being jumped on.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: It was put very clearly in an article in the Teachers Journal of October 8 as follows:

A resolution expressing dismay that not all State members of Parliament had given support to the campaign for better education was carried at last Saturday's combined meeting of branch councils. Individual members said they had been disappointed that some M.P.'s had made personal attacks against Mr. R. Harris, accusing him of political motivation in his work for the teachers' publicity campaign. Statements made in Parliament concerning the campaign had differed from those made outside the House to members of electorates.

One member of branch council said that teachers in his district had a letter from their local M.P. saying that he shared their concern regarding education and would do his best to support the teachers' case. Under cover of Parliamentary privilege, however, he had made a personal attack on the institute's Public Relations Officer (Mr. Harris) who had been responsible for carrying out the instructions of the institute's Publicity Committee. S.A.I.T. president (Mr. W. A. White) said after the motion had been carried, "We would have hoped that the two Parties in Parliament could have combined with the institute in bringing to the notice of the public the importance of education."

The Hon. Mr. Springett drew our attention to the importance of education for the general public of today. The report continued:

In spite of personal attacks the institute had been successful in gaining good publicity for the cause of education, he added. He expressed appreciation of the work of Mr. Harris who had worked hard and long hours on the campaign. Earlier in the meeting Mr. White announced to applause that the donations to the campaign had just passed the target of \$15,000.

This was donated by the members of the institute themselves. To further illustrate what I consider to be a reasonable and genuine attitude on the part of the teachers, I will also read the introductory remarks of a spokesman for a group of primary school teachers who met the Hon. Mr. Banfield and me recently. Speaking on behalf of the teachers of that primary school, he said:

We wish you to know that we do not come to file a list of complaints about the present South Australian Government but to express our concern for the children whom we consider do not receive an education to which they are entitled as members of an affluent society and

one which upholds the principles of U.N.I.C.E.F. The causes of this situation we feel are generally beyond our control and as such consider this a crisis. We are fully aware that steps are being made to alleviate the position in some areas. However, these steps are well overdue and in many cases are a consequent reaction brought about by the present campaign by teachers to disclose the inadequacies thereby applying group and public pressures. Therefore, we are sure that only by continued publicity and discussion with people at Government levels can a necessary rapid improvement be achieved.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Have you seen the pamphlet that was distributed? Could it not have had a political aspect?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I cannot pass an opinion on the pamphlet because I have not seen it. The deputation's remarks continue:

We also feel that what has often appeared quite adequate and effective to the undiscerning eye has in fact been a false impression. We ourselves accept some of the blame for this position, because such inadequacies have often been carefully concealed behind a facade of exhibitions, displays, busy children, parents days, V.I.P. visits, etc., in an effort to prevent personal criticism and loss of personal recognition for our achievements (therefore affecting promotion, etc.). That is, "faking it" or stronger—"a failure to admit failure in the achievement of our own personal philosophy of education and our employer's requirements. Therefore, we hope, by showing you a closer and more realistic picture and expressing the reasons for our frustrations and failures, that you may more fully understand our requests and be able to influence others into greater action, thereby assisting us to the good of the many unsuspecting and trusting children and, indeed, many parents also.

If we approach this matter reasonably without endeavouring to lay blame on any particular South Australian Government, we must all agree that there is room for improvement in some areas of education, despite the great strides made in the past decade. If we remember the situation 50 years ago, when some of us were attending primary school, we realize that the improvement is truly amazing. I well remember sitting in classrooms in which the windows were strategically placed so that no child could look out of them and thereby be distracted from the parrot-fashion repetition of tables and of such classics as Longfellow's *Excelsior*. Nevertheless, there is still room for improvement today.

Shortage of teachers, the large size of classes, and the lack of sufficient school buildings are all related matters. Improvements can be effected if Commonwealth aid is provided; this is preferable to criticizing teachers for their efforts. We should all be giving support. If we stand still it will not be long before we fall

behind. Some of the problems brought before us by some groups of teachers have been common to most schools. However, some schools have problems peculiar to the areas in which they are situated.

A group of teachers from the Pennington Primary School who met the Hon. Mr. Banfield and me convinced me that that school has problems somewhat different from those of other schools; consequently, it should be given special consideration. Because it is near a migrant hostel it has many students who do not speak English, yet until recently (in fact, until after the teachers had spoken to us) there was no teacher available for special classes for these children. At the beginning of this month there were 53 children at the school who did not speak English: 12 Dutch, three German, 16 Yugoslav, eight Czech, 11 French and three Italian children. The children were given a copy of the book *English for Migrants* to assist them. These children really need constant supervision but it was not being provided at this school because of class sizes.

Like classes at most metropolitan schools, the classes at the Pennington Primary School were overloaded: first, there were nine classes with 40 or more students and, secondly, there were seven classes with between 30 and 39 students, one of which classes was taught by the Deputy Headmaster. Because of other duties, including clerical work, he was not available for tutorial work each afternoon. Consequently, his class was then split and distributed among three other classes in the second category, so those classes then belonged to the first category.

Because the school is so close to a migrant hostel there is a rapid turnover of students—about 47 per cent a year. The school's total enrolment is now 650, which, under the new scheme announced by the Minister of Education, means that it will have one full-time clerical assistant from the beginning of 1970. A total of 435 new students (mostly migrants) were enrolled between the beginning of this school year and September 30, and there were 303 transfers "out" in the same period. Therefore, there was a increase in enrolment of 132 in that period—but there was no increase in staff! The Government has now admitted the need for clerical assistance in most schools, and steps are being taken to alleviate the position to a small degree. However, because of the additional clerical work created by the rapid turnover of students, a specially large amount of clerical help is needed at the Pennington Primary School.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: South Australia has had the largest proportionate increase in school population in Australia—more than 200 per cent over 20 years.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: One other area where improvement is necessary is that of remedial and opportunity classes. It was reported to me that there is one remedial teacher at the Pennington Primary School; she takes 60 children in groups of 15, each for one hour a day. I believe that 53 children have been tested for remedial classes this year, and many children are awaiting vacancies. In addition, 59 children were tested by the remedial teacher and found to be below the standard for remedial classes—they had intelligence quotients between 55 and 85. Of these 59 children the psychology branch has tested only 12 this year, and seven of them have been recommended for opportunity classes. I was told that many of the remaining 47 children, too, would probably be recommended for opportunity classes.

However, the problem connected with testing is difficult this year because the psychology branch has informed the school that, because of a staff shortage, it is two years behind. There is no opportunity class at this school, and no vacancies are available in surrounding schools. In the meantime, these children remain in ordinary classes and retard the progress of other children, but do not make much headway themselves. It is clear that there is an urgent need for more teachers of remedial classes, more opportunity classes and much improvement in the outlook of the psychology branch. Something will have to be done to retain psychologists in the department and also to attract new staff. Apparently, conditions and rewards are at present more attractive outside the Government than they are inside, and this is apparently why these people are not available.

Honourable members will agree that if one school such as I have mentioned is experiencing the problems that I have enumerated, other schools must be experiencing similar problems. Other members will probably have received as many letters as I have in this regard. I have received letters from at least 10 schools, each with different problems that have given their teachers the impression that something further should be done to advance education in this State, whether or not with the aid of the Commonwealth Government. I consider that improvements can be effected only with such aid, and for this reason we should not criticize

the teachers. Indeed, both Parties should join together and exert further pressure on the Commonwealth Government for additional finance both in this field and in other fields in which the State is experiencing difficulty with its finances.

Honourable members will agree also that this is not a Party-political campaign but a genuine one. I do not know what any schools would do without the voluntary contributions that parents make to school funds or without the magnificent work that the school committees do in raising funds that are used, with the assistance of the Government subsidy, to buy amenities and teaching aids. Many of the things that are bought by subsidy would not be available without the subsidy. In my opinion and, indeed, that of the committees, such things are essential parts of teaching aids in schools and as such should therefore be provided by the department, which should not have to rely on the subscriptions of the parents—a most unfair way of dealing with the problem.

I do not want to criticize particular areas, but in some working-class areas people do not have enough money to contribute to school funds, as a result of which the school in that area does not receive the teaching aids that a school in a more affluent area receives. I am also concerned with the student who, because of the financial situation of his parents, is forced to become a free student. In some areas where voluntary contributions are made by the parents, the school must carry some free-book students because the Government does not provide the same sort of contribution that is voluntarily given by the parents of other children.

I refer also to aid for maintaining school grounds and for art and craft work. True, the Government supplies a certain amount of money for such students as I have already mentioned but, if a class doing craft work runs out of money, the free student is placed in an embarrassing situation and cannot continue with his work while the remainder of the students are doing so.

Also, assembly halls for schools is a subsidy item. It was announced recently that a certain school was to build an assembly hall that was to cost much money. That hall could only be built as a result of much hard work by the parent bodies and school committees to raise their portion of the subsidy money. I have been told by the parents of children going to

that school that, because all the money was put aside for the hall project, no money was available for other amenities in the school. In Victoria a \$3 for \$1 subsidy is provided for school assembly halls, whereas here only a \$1 for \$1 subsidy is provided.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: They have many more temporary schools, too. We have done much better than Victoria in that respect.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I have not had much experience with the Victorian Education Department. I merely know what I have been told by people who live in Victoria, and I cannot comment further.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They spend more money per capita, too.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I accept that. Having heard what the honourable member said yesterday, I believe he knows the facts. Victoria spends much more money for each student than we do here. I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government): The Hon. Mr. Kneebone has made some comments regarding departments within my administration as well as asking some questions in relation to which I shall do my best to satisfy him in my reply. First, he commented on the fact that, according to his calculations, the Minister of Roads and Transport and Minister of Local Government departments had increases for the current financial year somewhat higher than the average of other departments. I have not checked those calculations, but I accept his word for that. There is an increase on the Estimates of \$39,808 compared with actual payments of \$270,962 in 1968-69. Generally, these increases have occurred because these offices are increasing a little in size. This will be the first full year that the Local Government office has operated in the new administrative building in Victoria Square. We found it necessary and thought it wise to create a new position of field officer and also of office assistant with the Road Safety Council. I do not think this area of expansion would be questioned, because road safety is a vital aspect.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: How many field officers have you got now?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I believe we now have two.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: There were two before I left office; I made the last appointment.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It may be four, but the honourable member will recall that one of those officers went into a higher position in the Road Safety Council organization. Nevertheless, the extra money involved as a result of that modest increase in the size of the staff of this organization will be money very well spent. We have had to employ some temporary clerical assistants because we have had to hasten the report of the Local Government Act Revision Committee. That has been a very big job for the existing staff to undertake. In fact, this has been one of the main reasons for the delay in the completion of that report, so we have had to bring in more staff to assist us in that work.

I think the largest item that may have caught the eye of the Hon. Mr. Kneebone is the line dealing with an increase in clerical and other staff in the State Planning Office. I trust honourable members opposite will agree that it is proper gradually to increase the staff in the State Planning Office. It has been difficult for some years to find qualified staff for that type of work. Therefore, we have made a further allowance to increase the staff in the State Planning Office so that this important work of town planning can be carried on at an increased rate.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: That is different from what you thought in 1967.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In 1967, my opinion was that we had to be cautious because we had a very big Act to deal with; I doubted whether everybody understood its implications. The principal note I struck at that time was that we had to be very cautious in the realm of town planning. Generally, the reasons for the increases that have been referred to within my office in Victoria Square, and within the State Planning Office, are attributable to general, but quite reasonable, expansion.

The Local Government Office now operating as a separate entity from the old Highways Department set-up has proved to be a successful development. I have heard reports that it was acclaimed by local government, because district councils and metropolitan councils now go to this office for advice from specialist officers. I have no plans to increase the size of this office further from its present size. There are three principal officers there, three senior men.

I do not want to make that office any larger than that, simply because I believe the central office of local government should never become too large. The principle I am applying in this

matter is that local government in the field should be given every opportunity to develop its own initiative within its own particular area, and, the less interference it suffers from any central authority or control, the better.

The Hon. Mr. Kneebone also questioned the increase in the Highways Department Estimates. It is true that these amounts have increased by \$497,692 compared with payments of \$4,039,337 in 1968-69. A close scrutiny of all the various lines on page 90, referred to by the Hon. Mr. Kneebone, reveals that the increases have been fairly general. The facts of life are that we are getting more money from the Commonwealth Government now. The honourable member will recall that we were given a 50 per cent increase last March for the next five years under the Commonwealth aid roads legislation. The amount of money the Commonwealth is giving us under that heading has increased from \$86,000,000 in the last five-year period to \$129,000,000 in the current five-year period, commencing on July 1, 1969. This vast increase must be spent wisely, so that we get the very best value from the money spent.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: It will take more people to spend it.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: We cannot spend this increased sum of money unless we are staffed at the correct level in the planning and design areas. It will reach a stage at the end of the five-year period when the Highways Department will be spending about \$1,000,000 a week in its operations in this State.

At present, I think the figure is about \$41,000,000 a year but these payments from the Commonwealth are increasing over this five-year span and it will reach the stage when we shall be spending about \$1,000,000 a week. This is an operating department; the money has to be spent and it is the department's job, my job and that of the Commissioner and his senior officers to see that it is spent wisely so that the best results can accrue. Therefore, we cannot avoid some staff increases so that this money can be spent wisely.

A new department has been set up, for example, in the field of property acquisition. These new departments require staff. Therefore, we cannot avoid the increase in expenditure. The honourable member mentioned two items under the Railways Department. The first of these dealt with mechanics and labourers, where there is a proposed decrease of \$79,409 on a total expenditure last year of

\$2,957,596. The reason for this is that the award variation has been offset by the reduced number of men in this particular area.

The other item to which the Hon. Mr. Kneebone referred was the adjustment account for the Elizabeth feeder bus service. Whilst there were actual payments of \$678 last year, the Railways Commissioner proposes that the amount should be only \$300 this year, the decrease thus being \$378. That has been questioned by the honourable member.

The position in this matter is that the current agreement with Transway terminates upon the introduction of the Adelaide-Elizabeth bus service, and the Railways Department must now renegotiate an agreement in respect of subsidizing Transway for its feeder and internal services within Elizabeth.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: But this reduction must result whatever agreement is reached; it must take care of the losses.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Transway Company in regard to the Adelaide-Elizabeth service is not involved.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: No.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I agree that it would appear that the feeder and internal services within Elizabeth of Transway will suffer.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: This has been put in the Estimates prior to the decision?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes, it may have been, and it may need some adjustment. I was just going to make the point. I have not had time to check the actual timing. I feel there must be some further adjustment here, but what the adjustment figure will be I do not know. Although the Elizabeth-Adelaide bus service is to start next Monday, I know the negotiations are in train now with Transway, so I cannot advise the honourable member what the new figure will be.

The last point referred to by the Hon. Mr. Kneebone was that the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport made a statement, reported in the newspaper, to the effect that he would look into the matter of the Eyre Highway. The honourable member said that the statement had an ominous ring about it and that it had been made for political purposes. I assure the honourable member that I was absolutely delighted by the manner in which the Hon. Mr. Sinclair discussed the whole problem of sealing the Eyre Highway with me and with senior officers of the Highways Department at Eucla last Friday. We

had long discussions about it. He, of course, saw the problem at first hand on the site and took a deep interest in it.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: It is a big change of attitude from his previous attitude.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Previous replies he has given to our submissions had been made by him without, I think, any inspection of the roadway concerned; but it was a change, and I think it was a change brought about because of the speeches that were made at the opening ceremony and because of submissions made on the site by representatives from South Australia and by the Western Australian Premier.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Because of October 25, too!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The honourable member may look at it in that way if he likes, but I do not think it had anything to do with October 25. I believe that here we had a young and active Minister for Shipping and Transport coming to grips with a problem, and it is something for which this Government in South Australia can at least take some credit, because the Commonwealth Government is seriously considering this question. This represents more progress than was made by the previous Labor Government, which also made submissions but made no progress at all.

The Commonwealth Minister announced at Broken Hill that he would examine the matter closely. I know that he had discussions at Eucla along such detailed lines as inquiring from the South Australian Commissioner of Highways how long that department would take to do the job. He also had discussions concerning the estimated cost of the work, and he showed a deep interest in this problem. I believe he now acknowledges that it is a problem that must be faced by the Commonwealth Government and, indeed, will be faced by it in the reasonably near future. I refute any suggestion of an ominous political ring in the announcement made by the Minister at Broken Hill.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: How naive can you get!

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1): I had no intention of entering into this debate until I heard the Minister of Roads and Transport this afternoon giving a very nice eulogy of what he, as Minister, has done since this Government has been in office. I would like to correct one or two matters mentioned by the Minister in answer to the Hon. Mr. Kneebone.

The first point related to the Road Safety Council, a council for which I claim full credit for establishing in this State whilst the Labor Government held office. It was established because the Government was not satisfied with circumstances and conditions of work as they applied in this State in relation to road safety. As Minister in charge of that section of local government I arranged for the appointment of two field officers, who commenced duty whilst the Labor Government was still in office and before I left my position as Minister. Because of that, it is no use the Minister saying that the expenditure on this line was increased by the appointment of those officers; both officers were employed before the present Government took office.

The Minister also mentioned local government and its administration, and claimed full credit for its reorganization as it affected the two officers mentioned. When the Labor Party took office local government was administered by the Highways Department and I brought local government officers into the Minister's office for the purpose of a closer administration of local government affairs. I was also responsible for appointing another officer to that section from the Auditor-General's Department, again for the purpose of better administration of local government.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But you got criticized for it, didn't you?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I certainly did get criticized.

The PRESIDENT: Order! If the honourable member would address the Chair we would get on much better.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I thought I was addressing the Chamber, but I apologize to you, Sir. I repeat that those matters were in operation during the Labor Government's term of office and were paid for at that time from funds made available to local government from the Treasury. This has not resulted in increased expenditure to the present Government because that expenditure had been approved prior to this Government taking office. The Minister mentioned (and I think I am quoting him correctly) the following:

The great advance under the Commonwealth Roads Aid Agreement that this State now receives . . .

When we make a comparison with other States, we find this State has received the lowest aid of the whole of the States.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: That is not so.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Everything I have seen substantiates it.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: I believe Tasmania probably got less.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I said on a comparable basis, and on that basis Tasmania received a better deal than did South Australia, and so did Western Australia. As far as the Eyre Highway is concerned, the work from the Western Australian border into Perth has been done principally on moneys made available to the Western Australian Government by the Commonwealth Government. There have been repeated applications made to the Commonwealth Government for financial assistance, and question upon question was asked of me in this Chamber when the Labor Government held office concerning the sealing of the Eyre Highway. I said then, and I still maintain, that it is economically impossible for the State to provide money to continue sealing the roadway from Ceduna to the Western Australian border. However, there have been a number of occasions—and I repeat, a number of occasions—when representations have been made to the Commonwealth Government; whilst we were in office a joint application was made by the Premier of Western Australia and by the South Australian Government to the Commonwealth Government for financial assistance to enable the Eyre Highway to be sealed from Ceduna to the Western Australian border.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: That was under the Developmental Roads Act.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: We received the same sort of reply from the Commonwealth Government, "This is a State responsibility and the Commonwealth cannot make any moneys available." We were given that reply on every occasion that representation was made, and I submit that the statement made recently by the Minister for Shipping and Transport, the Hon. Mr. Sinclair, in Broken Hill was purely and simply political. I wish I had the same confidence and enthusiasm as the Hon. Mr. Hill has in the Commonwealth Minister's statement, but I have not, knowing what has gone on previously. Unless there is a considerable reversal of form by the Commonwealth Government South Australia will not receive any assistance to seal the Eyre Highway.

If it is said that applications are made by this Government under the present Minister of Roads and Transport, then I contradict that statement because I know that that is not so. We submitted a detailed account of work done, mileage, and estimated cost of completion of the Eyre Highway to the Commonwealth Government. It took us some little time and

it cost the department a nice sum to prepare the whole thing for forwarding to the Commonwealth Government. It was sent to the Prime Minister himself. However, back came the stock reply, "This is a State responsibility, and the Commonwealth cannot see its way clear to make funds available."

The amount of money made available under the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act is only in conformity with the considerable increase in the amount of money that the Commonwealth itself is collecting from petrol tax today, and if it made all of this money available to the States under the agreement, which it should do, we would be better off in this State and perhaps on a more comparable basis with the other States in this respect. However, the Commonwealth is not doing it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you agree that it should make all the money available to the States and that the States should decide what they do with it?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes, provided it was spent on the roads. This is supposed to be the reason for the collection of the petrol tax.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: That is a bit open to challenge these days, isn't it? You are going back into history.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Of course I am: I am going back to the original agreement.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Come up to 1969.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The honourable member said some time ago that the money in the Highways Fund should be paid into general revenue and used for general purposes. I do not agree with him on that point, and I will oppose that suggestion at any time, because this money is raised for a specific purpose, namely, for spending on roads, and this is what should happen to it. If we examine the expenditure on roads in this State over the years we find that for a considerable number of years the rural roads have had a far better deal than the metropolitan roads. I know that we have to supply these roads. At present we have a highway which goes from one side of Australia to the other with only about 300 miles not sealed, yet the Commonwealth Government adopts the attitude that this State should provide the money for sealing that section, despite the fact that it has made a big allocation to Western Australia over the years to assist that State in sealing the section of the highway within its own borders. South Australia cannot get the proverbial cracker out of the Commonwealth to complete its section.

I will support the Minister of Roads and Transport as much as I possibly can at any time in representations to the Commonwealth Government for a better deal for this State, not only in respect of roads but in everything else. I consider that not enough pressure has been brought to bear on the Commonwealth in relation to these matters. On the eve of a Commonwealth election we read in the press that consideration will be given to this matter in the future. However, in my opinion we will find the Commonwealth again saying that this highway is a State matter and that the State itself will have to provide the funds for it.

I said earlier that I had no intention of speaking on this measure. However, because of the Minister's statement claiming credit for so many things, I considered it necessary to give the true position. Many of these things were started before the present Minister came into office. I congratulate him on carrying on the work, but I make it clear that this work was started before he was the Minister.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Chief Secretary): I thank honourable members for the expeditious way in which they have debated this matter. I think we all appreciate that very often in a matter such as this the co-operation of members of this Council is sought in an endeavour to pass a measure with some expedition.

The Hon. Mr. Springett said in his speech that South Australia was on the upgrade, and with this I think that we as a Government can completely agree. All the figures to which we have access and every economic indicator show that this is the position. We are justly proud that there is again a great deal of confidence being expressed throughout South Australia.

The Hon. Mr. Banfield in his speech referred to the fact that new industries were coming to South Australia. In fact, there has been an expansion in other industries in this State. Also, the migrant intake to South Australia has improved to the point where we can say that it is now comparable with what we were experiencing about three years ago.

Throughout South Australia there has been a very strong growth in expenditure by private explorers in the mineral field. The last figures I saw indicated that the present expenditure in mineral exploration in South Australia by private enterprise amounted to about \$5,000,000 a year. This is a very significant increase, indicating once again the point I am making that there is in South Australia at present a returning confidence.

Much has been said in the debate about Commonwealth-State financial relationships. If I remember rightly, I think it was the Hon. Mr. Banfield who was critical of the fact that some time ago Liberal and Country Party members in this Council had openly criticized the previous Government regarding the insufficient amounts being made available by the Commonwealth Government to this State. The reason the attitude of the previous Government was criticized was that in the criticism that was levelled at the Commonwealth Government the statement was made that South Australia was being singled out by the Commonwealth for different treatment regarding financial reimbursements from what the other States were getting.

I agree entirely with honourable members in this Council and with the Government in its attitude on this matter. I consider that the States must negotiate a much more satisfactory arrangement with the Commonwealth in relation not only to the tax reimbursements but also to the whole financial arrangement between the Commonwealth and the States. At present there is much concern throughout Australia about the tendency for complete centralization in the Commonwealth capital. I know what chance the States would have to develop what I might term a co-operative federalism under an Australian Labor Party Government. I make it clear that in making that statement I am not doing so in, shall I say, a political sense. Every State is at present somewhat concerned about the trend at the Commonwealth level. The Leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly has already expressed himself clearly; he has said that he believes in abolishing State Parliaments and setting up administrative units throughout Australia under the control of the Commonwealth Government. This cuts across so many accepted traditional practices in Australia that it is of great concern to anyone who supports what I have termed a co-operative federalism.

Whilst some members have clearly stated that they expect a somewhat better deal from the Commonwealth Government, we must put alongside such statements the expressed policy of the Hon. Mr. Dunstan to get rid of the States completely. I wonder where the truth of the matter lies and whether the statements of some people about a better deal from the Commonwealth Government are really genuine.

Although the Commonwealth Government can be criticized in relation to Commonwealth-State financial arrangements, I do not think

the States have any future at all if Mr. Dunstan's philosophy is implemented. I believe I am accurately quoting his philosophy.

The Hon. Mr. Banfield made a strong plea for more money in many fields, particularly education. He said that the whole trouble was that this Council had defeated a Bill to increase succession duties in South Australia. It is perfectly true that this Council did defeat a Succession Duties Act Amendment Bill, but its purpose in doing so was not to affect adversely this State's finances but to prevent a move that could accurately be described as a fraud. The Hon. Mr. Banfield said that the Liberal Government had attempted to protect the large estates in South Australia but, as was pointed out during the debate on the Bill, that is incorrect. Indeed, in the Bill I have referred to many large successions would have been taxed to a smaller extent than they are at present.

Under that Bill the small estates and the primary producers had to bear the full brunt of increased succession duties. I point out that the value of 97 per cent of estates in South Australia is less than \$40,000, and it is in this area that any increase in succession duties must fall. Today, an estate of \$40,000 would probably consist of a house, a motor car, some furniture, some insurance and a handful of shares. If we increase succession duties the big impact must be borne by estates of this size.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: It still would not cover the State's deficit of that time.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I agree entirely. The burden would have been borne by this group and by primary producers, particularly those with a large capital investment and a very low return on capital. I think the Hon. Mr. Kemp recently said that the primary producer today is paying his total capital invested in capital taxation over 20 years—this takes into account all forms of capital taxation levied upon his property.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: If primary producers have had to pay all the increased taxes that the present Government has imposed upon them, they must be broke by now.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: If we allow capital taxation to run riot we will destroy incentive in the community and stop its dynamic economic growth. South Australia's whole development has been based upon this philosophy—that we do not over-tax in this field.

The Government introduced its recent taxation measures not to destroy initiative but to impose taxation where ready money was available. As a result of past policies this State has developed more rapidly than has any other State, even though South Australia is lacking in natural resources. The succession duties legislation was defeated because it would not have done what its supporters claimed it would do.

The Hon. Mr. Banfield referred to the replacement of Wattle Park Teachers College and Western Teachers College. In 1962 the two annexes at South Road and Currie Street of Adelaide Teachers College were combined to form Western Teachers College. Immediately, steps were taken to obtain sites for sports grounds and sites for a new building.

We were immediately successful in obtaining a lease of 13 acres in the west park lands for sports grounds for Western Teachers College. These have subsequently been developed into the best sports grounds with change rooms of probably any teachers college in Australia. The search for a site for new buildings for Western Teachers College proved fruitless. Consideration was given to buying property in Currie Street. The Engineering and Water Supply Depot at Thebarton was considered. Land on South Road (even the pug-hole) was considered and the site on Holbrooks Road was also investigated.

With the change of Government in 1965, the Education Department was promised the Adelaide Gaol site adjacent to the sports grounds in the west park lands and this would have been satisfactory. However, before the gaol site could be used for Western Teachers College, a remand gaol needed to be built. The present Government saw that it would be necessary to wait for some years to use the gaol site, and it is at present compulsorily acquiring 28 acres of land on Holbrooks Road, Underdale.

Until 1967, when Commonwealth money became available for the building of teachers colleges, Western Teachers College was the top priority for replacement. However, when \$3,200,000 became available and had to be spent in the triennium July, 1967, to June, 1970, and no site was available for Western Teachers College, the decision was made to build the new Salisbury Teachers College to increase the number of places available in teachers colleges. In addition, \$270,000 was available to purchase the Murray Park property for an Eastern Teachers College to replace the other temporary teachers college at Wattle

Park, which had been in existence five years longer than Western Teachers College. If a site had been available for Western Teachers College, it certainly would have been purchased before Murray Park.

The Commonwealth Government has not apportioned to the States its total grant of \$30,000,000 for the triennium July, 1970, to June, 1973. However, it appears that South Australia should certainly get sufficient funds from the Commonwealth Government to build Eastern Teachers College, to purchase land for Western Teachers College and possibly to begin building Western Teachers College.

The fact is that we have wanted to rebuild Western Teachers College from the day it was founded, but fortuitous circumstances have led to the building of a new teachers college at Salisbury and the possible replacement of Wattle Park Teachers College before the new Western Teachers College.

In the meantime, everything possible is being done to expedite the purchase of land for Western Teachers College and to make the facilities and conditions at the existing college more suitable. Enrolments over the past two years have been progressively reduced, and accommodation extended. A new craft building was erected at the South Road section of the college at the beginning of this year and extensions were made to the library at South Road. A contract has been let for cool air-conditioning of temporary buildings at the South Road and Currie Street sections.

The building of a new Eastern Teachers College was not meant to increase the number of places. With the existence of Adelaide Teachers College, Bedford Park Teachers College and Salisbury Teachers College, the number of student places will have been increased sufficiently to turn attention to replacement of existing temporary teachers colleges. The new sites at Salisbury and Murray Park will allow for extensive additions to these colleges in the future as needs require. I hope this indicates the general history in relation to the provision of teachers colleges in South Australia.

A number of other matters relating to education were raised by the Hon. Mr. Banfield. All members agree that if one plays around with figures long enough one will get into trouble. Perhaps I could deal with one or two matters that might be of interest to honourable members if they are interested in figures. In relation to the total expenditure on education, before Commonwealth contributions for

science, library and technical equipment are excluded, the 1968-69 vote to the department from State revenue funds alone was \$53,317,000, while actual payments for that year amounted to \$54,632,000. The vote for the 1969-70 financial year is \$59,831,000 or, in other words, an increase of \$6,514,000, or 12.2 per cent over the 1968-69 vote. The increase over actual payments in 1968-69 was \$5,189,000 or 9.5 per cent, which is the figure mentioned in the Treasurer's speech. One can see, therefore, that there has been a significant increase in education expenditure from State funds.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: But that applies nearly every year, doesn't it? Isn't there a natural increase of between 11 per cent and 13 per cent?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: If one examined the figures (and I gave some during the debate on the Loan Estimates) one would see that there was a significant downturn in expenditure during the three years from 1965 to 1968. Those figures have been given, and they are accurate. The Hon. Mr. Banfield referred to the figure of 18 per cent in relation to education expenditure; there is a 0.5 per cent increase in this expenditure. This year 18.5 per cent of the total State expenditure is devoted to education, and I understand that that is the highest percentage of moneys expended by the State in South Australia's history.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Is this specifically for education as distinct from art galleries, libraries, and so on?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: This is for departmental education only?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes. There has been a significant increase; the 1969-70 increase is \$6,514,000, or 12.2 per cent higher than last year. I could give many other figures in this respect. I think the Hon. Mr. Kneebone said there is room for improvement in our education system, and one must agree with that. Indeed, no-one could disagree with it. There is room for improvement in every avenue of Government activity as well as in the private sector of our economy. It does not matter which area one looks at. I believe there is even room for improvement in the Trades Hall.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: But they are making improvements there.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Well, there is plenty of room for improvement.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: They are building a new one.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Be that as it may, it is easy for one to say that something can be improved. However, every field of human activity could be examined and it could be said that there was room for improvement. What we have achieved in education in South Australia over 20 years has been magnificent. We talk about the number of children in some of our classes, and we have been criticized in relation to the shortage of teachers and also in relation to class sizes, which are now generally smaller than they have been for 20 years. The ratio in the secondary schools has improved from 23.8 students for each teacher to 17.9 students for each teacher.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: But you are taking an average over the whole State.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I realize that, but this is the only figure upon which one can compare our situation with that in other parts of the world or in the other Australian States. The Government appreciates that the number of children in various classes must vary. Indeed, it would be ridiculous to say that there are 17.9 children in every class in this State. However, as I have already mentioned, significant improvements have been achieved. I point out that in South Australia we have had an increase of 218 per cent in the number of children attending our schools in the last 20 years. Western Australia is the nearest to us, with an increase of 167 per cent. We have been presented with the most difficult problem in Australia, yet we have managed to achieve these good figures.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: The increase for secondary schools is greater *pro rata*?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Exactly; the increase is greater *pro rata* in the secondary schools. Some individual classes are still greater than we would wish for, but there is always an area where there is room for improvement; but, overall, there has been a steady reduction in our pupil-teacher ratios from a peak of 34 to one in 1959 to 27.5 to one in primary schools today. I repeat that in secondary schools there has been a reduction from 23.8 to one to 17.9 to one, and in 10 years there has been a reduction in primary schools from 34 to one to 27.5 to one. This is better than in any other State in Australia and, I believe, than in any other country in the world.

Scotland is often cited as a country where education is reckoned to be at a high level; yet our figures are better than those for Scotland, where the relevant figures are: primary schoolchildren in classes of more than 41—145,000; primary schoolchildren in classes of more than 51—3,400. So, by comparison, we have done very well in South Australia.

Perhaps I can tell this story, which may interest honourable members. I went to a university in Chicago where a gentleman had produced what he felt was a completely adequate and Utopian health service for the city of Chicago. He had provided for everything—for his hospitals, his nurses, his doctors, his domiciliary services and his paramedical services. He thought it was a Utopian health service. On analysis, it was found that seven out of every 11 children in school in Chicago at that point of time would have had to be trained to go into the health service to produce this Utopia. That is all very well: we can look at the health service in Chicago and say it should be improved; we can bring down plans to improve it, but we are restricted by the amount of human resources available to staff these improvements.

The same thing applies to the whole of Australia. We can look at our health and education services and, for all the bright ideas on how they can be improved, we are limited by human resources in aiming to produce a Utopian system. It has been said of the "education crisis" that the protest that has occurred was not a Party campaign. I believe from the teachers' point of view that that is so. I do not believe the teachers would have been involved in a Party-political campaign. Much false information has been given. The fact that the teachers of South Australia wanted to put forward their ideas about education was exploited by other people for Party-political purposes.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Including the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am not naming any particular person.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What was the false information?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I suggest that if the honourable member reads his own speech he will find out what I am referring to.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Don't you believe there are over 40 children to a class around the State?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have already dealt with that matter.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Of course you have, but you have brought it down to the average.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have pointed out clearly that one can criticize any service if he wants to. It is not so very long ago that an education campaign was directed at the Commonwealth Government and, in that case also, I believe the situation was exploited for Party-political purposes. We could walk around Adelaide and see motor cars with a placard on the back "No confidence in Joyce" during this recent campaign. I do not believe the teachers did this, but there are people who are exploiting the situation for Party-political purposes.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What about the Walkerville Primary School?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: If the Hon. Mr. Banfield does not agree with me, I refer him to his own speech, where there is a mass of misinformation about education in South Australia. However, I thank honourable members for their expedition in handling this Bill.

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

CHIROPODISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Minister of Health) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Chiropractors Act, 1950. Read a first time.

PRISONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Chief Secretary) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Prisons Act, 1936-1968. Read a first time.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (PRISONS)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Chief Secretary) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 1935-1966. Read a first time.

OFFENDERS PROBATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Chief Secretary) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Offenders Probation Act, 1913-1963. Read a first time.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Supreme Court Act, 1935-1969. Read a first time.

CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Crown Lands Act, 1929-1968. Read a first time.

ENCROACHMENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Encroachments Act, 1944. Read a first time.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Roads and Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Highways Act, 1926-1969. Read a first time.

LAND SETTLEMENT (DEVELOPMENT LEASES) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Land Settlement (Development Leases) Act, 1949. Read a first time.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Land Tax Act, 1936-1967. Read a first time.

LAW OF PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Law of Property Act, 1936-1966. Read a first time.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Local Government Act, 1934-1969. Read a first time.

PASTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Pastoral Act, 1936-1968. Read a first time.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1967. Read a first time.

RENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Renmark Irrigation Trust Act, 1936-1966. Read a first time.

SEWERAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Sewerage Act, 1929-1967. Read a first time.

SOUTH-EASTERN DRAINAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the South-Eastern Drainage Act, 1931-1959. Read a first time.

WATER CONSERVATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Water Conservation Act, 1936. Read a first time.

WATERWORKS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Waterworks Act, 1932-1966. Read a first time.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Schedule of the Legislative Council's amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed:

No. 1. Page 3, line 22 (clause 14)—After "illiteracy" insert "or by reason of any physical incapacity".

No. 2. Page 4, line 4 (clause 15)—After "illiteracy" insert "or by reason of any physical incapacity".

No. 3. Page 5, line 35 (clause 19)—Leave out "eighteen" and insert "twenty-one".

No. 4. Page 6, line 29 (clause 20)—After "his illiteracy" insert "or by reason of any physical incapacity".

No. 5. Page 6, line 43 (clause 20)—After "place of residence" insert "and he shall insert in the place provided the day and time of the day he so signed his name".

No. 6. Page 7 (clause 20)—After line 13 insert following new subclauses:

"(6) For the purposes of this Act or of any proceedings under this Act, the day and time of day inserted on the certificate on the envelope referred to in subsection (3) of this section shall be *prima facie* evidence that the vote recorded on the ballot-paper enclosed in that envelope was recorded on that day and at that time of day.

(7) An authorized witness shall not insert on an envelope, pursuant to subsection (3) of this section, a day or a time of a day which is to his knowledge not the day or the time of the day on which he signed his name on that envelope.

Penalty: For an offence that is a contravention of this subsection, five hundred dollars."

No. 7. Page 8, lines 11 to 13 (clause 25)—Leave out paragraph (a).

No. 8. Page 8, lines 14 and 15 (clause 25)—Leave out paragraph (b).

No. 9. Page 8, line 33 (clause 25)—After "case requires" insert "and if he is also satisfied that the certificate discloses that the vote recorded on the ballot-paper enclosed in the envelope was so recorded before the time of the close of the poll,".

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government) I move:

That amendments Nos. 1 to 9 be not insisted on.

These amendments fall into three groups: amendments 1, 2 and 4 deal with authentication of documents; amendment 3 deals with the age question; and amendments 5 to 9 deal with clauses 20 and 25. Do you, Mr. Chairman, want the Committee to deal with these groups separately?

The CHAIRMAN: It is advisable to take them separately.

Amendment No. 1:

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Very well, Mr. Chairman, I shall do that. I ask leave to withdraw my motion, and I now move:

That the Council do not insist on the amendment.

This relates to the extension of grounds upon which a person may have a document authenticated instead of signing it himself. Honourable members will recall that the Council widened the scope of persons who could apply for postal votes from that which dealt specifically with those who were illiterate or, to put it another way, who were unable to read or write, to those people who were incapacitated. This Council considered then in its wisdom that these people should also come under this heading.

I stress that some circumstances in relation to postal voting have caused concern in many quarters. There is always a possibility of error, and I am not saying that dishonesty is involved. People who are incapacitated in various ways can easily make quite genuine errors in some instances when applying for postal votes. The Government considers it wise and desirable

that the whole provision be narrowed down to illiterate persons and that it should not be widened to include the other group of people.

I stress that the Government is trying to ensure that the whole system of postal voting is restricted so that it is safer from the point of view of further contentious issues arising and of errors being made. Believing it is wise and prudent that we deal only with people who are illiterate, the Government seeks this Council's support not to insist on the amendment as it was moved previously.

I hasten to add that some of our incapacitated people are able to go to the booths, and by the machinery that exists there are ways and means in which they can cast their votes.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I was interested to hear what objections could possibly have been raised to the amendment in another place, because in my opinion it is a fair amendment as it does not single out a particular category of people. I was even more interested to hear the Minister's reply, which no doubt expresses an opinion that has led to the rejection of the amendment passed by this Council, that reason being that incapacitated people are in many instances capable of making a mistake in their application for a vote. Surely that is one of the oddest reasons one could possibly hear, when one considers that an illiterate person could do precisely the same thing. A distinction seems to be drawn between an illiterate person and one who is physically incapacitated in relation to their chances of making a mistake. If anything, I should have thought the Minister's reason would apply in the opposite way. I strongly oppose the Minister's motion.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (7)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, S. C. Bevan, R. C. DeGaris, C. M. Hill (teller), A. F. Kneebone, A. J. Shard, and C. R. Story.

Noes (11)—The Hons. Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan (teller), L. R. Hart, Sir Norman Jude, H. K. Kemp, C. D. Rowe, Sir Arthur Rymill, V. G. Springett, and A. M. Whyte.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Amendment thus insisted on.

Amendment No. 2:

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I move:

That the Council do not insist on the amendment.

I have already given my reasons in this respect in relation to the previous amendment.

Amendment insisted on.

Amendment No. 3:

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I move:

That the Council do not insist on the amendment.

It relates to the raising of the age of an authorized witness from 18 to 21 years. I repeat the points that I made previously on this matter, especially that there are people at present under 21 years of age who can act as authorized witnesses. They include commissioned officers from the Services, some members of the Commonwealth or State Police Force, and people such as postmasters, postmistresses and postal officers in charge of post offices. It seems to be a retrograde and backward step that this Council causes this situation in which people who previously could have witnessed applications for postal votes are to be unable to do that now.

My second point is that I think there is some suspicion in this Chamber that this measure is the forerunner of a general approach to reduce the voting age and that the whole question of the 18 to 21 age group may be partamout in people's minds. There is no intention of involving the much wider question in this issue. The Government simply wants to give young and responsible people of 18, 19 and 20 years of age the right to witness an application for a postal vote.

I challenge honourable members here to submit that people in this age group, generally speaking, are not responsible young people. If honourable members believe they are responsible, what is wrong with giving them an opportunity to act as a witness, thus making application for a postal vote in some instances an easier procedure for the voter to carry out? Why restrict them even further?

This whole approach is difficult to understand. There are young people, especially in country areas, where it is not easy at times to find a witness quickly in this age group, that the Government believes should have the right and the opportunity to act as a witness. I urge honourable members to accept this principle, that these people are responsible; I urge them also not to restrict further the present practice, and therefore they should not insist on this amendment.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I believe it is true that when the Minister is on poor ground he is generally more forthright than when he has a good case to make.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You answer the question! You got up; you answer the challenge!

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I am aware of that. The first point I raise is this. I may be under a misapprehension but I do not think the fact that we want to limit the age to 21 debar a person who, because of some other qualification, can act as a witness. In other words, as the Bill is drafted (I am subject to correction on this) if a person is a postmaster and is under 21, because he has the capacity of a postmaster he is entitled to be a witness and does not have to be 21.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: There would be only a handful of those people.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Yes. My second point is that the Minister is trying to shift ground. I do not suggest we should increase the age from 18 to 21 because of any lack of confidence in these people. That was not my argument at all. My argument was that there was no means by which we could check on a witness because we have no record of people who are under 21. Everyone over 21 has his name on the electoral roll and can be traced. That is the sole purpose of the amendment. The age of 21 is the voting age, and I think it is reasonable that this should be the age for witnessing. As regards some other amendments before the Committee there may be room for argument, but with this amendment the Government is being a little unreasonable in not acceding to our request.

Although the Minister has said there may be areas in the country where it is difficult to find people over 21 as witnesses, that has not been my experience. In most places where I go there are people over 21 who can be obtained as witnesses. It is not as though we are restricting the category by limiting it to people over 21. There are plenty of people in the community who can and are anxious to assist and who can be traced, if necessary.

My third point is that, if we are limited to people over 21, who are therefore on the electoral roll, there is no doubt about a person's capacity whereas, if we adopt 18 as the age, we shall have no method of telling whether a person is under or over 18. Therefore, it would be better if we lifted the age to 21. I am informed that I may be under a misapprehension about the fact that we are affecting the rights of other people to hold certain positions and act as witnesses under the

age of 21. If that is so, it is certainly a very limited category. On this matter, I repeat my argument that I made in the second reading debate, that it is easy to identify people who are over 21 and even to trace a witness, because those people are recorded on the electoral roll. I admit it as an argument but I do not use it now in respect of people under 21 years of age.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (7)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, S. C. Bevan, R. C. DeGaris, C. M. Hill (teller), A. F. Kneebone, A. J. Shard, and C. R. Story.

Noes (11)—The Hons. Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, Sir Norman Jude, H. K. Kemp, C. D. Rowe (teller), Sir Arthur Rymill, V. G. Springett, and A. M. Whyte.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Amendment thus insisted on.

Amendment No. 4:

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I move:

That the Council do not insist on the amendment.

This deals with the same matter that was covered when we considered Amendment No. 1, and the arguments I submitted then still apply.

Amendment insisted on.

Amendments Nos. 5 to 9:

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I move:

That the Council do not insist on its amendments Nos. 5 to 9.

These amendments deal with the question of the reception of postal votes as valid votes up to seven days after the close of a poll. This issue raised much controversy when the matter was in this Chamber before. The Government, having the intention to simplify and make safer the whole procedure of postal voting from everyone's point of view, considers it absolutely essential that the actual vote must be in the hands of the returning officer at the close of the poll. What better method could be implemented than that?

I have had some personal experience with this matter in local government elections when late on the day of the poll one knows exactly where one stands in regard to postal voting, and that is what the Government wanted to achieve on this occasion, following the many contentious matters that have arisen over the past 18 months or so.

However, this Council wanted to go back to the old system of having a further seven days after the close of the poll. It must be remembered that post offices nowadays frank letters far less frequently than they did previously. All sorts of grave problems are posed because it is impossible as a rule to show that a vote which was put in a letterbox some time on a Saturday morning was in fact posted then and not some time on the Sunday, because as a rule no franking takes place between Saturday morning and early Monday morning.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: That is one of the reasons for the amendment.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will quote an example of what can happen under the amendment that this Council put forward. I realize that it is an extreme example, but it is proof that we are on the wrong track in this Chamber at present in regard to this issue. A voter could complete a postal ballot on Friday afternoon and have someone witness it and set out that the vote was recorded at 5 o'clock, for example, on the Friday afternoon. That voter could then put that postal vote envelope in his pocket and on a day subsequent to the election, within the following seven days after the close of the poll, having made no effort at all to post it, he could go to the returning officer and say, "I voted last Friday; here is my vote."

Are honourable members in this Council prepared to pass legislation that permits that type of thing to happen? I will not be convinced that it is a true postal vote when, knowing the result of the election, a person can go along after the close of voting on the day and put in an envelope.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: But he actually voted on the Friday.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Is the honourable member prepared to support legislation which permits the envelope to be handed to the returning officer after the votes have been counted and the results have been announced? The Government wants a clear, simple and definite scheme. It wants to overcome the problems that have occurred previously, and the best way to overcome these problems is to see that all papers are in at the close of the poll on the day of voting.

Again I stress the point that the Government does not want the same situation to occur as has occurred previously, when there has been a great deal of confusion and uncertainty. The Government would rather be in a position where all the papers were in and the result of the count was known and fully understood.

That is why the Government seeks the support of this Council in this matter.

The CHAIRMAN: I understood the Minister to say that Amendments 5 to 9 covered the same point. Is the Minister happy to treat all of these together as a test vote?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I listened to the Minister's explanation with much interest. It seems, according to what he has said, that the solution to overcome any difficulties in postal voting is to deny people the right to have their votes counted if those votes are not in the hands of the returning officer on polling day. I was under the impression that the purpose of an election was to enable people to vote and to have their votes counted so that the opinion of the people could be found.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Then why restrict it to seven days?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Members will find that under the terms of this Bill it is possible to apply for a postal vote up till 5 o'clock on the Friday immediately preceding the election day. We face the position that a number of post offices are closed on Saturday and that possibly all post offices will very soon be closed on that day. Also, a vote can be handed to a returning officer: there is not a total insistence on its being posted.

The person who has a postal vote has already made a positive move to vote when he applies for that vote; this is a first positive genuine move to record his vote. I cannot see why a person who is responsible enough to apply for a vote would carry it around with him and not post it.

I believe the question being considered is the desirability of minimizing undesirable practices. I fail to see what is dishonest about a person who has voted legitimately omitting to post his vote, which is the extreme example quoted. I believe that we have a very important principle before us. I consider that the main objection to the amendment of this House was that no provision was made for posting the vote. I think we have to face the fact that, if we are going to hold elections on a Saturday, under the present system of handling mail through the post office in bulk and franking it will be extremely difficult in future to obtain proof of posting through the activities of the post office. Therefore, we have to find another practical way of allowing people to record their votes. There have been many instances of people who have

genuinely wished to vote but have found late in the week that they have been unable to attend a polling booth through sickness, pregnancy, etc. Unless they have a reasonable time in which to get their vote into the hands of a returning officer, it will not be counted. I checked the actual figures for several electoral districts in the last election. Admittedly, there is a possibility that electoral boundaries will be changed in the future, but it is clear from the figures that postal votes can have a substantial effect on an election.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: All postal votes are not cut out.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Under the House of Assembly's proposal a number of postal votes will, of necessity, not be counted, because they will not be in the hands of the returning officer at 8 p.m. on the Saturday.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Why?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: There could be a postal strike. The House of Assembly's proposal is more strict than the Commonwealth provision. Absent and postal votes can be very significant in by-elections, because the only polling booths in the State that are open are those in the district where the by-election is being held. In this case a substantial number of what are now absent votes would become postal votes.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: What about a postal vote that was posted in another country? It could have been posted days before an election.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Yes. The whole purpose of an election is to gauge the opinion of the people. As the Bill first came to this place, it denied to a significant proportion of the people the right to have their votes counted. Because the House of Assembly's proposal would prevent a true expression of the people from being obtained, I ask that the amendments be insisted on.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I support the motion. If this Committee insists on the amendment it will be acting against the wishes of the vast majority of the people of this State, the Court of Disputed Returns, and another place. The hardship involved in a postal vote in the country is not nearly as severe as some honourable members would have us think. If this amendment is insisted on, there is a danger that people could mark their ballot-papers on the Monday and back-date them. I hope no-one will try to tell me that this has not happened. If this Committee insists on this amendment it will be an affront to the community. The people have not forgotten the Millicent election. The Labor Party was accused of whipping up demonstrations, but those demonstrations represented an instantaneous reaction from the people.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What did go on?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The Chief Secretary was in it. The Government said that it would not allow this sort of thing to go on, but these amendments worsen the position. If the next election is fought under the principal Act as it stands at present, this Committee must take full responsibility for it.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (7)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, S. C. Bevan, R. C. DeGaris, C. M. Hill (teller), A. F. Kneebone, A. J. Shard, and C. R. Story.

Noes (11)—The Hons. Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan (teller), L. R. Hart, Sir Norman Jude, H. K. Kemp, C. D. Rowe, Sir Arthur Rymill, V. G. Springett, and A. M. Whyte.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Amendments thus insisted on.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.3 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, October 23, at 2.15 p.m.