

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, September 30, 1971

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

HOUSING IMPROVEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

MINING BILL

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such moneys as might be required for the purposes of proposed clause 62a of the Bill.

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Daylight Saving,
Foot and Mouth Disease Eradication Fund
Act Amendment,
Swine Compensation Act Amendment.

QUESTIONS

MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Mr. HALL: Will you, Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Standing Orders Committee, arrange for a discussion on interpretations and rulings given by the Speaker and give members the opportunity to appear before the committee and to set out certain complaints? My question is based on what I believe to be behaviour and statements in this House which are not in accord with the standing that some members would desire and which affect the public's regard not only for the House as an institution but also for individuals who work in it. I give as examples in my explanation certain statements that have been made in the House, and I refer you, first, to page 122 of *Hansard* of July 21, 1970, where the Minister of Roads and Transport is reported as saying:

If the honourable member will shut up, I will answer it.

At page 295, the member for Ross Smith is reported as saying:

Later, I want to talk about three Fascist-minded members on the other side of the House—those who have already made it clear that they are Fascist-inclined.

There are many other examples of this sort of thing in *Hansard*, and at page 1402 the member for Unley is reported as saying:

You're only a snake.

At page 2017, the member for Salisbury is reported to have said:

If one of them contests the election, he will receive the greatest bath in political history, as befitting a dingo of his class.

That was a reference to the Mayors of Salisbury and Elizabeth. Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to what occurred in the House yesterday, when the member for Playford referred—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader is aware that Standing Orders provide that matters must be dealt with at the time they arise and, in explaining the question, he is not permitted to open up a matter that has been finalized in the House.

Mr. HALL: Mr. Speaker, I accept your ruling that I cannot quote from the statement made by the member for Playford yesterday. Suffice to say that a statement that was entirely obnoxious was made concerning one of my colleagues on this side.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not know to which statement the Leader is referring.

Mr. HALL: I am trying to tell you, Sir.

The SPEAKER: The Leader is making general statements, and I have said before that the incidents in question should be dealt with at the time they arise. Members are permitted to ask a question and to explain their question so far as is necessary, but they cannot use the explanation as a means of opening up a debate. The Leader cannot continue in that vein.

Mr. HALL: I again accept your ruling. I was not opening up a debate, but I believe that the matter I am putting to you by question is of great importance to the future of this House, as it concerns the South Australian public's regard for their Parliamentary representatives. The point I am making in further explanation is that all of those statements that I read emanated from Government members, and it would appear that your verbal determination to control this House and to ensure some sort of acceptable decorum is not an established fact and that your verbal determination is not backed up by your actual behaviour as Speaker. Therefore, I make these representations to you in the hope that we shall be able to settle this question on a higher plane than that of argument across the floor of

the House and perhaps in a type of debate less filled with personality issues when it is discussed at the committee hearings that you will chair.

The SPEAKER: A meeting of the Standing Orders Committee has been arranged. Several meetings of the committee having been held this year, progress has been made in matters relating to Standing Orders. We have considered matters arising from suggestions made by members on both sides. With regard to the committee's discussing the behaviour of members in this Chamber, I point out that the Standing Orders set out the conduct to be followed by members, and it is the duty of the Speaker to interpret those Standing Orders. If any honourable member disagrees with the Speaker's interpretation, the appropriate time to raise the matter, under the laws of the House, is the time when the matter arises. I remind the Leader that the standard of language used and the conduct displayed in this House are primarily a matter for each individual member on both sides. By the sum of individual behaviour the corporate status of the House is enhanced or deteriorates. I shall be pleased to refer to the Standing Orders Committee the matter raised by the Leader.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In the meeting of the Standing Orders Committee that has been sought by the Leader of the Opposition will you, Mr. Speaker, request that the Leader indicate to members on his side of the House, particularly to the member for Mitcham, the desirability of refraining from rudeness towards and provocation and abuse of members on this side of the House? Members on this side have been constantly provoked—

Mr. Venning: That's a lot of rubbish.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —by members opposite, particularly by the member for Mitcham, whose constant rudeness to members on this side has led to greatly incensed feeling. I give one instance of the sort of thing that has been happening. During the Estimates debate, information on a certain line was sought of me by members opposite. The questions were wrongly directed to me, as they should have been directed to the Minister representing the Chief Secretary. I replied that I did not have the information available immediately, and that brought protests from the member for Mitcham. I sought and obtained the information. It was in the hands of another Minister but, as soon as I got it,

I gave it to the House. The member for Mitcham then said, "At least we made you get off your behind and get the information for us." I said, "If that is the kind of reaction I get when I assist honourable members opposite, you will get nothing." Whereupon the honourable member very audibly to me and members on this side said, "Bad tempered bastard."

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: He didn't—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knows perfectly well that he did say it. It is not only here, but in the lobbies also, that he calls members on this side bastards.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This sort of constant rudeness, provocation and abuse from members opposite has produced a situation which now leads the Leader of the Opposition to adopt a holier-than-thou attitude to the reaction he gets, whereas this matter is by no means as one-sided as he would have the House believe. I suggest to the honourable member that he—

Mr. HALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Premier is engaging in his usual persecution complex attitude and is not directing a question to you.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I appeal to honourable members to give due consideration to what they say in the House. As Speaker, I endeavour to maintain a high standard and I expect co-operation from honourable members generally. Some honourable members show a complete disregard for the Standing Orders, which they have made and which is my duty to interpret. I suggest to honourable members that they take a serious look at themselves, and we might then be able to maintain dignity in this Chamber, operating in accordance with the Standing Orders which are made by this House and which I fairly interpret. Because of the continual barrage of interjections, I must constantly concentrate on deciding whether or not honourable members' remarks are Parliamentary. In reply to the honourable Premier, I assure him that the matter he has raised will be considered, for I am most anxious to see that the type of incident to which he has referred is eliminated in this Chamber to the benefit of Parliamentary democracy in this State.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I very much regret the aspersions that have been cast on me by the Premier in the question he asked. Incidentally, this procedure, to my recollection, has not been followed previously: a question from the Premier to the Speaker is unique in my memory.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I very much regret the aspersions cast by the Premier on me and on my conduct, both inside and outside the Chamber. I take this opportunity, the first available opportunity and the only way I can do so, to reject utterly and absolutely the allegations and the aspersions—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: As the honourable member has sought leave to make a personal explanation, he is entitled to be shown courtesy by honourable members.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I try never to take my politics outside this Chamber: even though we may engage in political controversy across the floor of the House, I do not engage in such controversy outside. I can think of only one occasion within the last few weeks in which there has been any such suggestion, and that was an incident in which the Minister of Education approached me in the dining-room. However, I invite the Premier to name specific instances in which I have called—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is inviting comment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Premier said that I had called Government members “bastards” outside the Chamber. I ask him to give me specific instances in which I have done that, because I deny absolutely ever having done so, or ever having called Government members any such names, or having used such an epithet. I try to show them, outside the House, the courtesy and friendship I would show to anyone else. I ask for any instances in which I have failed to do that. Regarding the instance in the House that has been referred to by the Premier, it took me a few minutes to find the reference in *Hansard*. It is on page 1601, and it shows clearly what happened. Dr. Eastick (member for Light) asked the Premier for information and the Premier said:

I do not have information on that matter, but I will get it for the honourable member.

I then rose in protest because, obviously, the information was available if the Premier cared to look in the bag that was a little way down

the bench. After my protest, he got the information and gave it to the member for Light. I was entitled to protest. I do not remember using any such words—

Mr. Jennings: We do!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —as the Premier alleges; certainly, they do not appear in *Hansard* nor does any suggestion of them appear in *Hansard*.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You know that, if I did not reply to your interjection, it would not be recorded in *Hansard*.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: *Hansard* shows that all or almost all (I say that advisedly, because I cannot recall an instance of this) the abusive words that have been used in the House have come from Government members. I do not enjoy being told that I am not entirely straightforward, that I am a bloody little rat, or that I am more like a mongrel than a rat: all three things have been said about me within the last week. In the House, I try to do my best, as a member of the Opposition. The Premier complains of my rudeness, my provocation and my abuse, but I am satisfied that what I do and say in the House is not unparliamentary. You, Mr. Speaker, are only too quick to pull me up if you consider that anything I do or say is unparliamentary. I am surprised that the Premier and his supporters are as thin-skinned as they appear to be from the complaints which have been made and which are implicit in the Premier's question to you.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The member for Mitcham has challenged the Premier to cite an example of his referring to any Government member as a “bastard” outside the Chamber. I am not in the habit of talking about things that happen outside the Chamber, but I feel compelled, in defence of the Premier, to do what I am about to do. I draw the attention of the member for Mitcham to the evening, I think last week, of the law dinner, when the Deputy Leader returned to the Chamber after the House had risen, and I was walking along the lobby toward the front door. The trap door in the main door opened and in came the member for Mitcham. As he entered, he noticed me fairly close to the door and said to me, “I ought to shut this in your face.” My exact reply was: “It would not bloody well matter if you did.” As I walked

through the door the Deputy Leader held it open for me and simply remarked "Bastard", and I said, "Goodnight". I never object to being called by that word if it is used in endearing terms, but I assure members that it was not used in endearing terms. I want to defend the Premier, and I think that other examples could be given. I cite that instance to the House, and I am pleased that it will be recorded in *Hansard*.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: The member for Mitcham must wait his turn.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: A serious allegation has been made against me—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Salisbury.

Mr. GROTH: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. GROTH: In view of the endeavour of the Leader of the Opposition to maintain the dignity of the House, I point out that he misrepresented the position when he quoted what the member for Salisbury had said. I apologized to the House later and withdrew my references to the Mayor of Salisbury and the Mayor of Elizabeth. Therefore, I request that the Leader's reference to me be struck from the records.

Mr. EVANS: Before the member for Mitcham asked leave to make a personal explanation, you, Sir, gave me the call. I had intended to seek leave to make a personal explanation concerning my position in the situation that arose earlier. I now seek that leave.

Leave granted.

Mr. EVANS: In the Premier's comment, when he referred to members on this side using a certain word about members on his side, he encompassed all members on this side by using the words "members of the Opposition". Without naming members (he named one without naming others), he apparently included me. I have never made a statement in this House in that manner about any member on this side or on the other side, and I do not recollect making one in the corridors. It is possible that one may, at times, say things in a similar vein, but I cannot recall doing that. It is recorded in *Hansard* that I objected strongly to matters that were discussed in the corridors being spoken about in this Chamber. As an individual, I believe that we as members should

be big enough to accept what is said in the corridors, because members of each side may have said it about members on their own side. I can remember on one occasion speaking to you, Sir, when you used a reference in terms similar to that which the Premier objected to today. I believe that it is time that we, as individuals, grew up. Anything that happens outside this Chamber we should be able to speak about in private, forget about it, and consider that it is part of our ordinary lives. As an individual, I object to the attitude that has been taken today. My personal explanation is that I do not remember making that accusation against a member, and I do not intend in future to do so. I dissociate myself from the accusations made by the Premier of this State.

Later:

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I ask you, Mr. Speaker, why you did not give the call to the member for Mitcham, as you know that he wishes to seek leave to make a personal explanation. When the member for—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should take his point of order at the time the incident occurs. It is the function of the Speaker to call on honourable members, and I have to ensure that members in the Chamber get a fair go. The member for Mitcham is not entitled to any special priority for the call. I have given the member for Mitcham as reasonable a go, as the records will disclose, as I have given other honourable members.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I take the point of order that when the member for Mitcham asked for leave you said that he had to wait his turn, but you readily gave the call to the member for Salisbury, who, evidently, had informed you that he wished to make a personal explanation. Since then you have called on other honourable members to ask questions, but it is the custom of this House always to grant leave to members to make a personal explanation, especially in the circumstances existing today, when the matter is of such great interest. Although it is rather disgusting to some members, it is a matter of great interest, and I think every member would want a member wishing to make a personal explanation to be given that right forthwith.

The SPEAKER: That is not the practice during Question Time. I cannot uphold the point of order.

Later:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I now seek leave to make a further personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thank the House for its indulgence in allowing me to make a further personal explanation. I was genuinely distressed by the personal explanation made by the Deputy Premier. I concede that, to the best of my recollection, the words he recounted to this House were accurate. Those things were said, but I assure him (and I assure every honourable member) that, so far as I was concerned, they were said in good nature (indeed, in affection), and I have never in my life felt any other sentiment towards the Deputy Premier, certainly not outside this Chamber. If I may recall to him the circumstances in which the exchange took place, I had, in fact, been out to the law dinner, as he said, with the Attorney-General. The Attorney-General had been kind enough to give me a lift back to the House and had even got out of his car and unlocked the door for me to get in, because I did not have my key. I then saw the Deputy Premier coming down the passage, and the exchange occurred. I assure him, as I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that, while it may be literally accurate that I said this, it was all said on my part and I believe on his part in the utmost good nature.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say what the Government intends with regard to the sittings of the House for the remainder of the session? We are now past the point of the Budget and, at the end of September, into what is normally regarded as being towards the end of the session. Honourable members are naturally most anxious to know just what the Government intends so that they can make arrangements depending on whether or not the House is sitting. I remember that last year we got up, I think, for a fortnight in the period between the show adjournment at the beginning of September and the Christmas adjournment. I wonder whether that will be repeated. Particularly I wonder whether the Government has yet decided the date on which the House will adjourn for Christmas and whether we are to come back again in the autumn to complete the session or whether it will be completed before Christmas.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As the Government still has a very heavy legislative

programme to be dealt with during this session, we do not intend to adjourn for any period before December. In fact, we will ask the House to sit continually until then. The precise date on which the House will adjourn this year before Christmas has not yet been determined; that will depend on the speed with which the House is able to deal with matters put before it. I shall have to ask members from now on to sit consistently late in order to deal with measures that will be coming before the House. I expect that the House will resume early in the New Year, some time in February, when I expect to complete the business that has been outlined in the Governor's Speech.

BUILDING CONTROLS

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to my recent question about building controls and planning regulations?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Although the honourable member asked the Minister of Local Government this question regarding building controls, I am providing the reply, because the matters referred to come within the Planning and Development Act. I have discussed this question with the Director of Planning, who states that an excessive concentration of shop and office buildings results in both vehicular and pedestrian traffic congestion, overcrowding of public transport, and poor working conditions for employees. Controls are necessary to prevent such undesirable conditions developing. The Planning and Development Act enables planning regulations to be made relating to building bulk. Such bulk controls are included in planning regulations that are already operative but more particularly in relation to flats. Provision will not be made in the regulations to accompany the new Building Act for matters which lie in the field of town planning. The Adelaide City Council has the power to initiate planning regulations under the Planning and Development Act for the city or any part of it. Such regulations must conform to the provisions of the Metropolitan Development Plan and, as the report accompanying the plan makes specific reference to the control of building bulk in the city of Adelaide, the council could proceed to recommend such regulations if it so wishes. The extent of the control must be based on a judicial appraisal of the physical, social and economic factors involved.

LOTTERY LICENCES

Mr. SLATER: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary how many small lottery licences his office has issued in the various categories of licence since the inception of the issuing of such licences?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I shall obtain the information.

DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF TRANSPORT

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question regarding the position of Director-General of Transport?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Last Tuesday the honourable member raised the matter of the Director-General of Transport, and I can now give him the information, which I trust will meet his requirements. Following the request by Dr. L. L. Alston to be released from his earlier acceptance of the position of Director-General of Transport, a series of consultations took place between Dr. Alston and senior Government officials. The last consultation of which I am aware was a telephone call late on Wednesday evening, September 22 (S.A. time) from Dr. Alston to a senior member of the Public Service. This was reported to me at 9.45 a.m. on Thursday, September 23. I then reported to Cabinet, which met following Executive Council on Thursday, September 23, and Cabinet agreed that Dr. Alston's request for release should be acceded to with considerable regret and that a public announcement should be made accordingly. As a result, I issued the following statement at 12.15 p.m. on Thursday, September 23:

Following receipt of a cable of acceptance a few weeks ago, followed by a letter of confirmation, I publicly announced that Dr. L. L. Alston had been appointed to the position of Director-General of Transport in South Australia. However, Dr. Alston has now requested that he be released from his earlier acceptance and consequent appointment because of new developments that were not apparent when he accepted the position. In seeking release, he has said that he had been looking forward very much to the challenge that the position of Director-General constituted, but since notifying us of his acceptance, he has been offered another position which is still under negotiation and which he (Dr. Alston) considers to be more in line with his professional development. In expressing regret for any inconvenience caused, he has stressed that his two decisions, first to accept the position of Director-General and now not to take up the appointment, were both taken only after very serious and deep thought and discussions with his wife and family.

As can be seen from the above, the information I gave the Committee in the early hours of Thursday morning was the position as I knew it at that time. Subsequently, the Public Service Board sent the following cable to Dr. Alston at 8.53 a.m. on September 24:

With regret but with best wishes for your future Public Service Board accepts your withdrawal.

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation tell honourable members what is his programme to fence the national parks and reserves under his control in South Australia? I have been approached by landholders in my district who have expressed concern not about the setting up of these reserves, which they appreciate, but about the fauna and vermin that encroach on to their properties from the reserves. Satisfactory fencing could keep such fauna and vermin within the confines of the areas the Minister has under his control.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The National Parks Commission has a programme for fencing, based on the funds available in any one year. I shall be pleased to refer this matter to the commission and to ascertain what specific programme it may have for fencing in the honourable member's district and in the South-East generally.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether the National Parks Commission intends to clear a fire break around the Belair National Park boundaries before the coming summer season? For some years now, residents living around the perimeter of National Park have been concerned at the flammable material that builds up inside the park during the winter months, especially in a winter such as we have had this year, when there has been a heavy rainfall. Any person driving along the main Upper Sturt Road at present would see an abundance of growth which, when it dries off, will virtually become a tinder box. Consequently, there is a serious risk of a major fire being started by a discarded cigarette butt, a spark from a motor vehicle, or perhaps by a firebug. This concerns people who live in the area and who cannot leave their properties during summer months, with any feeling that their homes are safe, to go to the beach, on picnics or to visit friends at the weekend or any other time. They are virtually bound to their homes in the summer months, just to protect what is rightfully theirs from fires that may start in

or alongside National Park. I have raised this matter with the Minister at this early stage so that boundaries can be cleared to some extent before the summer months arrive. Will he take up the matter with the National Parks Commission?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be pleased to do that and provide the honourable member with a report.

SWIMMING POOLS

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Premier examine the effectiveness of the power that now exists under certain sections of the Building Act, if applicable, and the Local Government Act which require the owner of any property on which a swimming pool is located to fence adequately portions of the property that abut a street or road? If this power is inadequate, could it be strengthened, or could new legislation be introduced to stipulate safety standards designed to protect all home swimming pools from wandering children, both during and after construction? I first raised this matter in the House on August 28, 1968, when speaking in the Loan Estimates debate and again by questions on October 3, 1968, and February 6, 1969. Unfortunately, yet another tragedy has occurred, regrettably in the Tea Tree Gully District, and this suggests that the existing power may be inadequate.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will have the matter examined for the honourable member.

SOUTH-EASTERN FREEWAY

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about accidents on the South-Eastern Freeway?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: During the period from January 1, 1969, to September 21, 1971, there have been 69 reportable road traffic accidents on the South-Eastern main road between Snows Road, Stirling, and Arkaba Road, Aldgate. However, no fatalities have occurred as a result of these accidents.

LAURA RAILWAY CROSSING

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about accidents at the Laura railway crossing?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Apart from the recent accident referred to in the honourable member's question, the accident record for the railway crossing at Laura shows that five accidents have occurred at the locality during the last six years. All of the accidents involved

single vehicles travelling west losing control on the approach and colliding with guard fencing. Excessive speed of motor vehicles has been listed as the cause of each accident. The wing fences at this crossing are not considered to be well designed, and it is intended to relocate them.

HILLCREST BOY SCOUTS

Mr. WELLS: Will the Minister of Social Welfare obtain information about the subsidy entitlement available to the Hillcrest Boy Scout group? At present this group meets in an old building on the premises of a Catholic school at Hillcrest, but this building is to be demolished, as parts of the school are to be rebuilt, and this will leave the scout group homeless. I understand that the Enfield council has been gracious enough to give a block of land to the group so that it may build a new headquarters, and the group is now trying to raise money to finance the building of a new hall.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will inquire about this matter.

SCHOOLYARDS

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about schoolyards at several schools in my district?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A contract for civil works at the Gawler Primary School was let to L. R. & M. Contractors Proprietary Limited on September 21, 1971. It is expected that the work should be completed within 16 weeks of this date. Included in this work will be the establishment of 1,085 sq. yds. of grassed area, as a result of a recent request from the Headmaster. The development of the Kapunda Primary School is dependent on the purchase of additional land adjacent to the school. Agreement has been reached between the Education Department and the vendors for the purchase of this land, and arrangements are being made for its transfer. At Greenock Primary School a retaining wall about 75ft. long, varying from 1ft. to 4ft. high, is required to prevent erosion of the bank slope to the oval which causes muddy conditions around a wooden portable classroom. It is expected that work will proceed shortly. Messrs. Belaton and Associates, consultant civil engineers, were engaged to investigate improvements to the grounds of Kersbrook Primary School. Specifications have been prepared and it is expected that tenders will be called within the following week. Messrs. K. W. G. Smith and Associates were engaged

to inspect the Lyndoch Primary School and report on the existing condition. Designs, drawings, and specifications are being prepared by the consultants for submission at the end of the current month, to enable the early calling of tenders.

SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. PAYNE: Can the Minister of Education say what procedure is to be followed in awarding the fifth-year State Government scholarships that have been announced recently?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Normally, once the scheme is introduced applications will be called by the end of October in each year. As slightly less time has been available this year, applications will close, I think, towards the end of November. Each scholarship is valued at \$200 and is subject to a means test, so that the value of the scholarship will be reduced to nil (depending on the size of the family) at an income level of about \$7,000. The scholarships will not be available to any student who holds a Commonwealth secondary scholarship, because they are to provide for students who have not received an existing award. They will be available for students studying Matriculation or for students wishing to enter a fifth-year course of a non-Matriculation variety. At this stage it is not possible to say exactly how many scholarships will be available: the number will depend on the average income of parents of children who are awarded a scholarship, because the amount that each scholarship will cost will vary from student to student. It is expected that between 350 and 400 of these scholarships will be available.

LICENSING ACT

Mr. FERGUSON: Can the Attorney-General say whether the Government intends this session to amend the Licensing Act, particularly section 67 relating to permits for clubs? It is now four years since this Act was proclaimed, and I think members who were in Parliament at that time have some idea why provisions of this section are worded as they are. However, I believe that, since then, several legitimate clubs, particularly sports clubs, have been established, and that such clubs would wish to apply for a permit under this section.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Government intends to introduce amendments to the Licensing Act this session, but I cannot say what those amendments will be. However, I assure the honourable member that I am

conscious of the matter to which he has referred, as it is one of the aspects being considered.

RURAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Minister of Education (in the temporary absence of the Minister of Works) ask the Minister of Lands whether he intends to ask creditors of those farmers who are seeking assistance under the rural reconstruction scheme to accept less than full payment? I have been approached by a creditor of a farmer who has applied for aid under this scheme. Yesterday, or the day before, this creditor received from the committee a letter that asked him whether he would be willing to accept 80c in the dollar in full payment of the farmer's debt, and I assume that all creditors of this farmer would have received a similar letter. I do not think that it was expected when the scheme was introduced, or when debts were consolidated, that creditors would be expected to accept less than full payment, although the Act provides that payment may be wholly or in part. Will the Minister ask his colleague whether this is to be the normal situation or whether the case I have cited will be an isolated case? Also, if this is to be the normal practice does it mean that if the creditor does not agree to accept part payment the farmer, in turn, will be penalized and not receive aid? In other words, is this to be a form of blackmail used against both the creditor and the farmer?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will refer the question to my colleague and obtain the appropriate information.

JOINT TENANCY

Mr. SIMMONS: Can the Treasurer say whether it is true that a widow, as a surviving joint tenant, has to establish her right to property by satisfying investigators who move in and ask how she has achieved half ownership of her home or bank account, particularly the former? With your indulgence, Sir, and leave of the House I should like to explain my question. No doubt members have received, as I have, a remarkable circular from a Western Australian Senator (Senator Negus), who is notorious for his rather unusual ideas. However, it is difficult to believe that a member of Parliament (even an Independent or, indeed, a Liberal) would deliberately put his name to an incorrect document. The following passage—

Mr. Gunn: This is a Dorothy Dixier.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. SIMMONS: The document states, in part:

Most married couples regard themselves as "true partners". Many have put their homes in joint names and have a joint bank account, both of which are perfectly legal while both are alive. The trouble all starts when one or the other dies. Investigators move in and ask how you achieved half ownership of your home or bank account.

Mr. McANANEY: I rise on a point of order. The member for Peake has not asked a question and has not asked for the permission of the House to explain his question.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The honourable member sought leave of the House to explain his question.

Mr. SIMMONS: The circular continues:

It is then, and only then, that people discover that, to become a half owner in anything, one has to pay for it, or have it "gifted" to them. If gift tax was not paid at the time, you are in trouble again. You find to your amazement that everything your husband gave you during the three years prior to his death is regarded as a gift and is either taxed as such, or added to his estate. Either way, you are up for more tax. As the law stands, a woman is considered to own absolutely nothing unless she has absolute proof of ownership.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is quoting from rather copious notes, and I ask him now to put his question.

Mr. SIMMONS: I am just reading the last part of the extract that has prompted the question. It states:

She must produce receipts (how many women keep receipts?) to prove that she either paid for or was "gifted" the property in question. If she paid for it, she must then show how and when she earned the money.

In view of the widespread faith in joint tenancy as an appropriate way of sharing the wealth jointly accumulated in a home by partners in marriage, I ask the Treasurer whether the State subjects a widow to the kind of inquisition referred to.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, the State does not, and the document is completely ill-based and incorrect. As a member of the legal profession in this State I have, as have other members of the profession in the course of their practice, placed much property into joint ownership on behalf of clients. Subsequently, those properties have been dealt with as part of estates, and it is absolute nonsense to say that the State undertakes the kind of inquisition that Senator Negus would represent to the public as occurring.

DOG REGISTRATIONS

Mr. BECKER: Has the Minister of Local Government a reply to my recent question about dog registrations?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: During the debate on the Estimates of Expenditure the honourable member raised the question of expenses of dog registrars, and also the line relating to the Woomera board. Under the heading "Dog Registrars—Expenses" the provision is for the cost of providing dog discs to those registrars who are located outside local government boundaries. There are at present 20 police stations in the Northern area of the State that carry out the duty of a registrar of dogs. The sum provided under "Woomera board for dog registration and control" is a provision for a grant to the Woomera board to assist that body in maintaining and operating a pound at Woomera. There is no connection between the two lines.

WEST TORRENS COUNCIL

Mr. WRIGHT: Will the Minister of Local Government obtain for me a report itemizing award and over-award wages paid to all clerical and administrative staff employed by the West Torrens council? There is currently a dispute within the council concerning service payments for outside staff, and I have been involved, because I was asked by some of my constituents to arrange with the council a conference, which had previously been refused. Following that conference, I have now been informed that the council is still somewhat reluctant to meet the men's demands, but it has come to my notice this morning that over-award payments are actually paid to inside staff.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The West Torrens council, in common with all other local government bodies, is an autonomous organization and, as such, has the right to set its salaries and wages as it sees fit, provided that it does so in a proper and constitutional way within its framework and in accordance with the Local Government Act. I will certainly refer to the council the matter raised by the honourable member concerning over-award payments that may be currently made to a section of the staff, and I will ask for that information so that I can give it to the honourable member.

COOBER PEDY CENTRE

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Social Welfare say when the planned social welfare centre is to be built at Coober Pedy and

whether it will provide facilities for Aboriginal children to do their homework?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

STRATHALBYN SCHOOL OVAL

Mr. McANANEY: Although my question should perhaps be directed to the Minister of Works, who is temporarily absent from the Chamber, I address it to the Minister of Education, whose department is also involved. Will the Minister investigate what is taking place regarding the provision of an oval at the Strathalbyn Primary School? The department was asked to provide a playing oval at this school, the school committee being required to arrange for it to be grassed. However, a contract was let without its being shown to the school committee and without an opportunity being given to discuss the matter and to reach agreement on a suitable site. As a result, a much larger area than necessary was partly levelled but the slope is too steep and, as a result of levelling the area, sewerage equipment has been exposed. Despite a visit to the school by an officer of the Public Buildings Department, the committee is still dissatisfied with the treatment it has received compared to that received by other schools. In fact, I think members of the school committee are talking about resigning if there cannot be at least some public relations between the committee and the Public Buildings Department or the Education Department. I think that, judging from what has been done—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting and going beyond explaining his question. The Minister of Education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to examine the matter raised by the honourable member.

NIAGARA CYCLO-THERAPY

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question about Niagara Cyclo-therapy?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The police have made investigations but have discovered no evidence of criminal activity. The Public Health Department has investigated the literature submitted, but notes that any claim for actual cure of a disease is carefully avoided in the literature. There does not appear to be evidence of any infringement of the law.

DARTMOUTH DAM

Mr. HALL: Can the Premier say what progress, if any, is being made on an agreement to construct the Dartmouth dam?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I expect a resolution of the River Murray Commission to be passed at a meeting early next month recommending to the Governments concerned that contracts be let for the commencement of diversion works next January.

ABORTION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier explain the refusal of the Chief Secretary to release to me on my request, to assist in the preparation of a paper, the report of the medical committee overseeing the operation of the abortion legislation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have the following report from the Under Secretary:

Attached is a copy of the report of the Statutory Committee to Examine and Report on Abortions for the year ended January 7, 1971. At the time of the request from the Parliamentary Library it was assumed that it was not the above report that was asked for, but a subsequent report that had not been released. The honourable member's letter of the 16th did indicate the report sought by reference to its publication (in part) in a newspaper on May 4, 1971. The error rests in this office, and for this I take responsibility. Arrangements have also been made to make a copy available to the Parliamentary Library.

I point out that the report of the committee relating to the period ended January 7 was published, is available, and will be made available to the honourable member; I regret that he did not get it at the time. However, a subsequent report has not been published, as it contains material that could identify certain practitioners, hospitals and patients. Consequently, it contains confidential information that simply cannot be published.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE

Mr. CUMBE: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry anything further to report on the industrial dispute at British Tube Mills (Australia) Proprietary Limited, as I understand it has resulted in the laying off of many more men? Also, can the Minister say whether the conference to which he referred on Tuesday has been held and, if it has, what is the outcome? Has the Government taken further action to settle the dispute?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I appreciate the honourable member's concern about this industrial dispute. At this stage, all I can say is that it was expected that, at 2 o'clock this

afternoon in Sydney, a decision would be brought down by the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission. I am now awaiting that report. Possibly at this stage the commission is still discussing the matter.

KIMBA MAIN

Mr. GUNN: Now that the Commonwealth Government has refused to grant assistance to South Australia, under the national water resources development programme, for the Poldo-Kimba main, can the Minister of Works say what plans the Government has to re-apply for assistance in respect of this urgent project? I hope that the Minister of Works will not take this opportunity again to attack the Commonwealth Government.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have no intention of taking this opportunity to attack the Commonwealth Government, but I appeal to the honourable member and his colleagues to help the Government in trying to change the mind of the Commonwealth Government in relation to this matter. I make that perfectly clear. For several days, I have had with me a report on the letter received by the Premier from the Prime Minister. If the honourable member will bear with me, this will be of necessity a fairly lengthy reply. If objection is taken, I will seek leave to make a Ministerial statement. I have with me the submission which was made by the State Government to the Commonwealth and which is dated January, 1970. I have the only copy of the report that is available. However, I shall be happy to make this available to members, if they desire to peruse it, in order to show the House how complete, concise and effective I believe that this statement to the Commonwealth Government about the Lock-Kimba scheme has been. The Premier has replied to the Prime Minister's letter, seeking reconsideration of the matter and asking the Commonwealth Government to make available to the State the amount requested in our submission. I think I can summarize the report by saying that it contains a cost-benefit study of the proposal and deals in detail with 10 matters, namely, history, water resources of the area, existing water supplies in the area, the availability of water on Eyre Peninsula, agriculture, details of the scheme, land values and rating and revenue, construction progress, economic considerations, and the national water resources development programme. There are also six appendices which contain supporting and amplifying information.

As stated in the introduction, the purpose of the scheme is to permit, at the earliest possible time, the full development of the maximum area of rural lands which can be supplied by the water available. It is pointed out that the major portion of the area to be served is presently served only by the use of local depressions which provide run-off areas and surface catchment reservoirs for the collection of the sparse and unreliable natural rainfall. There are 16 such catchments spread generally throughout county Buxton. Their location is dependent on the existence of good holding soil and for this reason their distribution over the area is not uniform, and for the same reason it is necessary to maintain a minimum 18in. silt layer in the bottom of some of the reservoirs reducing their effective capacity.

The basis of the scheme was that settlers in the county could use these Government supplies to augment their own dams by carting water where required. There have, however, been some years in which the supplies have failed because of the sparse and unreliable rainfall as well as the evaporation problems and for these reasons the Government has erected 1,000,000gall. reinforced concrete surface tanks at these catchments which are filled by pumping from the open dam. These tanks are roofed to minimize evaporation. The catchment areas have been graded on a contour basis to assist with run-off but it requires intense or very continual rains to obtain good intakes and this cannot be relied upon. The area is, however, particularly suitable for pasture and water is the limiting factor. Stocking levels are therefore necessarily dictated by this as the cost to the Government of carting water into the county, as well as the cost to farmers and time involved in carting, is a most significant factor. The same problem affects the development of the township of Kimba, which is the principal town serving the area.

I may add that only last Monday Cabinet approved of \$120,000 being made available to cart water in this area again this summer and, in fact, water carting will commence next Monday. This highlights the problem in the area, and the same problem existed last year. The submission was therefore made to endeavour to secure Commonwealth financial assistance so that these problems could be overcome. Appendix I states:

The function of the Lock-Kimba scheme is to provide a reticulated water supply for approximately 1,000 square miles of farm lands and to provide an assured water supply

for the country township of Kimba. Thus, it is a large distribution system to serve the needs of the district and of the farming community, and qualifies for consideration under the programme.

That is under the \$100,000,000 made available by the Commonwealth Government for this purpose. In this report it has been shown:

- (1) that the Lock-Kimba scheme is to serve an area which lacks water in quantities adequate to allow its rural industry to develop;
- (2) that the scheme will serve an area which has sufficient rainfall to assure the growth of the industry if water for stock purposes can be provided;
- (3) that there is water of sufficient quantity and quality in the Poldra underground basin to meet the demands of the area to be served;
- (4) that the scheme is soundly based and designed;
- (5) that the scheme will lead to an increase in the gross national product;
- (6) that the scheme, estimated to cost \$5,050,000, is an economically sound proposition;
- (7) that the South Australian Government has experienced difficulty in the past financing the construction of the scheme from its own financial resources, and has had to postpone the construction programme on one occasion already because of this;
- (8) That, if the South Australian Government is to finance the construction of the whole scheme from its own resources, the work will take a further 21 years to complete;
- (9) that if the scheme is financed from the national water resources programme, the much earlier completion of the works will result;
- (10) that the earlier completion of the scheme will bring forward the increase in the gross national product expected from the scheme; and
- (11) that the most economical scheme in terms of a cost-benefit study is the one in which the construction programme is accelerated by the provision of funds under the national water resources programme.

Part 10 of the submission deals with the economics of the scheme and points out that the projected benefits cannot be achieved unless financial assistance is provided. It states that if assistance can be provided to maintain construction rates the laying of the whole scheme could be completed by 1977-78. Otherwise, the scheme would take about 20 years to complete in the light of current commitments. The conclusion reached was that the faster development is to be preferred, since it has a higher cost-benefit ratio, a greater margin between benefits and costs and incidentally an earlier break-even point.

The Prime Minister has told us, as the honourable members knows from the letter written to the Minister for National Development (Mr. Swartz), that the Commonwealth Government is not prepared to consider giving financial assistance for the Lock-Kimba scheme at this stage. The term "at this stage" is significant. He states that "it is deemed inappropriate to provide special assistance under the national water resources development programme to support an expansion in the sheep industry in one area, at the same time as the Government is involved in measures to alleviate the economic problems of the industry generally".

This contention might be valid if the submission was in respect of virgin land which it was intended to open up for additional settlers. However, in this instance this aspect is minimal, as the effect of the scheme will be to allow existing settlers to achieve proper development of their holdings, a balanced diversification, and thereby become more economically viable than at present to the point where the necessity "to alleviate economic problems of the industry" will be minimized or eliminated. In fact, we believe that the opposite would be the case, rather than the statement made by the Prime Minister.

The failure to obtain Commonwealth Government assistance will therefore have an adverse effect both on the State of South Australia generally and the people living in the area. The slower development will naturally reduce overall State production and consequently will reduce demand for both consumer goods and capital expenditure for development. This will have a snowballing effect on the overall economy. If a grant were made, this disability would be eliminated. In addition, there would be two further effective benefits. Overall, as far as the State is concerned, additional men would be employed, material would be required, and foodstuffs and other ancillary items would need to be produced, stimulating production, industry and merchants generally. The unemployment rate would be reduced both directly and indirectly. The additional employment in the area would have a particularly beneficial result as it would allow settlers to supplement their income during the developmental stages while productivity was increasing.

Regarding the landowners, they will, without the grant, be restricted to less efficient operation and be prevented from diversifying fully and becoming more economically viable because of the unavailability of water. They

will continue to be tied to the costly and time-consuming work of carting necessary water from the few watering points available in the county. When these fail, the State will have to provide assistance by carting water into the area.

Another significant point is that these settlers, although they can produce grain satisfactorily, cannot fully diversify. Not only can they not carry stock equivalent to the pasture capacity of their properties but periodically they have to reduce below present minimum stocking levels because of water problems, so that frequently they are forced to quit stock at low prices, even though ample pasture is available, and restock later at a substantial loss. Wheat quotas prevent expansion of grain production to compensate for reduced production at such times.

I have given this information to the House to indicate that the report has formed the basis of the letter that was sent in reply to the Prime Minister's letter which said that financial assistance would not be available from the Commonwealth Government at this point of time. I appeal not only to the member for the district and to this State's Commonwealth Government members to get behind the State Government in trying to obtain the financial assistance: I should also be grateful if the Leader of the Opposition, on behalf of the Opposition, would take up this matter with the Prime Minister and support what the Government has done.

RURAL YOUTH ADVISER

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Works a reply from his colleague to my recent question about the appointment of a rural youth adviser for Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The appointment of a rural youth adviser for Eyre Peninsula has been closely examined but, unfortunately, limitations of funds will preclude any additions to the rural youth advisory staff this financial year. However, the matter will be kept under review, and will be further considered in the light of funds available next year.

MUSEUM FACILITIES

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation consider the possibility of decentralizing to outer suburbs and country areas some of the facilities of the South Australian Museum? It is well known that much of the valuable geological and anthropological material that the museum

holds cannot be exhibited because of the limitations of its present property on North Terrace. Given the extended interest, in nature conservation particularly, by children in schools and by the growth of societies in the suburbs, to promote an interest in this matter it has occurred to me that it may be possible for the museum to make some of this material available to those schools and societies to be exhibited for the benefit of people living in those areas.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be pleased to examine this suggestion and obtain a report for the honourable member.

GAWLER HOUSES

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier confirm that the Government, on behalf of the South Australian Housing Trust, has received an allocation of \$105,100 from the Commonwealth Government concerning 17 units (14 single and three double) that are almost completed at Seventh Street, Gawler South, and that the release of this money by the Commonwealth Government will make it possible for low rentals of about \$3 a unit a week to apply? The construction of the 17 units in Seventh Street, Gawler South, is well under way and, if not completed, is almost completed. Applications have been received by the trust for entrance into these units from persons now domiciled in Gawler and in other places and, as has been pointed out, the rent charges will be low. The important point is that the funds to the extent to which I have referred (\$84,000 in relation to the 14 units and \$21,000 in relation to the three double units) have been made available to the Government of this State.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

ABATTOIRS INSPECTOR

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to endeavour to have readily available to stock firms operating at the Gepps Cross abattoirs an inspector from the Department of Primary Industry at all times? I was approached at the weekend by representatives of one of the stock firms operating at the abattoirs who told me about the difficulty the firm had been having with the Department of Primary Industry in getting an inspector to inspect stock in the old section of the abattoirs, including pig and sheep sections. No difficulty had been experienced in the southern yards in obtaining an inspector in order to inspect

a beast that had broken a leg, but in the old section much difficulty had been experienced in obtaining an inspector. If an inspector is not available immediately an animal that may be worth \$150 to \$200 may have to be destroyed, but the same animal, after inspection, could be used for human consumption in the usual way.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to ask my colleague about this matter.

CEMENT PRODUCTS

Mr. HALL: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked him in the debate on the Estimates about a person named Mr. Goree who had written to me about industrial activities in the manufacturing of cement products in South Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Goree has been given the names of seven organizations in South Australia. The organizations have been contacted by the Industrial Development Branch and have shown an interest in Mr. Goree's proposals, subject to the receipt of more detailed information. Mr. Goree has been contacted and told what more detailed information is sought by the organizations concerned.

RIGHT-OF-WAY RULE

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport seen a report attributed to the Australian Road Research Board concerning a proposal that the normal give-way rule that has applied for so many years in this country may be varied? If he has seen this report, will he inform the House of his views or of any departmental opinions he may have received on this matter, and will he provide any additional information that might be available?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I saw the article to which the honourable member refers, in the newspaper this morning, but I was not able to understand it, because it is not an accurate report. The South Australian Commissioner of Highways now holds the position of Chairman of the Australian Road Research Board. I do not know whether members are aware of that appointment, which was made a few months ago, but it is something of which I think all South Australians should be justifiably proud, and the Commissioner has been congratulated by the Government on his appointment. He has informed me that the press report is inaccurate. The board is investigating the matter but has not had any report before it to the extent set out in the newspaper article. The board will

be meeting again on November 11, when it is possible that a report will be to hand, but there is no certainty of this, because it is still being compiled.

However, the desirability of the give-way rule has been the subject of fairly deep consideration by a committee set up by a former Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport (Mr. Sinclair). That committee, one of whose members is Mr. Pak Poy, of South Australia, has been considering this matter in depth. In fact, in the report of the Pak Poy Committee on Road Safety in South Australia there is a reference to considering the desirability of retaining this rule. This expert committee is considering whether a pilot study should be undertaken for the purpose of evaluating the rule, as against the major road system or any other such system that may be evolved. I would personally support any investigation into this matter. I think the give-way rule has served us reasonably well, but I think that every person who spends any time on the road realizes that there are weaknesses in the rule. If these weaknesses can be removed without the present benefits of the rule being lost, I think such a finding ought to be actively pursued as far as possible. Obviously, if a solution to this problem can be found, its implementation could apply only on a national basis; it must be uniform.

WEST BEACH WATER SUPPLY

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Works obtain for me a report from the Engineering and Water Supply Department on what steps, if any, are being taken to improve the quality and pressure of the West Beach water supply? I have been informed by some constituents in certain areas of West Beach that during the summer they have experienced low mains water pressure and that this generally occurs between 8 a.m. and 12 midnight; and they have also complained to me about the quality of the water.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will check the matter with the department and bring down a report for the honourable member.

GLENSIDE CHAPEL

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Works say whether it is intended to remodel the chapel at the Glenside Hospital and, if it is, what the work is expected to cost?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although I seem to recall having seen a report on the matter recently, as I am not certain about this I will call for a report for the honourable member.

SCHOOL OVALS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Education say whether questions about the maintenance and upgrading of school ovals should be more properly directed to the Minister of Works than to him? I believe that the Public Buildings Department, which is under the control of the Minister of Works, is responsible for school ovals. I have found that, with regard to questions directed to the Minister of Education about the upgrading of school ovals, there is always considerable delay because, I believe, some contact must be made between the Education Department and the Public Buildings Department. Therefore, would it be better to direct such questions to the Minister of Works?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is really a matter for the preference of the individual member. The basic determination and altering of the priorities in which work is done is a matter on which the Education Department obviously has a significant influence, because we are the users of the buildings and grounds in question. I point out that, whenever questions are asked about some of these matters, there are often considerable complications involved; consequently it is not always easy to provide an early reply. Also, it is important, as a general principle, that officers of the Education Department should be fully informed of any questions being asked about school facilities. Probably for that reason it is worth while directing such questions through me. I know that the Minister of Works and the Public Buildings Department have been having difficulty with regard to establishing school ovals, simply because of the lack of contractors available to do the work. At present, only one contractor in the State will offer for this type of work. I am sure that, in these circumstances, the honourable member will appreciate that difficulties, problems and delays are bound to occur. Much depends on what other grass establishment work is taking place in the community generally. As this work is concentrated in a certain period of the year, difficulties arise in that respect.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I am referring to the Birdwood High School.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If there is any difficulty about the Birdwood High School, for example, I believe that in the first place the question should go through the Education Department because, if there is to be any change in priorities, the Education Department must be consulted by the Public Buildings Department. Basically, the priorities

that enter into providing new facilities or grounds will be determined in consultation with the Education Department. I have made that further explanation in relation to the difficulty of finding people willing to take on this kind of work. Considerable difficulties have been experienced in the past in relation to this. I know of one case that I took up with the member for Torrens, when he was Minister, in relation to the work in the Seacliff Primary School grounds. That work dragged on for ages, because in that case a contract had to be determined. If there is any further point that the honourable member wants to raise, he can do so by question or by letter.

LAMB CARCASSES

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Works obtain from the Minister of Agriculture a report on the significance of the increased rejection rate of lamb carcasses reported in the daily newspapers? A current report indicates that there has been a considerable increase in losses to the farming community as a result of the increased rate of rejection of damaged carcasses when they are inspected for export. The monthly livestock report No. 54 of 1971 of the Agriculture Department, dated September 27, 1971, and standing under the name of the stock inspector of lower Eyre Peninsula (Mr. J. D. Habel), states:

1970 was a record season at the Port Lincoln Government Produce Department works with 43,179 lambs slaughtered up to September 12, 1970, with 6,621 carcass rejections. To the same time this year there have been 52,100 lambs treated with 11,858 rejected from export.

I point out that the figure for 1970 represents slightly more than a 15 per cent rejection, whereas the figure for the 1971 period is a rejection of almost 23 per cent. As that increase is considerable, I ask the Minister whether there is any reason for this increase attributable to actions by farmers or to other handling methods.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take up the matter with my colleague and obtain a report.

POLICE STATIONS

Mr. GUNN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary whether the Government intends to close small police stations, especially those in my district? It has been widely rumoured in certain parts of my district that certain one-man police stations are to be closed. This has caused concern to my constituents, particularly those living along the Eyre Highway.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain a report.

SCHOOL PROGRESSION SCHEME

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Minister of Education comment on the freedom of primary school headmasters to introduce the student progression scheme, and on the attitude of the department towards that scheme? Although I do not criticize headmasters who have introduced the scheme, I should like to know how parents' wishes will be met. I have received several complaints about this; some parents do not like the scheme introduced in schools which their children attend. I have no idea whether or not most parents happily accept this scheme. Some parents have asked whether their children can go to another school, but I presume that that would not be possible. One question asked is whether the headmaster is free to introduce the scheme and, if he is, what happens if he is transferred. The explanation given is that the department would be told that that school had adopted the student progression scheme of tuition, but I am wondering what would happen in the event of a new headmaster not wishing to continue it. Is there some control in the department on the matter; is it discussed with the Minister or his senior officers before it is instituted; and what type of public relations programme is used in respect of it (because I think it is important to have the confidence of the parents also)? Under this scheme the children follow their own programme of work, and I understand that the bright student advances from one year to the next and may get far ahead of a student who is much slower.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: This is at primary school?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes. The students do not have set homework. They do homework but they set it for themselves and, as far as I know, no marks are awarded or examinations held, or anything like that. Naturally, this matter has stirred up some parents who, although they may be in a minority, are concerned about it, and I am also concerned about the continuity of the scheme when a headmaster is transferred. Can the Minister say whether he or the senior officers of the department exercise control in respect of the schools at which the scheme is introduced and in respect of the type of scheme introduced?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will examine the honourable member's question in detail and will discuss it with the Director-General of Education and other senior officers but I

wish to make some points. My recollection is that this sort of individual progression scheme would be discussed with officers of the Primary Division of the department before it was introduced in a school, because the success of the scheme would depend to a significant degree on the way the school was staffed and the attitude of teachers within the school and their willingness to be associated with what is possibly an ungraded situation. I appreciate the honourable member's point that the support of parents is necessary and that further explanation may be needed if the scheme at the school in question has not the full backing of parents. The possible transfer of the headmaster, and thus the continuity of the scheme, is another matter which obviously is important and must be discussed. Schools like those at Kilkenny and Taperoo, which would not be the ones to which the honourable member has referred, are ungraded schools and we intend to keep them that way. In general, it is recognized that an education system needs to be student-centred and directed towards achieving for each student the full development of that student's learning potential. Consequently, the case for a system of individual progression, for that kind of reason, is indeed strong, and I think the honourable member appreciates that in any normal type of class or in any school the range of abilities amongst the students can vary enormously. A teacher dealing with a group of students who have a wide range of abilities cannot insist, if he is to be a good teacher, that all the students progress at exactly the same rate, and any attempt to do that must surely be anti-educational. Whilst as a general principle the department and I would defend the importance of paying more attention to the needs of each individual student, there are matters in the honourable member's question that require further investigation and I will bring down an additional report for him later.

PUBLIC STORES DEPARTMENT

Mr. CUMBE: Can the Minister of Works, as the Minister responsible for administering the Public Stores Department, say whether his attention has been drawn to the Auditor-General's comments regarding the reorganization of the system of charging for services of that department, and will the Minister give me, as a former Minister in charge of that department, a report on this comment by the Auditor-General?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to obtain a report for the honourable

member on the matter. Of course, the Auditor-General often comments on things of this kind and it is not always possible for the Government to give effect to them, because the Auditor-General, in deciding to make the observation, would not be subjected to certain consequences that flow from Government action. On several occasions, for instance, the Auditor-General has reported that perpetual lease land in this State is leased at an extremely small rental and that there should be an adjustment in the rental, but I have yet to know of a Government that has tried to make that adjustment.

HOUSING TRUST OPERATIONS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier, as Minister in charge of the Housing Trust, say whether the trust has cancelled all private contract work in its maintenance section? About four weeks ago it was reported to me that all private contract work in this section had been cancelled and that the services of 52 painters and six plumbers had been discontinued. If the trust has cancelled this contract work, will the Premier give the reasons for the cancellation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not aware of private contract work being cancelled and I am certainly not aware of anyone being retrenched, but I will get a report from the trust for the honourable member.

AGRICULTURAL REPORT

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture, say whether the report of the Committee of Inquiry into Agricultural Education. Research and Extension in South Australia will be made available to the public free of charge? The front page of this report, which has been distributed to members this afternoon, indicates a price of \$2. Can the Minister say whether this price will apply to purchases of the report by persons in the community and, if it will, can he say how many copies will be made available free of charge to agricultural education officers and persons in specialist fields in agriculture? Also, has this distribution been undertaken and, if it has not, when will it be undertaken?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will refer the question to my colleague and obtain the information for the honourable member as soon as possible.

UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the University of Adelaide Act, 1971. Read a first time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes a number of miscellaneous amendments to the University of Adelaide Act, 1971. As honourable members will recall, that Act was passed in the last session of Parliament. Some doubts have been expressed by the university in relation to certain provisions of the Act, and this opportunity is being taken to clarify the legislation. The Bill covers all matters on which the university has requested amendment, and I shall deal with its provisions in detail.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 inserts saving provisions in section 2 of the principal Act. After the principal Act had been passed, it was suggested to the university that the absence of a specific provision in the Act providing for the continuance of the existing statutes of the university might result in the invalidity of those statutes. The Acts Interpretation Act, which is normally effective to preserve subordinate legislation on the repeal and re-enactment of statutory provisions, provides as follows:

The repeal of an Act conferring a power to make regulations, rules or by-laws, shall not affect any regulations, rules or by-laws made and in force under such Act . . . but they shall . . . have the same effect as if the repealing Act had been in force when they were made and conferred power to make them and they had been made thereunder.

It was argued that because there is no specific reference in this section to "statutes", the university statutes might not have been caught by the provision and hence might have been rendered invalid by the repeal of the provisions under which they were made. The use of the word "statutes" to designate a species of subordinate legislation is unusual and derives from university tradition rather than from any juristic distinction that Parliament desired to make by adopting that designation. When the essential character of the "statutes" contemplated by the university Act is examined and compared with that of the "regulations, rules or by-laws" as they are normally understood in a legislative context, it seems that there is little, if any, cogent or material distinction. However, the consequences of a successful challenge to the validity of statutes passed under the repealed Act would be so serious

that it seems a reasonable precaution, in the circumstances, to include a retrospective saving provision. This is effected by clause 2.

Clause 3 inserts a new definition of "university grounds" in the principal Act. The opportunity is now taken to insert a provision in a more comprehensive form. Clause 4 amends section 12 of the principal Act. Its purpose is first to overcome difficulties that the university anticipates in consequence of amendments made to the original Bill by the Legislative Council. When the Bill was introduced into the Legislative Council it provided that one category of candidates for election to the University Council should consist of persons in the full-time employment of the university as members of the academic staff, and that another category would consist of persons who were not in the full-time employment of the university. The Legislative Council deleted the reference to "full-time" employment in both instances. The university now considers that uncertainty has been introduced into the administration of the provisions because there is a significant class of persons, consisting largely of eminent professional men and women, who are occasionally called on by the university to give lectures to classes at the university. These could hardly be regarded as members of the "academic staff" but, on the other hand, they are occasionally employed by the university. They are thus apparently excluded from membership of the council. The amendment overcomes this problem by providing that a person shall not be regarded as being in the employment of the university unless he derives remuneration from services rendered to the university in excess of limits determined by the council. The clause also inserts a more comprehensive provision dealing with the term of office of members of the council.

Clause 5 amends section 13 of the principal Act. The amendment removes any possibility that an employee of the university elected to membership of the council could, after leaving the employment of the university, remain in office for a period extending beyond the time of the next election of candidates by the convocation of electors. Clause 6 amends section 18 of the principal Act. The amendment provides for a more flexible approach to the question of determining the term of office of a warden. It provides that the term of office it to be fixed under the constitution and rules of the senate, but that a term of office so fixed should not in any case exceed a period terminating at the expiration of the calendar year next ensuing after the date of his election.

Clause 7 amends section 22 of the principal Act. A specific provision is inserted dealing with the power of the university to make statutes, regulations and rules regulating the admission and matriculation of students. This is a matter that appeared to be covered in the power to regulate matters pertaining to the administration of the university. However, specific reference to this power has been requested and is, accordingly, inserted. The amendment also provides that a proposed amendment or repeal of a university statute or regulation must be submitted to the same procedural processes as the original statute. Such a provision is not normally inserted where power to make, alter or repeal subordinate legislation is given, because it is commonly understood that the alteration or repeal attracts the same procedural requirements. However, specific provision to this effect has been requested by the university and is accordingly included in the Bill.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

DENTISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 24. Page 1001.)

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): This Bill has been received from another place and is a most significant Bill. It may prove, and I hope that it will prove, to be a guide and forerunner to similar legislation in the field of medicine. The Bill, which is the first major amendment relating to the admission of dentists in South Australia, contains a number of matters, all of which will be to the State's advantage. The Bill will make it possible to register overseas graduates whose qualifications measure up to our standards and who can satisfy the Dental Board that their ability is such that they can practise in this State.

Now, there is a tremendous shortage of dentists. It is a shortage that is being gradually overcome, but has not yet been overcome to the extent that we can afford not to use graduates from overseas where possible. The Medical Board has done much the same in the past, and I can recall students in my year in medicine who, coming from other countries and having qualified there, were required to pass the third-year exam in anatomy and physiology (a most difficult exam) and to complete the last three years of their medical course before they were allowed to register here. The same position applied to dentists as now applies to medical practitioners, and the board may, at its discretion, admit such

well-qualified dental practitioners to practise now.

Also, it will make it possible for visiting overseas dental graduates to practise in hospital appointments, and they will be granted temporary registration for this purpose. Once again, this will be of tremendous value to South Australia, because it will encourage post-graduate dental students and visiting teachers and lecturers to visit South Australia and spend some time here and give us the benefit of their knowledge and experience. It will contribute to the already high standards of dental practice in this State.

Perhaps the most significant development is the widening of the scope of registration to include persons qualified in North American schools. This, in turn, may well pave the way for reciprocal registration with statutory authorities in North America. One of the major problems relating to medical and dental practice in North America by an Australian graduate and *vice versa* is the multiplicity of medical and dental boards in both continents. This is a State matter, and boards of registration in the States are not affected by Commonwealth authority.

Thus we have a rather anomalous position of a medical or dental graduate qualifying in one State of Australia and having to seek registration in all other States if he wishes to practise there. We have the almost impossible situation where there is no reciprocity between the States in North America (and I include Canada) and Australia. It is possible, and it specifies the high standard of the Adelaide Medical School, to have reciprocity of registration with Winnipeg, but I believe this is the only place in North America in which reciprocity applies. At some stage I should like to see uniformity of registration and reciprocity of registration between all English-speaking countries, because most of these countries now enjoy high standards of instruction and professional skill, and the language barrier is the major obstacle applying in respect of other countries.

One of the major difficulties has been the fact that the qualifying degree in North America is the Doctor of Dental Science, which is hard to equate with our Bachelor of Dental Science. The B.D.S. is equivalent to the D.D.Sc. in the United States. Our own doctorate represents a much higher standard of qualification and, involving some original work and a thesis, it is generally a title that has been won at considerable cost in time,

effort, and research, after the bachelor's degree has been gained. The same applies to the M.D. degree in North America, the M.D. being the equivalent of our M.B., B.S. The standards of qualification and professional skill in America and Australia are extremely high and I am disappointed in some respects, to find that the United States has replaced the United Kingdom as the source of post-graduate study. This is a source of regret for someone who did his post-graduate study in the United Kingdom, and I think it has something to do with the fact that they have more money in the United States than they have in the United Kingdom for research and further study.

In Australia we tend to have something of an inferiority complex about our achievements in the medical and dental spheres, but we can be proud of our standards, which are recognized the world over as being of the highest quality. Dental students undergo a five-year course, and part of the training is associated with medical students' training, which must be a tremendous advantage to them. They study anatomy and physiology in great detail and this adds to their skill in practice.

It is pleasing to know that the shortage of dentists that has persisted in the past years is being overcome, and the number of students in the early years of the dental course is now increasing. I understand that 68 students are attending in the first year of dentistry this year. The shortage of dentists raises the subject of the need for additional assistance. Dentistry has developed into a science and far more is being done in dental science now than has been done previously, as more is being done in medical science than has been done previously.

With the shortage of dentists it has been found necessary to provide additional assistance for dental surgeons, and the team concept that has now grown up, based on the dental surgeon as leader of the team with various assistants, has been recognized by the International Dental Federation and the World Health Organization. Under the care and control of the dentist we have the dental nurse: this is one member of the team with whom we are familiar. She performs the necessary duties of preparing fillings. Also, we have the dental therapist, who is a relatively recent innovation in this country, but a most successful one. The therapist practises mostly in school clinics and in mobile

clinics, a scheme that worked remarkably well in New Zealand for many years, and was being practised when I was a house surgeon in Wellington. I think it has been proved to be of great assistance to the dental health of our children. I pay a great tribute to these workers. One of my children recently came home from school and said how much he liked the nice lady who took out his teeth.

Mr. Jennings: How old is he?

Dr. TONKIN: He is aged nearly eight and, if he can still find some sort of feeling for someone who has extracted his teeth, he must be quite impressed. Dental therapists undergo a two-year period of intense study and training and acquire the skill and knowledge necessary to work under the direction of the dental surgeon. In other words, they provide care in examining teeth, and they may remove deciduous teeth that are diseased. Also, they can X-ray teeth and prepare simple cavities for fillings. One of their most important functions is in the field of dental education. I think there is a different attitude now among young people towards the dentist and towards dental care, compared to the attitude in the past.

Dental therapists give instructions in the simple matter of how to clean teeth properly; indeed, I think many members of the community clean their teeth most inefficiently and with the wrong action of the toothbrush. I think it is a good thing that children at this age should be taught to use their toothbrush adequately. At the end of their course when they have passed their examinations, dental therapists receive a certificate of qualification. Dental hygienists are another ancillary group who are more concerned with private practice, whereas dental therapists tend to deal with young children in schools.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Are many of these people allowed to kill teeth?

Dr. TONKIN: No. The dental hygienist provides the chairside assistance that the dental nurse provides and, besides examining teeth for cavities, he is qualified to take simple dental X-rays and polish fillings. The dental hygienist plays a tremendous part in dental education, as does the dental therapist. There is no set training course at present for the dental hygienist. Indeed, I believe we have had only one such person practising in South Australia, and that has only been during this year, in association with the Dental Hospital. I believe there is a real and necessary place for these people in the dental team. The team concept would not be complete without a

reference to the dental technician, of whose work I think we are all well aware. Although he is not trained clinically in any way, he is a highly skilled technician. He works in the laboratory and is skilled in his duties of making prostheses or (without dressing it up too much) false teeth (I do not like the word "dentures"). The team concept is, once again, most significant, and we are making the maximum use of the skilled training of the dental surgeon by providing him with adequately trained staff concerning his routine duties, and allowing him to spend more time on the skilled duties that can only be performed by the trained dental surgeon. This measure has the support of the dental profession (both the Dental Association and the Faculty of Dentistry at the University of Adelaide), and I have much pleasure in supporting it.

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): I, too, support the Bill. I intend mainly to consider clause 17 which, as I understand it, amends the principal Act in such a way as to allow in future the use of the word "dental" as a prefix to the title of persons other than registered dentists who are involved in the dental calling. I had earlier considered the necessity of moving an amendment by way of an addition to new section 32 in new Part IV. This amendment would have taken the form of an addition to the list of exclusions from registration of dental therapists. This addition involved the title "dental technician" but, after discussing the matter with the Minister and also with the draftsman, I am now reassured that no amendment is necessary to achieve the purpose I had in mind. Reference is made in new Part IV to "dental auxiliaries"; in other words, the Bill is attempting, as the member for Bragg has said, to cope with the modern trend in many professions involving the team concept.

That dental auxiliaries are included in the Bill has led to much worrying in the ranks of prosthetic dental people in South Australia, whether they are members of the Australian Dental Technicians Society or of the Prosthetic Laboratory Proprietors Association of South Australia. Both these organizations have indicated to me that they have been worried about this matter. These two bodies met with the Dental Board on July 30 last to discuss the position, and the Chairman of the Prosthetic Laboratory Proprietors Association of South Australia subsequently received a letter, the relevant part of which states:

Following the meeting on Wednesday, June 30, 1971, of representatives of your association with the Australian Dental Association (S.A.

Branch) and the Dental Board, I write confirming the discussion regarding proposed amendments to the Dentists Act. It was never the Dental Board's intention to include dental technicians in Part IV of the new Act, headed "Dentists Auxiliaries". In early deliberations with the board's solicitors the term "licensed operative dental assistants" was suggested and was intended to refer only to the hygienist. It is the duty of the Parliamentary Counsel to draw up finally and present amendments to Parliament. At this stage, the new section (Part IV) was rewritten to cover the proposed hygienist and also any other auxiliary, such as a dental radiologist, that may be considered in the future.

Subsequently, the dental technicians contacted the Minister concerning this matter, and I hope that the position will now be clear to all the interested bodies to whom I have referred. The members of the Australian Dental Technicians Association Executive have been in touch with me several times regarding this matter and other matters, and their concern arose from what is expected to take place in the future in regard to prosthetic dentistry. I point out that in only one State of Australia at present are prosthetic dental technicians able to deal directly with the public. I refer to Tasmania where, for about 13 years (first under the supervision of a qualified dentist for several years, and in the last few years in their own right), dental technicians who are suitably qualified have provided a direct service to the public in supplying artificial dentures. As I understand the Bill, it is not concerned with the matter to which I have just been referring, but I am constrained to ensure that, accidentally or otherwise, the ambitions of dental technicians in States other than Tasmania perhaps to upgrade their calling are not cut off short.

Mr. Hall: Do you approve of these technicians?

Mr. PAYNE: Following what you have said earlier this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I do not think I should reply to that interjection. I do not think it is for us to consider the merits of the claims of technicians at this time in relation to the situation that prevails in Tasmania. However, it is only fair to say that I have received considerable evidence from Parliamentarians in Tasmania and in Victoria that seems to support the claim that technicians who are prepared to undertake a further extensive course of study and training might well be allowed to proceed to chairside status, which I think is the term used in Tasmania.

I think I have gone as far as one should go in this matter. The organization of dental

technicians is an Australasian body, and the future of those technicians is up to that body. If they have ambitions and aims that they wish to achieve, it is up to that body; it is not the province of this Parliament at this time to debate what technicians may or may not wish to do. My aim has simply been to try to provide a measure of reassurance that what is contained in the Bill does not affect their views on the matter.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I do not intend to say much about the Bill except to say something on behalf of those representatives of dental technicians who have approached me asking for chairside status, to which the member for Mitchell has referred. I have great sympathy for this group, for I believe that its proposals are backed by a commonsense approach to establish a standard of practice that will ensure that proper safeguards are taken with regard to the public. It appears to me that their proposals, if implemented, would mean that the public would receive a service at probably a cheaper price than is now available from dentists. Surely the time has come when we should properly consider the request of this body because there is obviously a shortage of dentists. If the community has insufficient trained dentists, it should try to remedy the situation. Some remedy has been afforded by the auxiliaries who are referred to in the Bill and to whom we have referred in this place before.

Representatives of dental technicians suggest that, after such people have fulfilled proper training requirements and have received an assurance from a registered dentist, they will be able to deal directly with the public. Although I do not intend to suggest that we move in this direction at this time, following the request made to me by these representatives I will continue to study this matter. At the moment I look favourably on these people, and I will continue to examine the facts that become available. Although this Bill does not harm dental technicians, it does not do them much good, either; it does not in any way meet their request. I will pursue their case further.

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

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 29. Page 1786.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I suppose that this Bill could be termed a machinery measure, because it implements the drastically increased charges on certain items, as provided for in the recent Budget. I suppose that I would risk getting severe reaction from the Government if I criticized the extremely short time that we have had to study the Bill and present any coherent criticism or assessment of it. The measure was introduced yesterday and copies are not yet on the files, although I understand that members have been given copies. All members are supposed to be able to study the complex items, despite the continuing amount of work that they have had to do on other legislative matters during this session and also the work they have had to do in relation to their districts. It is not a commonsense approach to expect members to understand the Bill at this stage.

I suppose we must accept that the Government is not doing other than is stated in the second reading explanation of the Bill. However, it would be unusual, in some respects, if the Government was not trying to do something other than has been included in the explanation, because often we are being treated by this Government with contempt in regard to the small amount of information given in explanations of Bills. However, we will have to assume that the Bill does nothing more than gather for the Government the additional stamp duties referred to on page 5 of the Treasurer's Financial Statement, which states:

Accordingly, the estimates of receipts include the expected revenues from (1) a wide range of increased stamp duties on documents estimated to yield about \$4,150,000 in a full year and about \$2,250,000 in 1971-72; and (2) increased hospital fees expected to yield about \$900,000 in a full year and about \$600,000 in 1971-72.

These increased stamp duties are a part of a general increase in imposts on South Australians of just under \$6,000,000. The amount of \$4,150,000 in increased stamp duties must be added to the increased hospital fees of \$900,000, the increase of \$500,000 in charges for tertiary education instruction, and the \$300,000 that will not have to be made available to subsidize the hospitals because of the increased charges imposed on patients. The Budget set out to increase the total impost by \$5,850,000, and increased stamp duties of \$4,150,000 comprise the bulk of that increase.

I have referred previously to the Government's taxation policies and the efficient way it has announced the increases. Over a period of 16 or 17 months it has increased taxation and charges in this State by an amount greater than the increases imposed by any other Government in this State. The increases have been imposed in stages and the people have been lulled into the belief that these increases are minimal and will have little effect on the community. Of course, they have a real and great effect, as the second reading explanation and the Treasurer's Financial Statement indicate.

It is revealing to examine some of the charges. Once one moves above the \$1,000 price for a motor car, one is involved in the substantial increase in taxation of 100 per cent, which represents a doubling of the tax in respect of prices between \$1,000 and \$2,000. However, for prices of more than \$2,000, the Government does not stop at a 100 per cent increase. It has said, "Let us increase the charge to two and a half times, to \$25, in place of the \$10 charge now made." In this sort of situation, shown in fine print, we see the Government's tremendous moves in taxation. Few other Governments have increased taxation to this extent with so little publicity as this Government has received, and I congratulate it on the efficient way this has been done.

The duty on conveyances of marketable securities will be increased from .4 per cent to .6 per cent. Those figures seem small when we pass over them quickly, but they represent an increase in taxation of 50 per cent on these items. The duty on cheques increases by only 1c from 5c, but it is an increase of 20 per cent. The duty on mortgages in excess of \$10,000 will be increased from the present rate of .25 per cent to .35 per cent, an increase of 40 per cent.

I am sure that the Government is already considering the next taxation increases, and doubtless these can be expected in about March next to supplement the Budget, and in the next Budget the Government will again increase taxation by a nominal or minimal amount but by a large percentage. This is what the stamp duties constitute, and they will have their effect on many South Australians. As I have said before (and this is what the Treasurer derides and throws back by saying that the Opposition, especially me, does not want to spend money on essentials; it is a foolish reaction to the contention, which is unanswered by him), the Government cannot maintain an increased expenditure of 16 per cent or 17 per cent annually.

It is not sustainable, and no Treasurer of any State who tries to lead the populace on with that contention is being truthful. It cannot be sustained, because it is not matched by a corresponding productivity increase. The annual 3 per cent productivity increase will not sustain in this community an expenditure increase of 17 per cent a year by a State Government. Some day the Treasurer will have to acknowledge that (if he is here long enough to do it).

I suppose I must support the Bill, because there is nothing else I can do. The Government has been elected, and it will be known for its expenditure and taxation. It should stand in the spotlight of public opinion and be known now for its own moves, the blame for which it cannot place on the Commonwealth Government's shoulders or on the former Government's shoulders. This is this Government's taxation, and it will be known for it. Houses and motor vehicles will be more expensive, and it will be this Government that has caused the additional costs. As long as the Government is judged in that way, I suppose we can say all is fair. In giving my approval to the Bill on the basis that it is a machinery measure to institute what has already been passed by the House in the Estimates, I express disapproval of the Government's disregard for any basic economic approach to its expenditure and taxation. Apparently, in the Budget the Government is willing year after year to ignore completely these basic questions of how much increased expenditure this State Government or any other State Government can sustain. At the same time it continues to blame the Commonwealth Government for what it says is an inadequate increase in payments.

One could ask the Government what it believes is an optimum and proper increase yearly. If 17.3 per cent is insufficient, should it be 25 per cent or 50 per cent? We get no such consideration from this Government, but simply an accusation put back on to others. This is not good enough. Although the Bill represents only a component of the large general increase in taxation and charges the Government has initiated in its short term in office, it is an example of the recklessness of Labor when in office.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): As the Treasurer has pointed out, the Bill aims to raise \$4,150,000 in increased stamp duties. I made one or two points on this matter in the Budget debate, and I will now repeat them. All honourable members realize the

importance of the motor vehicle building industry to the State. There was a widespread rumour that the Commonwealth Government intended to increase sales tax on motor vehicles, and this caused considerable apprehension in the State, but fortunately the Commonwealth Government did not see fit to increase this tax. However, the State Government has moved into the field with a further impost and has increased the duty significantly on motor vehicles. There is no real alleviation up to the cost of \$1,000; it is purely illusory: \$1 for each \$100 is the same as \$2 for each \$200, except for the benefit of the odd multiple, the maximum benefit being \$1. Regarding the motor vehicle industry, it is mainly the sales of new vehicles with which we are concerned, and the popular makes of vehicles sell in the range of \$2,500 to \$3,000. The duty on a car costing \$2,600 (the price that I paid for my last car) will be increased from \$26 to \$45, an increase of about 70 per cent.

The duty on conveyances of over \$12,000 is increased by over 100 per cent. The duty on conveyances of marketable securities is increased by 50 per cent. A significant tax to the public is the duty on credit and rental business; this duty, as well as the duty on instalment-purchase agreements, will be increased by 20 per cent. The Treasurer has made great play of the fact that the Government is taxing the wealthy. These are the measures he says will be aimed at the wealthy. I think he said on television that the duty on motor vehicles would hit the wealthy, because it was only the wealthy who could afford new vehicles. Yesterday, the Treasurer said that there was a provision in the Act whereby the duty might not be passed on. I draw attention to the Treasurer's words in 1964 when these very taxation measures were being discussed and when he was making a speech on the Budget. Regarding the duty not being passed on, the Treasurer apparently had a different view then. He said:

The proposal in the measure to see that the companies do not hand on this impost is simply useless. It is clear that this extra impost will be passed on to people buying goods on time payment.

I have examined the Bill to see whether there is any change so that this tax will not be passed on. To the best of my knowledge, the Bill has not been amended since 1964 to tighten up this provision. Apparently, the Treasurer has had a change of opinion and

thinks that, although this condition could not operate in 1964, it can operate now. The Treasurer also made interesting comments on the very matters which are the subject of these increases in taxation. The Bill increases the duty on cheques by 20 per cent and the duty on mortgages of over \$10,000 is increased by 40 per cent. The very people these taxation measures, particularly the duty on mortgages, will affect are those we should be encouraging. I know as a result of personal contact with many young people who are trying to finance the building of a house that they are becoming increasingly disturbed about the cost and about the mortgage they must secure. I consider that the increased charges which the Treasurer is introducing and which no doubt will have to be accepted will make it more difficult for young people to finance the building of their own home.

We know that the Labor Party is not really interested in private ownership, but we, as a Party, are interested. We consider that it is socially desirable for young people to own a house, and we encourage them to do so. This financial measure, with the increase in mortgage fees, and the other actions of the Government in the taxation sphere, will make it more difficult for young people to finance the purchase of their home. Also, the increases in building costs will add to their difficulties. The implications of some of these charges are wide, and they will have far greater social repercussions than the Government is willing to admit. I do not subscribe to the view once propagated by the Treasurer that we should consider housing people in high-rise accommodation, because the cost of servicing cottage development (as he called it) is becoming difficult. This is not a desirable type of housing, and we should encourage young people to purchase houses, so that we do them, as well as the community, a service. This is one of the basic philosophical differences between the two Parties. What the Treasurer is saying now completely contradicts what he said in his speech on the Budget in 1964, as follows:

On this occasion the Budget proposes to increase charges upon a certain section of the South Australian people. It does so in a number of ways, the first of which is an increase in stamp duty of certain kinds. That stamp duty increase will for the most part fall heavily upon the poorer sections of the population. Quite clearly, the increase in charges in respect of mortgages will most heavily affect those people who need to borrow to erect houses. In many instances these are the younger members of the community who are trying

to buy houses. The Treasurer, as a private member, continued:

The proposed new impost upon motor vehicles, not only new but also second-hand, will fall most heavily upon the working section of the people. These people are the heaviest buyers of used cars within the community, and also constitute a large proportion of those who purchase new cars.

I am sure that many people living in the fringe areas today buy a motor vehicle, but most of them have to sign a hire-purchase agreement. That trend would be more marked today than it was in 1964. I quote these remarks to show the hypocrisy of the Treasurer in his statements. I do not believe that the public is as gullible as the Treasurer thinks. This seems to be a deliberate attempt to mislead the public, but I consider it will not be as successful as the Treasurer thinks. I have a high regard for the intelligence of the average John Citizen in this State. One said to me last week, "I think he is doing a good 'con' job." Perhaps that statement should indicate to the Treasurer that he is not fooling all of the people. The sheer hypocrisy of the Treasurer's statements is shown by the differences between what he is saying now and what he said in 1964. Then, in his speech, he said:

The impost on personal loans, designed to catch the companies that are not now using hire-purchase agreements will again fall upon these people who are involved in time-payment contracts ... In every case except one minor one, these new stamp duties will fall heavily upon the working sections of the population in South Australia—and this within a tax structure which significantly within this State taxes the wealthy far less than does any other State of the Commonwealth.

This gives the lie to the Treasurer's statement that his Government is taxing the wealthy in this State. Any taxation measure introduced to raise significant revenue must be aimed at the general public: in other words, the average citizens. If the Commonwealth Government wishes to obtain revenue by increased taxation measures, they must be aimed at the income group between \$3,000 a year and \$8,000 a year, and that is a fact that can be proved statistically. Unfortunately, we have to formally accept this measure. The financial administration of the State is in the hands of a Labor Government, but the public of South Australia is not as gullible as the Treasurer thinks it is. In 1964 he said that the Liberal and Country League Government was taxing the poorer community; now he has increased the same

taxes but states that he is taxing the wealthy, and when the contents of that statement become widely known the Treasurer will be shown as a complete hypocrite. With these comments, I give not hearty but formal support to this measure.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): As I do not think that members are obliged to support this Bill, I strongly oppose it. Because of your ruling, Mr. Speaker, a ruling that I understand has not been given in any other State, I am not allowed to discuss general State finances when speaking to a revenue-raising Bill. I will conform to your direction, or to the direction of the Treasurer to you, that I must not discuss the general finances of the State. However, I agree with what the member for Kavel has said, particularly in connection with the duty on applications to register motor vehicles. The average person does not often buy a car but, when he does, he will have to bear that duty. Before the Government first imposed a duty on applications to register vehicles, I used to buy a car every year, but after the duty was first imposed I switched to buying a car every two years. Now, in view of these increases, I shall buy a car only every four years. As a result, the Government will receive less revenue and there will be less work for people in the motor car industry. There are many other ways whereby revenue could be earned without imposing such a vicious tax.

The Treasurer, in reply to an interjection, said that the Prices Commissioner would ensure that the increased stamp duties were not passed on to the public. Surely, if firms are making sufficient profit to bear these increased stamp duties, they are already making too much profit; if that is so, the Prices Commissioner should have stepped in already. I am sure that the Prices Commissioner, in considering the price of an article, would take into account its cost. If he is logical, he will agree that the price of an article should be increased if there has been an increase in its cost. Overall, price control in this State has not been effective, but the Prices Branch has succeeded, through negotiation, in protecting some consumers from unfair treatment. A letter from one of my constituents states:

It seems a paradox that the present Government, which raised its voice loud in protest against any federal sales tax increase, now seeks to impose a State tax of like effect.

I have already heard from a reliable source that a car manufacturing industry will be commenced in New South Wales, because car

manufacturers here are fed up with the treatment they have been getting from this Government. The letter continues:

The proposed new method of calculation of duty will also impose a unilateral burden on the operator of expensive vehicles. As an example, the transport industry, by its highly competitive nature already very efficient, will be hit hard when it is necessary to replace vehicles.

Cheap transport is essential in South Australia. The railways should be given better equipment for services to other States and for other long hauls, and we must keep the costs of intrastate transport down. In increasing transport costs the Government is imposing further burdens on country people. Three years ago Gilbert Motors Proprietary Limited at Strathalbyn employed 33 people, but now that firm employs only 21 people because the cost of cars and transport generally has become so high. I therefore strongly protest against this tax, which is inflationary and will hit everyone.

I cannot understand why the Government, which claims to represent the poorer sections of the community, is imposing further levies on instalment purchase and rental business, because those levies will result in the poorer people suffering further. As a result of taxation, 90 per cent of us are pretty much on the same level, so I do not know just who are the poor people. People on low incomes will be hit hard by these levies, because they have to enter into instalment purchase contracts. I know that the Treasurer will make a magnificent speech in reply, with many gestures, but, as usual, his speech will be full of words but without cold, hard facts.

The levies proposed in this Bill are not as bad as pay-roll tax. I believe that the States gave in weakly when the Commonwealth Government proposed to hand over pay-roll tax to them. The only time we made progress in our financial relations with the Commonwealth Government was when Steele Hall was Treasurer. He put up such a good case that the Commonwealth Government greatly increased its handouts to the State. Because there are ways of saving money and better types of taxation, I oppose the Bill.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I do not think anyone likes to see imposts put on any section of the community, particularly the family man. We have heard much about the working man who has to bear many increases in taxation. The average family man has been educated to use a cheque account. There is a 20 per cent increase in stamp duty on cheque forms,

the cost of which will be increased from 5c to 6c. As postage costs will be increased by the Commonwealth Government from 6c to 7c, plus 3c bank charge, it is reasonable to assume that it will cost a person 16c to draw a cheque and to pay an account through the post. A long programme has been run by the banks to convince the man in the street that he can afford to operate a cheque account; this saves time and is an efficient way of paying bills, and it provides a record of the payment of an account.

However, these increases put the keeping of a cheque account in the luxury class and, from my experience, banks will lose many accounts. Many people will close their trading accounts and open savings accounts, from which they will draw out cash at the end of the month in order to pay various accounts. Many people who pay accounts by cash will insist on a receipt. I believe that stamp duty on cheque forms has always been an unfair impost. When I first joined the bank, a cheque form cost 1½d., whereas it now costs 6c. Most of us have received a pamphlet from the Royal Automobile Association pointing out that in the past year or so the cost of a driver's licence has increased by 50 per cent; car registration by 16 per cent; third party insurance by 3.6 per cent; the cost of a vehicle by 9.8 per cent; and stamp duty will now be increased by 83 per cent on a motor vehicle costing \$2,962.

People who buy houses will also feel the effect of this Bill through increased stamp duty on mortgages. I am sorry for young married people who, because of inflation, will need to obtain higher mortgages, which will be subject to increased stamp duty. I think that a property costing about \$12,000 will involve an increase of about \$60. Although this may not be much on a transaction of this size, it can mean the difference between, say, planting one's lawn this year and next year, or it may mean that cement paving will have to be postponed. This all puts young married couples further behind when they are trying to achieve a reasonable standard of living. Although this is probably the only area left in which an increase could occur, I should have hoped that it would not be as severe. No-one likes to see these imposts introduced, but the State Budget must be balanced. The Government has a certain commitment that must be met. However, I hope that greater economies will be achieved in future.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I oppose the Bill, which is typical of the measures introduced

by a political Party that has a hatred for anyone that owns property. This Government is imposing vicious increases in taxation that will have a detrimental effect on the working class, which it claims to represent but which, in fact, it does not represent. An additional impost on motorists will affect the primary producer. People who live in country areas require motor transport in order to carry out their various activities. It is interesting to note from the pamphlet of the Royal Automobile Association giving details of increased costs that the cost of a driver's licence will increase from \$2 to \$3 (50 per cent); car registrations will be increased from \$34 to \$39 (16 per cent); the cost of third party insurance will be increased by 3.6 per cent; and vehicle costs will increase by 9.8 per cent, etc.

The Government's attitude to increasing duty on mortgages will seriously affect primary producers, many of whom have mortgages on which there will be additional taxation. One would expect that the Government would encourage people to buy houses, because this is a good investment, but the Government would try to discourage it.

Mr. Venning: Everything should be owned by the State!

Mr. GUNN: Yes.

Mr. Wright: Tell us how you'd solve the problems.

Mr. GUNN: The Government should not waste the public's money by spending \$5,500,000 on a performing arts centre. This is a shocking waste of the taxpayers' money, which could have been spent on highways, water mains or other such worthy projects. The Government should have an inquiry made into its finances, as I believe that many Government departments are inefficient and that room for improvement exists. If this happened much money could be saved, as happened in the Railways Department when the Liberal Government was in office. That sort of measure should be implemented now. The Government should not continue to tax the public as it does. It is interesting to note the following remark made by the Auditor-General in one of his annual reports:

The Government has leased accommodation for departments in a number of city buildings for varying terms up to 1993. The rental being paid in terms of lease for 25 premises exceeds \$800,000.

Thereafter, the Treasurer announced that he intended to give away this State's money to some Japanese millionaire to encourage him

to build a huge hotel complex in Victoria Square. The Treasurer could have built Government offices on that land instead.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has pursued that matter in a previous debate. I ask him to confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: I believe the matter to which I am referring is pertinent, as we are dealing with a revenue measure. I am merely pointing out why the Government should not—

The SPEAKER: Order! This Bill involves the payment of taxation, and the honourable member is not permitted now to repeat what he has said in a previous debate. That is entirely out of order, and I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: Very well, Sir. I will therefore continue with my other line of argument. This Budget is aimed at those people in the community who are trying to improve their position, particularly young people. It does not encourage young people to own property or to go into business. This is a deplorable form of taxation and, like the member for Hanson, I oppose the Bill.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I rise not to oppose the Bill but to give a warning to the Government. It was interesting to hear the Treasurer say that, when this Bill passes into law, it will raise \$2,250,000 this year and \$4,150,000 in a full year, and that it will extract that money from this State, some regions of which are experiencing extreme

financial difficulties. It must be remembered that discussions are proceeding abroad regarding the International Monetary Fund, which must have an important bearing on the future not only of this State but of the Commonwealth as a whole. The Government has laid down a plan of action, the implementation of which will cost much money. I cannot help harking back to last year, when the Treasurer, although budgeting for a deficit, ended up with a nominal surplus.

Government members may ask where the Government can reduce expenditure. However, in the final analysis I believe we must face facts and cut our suit according to our cloth, otherwise we will have in our community some very poor sections. I am referring to rural areas, which have been mentioned so often by the member for Rocky River. As I travelled to the city on Monday, I met business men in two country towns in my district. Currently, they do not know which way to turn. Can the Treasurer say what will be the result of these imposts? Either people will pay these extra charges or there will be a buyer's resistance. The embodiment of this Bill is in the figures that the Treasurer has indicated. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.32 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 5, at 2 p.m.