

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, September 18, 1968

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

QUESTIONS

ADELAIDE VALET SERVICE

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Some months ago a young lady, soon after purchasing a frock, took it to the Adelaide Valet Service, at 120 Hindley Street, Adelaide, to be dry cleaned. On receipt of the frock, she found that it had been practically destroyed. She came to me about the matter, and I wrote to the manager of the establishment but received an unsatisfactory reply. Later, *Action Line* took up the matter and was promised that, if the young lady took the frock back to the party concerned, it would be renovated, repaired and returned.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: That is to the valet service, is it?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes. When the young lady took the frock in, she was spoken to rudely and her mother was abused.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Was the frock fixed?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: No, nothing was done. There was a flat refusal, after the manager had promised *Action Line* that the firm would repair the frock. Can the Attorney-General say whether action can be taken to protect people from such treatment?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It sounds to me as though it is a matter for private legal action rather than for any action by the Government. However, although I acknowledge that the honourable member has given much detail in his question, if he gives me the full details, including names, I shall have the matter investigated. My immediate reaction is that the person concerned should seek private legal advice.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr. RODDA: Can the Premier say what the Government intends regarding the sittings of this House?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It is far too early to forecast when the session may end. I consider that it is of assistance to all members to have a week off occasionally so that they may catch up on work that falls behind during a lengthy session and be able to serve their districts with greater intensity. For this reason,

we could perhaps have an adjournment for one week at the end of October to enable members to make use of the time in this way. This would not inhibit debate in any way, because the Government would be quite happy to carry the session on so as to meet any demands that may be made. As long as the Budget and complementary Bills are passed, the Government intends that the House will rise in the last week in October; in other words, that it will not sit on October 29, 30 or 31. I hope that this information will be of some guidance to members.

BORES

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about installing bores to enable school ovals to be watered?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The Mines Department has sunk bores for schools in many metropolitan areas. These are undertaken at the request of the Public Buildings Department following representation by the schools concerned. The selection of sites and recommendations for specifications are provided by the Mines Department, but all costs are met from other sources. Within the limits of the staff capacity, these procedures will be followed in the future.

EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Early this week the Commonwealth Minister of Labour and National Service made a statement relating to the employment position in the various States as at the end of August this year. Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what the position was in South Australia, and has he any comment on that position? Also, can he say how that position compared with the position at the end of August last year?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: There has been a substantial improvement in the employment situation in South Australia, according to the review of the employment situation as at the end of August, 1968, which was issued last night by the Commonwealth Minister for Labour and National Service. During the month of August there was a reduction of 911 persons registered for employment with the Commonwealth Employment Service. This is the largest reduction during the month of August since 1963, and the number of persons now registered for employment (7,107) is the lowest number registered at the end of August since 1965. This reduction during August

follows a decrease of 341 during July. The number of adult males registered for employment fell by 478 during the month, while 200 fewer junior males were registered: a reduction of 108 adult females and 125 junior females:

Notwithstanding the substantial decrease in the number of persons registered for employment, 129 additional vacancies were available than there were a month earlier. The number of 1,844 vacancies available with the Commonwealth Employment Service was the highest number of vacancies at the end of August since 1965. There was once again a substantial decrease in the number of persons receiving unemployment benefit, there being a reduction of 360 for the month, following a reduction of 275 in the previous month. The number of recipients of unemployment benefit as at the end of August was 2,865, and was also the lowest at the end of August for three years. Although the number of persons registered for employment in South Australia, expressed as a percentage of the estimated work force (1.4 per cent), is still higher than the percentage for Australia as a whole (1.1 per cent), the August figures indicated a further substantial improvement following a significant improvement in July.

MAIN ROAD No. 30

Mr. McKEE: A letter I have received from the Town Clerk of the City of Port Pirie states:

I have been instructed by my council to draw your attention to what is considered a serious delay in the reconstruction of Main Road No. 30, Port Pirie. On July 24, 1968, an order was received from the District Engineer to cease work on the construction of traffic islands on this main road. Our City Engineer, Mr. Zablonksi, mentioned this matter in a discussion with Mr. McInnes of the Highways Department, and to date no authority has been given for this work to proceed. I would also point out that no authority has been given for a grant to proceed with this work.

As this work is at the main entrance to the city of Port Pirie, will the Attorney-General take up this matter with the Minister of Roads and Transport with a view to having work expedited?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

HILLS FREEWAY

Mr. EVANS: Has the Attorney-General obtained a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to my question relating to road markers on the Hills freeway?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The drums used on the freeway for traffic purposes are painted white because white is the most satisfactory and visible paint colour under all conditions, including fog. While yellow sodium lamps have some advantages in foggy conditions, the same theory does not apply to objects simply painted yellow. The difficulties of definition for traffic on the freeway in winter have received attention. The use of additional flashing red lamps and of more reflectorized aids is planned.

Mr. EVANS: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about the Hills freeway and the purchase of properties in that connection?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Acquisition for the south-eastern freeway has been initiated as far as Verdun. A further two miles extending to some distance past Hahndorf will be processed in some four months' time. This will be the extent of stage acquisition for the current financial year. An isolated length of acquisition has also been completed in the vicinity of Petwood siding. The Highways Department is loath to initiate acquisition until design is far enough advanced to avoid taking land unnecessarily. However, acquisition for the whole length to Callington is being arranged as quickly as possible. The alignment of the freeway is known in general terms and the department would be pleased to do anything possible to assist owners wishing to sell their properties.

MOUNT GAMBIER TROTTERING CLUB

Mr. BURDON: I recently received a letter from the Secretary of the Mount Gambier Trotting Club stating that at the club's annual meeting concern and dismay were expressed at the share allocated to the club of Totalizator Agency Board profits and the distribution apparently released by the T.A.B. Chairman. The club appreciates that the major clubs should receive a greater share of any T.A.B. profits. In fact, the figures would indicate that nine clubs outside the 100-mile radius of Adelaide would receive \$3,488, and six clubs inside that radius, \$33,832. In view of the contributions made by the Mount Gambier Trotting Club to this sport, will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary to refer to the T.A.B. Chairman the distribution of profits in order to ensure that people in remote areas of the State, such as those connected with the Mount Gambier Trotting Club, receive a better allocation of these profits?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be happy to refer the question and the honourable member's representations to the Chief Secretary and to obtain a reply at the earliest opportunity.

LOWER MURRAY ROAD

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question about the sealed road to the Lower Murray?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Long-range planning provides for the road between Blanchetown, Swan Reach and Walker Flat to be constructed east of the Murray River. Construction of both the road between Walker Flat, Bowhill and Murray Bridge and the Walker Flat to Mannum road is also included. Work on this latter project will commence in the present financial year.

FIAT MOTOR COMPANY

Mr. HUGHES: Yesterday I asked the Premier a question about the visit of Mr. Galleotti, the Australian Manager of the Italian Fiat Company, to South Australia to examine the potential offering in this State in relation to setting up a factory. I also asked the Premier yesterday whether he had drawn Mr. Galleotti's attention to the potential offering at Wallaroo for setting up such a factory. However, in reply the Premier made no reference to the question I asked specifically about Wallaroo. As I understand that the Premier met Mr. Galleotti again today, will he say whether he took the opportunity today to bring before Mr. Galleotti's notice the potential offering at Wallaroo for setting up a factory?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Although I have not seen Mr. Galleotti since I spoke to him at lunch yesterday, I will see him before he leaves South Australia tomorrow. I assure the honourable member that the Government and the Industrial Development Branch are aware of the facilities available at Wallaroo. We are also aware of the facilities required by Mr. Galleotti on behalf of his company, and those facilities are not totally available at Wallaroo. I think that is the answer to the honourable member's question. In deciding whether we can encourage an industry to manufacture in South Australia, we constantly consider the facilities and natural and physical resources available in country areas. Only this morning I received a telephone call from a person in another large country town, a

town that has certain obvious advantages in respect of the very industry about which the honourable member has asked this question. The gentleman who called me put the case on behalf of his town, saying that it could claim to be able to provide some major requirements of the motor car industry. I reiterate that, in its negotiations, the Government certainly considers all aspects of country development, and will do its utmost to encourage industries to establish in country areas. However, I repeat that in this case Wallaroo does not have all the facilities sought by Mr. Galleotti on behalf of his company.

Mr. McKEE: In view of the many advantages offering at Port Pirie in the way of cheap land near direct rail transport to Western Australia and to the Eastern States (of course, when work on the standard gauge is completed early next year, Port Pirie will have advantages far above those in most places in South Australia, particularly in regard to industries that will depend on exporting their products to other States), and in view of the first-class shipping facilities available, can the Premier say whether this company has been informed about these advantages and whether it will be invited to inspect the facilities at Port Pirie?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Perhaps it is a coincidence that I received a letter this morning from a person concerned with a large parcel of land at Port Pirie who brought this to my attention and said that it would be suitable for this industry, which has been discussed publicly and in the House in the last two days. However, my reply must be essentially identical to that which I gave to the member for Wallaroo: that Mr. Galleotti's requirements clearly indicate that, if the company is to come to South Australia, it will come to the metropolitan area.

Mr. Clark: Does that include Elizabeth?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes. I refer to the metropolitan area in the widest sense. I am not at liberty to divulge, and it would be wrong for me to talk about, further details of Mr. Galleotti's plans. I assure members that many aspects of industrial development would lead, and do lead, the Government to promote country interests in this direction. I assure members further that nothing is left undone to bring industries to the country, if possible. There are many practical reasons why we should encourage industries to go to the country wherever possible. I again remind members, however, that we are not in a position, especially when in such a competitive

situation, to use any sort of direction in this instance or in other comparable instances to achieve this. We must use encouragement, and do our best to satisfy the requirements that are laid down. Port Pirie does not satisfy all these requirements, although I agree that it does satisfy a good number.

HAWKER-ORROROO ROAD

Mr. VENNING: Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked some time ago about sealing of the Hawker-Orroroo road?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The construction of the Hawker-Orroroo road is not planned for commencement before 1970-71. It has been established that the Quorn-Hawker-Wilpena road is the most important route in the area from a tourist viewpoint and for other reasons. It should therefore take precedence. Work on this project is progressing, but is not expected to be completed until 1971.

GOVERNMENT CAR

Mr. VIRGO: Can the Minister of Works say whether it is a fact that a Holden car from the Engineering and Water Supply Department fleet has, since the Government assumed office, been stationed at Port Lincoln solely for the use of the Treasurer to travel between the Port Lincoln Airport and his home? Also, is it a fact that the cost of running the car is charged to the E. & W.S. Department but that members of the staff of the department in the area are prohibited from using the car for legitimate departmental business even when the Treasurer is in Adelaide?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I shall be happy to find out the details sought by the honourable member and to let him have them as quickly as possible.

MUDDY WATER

Mr. EDWARDS: It has come to my notice that muddy water has rendered ineffective the steam sterilizer at the Cleve Hospital. The following report appears in the *Eyre Peninsula Tribune* of September 12:

Excessive amounts of clay particles in suspension have rendered ineffective Cleve Hospital's steam sterilizer, health inspector John Neill told the September meeting of the Local Board of Health. Mr. Neill said the sterilizer's being ineffective could be a matter for serious concern in the event of an emergency operation. Mr. Neill told the board the turbid water was also affecting domestic hot water systems and had an objectionable odour.

Will the Minister of Works try to have supplied clearer water for use in this town?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Yes. As I am aware of the problem to which the honourable member has referred, I will certainly expedite an inquiry to see whether it can be solved. I believe that the problem is not unique to this town and I will obtain information on the matter for the honourable member.

CATTLE VACCINATION

Mr. CORCORAN: My attention has been drawn to what I consider to be an anomaly in the vaccination of heifers against brucellosis with strain 19 in the South-East. Evidently, many heifers are purchased in Victoria, where there is no requirement to earmark the beast that has been so vaccinated but, if they are vaccinated on arrival in South Australia between the ages of three months and six months, they can be earmarked, which indicates that they have been vaccinated, and this has an appreciable effect on the market value of the animal if it is disposed of here. In the case to which my attention has been drawn the heifers had been vaccinated in Victoria but, because they might have been over the age and because they had not been vaccinated and earmarked in this State, they did not carry the same value unless a blood test was taken and a certificate issued by a veterinary surgeon. Will the Minister of Lands take up with the Minister of Agriculture the possibility of contacting his colleague's counterpart in Victoria to see whether provisions similar to those existing in this State could operate in Victoria so that this anomaly would be removed?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will take up this question with the Minister of Agriculture.

BOLIVAR TREATMENT WORKS

Mr. GILES: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question concerning work at the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: In the Loan works allocations for the financial year 1968-69, \$1,840,000 was provided for further work at the Bolivar Sewage Treatment Works. This amount will cover expenditure on current contracts and departmental works during the year. The work mainly involves the completion of the powerhouse and digestion tanks, with associated mechanical and electrical equipment. No provision has been made in this allocation for expenditure on irrigation works to use plant effluent.

WATER RATE ACCOUNTS

Mr. HURST: I understand that the Engineering and Water Supply Department has agencies located throughout the metropolitan area to provide a facility for people wishing to pay their water rates. I have been informed, however, that these agencies collect only the quarterly rate accounts: they do not receive payment from people wishing to pay annually. Will the Minister of Works ascertain whether it is practicable to offer at the agencies the facilities for those people desiring to pay annually?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I shall be pleased to take up the honourable member's suggestion, which appears to have merit.

RAILWAY FENCES

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my question of August 13 regarding railway fences?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague reports that the fencing of the railway between Clare and Spalding is being reinstated progressively, priority being given to those sections dividing railway land from that occupied by other landholders. Provision has been made for the necessary funds to proceed to this pattern during 1968-69, and once again priority will be given to fencing between railway land and that occupied by private landholders. It is intended to repair the railway fence bordering the road after that abutting the private landholders' property has been put in order.

STUDENT TEACHERS

Mr. HUDSON: One of my constituents, whose son is a trainee teacher at Adelaide Teachers College, has told me that none of the physical education trainees at that college has received travelling allowance or scholarship money for the second term, although it is some time since that term ended. Will the Minister of Education find out whether my information is correct and, if it is, will she ensure that these amounts are paid forthwith?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Yes.

GOOLWA FERRY

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my question about the provision of a second ferry at Goolwa?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague states that the establishment of a second ferry at Goolwa cannot be considered

until a decision is reached regarding the proposal to close the Victor Harbour railway line. The present location of the railway line along the right bank of the river is too close to the ferry ramp to permit satisfactory railway operation or road safety.

FLUORIDATION

Mrs. BYRNE: On September 4 the Minister of Works gave a list of Governments or Administrations of countries that have approved the fluoridation of their water supply. Will the Minister now provide a similar list of countries or parts of countries (such as States, cities or towns) that have fluoridated their water supplies and have since discontinued the practice, and also of those that have examined the matter of fluoridation and have rejected it? Will the Minister also give the reasons in all cases?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will try to get the information, although the honourable member will appreciate that this may take some time.

RAILWAY SERVICES

Mr. CASEY: Yesterday I received from the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to a question I had asked several weeks ago regarding passenger rail services between Peterborough and Quorn. Although the reply was partly to my satisfaction, some aspects of it did not make sense, and I refer to this last part of the answer:

Passenger accommodation will be provided in the brakevan of goods trains working between Peterborough and Quorn via Orroroo and no alteration to the frequency of this service is envisaged at present. It has not yet been decided when the changeover will take place.

If these people are to be asked to travel by goods train between Peterborough and Quorn via Orroroo (and this matter greatly affects the Orroroo people), I point out that the time table of the existing passenger service between Adelaide and Peterborough will not coincide with the goods service, because this morning I checked with the Railways Department—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot debate the question.

Mr. CASEY: No, I am only giving information, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member can give information without debating the matter.

Mr. CASEY: The passenger service operating between Adelaide and Peterborough at present runs on almost every day of the week and arrives at Peterborough at a fixed time. I refer particularly to the train that leaves Adelaide early in the morning and arrives at Peterborough about mid-day. This train would not coincide with the scheduling of the present goods train service from Peterborough to Quorn, so I do not know how the people of Orreroo, who are—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is debating the question. He must ask his question.

Mr. CASEY: Will the Attorney-General take this matter up with his colleague to find out how these rail passengers, particularly those at Orreroo, will be catered for by the existing train schedules?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I very much regret that the reply that I gave yesterday was not entirely to the honourable member's liking. I hope that this is the exception, not the rule, because normally the honourable member approves entirely the replies that I give him. However, I am confident about his liking this answer to the question he has just asked: "Yes."

ROLLING STOCK

Mr. BROOMHILL: Is the Treasurer now able to give information about the improvement of railway rolling stock, which matter I raised during the Loan Estimates debate?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Railways Commissioner reports:

The variation in the amount provided for improvements to freight vehicles was occasioned by the expected amount of Loan moneys available, the number of men at Islington who could be freed for this work, and other projects in hand. In this instance it was considered that certain items covering the provision of new rolling stock and the conversion of existing rolling stock to standard gauge demanded a higher priority than improvements to existing rolling stock. The lesser amount shown against this item does not mean, however, a reduced effort at the Islington workshops.

Mr. VENNING: As has been said from time to time in this House, there is a possibility this year of a record harvest. I want to know what is the present position regarding rolling stock in the Port Pirie Division, and how this relates to the situation that obtained in the last good season of 1964, when almost 1,000,000 bushels of grain was railed from the Port Pirie Division to the emergency storage at Solomontown. As rail standardization is just around the corner, so to speak,

it is possible that the rolling stock connected with this division could be somewhat depleted as compared with the position in 1964. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport what is the present situation regarding rolling stock, particularly as it relates to the situation that existed in the last good year?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, certainly.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my question about the assessment of value of property for acquisition purposes?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: There are several methods by which compensation for acquiring a church property may be arrived at. Many factors must first be taken into account and agreement reached before any one method is used. Investigations must be made as to whether other suitable land or alternative suitable premises are available, or will the need of a church in the area still exist in the light of proposed works and other relevant factors. Section 12 (5) of the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act, 1925-1966, provides for one special method whereby buildings such as churches, schools, libraries, park lands, etc., may be acquired and this method is known as reinstatement. Section 12 (5) reads as follows:

Where the land is, and but for the compulsory acquisition would continue to be, devoted to a purpose of such a nature that there is no general demand or market for land for that purpose, the compensation may, if the court or arbitrator is satisfied that reinstatement in some other place is *bona fide* intended, be assessed on the basis of the reasonable cost of equivalent reinstatement.

It is considered that the provisions of the Act are such that specific compensation would only be agreed after a thorough investigation of all the circumstances of an individual case.

Mr. VIRGO: A fortnight ago I drew the Premier's attention to a press statement attributed to the Minister of Roads and Transport that that Minister was seeking funds with which to commence the railway section of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report proposals. The Premier then said that the study that the Minister had made had obviously been made through the Minister's department, in order to assess what would be possible if the plan were accepted. I draw the Premier's attention to his colleague's statement

that, referring to approaches made to the Commonwealth Government by the New South Wales and Victorian Governments, he would be losing no time in getting in the queue. In view of this statement by the Minister of Roads and Transport and the Premier's obvious contradiction of it, will the Premier say whether his colleague was misreported in the press and, if he was, what steps have been taken to rectify this?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I do not consider that my colleague was so much misreported by the press as misinterpreted by the honourable member, who is probably a victim of an all-embracing problem regarding the presentation of the M.A.T.S. Report, because it is obviously necessary that the public of South Australia, particularly those in the metropolitan area, should be as fully informed as possible on the proposals. It is urgent that this information be put out to the public. The honourable member and, doubtless, many other people in the community have got the impression that the report has already been accepted. However, I take the opportunity to repeat that this report is put out for study and in the next few months there will be further emphasis on models and proposals in the plan. In case the honourable member would otherwise get impatient when the next model came out, I repeat that, when the time comes to make a decision, that decision will be made having regard to all representations made. Any talk of money or finance is exploratory. No part of the plan has been accepted or rejected, and a decision will be made at a proper time in the future.

FREEHOLD LAND

Mr. EDWARDS: I have been approached by a constituent of mine who applied to freehold his property on Eyre Peninsula. He received assistance from departmental officers, and enclosed a cheque for \$6 with his application. He has now received a letter from the Lands Department informing him that his application has been declined on the ground that he already owns over 4,000 acres and, therefore, is ineligible for a further land grant in terms of section 220 of the Crown Lands Act. I draw the attention of the Minister of Lands to a statement made by the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Anthony) at the official luncheon of the South Australian Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society at the show when he said that we should

combine our farms and make them bigger because they would be more economical to work as a large unit than they would as small ones. In view of this comment can the Minister of Lands say whether those farmers in my district who apply in good faith to make land freehold and thus work it and make it productive are to be penalized? Also, will the Minister review this policy with the idea of allowing farmers to work areas of 4,000 acres or more, and will he also consider refunding the \$6 when an application is refused?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I understand that details of this application were known to the department and that the Director of Lands knew the person concerned. Perhaps I should refer to the circumstances of the application before answering the general question. I understand that this gentleman approached the department (I think he went to the front counter) and asked for details about freeholding his land. As is the department's policy, the clerk was most helpful and gave all the information he could, as well as the forms that had to be completed. However, this clerk, who was not a senior officer and not directly involved in administering the policy of freeholding, did not total the area owned by the applicant, although eventually it was found that it exceeded the limit of 4,000 acres. The fee of \$6 was accepted but later, when the matter was considered by the proper authorities, it was found that the land owned by this person exceeded 4,000 acres, and, because of this, the application could not be granted.

One of the features of the Crown Lands Act is that no discretion is given under section 220, although there is a discretion in other sections. If, at the time of the application, it had been realized that the area exceeded 4,000 acres the applicant would have been informed immediately that his application could not be granted, and it is regretted he was not so informed. I will reserve some discretion for myself in the matter of refunding the application fee. There will be no problem in this instance, because it is not the department's policy to accept fees unnecessarily. People are encouraged to discuss problems with officers of the Land Board or the Director of Lands so that no confusion will exist but, unfortunately, this matter was attended to at the counter by a clerk of the department, albeit with the best intentions. In future the department is providing clear and concise written information to enable people to determine themselves what chance their application

has of being accepted. At present alterations in the limitation governed by this section are being closely considered. I cannot say more than that, but I hope that while this is being done there will be no more cases of this type. One or two applications that would normally have been declined are now being held while the question of introducing a Bill this session is being considered.

MILLICENT RAILWAY YARD

Mr. CORCORAN: The Attorney-General will remember that I asked him a question about the condition of the Millicent railway yard, and he was good enough to take this matter up with his colleague. Subsequently, he told me that steps would be taken to have the necessary repairs effected at the yard. However, I visited this yard last week and saw several loads of metal that had been deposited in some of the largest holes in the yard, but much work is still needed to be done before the yard is in a suitable condition, particularly at the southern end. Will the Attorney-General again speak to the Minister of Roads and Transport about the general condition of this yard with a view to a major programme of reconstruction being undertaken so that the yard will be in the condition it should be in?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will do that with pleasure.

REFLECTORS

Mr. GILES: Has the Attorney-General received a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to the question I asked on September 4 about fitting "cat's eye" reflectors to all traffic islands?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Highways Department has installed some types of "cat's eye" reflector for experimental purposes. Only the "self cleaning" variety is reasonably satisfactory and these are expensive. General employment of these devices is not proposed. The introduction and improvement of reflectorized beaded paints and other materials for line marking and traffic island definition have made the "cat's eye" reflector virtually obsolete. The reflectorized materials are superior in performance and considerably more economic.

MODBURY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Works say what sewerage projects are to be commenced this financial year in the Modbury, Tea Tree Gully, Highbury and Dernancourt areas, and the dates on which the schemes

are expected to start? I asked the Treasurer for these details during the Loan Estimates debate and he suggested that I ask his colleague.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: If I can, I shall obtain a schedule of the proposed works in these areas showing all the details requested by the honourable member. I hope to be able to give her this within a couple of days.

Mrs. BYRNE: On May 20 this year the Minister of Works informed me by letter that a sewerage scheme for an area at Modbury and Ridgehaven bounded by Jennifer Avenue, Hazel Grove, Hill Top Avenue, Highland Drive, Sunnyview Crescent, Leane Avenue, Selby Avenue, Keith Street, and Fleming Avenue, comprising 29,250 feet of sewers and estimated to cost \$133,000, which was commenced on December 1, 1967, would be completed in October this year. A constituent has informed me by letter that he has been informed by an officer of the Engineering and Water Supply Department that, because of some difficulty with the owner of an orchard on the west side of Leane Avenue, completion of the work will be delayed a further 12 months. Will the Minister of Works inquire whether this information is correct and, if it is, can he assure me that everything possible will be done to reduce this further delay?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I will ascertain first whether the reason for the delay is that suggested by the honourable member and, secondly, what steps I can take to expedite the completion of this project.

IRRIGATION LICENCES

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about irrigation licences?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: Since the proclamation was made in October, 1967, extending the Control of Waters Act from Mannum to the Murray River barrages, 173 licences have been issued covering an irrigated area of 8,274 acres. An application has been received from Dehy Fodders (Australia) Proprietary Limited, but to date no licence has been issued.

TRANSPORT SERVICES

Mr. CASEY: I understand that the present Government has an "open roads" policy. Indeed, the Premier has indicated on several occasions in this House that he would definitely abolish the Transport Control Board if he had

the opportunity. I should like to know what is his policy in this respect. Further, for some years motor transports have been operating between Broken Hill and Adelaide with no restrictions whatsoever (under section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution these operators are allowed free access between the States). This also applies to the operations between Peterborough and Broken Hill of road passenger services, namely, those conducted by Bonds Australian Scenic Tours Proprietary Limited and Pioneer Tourist Coaches Proprietary Limited. Many people in the north-east of the State are finding it increasingly difficult to use the train services operating in the area, because they operate very early in the morning or very late at night. Some time ago, I managed to obtain permits from the Transport Control Board for these people, so that two permits would be issued to them, enabling them to use the interstate passenger bus service. However, despite the issuing of those permits, the people concerned still find it extremely inconvenient having to renew these permits, sometimes at short notice. Will the Premier therefore indicate whether this system of issuing permits to people in the north-east (in the area between, say, Yunta and Olary) cannot be abolished (north-east of Olary people can travel freely to Broken Hill, anyway, so it does not make any difference in that respect) and will he see whether an "open roads" policy cannot be established so that the people concerned may use the interstate bus service without any restrictions whatsoever?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The member for Frome uses the word "abolish" fairly freely in relation to the two aspects of his question. First, he says that our policy is to abolish the Transport Control Board. I think he knows that the policy of the Liberal and Country League has been to create a free transport system in respect of freight, and this has been achieved. Referring to his second inquiry, the honourable member has asked whether we would obviate the need for the people in the area concerned to obtain permits in order to use the bus services operating interstate from Broken Hill. On both counts I will obtain for the honourable member a considered reply.

TEACHER REGULATIONS

Mr. McANANEY: I refer to the regulations concerning teachers' classifications made on June 17, 1965, in spite of strong and

continued opposition from the South Australian Institute of Teachers. Can the Minister of Education enlighten members in regard to allowing the employment of a person who possesses fewer than four classification units and who is known as an Assistant C?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The member for Stirling has no doubt received a letter, which I believe all members of Parliament have received, from the President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers. I believe that all members would like to know the circumstances that led to the circulation of this letter. The following statement covers the classification, certification and promotion of teachers, and it refers particularly to Assistant C Secondary, the classification to which the letter particularly draws attention:

From January 1, 1969, all teachers to be employed in the Education Department will be classified according to tertiary qualifications that they hold. Existing classification schemes classify and certificate teachers in many cases by including secondary school qualifications. In future, secondary qualifications will not count. The new classification scheme is intended to raise the professional status of teachers. In the case of secondary teachers, under the new classification scheme, a teacher can be granted the status of Assistant B if he holds at least four classification units (which might be university subjects, teachers college subjects, or Institute of Technology subjects), of which two must be acceptable to the board as teaching subjects other than Education. If only four classification units are held, one of these four units must be Educational Psychology and Principles and Practices of Teaching A and B or Speech Education plus Health Education plus Physical Education A plus an approved Teachers College Elective. Any teacher who in future is employed in a secondary school and holds lower qualifications will be employed as an Assistant C and at a lower salary. At the present time, teachers employed with these lower qualifications are employed as Assistant B.

The position of Assistant C corresponds with the unclassified teacher in primary schools, and the view is held by some people that the term "unclassified" should not be used in the primary service, but the term "Assistant C" should be used. The Education Department has no desire to employ teachers without the minimum qualifications for the position of Assistant B, but is still in no position to enforce such a policy. There are still a few students leaving our teachers colleges with satisfactory teaching reports but qualifications less than that for Assistant B, and we are forced to employ, fortunately in decreasing numbers, people with less academic qualifications than for Assistant B, but with special experience and qualifications that make them suitable to fill emergency gaps in the teaching force. As soon as we are able, we will cease to employ people at the status of Assistant C. In the

primary service, we have not employed unclassified teachers for some years from any source, for example, independent schools and other States, but we do still employ some exit students from teachers colleges as unclassified primary teachers. In five years the percentage of unclassified teachers in primary schools has fallen from 24 per cent to 12 per cent. Because of continuing retention and increased enrolments in secondary schools, we are not in this happy position in secondary schools but rest assured that we will cease employing teachers with Assistant C status as soon as possible. At the present time, such people are employed only under emergency conditions.

LENGTH OF QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the attention of all members to the fact that Question Time seems to be extending invariably to 4 o'clock. Indeed, members on both sides have the right to ask questions until then but, unfortunately, because of the time factor some members have been unable to ask all their questions. There seems to be a tendency on the part of some members to drag their questions out and to make them long, and I think this is acting to the detriment of the rights of other members. Although I do not wish to curb Ministers who may wish to make statements of policy and to give information that the House is entitled to have, I think I am entitled to ask members for their co-operation in trying to cut down their questions, in fairness to other members of the House.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. RICHES: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked recently about the time factor in respect of the standardization of the railway line between Adelaide and Port Pirie?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Railways Commissioner has reported that the honourable member is incorrect in saying that present plans envisage a delay of five years in the provision of a standard gauge railway between Adelaide and Port Pirie. The facts are that, apart from the desirability of integrating work that would become a natural follow-on of the present standardization between Port Pirie and Broken Hill, it would permit of time to undertake the intensive planning in and around Adelaide. Rather than the Port Pirie to Adelaide work being left in abeyance for another four or five years, this time would be occupied in the planning referred to and in what preliminary work it would be possible to undertake. This department is also keen that no delay in this important work occur. However, it is considered that what it proposes does not represent an unnecessary delay.

Mr. VENNING: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to the question I asked some time ago about the number of hopper-bottom rail trucks manufactured up to the present in connection with the new standard gauge railway line?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Roads and Transport states that tenders are currently being invited for the supply and delivery of 52 bulk grain hopper waggons for use on the Peterborough Division.

CHOWILLA DAM

Mr. HUDSON: On August 28, I asked the Minister of Works whether he would make available the minutes of this year's April meeting and last year's August meeting of the River Murray Commission, and he promised to give me a copy. Again I asked him the question on September 3 and he replied, "I will provide the honourable member with that information tomorrow." As there have been 15 tomorrows since September 3, can the Minister say, first, whether he interprets the word "tomorrow" in the sense in which many people use the Spanish version of *manana* and, secondly, if he does not interpret it that way, whether he will provide me tomorrow with copies of the minutes of meetings of the River Murray Commission in August last year and April this year?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: This is not a case of *manana* and we are not in Mexico. I said I would get this report for the honourable member and, had he asked for it on the day in question, he could have had it, as I had it in my bag. However, the matter was not raised on that day. As I have copies of the minutes in my bag today, if the honourable member asks me for them afterwards I will give them to him in person today.

DRAIN E BRIDGE

Mr. RODDA: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about the Drain E bridge in the Naracoorte district?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The bridge over Drain E on the Naracoorte-Stuart Range road was closed some weeks ago when it was discovered that the decking was in poor condition. The structure has been watched fairly closely over recent years. However, deterioration of the deck has been more rapid than expected. While this road is a main road, it has been replaced as such by another nearby road as portion of the sealed Naracoorte-Lucindale-Kingston route.

It is therefore of minor importance only and is primarily the responsibility of the District Council of Naracoorte. The Highways Department is prepared to assist in the problem and the District Engineer will investigate the matter with the council soon.

MURRIE ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr. VENNING: In the Auditor-General's Report (and also in this morning's newspaper) appeared reference to the costs of the Royal Commission on Mr. John Murrie. As the reference was to \$20,000 plus other costs, will the Attorney-General ascertain for me, if he does not have this information at his disposal now, the total cost of the Murrie Royal Commission?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: This was an unhappy business that should never have occurred. I notice in the Auditor-General's report the sum of \$20,000 as the approximate amount debited in respect of this particular matter. I remember (in fact I have looked it up) that in the Estimates for last year the sum shown as having been spent in 1966-67 was \$10,916, and only another \$1,000 was provided on the Estimates last year. As members will see from the Auditor-General's comments, that sum has been very greatly exceeded. One reason for this is that the present Government, when it came into office, had discussions with the South Australian Institute of Teachers regarding the payment of the institute's costs. The previous Government, when it tried to settle the Royal Commission before it had come to its conclusion, entered into negotiations with the institute for a payment of a proportion of the costs. The present Government substantially increased the payment (which I understand has now been made to the institute) above the sum the previous Government had been prepared to pay. This would account for some part of the extra money. I point out to the honourable member that the Auditor-General refers to fees and expenses, the salary of the Royal Commissioner, who, of course, was a Supreme Court judge, of the Crown Law officers representing the Education Department, and of other departmental officers not having been included in the amount. Naturally they have not been included, as the Government was responsible for their emoluments in any case. However, I will try to give the honourable member an estimate of these persons' salaries and expenses directly attributable to the Royal Commission.

WALLAROO HOSPITAL

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked during the Loan Estimates debate about additions to the Wallaroo Hospital?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: The sum of \$23,000 provided on the Loan Estimates for the Wallaroo Hospital is to cover the expected payment on the contract for the air-conditioning in the wards at the hospital.

GRAIN SILOS

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, give a list of the grain silos in South Australia that are nearer a grain terminal by road than they are by rail and by approximately how much?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will see whether this information can be obtained.

SOCIAL SERVICES

Mr. HURST: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry supply me with the monthly figures of the number of persons who have received sickness benefits over the last 12 months?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I shall be happy to do that.

ANGAS CREEK

Mr. GILES: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question regarding trestle bridges over Angas Creek?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I have a reply, which is additional to an earlier reply on this question. The previous bridges erected in 1954, during the construction period of the pipeline, were in existence for less than 12 months before being washed away by the floods of 1955 and cannot be considered to establish a precedent. The department would be faced with very many requests for bridges and great expense in providing them if bridges and crossings were provided for landowners in the Gumeracha-Angas Creek area. It is again pointed out that landowners experiencing difficulty with stream crossings should be advised to contact departmental officers, who will gladly assist them with these problems as far as they are able.

HOLDEN HILL INTERSECTION

Mrs. BYRNE: On September 5, I received a reply to two questions I had asked on August 21 and 22, requesting that the design of the intersection of the Main North-East and Grand Junction Roads, Holden Hill,

which incorporates a roundabout, be examined to ascertain whether any modification was necessary before the work was completed. I did this, because I had received complaints from some motorists. I point out to the Attorney-General that the answer received was in the form of a report as to what had been done and what would be done, but no direct reference was made to what I had requested. Will the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, take up this matter with his colleague and ask whether the matters I had raised were considered?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am sure they would have been, but I will certainly ask my colleague and make doubly sure.

CALLINGTON WATER SUPPLY

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question concerning the Callington water supply?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The department does not intend to lay a water main from the Murray Bridge to Onkaparinga main to supply the township of Callington when the laying of the Murray Bridge to Onkaparinga main has progressed that far. It will not be practicable to give consideration to providing a supply for the township until the pipeline has been completed and is in operation. When that stage has been reached there is a possibility of a branch main which could be laid down the Bremer River to enable a supply to be given to the township. If the larger main did not eventuate, then a smaller main for the supply of the township alone would be considered.

MOUNT BURR DUMP

Mr. CORCORAN: My question concerns the provision of land suitable for a rubbish dump in the Mount Burr township area. I believe that some time ago the dump that was made available to the residents of Mount Burr was closed, mainly because of fire risks. I have recently received a complaint from a resident at Mount Burr that, in order to dump rubbish, residents must now travel 14 miles. I know that the district council has asked the department to make land available, because most of the land in the area is owned, naturally, by the department. This approach, however, was unsuccessful. Will the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Forests, take up this matter with his colleague and see whether the department could make land near Mount

Burr available to the district council in order to provide this much needed facility for the people of Mount Burr?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will take up this matter with my colleague. I have no doubt that the action taken was in the interests of fire protection and that, so far as that goes, the honourable member would be in accord. If he has any particular suggestion to make regarding a suitable area, that would probably be a good thing to tell the Minister of Forests.

FLINDERS RANGES

Mr. RICHES: Was the Minister of Immigration and Tourism able to visit the Flinders Ranges during the recent show adjournment and, if he was, did he discuss with the Director of the Tourist Bureau the filming of the ranges while they are showing the colour that is evoking enthusiastic reports from all who have had an opportunity to visit the area, including members of this House and of another place?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I discussed this question with the Director, but I have not got a reply for the honourable member today. I know that some filming was to take place, but to what extent I am not sure. I will obtain the information. I did not go to the Flinders Ranges during the show adjournment, but I shall be there within the next few weeks.

O'HALLORAN HILL SCHOOL

Mr. EVANS: There has been a big influx of new residents in the O'Halloran Hill area over recent years. There is an acute shortage of school rooms at the Happy Valley school. Will the Minister of Education find out whether the department intends to build a new school in the O'Halloran Hill and Happy Valley area within the next two years?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I shall be happy to obtain a report for the honourable member.

WHEAT

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about wheat payments?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture states:

The South Australian Manager of the Australian Wheat Board reports that it is expected that the third payment on wheat delivered to No. 30 pool (1966-67 season) will be made early in October. Legal complications are delaying the final payment on wheat deliveries to No. 29 pool (1965-66 season).

RAILWAY LAND

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to my recent question about the use by the Housing Trust, for the construction of rental houses and flats, of land between Mitchell Park and Brighton?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The General Manager of the Housing Trust reports:

The land bought for the South Australian Railways some years ago for the proposed Mitchell Park to Brighton rail link is of interest to the trust. Inquiries made by the trust have confirmed that as soon as disposal is authorized the Railways Department will offer the land to the trust before trying to sell elsewhere.

KYBYBOLITE RESEARCH CENTRE

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question about work on the Kybybolite Research Centre?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Construction is proceeding on this new research centre and work is about 70 per cent complete. It is expected that the building will be completed within the contract period, which ends on November 22, 1968.

SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. CASEY: Some time ago I drew the Premier's attention to the statement by the Minister of Agriculture, at a meeting on Eyre Peninsula, that the Government was endeavouring to reduce succession duties (and the Minister also mentioned probate duties, but that is a Commonwealth responsibility). The Premier said then that the Budget would be introduced soon and that I would receive the answer from it. Can he now be more explicit and tell me what is in the Budget relating to a reduction in succession duties?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I understood that the honourable member required a reply on whether there would be any alteration of succession duty rates. I would have thought that, if he had listened to the Budget speech or read the papers concerning it, he would have received an answer. When the honourable member asked his question, the Budget had not been presented. It has now been presented and I think that, if he were to read the Budget papers, he would find his answer.

WEED CONTROL

Mr. HUGHES: A few weeks ago I asked the Attorney-General a question about the control of weeds in the Melton railway yard and yesterday he replied that arrangements had been made for their control. After that reply was given, an honourable member told

me of the danger at the crossing alongside the railway station yard because the weeds had grown so high that it was difficult for a motorist to see whether a train was approaching the crossing. Because of this, will the Attorney-General treat this matter as urgent and ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to request that these weeds be disposed of in the interests of safety?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will refer the matter to the Minister.

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my question of August 22, regarding weeds along the railway permanent way on Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Minister reports that the existing rail-mounted equipment on the Port Lincoln Division for weed poisoning is designed to poison over a width of 14ft., that is, 7ft. each side of the centre line of the track. Spraying to a greater width would not be justified from the point of view of railway purposes.

HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT STAFF

Mr. RICHES: Has the Premier a reply to my question about policy relating to the staff of the Highways Department and the action being taken to remedy the situation caused by staff shortage?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Minister of Roads and Transport states:

Reports containing recommendations for future staff requirements, both administrative and engineering, have been prepared and are in the hands of the Public Service Board. Recruitment of staff is proceeding. There is a scarcity of professional people of all classes available in the State and, for that matter, in the Commonwealth. The problem is being met to some extent by the increasing engagement of consulting engineers for specific projects. However, this policy has limitations and does not supply the complete answer, but it is assisting in lessening delays in target dates.

LINCOLN HIGHWAY

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Attorney-General received a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to my recent question about transporting steel between Whyalla and Port Augusta?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Port Augusta to Whyalla road is in poor condition because of its age, the wet season, and increased heavy haulage. Arrangements are being made for a full-time maintenance gang to work on the road. Reconstruction is

scheduled to commence during next financial year. Preconstructional activities have been commenced, and it is expected that work will start as planned.

DENTAL HEALTH

Mr. WARDLE: As I believe that it has been suggested a dental health clinic for children will be situated in Murray Bridge to serve the eastern districts area, will the Premier ask the Minister of Health whether a clinic will be situated at Murray Bridge and, if it will, when?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be pleased to take up this matter with my colleague and obtain a report.

FORESTS DEPARTMENT HOUSES

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to the question I asked during the Loan Estimates debate about Woods and Forests Department houses?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The purchase and erection of new houses is financed from Loan Account. Only two new houses are required this year, one at Comaun and one at Berri. The maintenance of existing houses is financed through the department's working account and, accordingly, provision is not included in the Loan Estimates.

RAILWAY HOUSES

Mr. McANANEY: I understand that when the Railways Department sells its houses (and possibly it will have some for sale when railway lines are closed) the sale is by tender. I have been asked to ascertain why these houses are not auctioned, as this method usually brings a better result and is the usual way of selling houses. Will the Attorney-General obtain this information from the Minister of Roads and Transport?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

CROSS ROAD JUNCTION

Mr. VIRGO: Recently, I asked the Attorney-General a question concerning the junction of Cross Road and Wattle Terrace and was told that Wattle Terrace had been converted to a one-way road. Since receiving that reply I have been informed that the city of Marion, in whose area these streets are situated, has drawn the attention of the Road Traffic Board to this alteration and has asked that the junction revert to its original form with an opening through the median strip on Cross Road, because the closing of the

Wattle Terrace and Cross Road junction to prevent traffic entering Cross Road is causing considerable hardship to local residents. Because of this situation, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to take the necessary steps to ensure that the request of the Marion council, on behalf of the residents, is acceded to?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will discuss the matter with my colleague with a view to acceding to the honourable member's request.

BRAKING LIGHTS

Mr. RODDA: Has the Attorney-General received a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to the question I asked on September 3 about installing braking lights at the front of vehicles as well as at the rear?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The question of providing front-facing braking lights on road vehicles has been discussed by the Australian Motor Vehicle Standards Committee. This committee has the responsibility of recommending draft regulations on vehicular equipment to the Australian Transport Advisory Council for Commonwealth-wide adoption. However, the committee has not yet seen fit to make a recommendation for the fitting of such lights, as it believes their beneficial effects could be marginal. The South Australian representative on the committee, however, will keep the matter under review by the committee. It is considered that this national committee is the appropriate body to handle such matters, as individual States should not take unilateral action in matters such as this where national uniformity is essential.

CHARITABLE COLLECTIONS

Mr. HUDSON: On August 29, I asked the Premier whether he would obtain from the Chief Secretary details of the number of beauty contests that employed professional organizers, and the percentage of funds collected in beauty contests that found its way to charity. Has the Premier a reply?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The number of beauty contests organized and managed by professional organizers is not known. Organizations raising funds for other than a "charitable purpose" as defined in the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act are not required to submit statements relating to fund raising

The statements submitted by properly licensed charitable organizations do not identify each separate fund-raising activity; therefore, the result of any one effort is combined with all other fund-raising efforts made during the year and presented as one annual statement. Few charitable organizations would specifically employ a "professional organizer", but most larger charities would employ an officer, part of whose duties would be to co-ordinate fund-raising activities.

RAINMAKING

Mr. CASEY: Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the South Australian Government has applied to the Commonwealth Government for grants to enable rainmaking experiments to continue in this State and, if it has, what amounts have been requested and, if the grants are available, when the experiments are likely to continue?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Although I think reference was made to this matter in my reply to a question about a fortnight ago, I will obtain a reply for the honourable member.

SOCIAL WELFARE DEPARTMENT

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Social Welfare a reply to the question I recently asked about office accommodation for the Social Welfare Department?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The information on which I base the answer has, in fact, been supplied by the Minister of Works. The approved plans for the relocation of Government departments following occupation of the new Government office building and the new Savings Bank building in Rundle Street, provide for the consolidation of the Social Welfare Department in the Rundle Street Government office building. With the vacation of these offices by the Public Health Department and the Hospitals Department, it is possible to make improvements in the office layouts, and this is being currently planned. I have discussed this matter with the Director and have had a look at what is contemplated. In addition, it is intended to make improvements in sound insulation by means of ceiling height partitions to interview and senior officers' rooms and to provide air-conditioning to rooms located on the west elevation and to other rooms having full height partitions. Further, floor surfaces will be covered with linoleum or carpet, according

to the proposed use of the area. At this stage, design work is proceeding and an estimate of cost will be submitted as soon as possible.

I acknowledge that the present accommodation of the department in that building is far from satisfactory. However, I am sure that what is being done by the Minister of Works, and by his department, will effect an improvement. I hope it does, because the officers of that department and other officers in Foy's building certainly deserve better conditions than those they have had to put up with for a long time.

SECONDHAND DEALERS

Mr. VIRGO: My attention has been drawn to the view held by the Marion council that a person who desires to set up business as a secondhand dealer merely has to apply to the Police Department for a licence and, without any reference to the council, the licence may be granted and the person concerned may establish himself in business as a secondhand dealer, irrespective of location and of the attitude of the council. I am informed that this matter has already been drawn to the attention of the Attorney-General, and to that of the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson), who, with me, represents the area covered by the Marion council. Will the Attorney-General say whether he agrees with the opinion expressed by the Marion council? If he does, when may we expect the necessary amendments to legislation to be made or other action taken to rectify what seems to be a most unsatisfactory situation?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Although I have no immediate recollection of the matter, I will certainly oblige the honourable member by investigating it and by giving him a reply which I am sure will be to his satisfaction.

PENOLA CROSSING

Mr. RODDA: My question concerns a railway crossing in the town of Penola, on the old Kalangadoo road. Adjacent to this crossing is a timber mill, which disposes of its waste (sawdust, etc.) by fire, and there is usually an extremely heavy pall of smoke that hangs over this crossing, where the railway line meets the road at an acute angle. It is therefore most difficult to see trains coming from Mount Gambier and, indeed, I saw the situation for myself last Sunday. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads

and Transport to investigate the danger of the crossing and the possibility of erecting warning lights at this busy site?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall be pleased to do that immediately.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTS

Mr. HUDSON: I quote from page 5 of the Auditor-General's Report under the heading, "Payment of Accounts by Government Departments, etc.", as follows:

During the financial year publicity was given in the press to a statement attributed to the Deputy President of the Adelaide Chamber of Commerce *re* alleged overdue debts to chamber members by the South Australian and Federal Governments. It was alleged that as a result of inefficiency in governmental accounting departments about \$500,000 in State Government accounts was overdue as at a certain date. No approach had been made to the Government on this matter.

Later in the report, the Auditor-General states:

An approach was made to the chamber on this matter but no details of the alleged overdue accounts were given. Further the chamber was invited to seek through its Secretary my personal assistance at any time where difficulty was being experienced in obtaining payment. No such approach has since been made. On the other hand it is noted that of an amount of \$4,500,000 land tax billed to registered companies in a November period, \$2,000,000 was outstanding after the due date of 30 days, \$445,000 after 60 days, and \$143,000 after 90 days. Amounts of land tax overdue are liable under the Act to fines after 30 days.

In view of the sincere co-operation that the Auditor-General tried to give the Chamber of Commerce in respect of possible complaints about overdue accounts to chamber members, and in view also of the delay in payment of land tax, will the Premier take up with the Chamber of Commerce, and such other organizations as may be involved, the matter of overdue land tax accounts with a view to requesting the co-operation of the chamber in having these accounts paid more promptly?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Auditor-General's Report is a report on the activities of Government and on certain representations made while the honourable member's Government was in office. I do not intend to add to the Auditor-General's comments on this matter. I point out that normal procedures are followed in respect of the late payment of State land tax, and I am sure that those procedures will be complied with in relation to all persons involved.

Mr. HUDSON: I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Treasurer, because it seems impossible to get information from the

Premier and because the Treasurer has always been kind in providing information for honourable members. Regarding the billing of land tax, the Auditor-General explains that, where amounts of land tax are overdue, these are liable to payment of fines after a period of 30 days. Can the Treasurer obtain for me information about the procedure that has been followed in relation to overdue land tax in the last year? Does he consider these procedures satisfactory or does he think that further action may be necessary in order to expedite the payment of overdue land tax?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The procedures adopted are the same as those which have operated for a number of years and which undoubtedly operated during the life of the previous Government. They are effective, otherwise undoubtedly representations would have been made to the former Treasurer and to me that the provisions should be altered in some way. Therefore, I have no reason to doubt that the Commissioner will do his job of collecting the tax in the proper and efficient way to which he is accustomed.

RAILCARS

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Treasurer a reply to the question I asked during the Loan Estimates debate about the provision of railcars?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have obtained the following report from the Railways Commissioner:

The new railcars proposed to be built for which provision was made on the current Loan Estimates will not be obsolete when the implementation of the M.A.T.S. Report is undertaken. The cars will be quite suitable for conversion to diesel-electric traction. In the light of the fact that all existing cars have diesel-hydraulic equipment and that this type of equipment must persist until such time as the underground is completed, it was logical to provide for the new cars to have the same type of traction. Further, it is not practicable to delay the construction of the new railcars until such time as the underground is to be built.

With regard to the provision of funds for suburban railcars, there appears to have been some misunderstanding. The proposals provide for work on a total of 24 cars, 20 of which were under construction during 1967-68, and four are to be commenced during 1968-69. The figure of \$914,000 for the construction of 24 railcars as mentioned by the honourable member does not represent the total cost, but comprises \$675,000 for continued work on the 20 railcars already under construction and \$239,000 on the four cars to be started anew.

MEAT DEPOT

Mr. CASEY: As I understand that, during the past few years, not as much meat has come into the meat inspection depot at Gilles Street as came in previously, will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the department or the Government intends to persevere in operating this depot?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will direct the question to my colleague.

RENTAL-PURCHASE HOUSING

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to the question I asked during the Loan Estimates debate about the very drastic reduction in the amount of funds provided for rental-purchase housing?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: In looking at the provisions in the Loan Estimates for 1968-69, a better picture of rental-type housing would be gained by considering rental and rental-purchase together, and by comparing the 1968-69 proposals with the actual experience of 1967-68, rather than with the earlier 1967 Budget estimates which were not achieved. A sum of \$6,640,000 was quoted for rental-purchase housing in 1967-68. This was the proposal at the beginning of last financial year. The proposal in August, 1967, for rental housing was \$7,500,000, so that the Loan Estimates for 1967-68 provided \$14,140,000 for rental-type or relatively low-cost housing. The actual expenditure for the year, however, was only about \$12,000,000. For comparable purposes, the 1968-69 Loan Estimates provide \$9,210,000 for rental and \$3,400,000 for rental-purchase dwellings, a total of \$12,610,000. The comparison between the 1968-69 proposals totalling \$12,610,000 for rental and rental-purchase housing and the actual expenditure of about \$12,000,000 in 1967-68 shows clearly an increased emphasis in this field by the present Government. I would point out that the trust's total capital programme of \$24,250,000 for 1968-69 is planned to be more than \$2,000,000 above actual expenditures in 1967-68. Although new funds this year will be about \$400,000 less than last year, the trust had a considerably greater balance of unspent funds on hand to call on from July 1, 1968, than was available on July 1, 1967.

PLYMPTON HIGH SCHOOL

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on

Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Plympton High School Additions.

Ordered that report be printed.

STATE BANK REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the annual report of the State Bank for the year ended June 30, 1968, together with balance sheets.

Ordered that report be printed.

BUSINESS OF THE DAY

Mr. BROOMHILL (West Torrens): I move:

That "Orders of the Day: Other Business Nos. 1 to 6" be postponed and taken into consideration after "Order of the Day: Other Business No. 8."

I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I have consulted all the members in charge of "Orders of the Day: Other Business Nos. 1 to 6", and that they agree with this motion.

Mr. HUDSON seconded the motion.

The SPEAKER: I draw the attention of honourable members to Blackmore's *Manual of the Practice, Procedure, and Usage of the House of Assembly of the Province of South Australia* as follows:

If the business interrupted is of importance, or such as the House desires to see continued without interruption, it is not unusual to postpone the orders until after the question is concluded. On a Government day such postponement would be moved by the Leader of the House; on a private day each order would be called on and postponed by the member in charge. But if a member has obtained the consent of all interested, he is allowed to move the postponement of all orders *in globo*.

As the member for West Torrens has assured me that he has the consent of all members with previous "Orders of the Day: Other Business" on the Notice Paper, I accept his motion.

Motion carried.

ADELAIDE BY-LAW: STANDS FOR VEHICLES

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

That by-laws Nos. 50, 60, 61, 69 and 72 of the Corporation of the City of Adelaide, in respect of stands for vehicles in park lands, made on December 18, 1967, and laid on the table of this House on June 25, 1968, be disallowed.

I move this motion in my capacity as a member of the Subordinate Legislation Committee and at the request of that committee. The committee in question has considered this by-law and I (and I feel certain that this would apply to other members of the committee) am reluctant to interfere with the

actions of a local government organization, particularly if the actions are legitimate. The matters dealt with in the by-laws and also in by-law 68, with which the subsequent motion deals, are matters of considerable public interest and concern. In view of that, the committee considered that an expression of the opinion of the House should be obtained whether the by-laws I have mentioned should or should not be disallowed.

The by-laws to which I have referred raise from 20c to 30c the fee for parking cars in the park lands of the city that serve the Wayville Showgrounds, the Victoria Park Racecourse and the Adelaide Oval. Part of the south-western park lands is made available for parking cars under by-laws of the city of Adelaide passed in September, 1926. This area of the park lands serves the showgrounds, and members will realize that, when the show takes place at the Wayville Showgrounds, the part that has been set aside for parking in the park lands is used for the parking of cars, as it was only last week when the show was held at Wayville. The fee initially fixed (I assume in 1926) was 10c a car, and this was increased to 20c in 1956. The by-laws to which I have referred increase the charge to 30c.

The areas of the park lands that serve the Victoria Park Racecourse and the Adelaide Oval were opened in 1947, and in 1956 the charge for parking cars in those two localities was fixed at 20c a car. This by-law increases that charge to 30c. In the area that serves the Adelaide Oval is situated the Pinky Flat area, which was opened in 1953. Members will know that portion of the Pinky Flat area is also used at various times for the parking of cars. The reasons for the increase in fees were given by the Town Clerk (Mr. R. W. Arland) in his explanation of the by-laws. I will quote from his explanation, which is attached to by-law 50, to which I have referred. As one reason, he stated:

The fee of 20c was fixed in 1956 and was based on the variation in the Consumer Price Index figure. Based on the variations in the Consumer Price Index figure and the basic (living) wage between 1956 and 1967, the equivalent fee is 26c and 28c respectively.

Secondly, he stated that the increased fee would defray the increased costs in providing, maintaining and conducting these parking facilities on those occasions when sporting fixtures are held in localities where otherwise only limited facilities would be available to the motoring public.

The committee took evidence from the Town Clerk and also from the Royal Automobile Association, through its Assistant General Manager for Public Affairs (Mr. R. E. Theel). I will refer to certain portions of the evidence of the Town Clerk, because I think the committee considered that, apart from the two reasons that were mentioned in the explanation, two further reasons were given. Mr. Arland stated:

It is proposed that fees for parking in the park lands now be adjusted to conform to others charged in the vicinity.

That is, all those other areas in the vicinity of the showgrounds area. Members know that the amounts that are charged for parking there are more than 20c. Mr. Arland continued:

The fee for parking in the showgrounds is 30c, and in private parks in the vicinity of the showgrounds the fee varies from 30c to \$1.

This would appear to be an additional reason for the increase. Another reason is contained in the evidence given by Mr. Arland, which states, in reply to Hon. A. F. Kneebone:

Would the increased cost amount to as much as 50 per cent of the previous cost of maintaining these facilities? — — — The costs of actually staffing the area, no, but I would suggest, with the amount of development that we have in mind to maintain it in this condition, yes. We are not satisfied with the existing condition of the park lands.

The committee felt, after considering the whole of the evidence, that the amount of the increase (50 per cent) was more than was required to meet the costs, as explained by Mr. Arland in his explanation, of providing, maintaining and conducting these parking facilities. Some of the additional revenue appears likely to be used for purposes other than providing, maintaining and conducting the parking facilities that are being made available for the parking of motor cars. It seems that it is intended to use some of the revenue for the development and improvement of the park lands generally. We know that the City Council has done an excellent job over the years in beautifying certain areas in the park lands, and I am sure that every honourable member appreciates that action. The beautification is a credit to the city.

However, the committee considered that the sum of 30c a car would go well beyond the sum required to maintain and conduct the

parking facility. This is also made clear from the evidence of the Town Clerk at page 6, where I asked:

What would you consider would be a reasonable increase in the parking fees to meet the expenditure for maintaining, providing and conducting car-parking facilities?

Mr. Arland replied:

I should like to answer this in a rather different way, if I may. The cost of policing and staffing the parking areas in 1957-58 was, in round figures, \$10,000. The cost of staffing them in 1967-68 was nearly \$19,000.

The Chairman (Hon. Frank Potter) then asked, "This is for all parking facilities in the city, is it?" to which Mr. Arland answered:

Yes. I am not able to be specific in my answer on the particular area mentioned. I believe that, if we can, we should keep ahead of these costs.

I then asked:

Would you say you would be keeping well ahead with the increase of 10c?

Mr. Arland replied, "Yes". I then asked:

Has any consideration been given to say, an increase to 25c? Was that considered at all as being sufficient to meet the present increased cost?

Mr. Arland replied:

I should like to answer that in two ways. First, in trying to assess the fee that we considered most appropriate, we considered three things. The first was what the consumer price index provided by way of an increase on the fee fixed in 1956, and this gave us a figure, depending on whether the consumer price index or the basic living wage was used, of 26c or 28c, so in round figures we called it 30c. The second thing that we considered was the charges imposed in relation to other areas of a similar nature, and the lowest of these in the vicinity of these areas was 30c. The third matter we considered was our expenditure generally on park land development.

There we have brought out again in the evidence reference to the expenditure generally on park lands development. The committee considered that the increase to 30c was somewhat steep. Whilst fully agreeing with the contention that the costs associated with the maintenance and conducting of the parking areas should be borne by those motorists who frequent the parking areas, the committee considered that the council's actions in keeping "well ahead" of the actual costs for these purposes were not warranted. As I have said, evidence was also taken from the Royal Automobile Association of South Australia, the association's views being expressed by Mr. Theel,

who made this submission to the committee, at page 12 of the evidence:

The council of the association desires to refer to the committee the importance of the fact that the charges refer to public land and that there is therefore no justification for regarding the charges levied as being for general Council revenue purposes. It is certainly incontestable that the Corporation should be recouped for providing the services of its traffic officers to regulate and control the parking of vehicles and for expenditure on any additional maintenance work in the parking areas occasioned from their use by vehicles, but the association believes that the responsibility of motorists ends there. The association council therefore submits that unless the Adelaide City Council has been able to adduce that the present charge of 20c fails to cover the essential outgoings referred to in this submission, then no warrant exists to vary the charge for parking in these areas of the park lands at the present time.

Evidence was also given by Mr. Theel that the association had contacted Melbourne. He stated, at page 14:

We sent this Telex message to Melbourne: "Please advise unit rate city parking meters 30-minute limit and parking fee generally charged by municipal authorities for parking areas adjacent sports grounds or racecourses." The reply was: "Unit rate 30 minutes, 5c; sports grounds 20c." The unit rate has remained at 5c in Melbourne through all the years that they have had parking meters, and that is a longer period than Adelaide has had meters.

That remark is also pertinent to the next motion standing in my name. I thought it appropriate to point out the reasons given by the council and the association, the two bodies that gave evidence to the committee. In fairness to the City Council, perhaps I should also refer to a letter dated August 7, 1968, which I understand was sent to honourable members. A paragraph in that letter would perhaps further amplify one of the reasons that I said earlier had been submitted by the City Council. The letter states:

The council has in recent years undertaken an extensive programme of park lands development and has, it believes, achieved a standard of which all South Australians may be proud. This has included developmental work within the past two years within the areas in question. The only way in which this advancement can be maintained is to ensure that those who receive benefit from the use of our parks make, where appropriate, some reasonable form of contribution towards their maintenance and development. Users of the sporting facilities contribute by means of the normal charges made to clubs for the sports areas they occupy—parkers are called upon also to make a contribution by way of a nominal parking charge.

It is pointed out, however, that a charge is made only to those who are not participants in sporting events.

When large concentrations of vehicles need to be parked, supervision is required. The areas where these concentrations occur must receive added attention to ensure not only that they remain suitable for constant and heavy use, but also that they remain as areas of park land pleasant to the eye and befitting a city with a high reputation for the attractiveness of its parks. The proposed charges will assist in maintaining these objectives.

The letter refers to developmental work undertaken by the council, but the committee considered that the amount of 20c to be charged to park cars in the park lands should be sufficient to meet the cost of providing supervision and of maintaining and conducting the parking areas. As the committee considered that the charge of 30c a motor vehicle would result in revenue in excess of those requirements, it considered that the House should decide whether the by-law should or should not be allowed.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I commend the member for Angus (Hon. B. H. Teusner) for the capable manner in which he has documented and presented the submissions on behalf of the committee in support of this motion. The presentation of the submissions leaves little more to be said. The criteria for the fee to be charged should be the reimbursement of the cost of providing traffic officers to control the parking areas and the cost of maintaining such areas, and not, as Mr. Arland suggested, the prices being charged for other nearby parking areas. Near the showgrounds people with private property charge motorists who use it for parking motor cars, but that cost should not be considered in relation to what the council charges for public land. The park lands belong to the people, and the council acts as a trustee in administering them on behalf of the public. It would be wrong for the council to compare its prices with those charged by private persons to use private property.

I was surprised to hear that the Town Clerk admitted to the committee that if these charges were introduced the council would do well financially. The council should not make a profit from these charges: it should cover only the cost of conducting and administering the parking areas. It seems that the policy of the council is to derive additional revenue from these parking fees, as well as using them to maintain the parking areas. It is interesting to compare these charges with

those operating in Melbourne, because the wages of employees in South Australia are below those of Melbourne employees. Though the minimum wage is lower in South Australia than in Victoria, the controlling authority in Melbourne has not increased its charges. I support the motion.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands): I oppose the motion. I am aware that the system by which this House delegates the supervision of regulations and by-laws to the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation is one of the best systems that could be devised. Rarely does one disagree with the committee's recommendations but, although appreciating the work of the committee, I oppose this motion. Formerly a member of this committee, I know the detailed attention given to these matters and, no doubt, the committee has studied this subject more than I have. However, it comes as a jolt to me to see that this House would administer a rather humiliating snub to the Adelaide City Council. We ask the council to undertake many responsibilities and we discuss with it many important State matters, including the festival hall, but when it asks for a modest charge on motorists, we refuse its request. I do not think it should be treated in this way.

The council is the custodian of the city and should know how to run it. The member for Angus said that the representative of the Royal Automobile Association told the committee that the charge in Melbourne was 20c and wanted to know why the charge should be increased in Adelaide. The Town Clerk (Mr. Arland) pointed out (and this has not been disputed) that, in keeping with the rise in the consumer price index since 1956 and in the basic wage, the equivalent charge would be 26c and 28c respectively. Why should we tell the council it should lose money regarding the parking of cars in the park lands? The council is spending much more money on providing a facility than it will ever receive from car parking, and it is beautifying the park lands considerably. Indeed, we should be encouraging the council in what it is doing in this respect.

Any comparison made with the Melbourne situation in this respect is not strictly a valid one. Car parking areas in and around Melbourne are far inferior to those provided here. Members may recall the outcry that occurred when our park lands were first used for the parking of cars: people who liked to see open spaces wished the park lands

to be kept completely free of motor cars, one of their fears being that the beauty of the park lands would be destroyed. However, the City Council has largely silenced that criticism. The Town Clerk points out that the revenue received from Pinky Flat, which, as everyone knows, is an attractive area, barely equals the expenditure on salaries and on maintenance the need for which is caused directly by the motorist himself; motorists drive over flower beds, spin the wheels of their cars when there is the slightest shower of rain, and cause all sorts of damage.

However, this is a most attractive area, and if we wish to encourage the City Council to establish more such areas we should not try to snub it, as the motion seeks to do. I am speaking now not from the Government's point of view but from my own, and I am sure that I will be supported by other members on this side. Although this may seem a small matter to us and to the motorist, it is not so in the case of the City Council. The Town Clerk has said that parking at the showgrounds costs 30c, private parking costing up to \$1, yet we are objecting to an increase to 30c. Although it is referred to as an increase of 50 per cent, I should prefer to regard it as an increase of 10c. If the charge were increased to 25c no objection apparently would be raised. Why bother about an extra 5c? Has anyone stopped to think about what it costs to own a motor car that is parked for any length of time? A cheap car (smaller than, say, a Holden or Falcon) costs about 7c an hour, so that within about four hours an owner of a parked car will incur a cost similar to that of parking his car in a park on a Saturday afternoon while he may be watching sport.

I believe the City Council is justified in asking those who use a park to help pay for its upkeep. I am concerned not so much with the detail of this matter but with the principle: we all appreciate the work of local government and pay much attention to local government legislation, but concerning a small matter such as this we suddenly seem to get an idea that what has been proposed is unpopular and therefore must be stopped. Let us accord local government a little more of the dignity that we believe it ought to receive. We should oppose this motion, so that the council may proceed to make this modest increase in respect of parking in the park lands, of which the council is the custodian.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): I, too, oppose the motion. I see no reason to oppose the increase from 20c to 30c. The motion represents the last resort in opposing an increase made by a properly elected and responsible body of people. Bearing in mind the many ways in which the Adelaide City Council is responsible for the South Australian community (most of which lives outside its area), I think it behoves us to be extremely cautious when considering a move to restrict the council's sources of revenue. Governments are involved in raising large sums of revenue for road and traffic purposes. Therefore, it ill behoves Parliament to decide that it is wrong for the council to make this increase which will, in fact, be a minor imposition on individual motorists. I do not support the motion, believing that we should leave the council free to stand or fall on the decision of the people who elect it. The increase proposed is not exorbitant and its announcement has not met with cries that it is unjust. Therefore, I agree with the Minister of Lands and oppose the motion.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I support the motion. It seems that the basis of the opposition that we have heard from the Premier and the Minister of Lands is unfounded. No doubt, they both believe that the City Council, being the preserve of the Liberal and Country League and the establishment, should be—

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Oh!

Mr. HUDSON: The City Council is the preserve of the L.C.L.: L.C.L. pre-selection is necessary to be a member of it. It is one of the open scandals of local government that this is in fact the case. I believe the member for Angas has demonstrated clearly that the argument for this increase has not been effectively justified. Furthermore, it seems to me that the whole basis of the approach in both this matter and in the next Order of the Day has been partly the need felt by the City Council to affect the relative cost of alternative parking outside of parking stations, so that a price could be charged for the use of a parking station to make this a profitable venture—

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You are talking about the other by-law.

Mr. HUDSON: No. I am talking also in relation to the by-laws in this case, because I believe there is a case for the parking areas used in the park lands to be used more. I am suggesting not that increased areas should be

made available but that the existing areas should be used more frequently, with feeder public transport provided for people to come into the city. Provided the charge was reasonable, this would make available to people in the community reasonable parking at a reasonable price. However, the City Council's reasoning is not only that it wants to make a bigger profit on what it gets out of charges for parking in the park lands but that, if any action is taken that encourages greater use of existing parking areas in the park lands by means of providing feeder transport, this will make parking stations in the city less profitable. A move is being made to push up the price charged for parking inside parking stations so that the provision of such parking stations will become sufficiently profitable to make them viable.

A student of mine, in an Honours thesis on parking in the city, showed that even four or five years ago the kind of charge that could be made at a multi-storey parking station would not justify the provision of such a station by private enterprise, because it would not make a profit. It seems to me that, from funds available from charges for park lands parking and from motor revenue, the City Council should be able to subsidize the provision of these parking stations. If we reach the stage where parking charges for multi-storey parking stations move to the kind of levels that apply in other cities of the world, particularly in the United States of America, I can see only the long run decline of the centre of the city of Adelaide as a commercial area compared with other developing commercial areas outside the central city of Adelaide. We are moving in that direction. True, if the charges are sufficiently high these stations then become profitable for private enterprise to erect. The consequence of this is to increase the relative attractiveness of outer-suburban shopping centres and to lead to a relative decline in the inner city area. As far as I can see, the whole thinking of the City Council, both in relation to this matter and to the next Order of the Day, has been misplaced.

I again draw attention to the constitution of the Adelaide City Council. We are told that, in general, it is necessary to keep politics out of local government, but we have a City Council which, in my view, is unrepresentative. Politics are in it well and truly, and it is about time that members opposite saw to it that the stranglehold which the L.C.L. has on

the City Council is removed and that the arrangements which currently exist, whereby (except in one or two isolated cases) it is obligatory to get L.C.L. pre-selection before having any hope of becoming a member of the Adelaide City Council, are altered. I should like to see a complete alteration to the Local Government Act, particularly regarding the basis of representation and the method of voting. I believe the situation, whereby multiple voting exists and whereby someone who is not a ratepayer but is resident does not get a vote, is wrong. I do not think this can be effectively justified except in terms of 19th century values and of a belief in property which, in this day and age, should at least have been modified to some extent.

I am disturbed to find that the two members of the Government who have seen fit to oppose this motion are both members of Cabinet. It looks as though they have been nobbled by the City Council in this matter. Members on this side thought that the motion would be carried unanimously, but this has now turned out to be a matter of some controversy. Despite the opinions expressed by the Premier and the Minister of Lands, I hope the motion will be carried by an overwhelming majority in the House of Assembly, because the City Council has simply not provided adequate justification for the charges it proposes.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): I support the motion. As a member of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, I point out that it seriously considered the evidence placed before it, which was both for and against. The committee came down with a unanimous decision that the increases in fees in these areas, particularly adjacent to the Wayville Showgrounds and to other sporting areas, were far in excess of a reasonable price for parking. As the member for Glenelg has pointed out, it is obvious that the Adelaide City Council is endeavouring to force motorists to use off-street parking facilities. I am surprised that the Premier and the member for Alexandra both oppose the motion. They are country members, and during show time many of their constituents visit the show and use the parking facility provided in the park lands. It is all very well to say that private car parks charge 30c and 40c, but it must be remembered that they are much closer to the showgrounds than are the park lands. I do not think motorists should have any further impost placed on them. Recently, the Government saw fit to raise third party insurance charges. If we

continue to increase imposts on motorists, it will be a question of how much they can stand. The City Council should encourage motorists to come to town.

Mr. Ryan: Make it free.

Mr. McKEE: At least, as cheap as possible, to encourage motorists to visit the city and shop in the city area. I am sure that this would be the wish of the Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Ryan: It's a wonder farmers can afford the increase.

Mr. McKEE: I am surprised that two Cabinet Ministers oppose the motion.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): The member for Port Pirie has said that the City Council is trying to force people to use off-street parking. The motion applies only to people using the facilities at the Adelaide Oval, the Victoria Park Racecourse and the Wayville Showgrounds: it does not force people to use off-street parking.

Mr. Hudson: Why couldn't that area be used, and then have a feeder bus service into the centre of the city?

Mr. McANANEY: I am pointing out the mistaken view of the member for Port Pirie.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Stirling must address the Chair and ignore interruptions.

Mr. McANANEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For once I went off the track and did not address the Chair. The member for Glenelg has stated that private parking stations could not pay unless they were forced to be used as a result of this increase in fees. The Miller Anderson Limited parking station was one of the first in Adelaide, and for at least two years it made more from its parking station than it did from the store's operations, so the member for Glenelg was erroneous. He also stated that the membership of the City Council should be elected by some different method. When the council is run by levying rates, the ratepayers must be the people to elect the members to spend their money. If there were a more general approach to raising funds his would be a more reasonable argument. I rose only to correct the erroneous statements made by the members of the Opposition.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (24)—Messrs. Arnold, Broomhill, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Evans, Ferguson, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens,

Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Nankivell, Riches, Ryan, Teusner (teller), and Virgo.

Noes (14)—Messrs. Allen, Brookman, Coumbe, Edwards, Freebairn, Giles, Hall (teller), McAnaney, Millhouse, Pearson and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Venning and Wardle.

Majority of 10 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

ADELAIDE BY-LAW: METERED SPACES

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

That by-law No. 68 of the Corporation of the City of Adelaide, in respect of metered zones and metered spaces for vehicles, made on December 18, 1967, and laid on the table of this House on June 25, 1968, be disallowed. I move this motion, too, as a member of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. This by-law purports to increase from 5c to 10c the charge for parking a motor vehicle in a 30-minute metered area. The areas affected by this by-law are Grenfell Street, Pirie Street, and portion of Hindmarsh Square. Before the passing of this by-law, these areas were not what is known as short-term zones: they were one-hour zones, it being possible to park there for one hour for 10c. However, it is now intended that these areas be made what are known as short-term zones, 30 minutes being the maximum time that a motor vehicle is allowed to be parked there, and the charge is to be increased from 5c to 10c. The reasons for the increase were given by the Town Clerk (Mr. Arland) in his explanation to the committee, and I think much time could be saved if I merely stated those reasons, which are as follows:

At the present time the kerb space of the central business district is insufficient to meet the demands made upon it. The council, therefore, extended the available space by providing off-street parking facilities in strategic locations throughout the city. The parking provisions within the city must now be considered in total; that is, both on-street and off-street are merely part of the overall supply of spaces. On-street spaces are becoming fewer year by year, and eventually in some streets the supply will be virtually nil. It is desirable, therefore, to encourage motorists to utilize off-street spaces wherever possible. There is no doubt that at present the most desirable parking space is on-street because of the time-saving to the motorist. It is also the cheapest space unless in the high demand areas the price is increased to 10c a half hour so as to be consistent with off-street garage charges. It could be argued that garage charges are too high. However, it can be shown that it is impossible to erect a garage

to serve the central business district and to operate it without loss unless the basic charge is 20c an hour. Recognizing that on-street parking is continuously decreasing and that even utilizing every means available it will not be possible to maintain an adequate supply of these on-street spaces, it is obvious that every influence should be used which will encourage motorists to park off-street if this is at all possible. The charges both on-street and off-street are therefore fixed in conjunction with time limits and other restrictions to spread the demand for kerb space as evenly as possible. Experience has proved that when parking charges are raised the type of parker alters to one who has a more essential need of the facility. The others move a little further afield to cheaper parking, and so there is a leavening of demand.

It was also submitted in evidence by the Town Clerk that, in the streets close to Grenfell Street and Pirie Street, it is still possible to park for an hour at a charge of 10c. Mr. Arland stated that, if a motorist wished to park near Pirie Street, he could park in Flinders Street for an hour for the charge of 10c, which charge has been in force for some time.

It is clear from the explanation given by Mr. Arland that the council considers that an effective turnover of kerbside space in Pirie Street and Grenfell Street is desirable, because of the excessive demand by motorists for kerb space. The council considered that that object could not be achieved simply by limiting the maximum time to 30 minutes: it went further and said that the object could be achieved only if, in addition to the limitation of the time, there was also an increase in the charge from 5c to 10c. I understand that the charge of 5c has been the usual charge for half-hour parking at kerb space within the city of Adelaide, so this intended increase is a 100 per cent increase.

The other witness, Mr. Theel, Assistant General Manager (Public Affairs), Royal Automobile Association, took a different view. He considered that the effective turnover of kerb space could be achieved by limiting the time, as has already been done. The time is limited to 30 minutes. In these streets it has been possible previously to park for up to one hour. It seems from the Town Clerk's explanation that the council's other object is, as a result of the increased charges, to divert (perhaps "force" is too strong a word) a large section of the motoring public to the parking stations. I understand there is one in Grenfell Street that is and has been well patronized, and another close by in Wyatt Street. From the evidence

given it appears that the Wyatt Street parking station is, on practically all occasions, half-empty; indeed, it has been filled on only one occasion, and it appears that this may be an attempt to equate the charges for parking against the kerbing with the charges in the parking stations. However, the parking stations provide a better service—for instance, a roof over the vehicle, and an attendant. An important factor is that the motorist who parks there for 20c an hour can leave his vehicle there for two, three or four hours without having to return to it. He pays his parking dues when he picks up his vehicle after a period of four or more hours. Certainly, the parking stations provide a better service and more facilities.

My view is that the highways and streets are there for the use of the public. A person is entitled to an uninterrupted use of the highway and, if he wants to park somewhere, I consider he should be entitled to. Naturally, if we are to have this done in an orderly manner, we shall have to have parking meters or some officers in attendance who will ensure that orderly parking or ranking is carried out. The committee of which I am a member considers that a motorist should be prepared to pay for the costs involved in orderly parking or ranking, that the charges made heretofore (5c for 30 minutes) have been more than meeting the costs involved in providing attendants, parking meters, etc., and that there would be considerable additional revenue not necessarily being used by the City Council for parking services and providing parking stations.

I want now to refer to the views expressed by the Royal Automobile Association. The evidence given by Mr. Theel can be summarized in a letter that the General Manager of the association wrote to, I believe, all members of Parliament, dated July 30, 1968. It is a summary of the R.A.A.'s views and, as I have said, would bear out the evidence given by the association through Mr. Theel. The summary is as follows:

- (1) Parking meters are not intended to be used for raising revenue, but to secure equitable turn-around of kerb space, basically by rationing time.
- (2) The principle of charging other than a token fee for parking on the street is objectionable.
- (3) The cost of operation of parking meters in Adelaide over the last 10 years has been less than 50 per cent of the total collections made from them.
- (4) The association does not agree that there should be any equating of the charge for parking at the kerb and in

off-street stations as the conditions available to motorists vary widely.

- (5) The new minimum fee declared now in specific areas must inevitably spread as additional short-term zones are introduced.

I think I have stated the reasons for this by-law from the City Council point of view, as given in the explanation by Mr. Arland, and also the different view expressed by the other witness, Mr. Theel. The R.A.A. contacted Melbourne to ascertain the position in that city. I quote from page 14 of the evidence submitted to the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation (I have quoted this in connection with the previous motion), that the information the R.A.A. received from Melbourne was that the unit rate for 30 minutes' parking was 5c. The evidence continues:

The unit rate has remained at 5c in Melbourne through all the years that they have had parking meters, and that is a longer period than Adelaide has had meters.

That is all I wish to say. I ask the House to consider the reasons given by the Adelaide City Council and the R.A.A. in this matter.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I support this motion. Some few years ago, when the Adelaide City Council commenced installing parking meters (I do not know how the debate arose in this House, because there was no motion similar to this for disallowance) the then Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) attacked the Adelaide City Council for installing parking meters. Probably he thought more of the welfare of the farmers coming into the city than some members here this afternoon do. He bitterly opposed the fact that farmers coming into the city should have to pay 6d. for half an hour (as the charge then was) but I defended the City Council and pointed out that, if the council did not have a system of meters, all parking areas in the city of Adelaide would be occupied before 8 o'clock in the morning and nobody could come into the city after about 7.30 in the morning and find a parking space. I believe that a charge on the motorist using the streets, as suggested by the member for Angas, to cover the cost of the inspectors' wages and the installation and maintenance of parking meters—

Mr. Casey: Administration costs.

Mr. LAWN: Yes—is fair but it should be sufficient to ensure a turnover of motorists because if, for instance, I want to go up

Rundle Street, Hindley Street or Grenfell Street to do 20 minutes' shopping, I should not have to walk there just because somebody got there at 7 o'clock in the morning and secured a parking space for the whole day. Since meters were first installed the total receipts have been \$2,410,192, of which only \$972,188 was spent in the actual initial cost and in operating expenses, and almost \$1,500,000 has become available to the council for its off-street parking programme. The council cannot justify, because of increased wages, any increase in the charge for meters. I do not object to the council's providing quick short-term parking periods at a reasonable cost but, obviously, no justification exists for any increase in metering charges.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands): In opposing the motion I would be out of order in referring to what I said during the debate on the previous motion, but what I said then indicates my present views. We should give local government more dignity and not snub the Adelaide City Council in this way. This charge has been operating for about four months and, as far as I know, without causing any protests. Now, we are to tell the council that it does not know its business and should immediately revert to the old fees.

The Town Clerk said that there was no adequate kerb space in the three areas referred to in the regulation and that the council wanted to ensure that the precious kerb space was used to the full. However, Parliament is to decide that the charges should be changed, because it has accepted the views of a representative of the motoring organization but rejected the views of the Town Clerk, who should know his business. We should leave this matter under the control of people who are responsible. The council is encouraging off-street parking. Every member will attend the opening of an off-street parking station (and open it if he is asked to), but when the matter is spoken of in this House it sounds as though it is an iniquitous practice indulged in by the council. Now the council is to be told that, although it wants a higher charge in the three areas, it is not to be allowed to impose this charge. This is a simple matter and should be left to people who are responsible for administering this city.

Motion carried.

AGE OF MAJORITY (REDUCTION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 4. Page 1068.)

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): When the House was gracious enough to grant me leave to continue my remarks (it seems a long time ago now) I had discussed and, I thought, answered some things that had been said by the Premier and by the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney). However, I had not addressed myself to what had been said that same day by the honourable Attorney-General.

Mr. Clark: It was hardly worth it.

Mr. JENNINGS: Now, having looked at *Hansard* I agree with my friend from Gawler that there is nothing in his remarks that calls for a reply. The Attorney-General, after minor flirtations with the truth (which is as close as he normally gets to the truth), apparently accepted but did not acknowledge that he had come here armed with opinions from the Parliamentary Draftsman and from Crown Law officers which he apparently considered, in his present elevated and exalted position, appropriate to carry around with him. He eventually bowed—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member should call him the honourable Attorney-General.

Mr. JENNINGS: As I had already described him as that, I did not think I should have to continue describing him in that way, but if you wish I shall do so. It will only take a bit more time. The honourable Attorney-General bowed to the ruling of a very wise and experienced Deputy Speaker. This left him without a feather to fly with, and the result is that he made a crash landing and said nothing at all. All we got from the Attorney-General was that he was not opposed to the principles of this Bill but could not support it. He said it was a dragnet Bill, and the Premier had also said that earlier. We concede that it is a dragnet Bill but certainly no more so than was the position concerning decimal currency, when practically every Act on the Statute Books had to be amended where moneys were mentioned at all regarding sentences, penalties, or anything of that nature, and it was done effectively.

The honourable Attorney-General asked us on this occasion, if we wanted to do something of this nature, to introduce legislation piecemeal. However, if we did this, not one member of this House, or even perhaps his

grandchildren, would see the day when all Statutes could be amended piecemeal. Other speakers referred to uniformity and last night the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn), talking about something else, accused members on this side of being a Party of uniformity. I know on one occasion he spoke to his backbencher colleagues behind him; he did not have a chance, of course, to see them, but we on this side could see that they were laughing at him, not with him. The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, who is the doyen of the Liberals in this House and apparently the hero of one of the new members, to whom the member for Light was addressing himself last night, always said, "Don't let South Australia be uniform; let's be ahead of the rest of the Commonwealth." Members of experience will recall that he often said this, although I may say that he did so when the matter suited him. He said that there was no reason why South Australia should not take the lead; there was no reason why we should restrict ourselves to the limit imposed in other States. We would agree with that gentleman, also when it suited us.

Let us examine the lack of uniformity that exists in various forms in legislation throughout the Commonwealth today. The complications in this matter are enormous. In the Northern Territory a person is entitled to drive omnibuses if he is 21 years or over; public hire cars, 21 years or over; and other vehicles, 17 years or over. In Tasmania the minimum age is 17 years for ordinary vehicles; for heavy vehicles, 20; for public passenger vehicles, 21; and for semi-trailers, 21. In Western Australia for cars or motor cycles the minimum age is 17 years or over; wag-gons over 14cwt. or over, 20 years or over; and for omnibuses, taxis and passenger buses, 21 years or over. In Queensland the minimum age is 17 years or over, and provision exists for the issue of licences for specific purposes to persons under 17 years. In Victoria the minimum age is 18 years or over but persons over 16 years may obtain licences to drive farm tractors in restricted circumstances, and persons over 17 years may be taught to drive without holding a licence provided they are accompanied by a licensed driver; for a motor cycle the minimum age is 17 years and 9 months.

Mr. Clark: That three months makes all the difference.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, as many things in this legislation make all the difference. In New South Wales the minimum age is 17 years; for lorries over 2½ tons and vehicles equipped to seat more than eight adult passengers, or vehicles being used to carry passengers for hire, it is 21 years or over; and a learner's permit may be obtained at 16 years and 10 months. In the Australian Capital Territory the minimum age is 17 years, but the Registrar has discretionary powers to issue a licence at a lower age in exceptional circumstances. As we know, in South Australia the minimum age is 16 years. Let us consider the age of drinking: in New South Wales it is 18; A.C.T., 18; Tasmania, 20; Western Australia, 21; Queensland, 21; Victoria, 18; and South Australia, 21.

Mr. Clark: What about voting ages?

Mr. Rodda: I think that is what you're chiefly interested in.

Mr. JENNINGS: I think that for voting there should be an intelligence test, and this would ensure the return of the Labor Government on every occasion. There would not even be an Independent in the place, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. JENNINGS: There is another important variation between ages in the States, and that is in the age of consent. In New South Wales it is 16, in South Australia 17, Queensland 17, Western Australia 16, Victoria 16 and Tasmania 18. Here again the situation is horribly complicated because there are other clauses inter-related dealing with abductions and things of this nature. Everyone who has respect for the law acknowledges that carnal knowledge of a girl under the age of consent with her consent is regarded as a very serious offence. If this happens in Cockburn apparently it is illegal, and therefore immoral, at the age of 16, whereas, just 100 yards away, across the border in New South Wales, it is not illegal, and consequently not immoral, if this happens at the age of 16. This surely indicates the present ridiculous situation existing in Australia, which results from lack of uniformity in these laws that bind us all.

Mr. Clark: You won't get uniformity until someone starts.

Mr. JENNINGS: Sir Thomas Playford often said, "Let us take the lead." Someone must take the lead in these matters and, as there is an enlightened Opposition in this Parliament (which will very soon become an

enlightened Government), this question is now being brought forward. Other matters arise, such as the question of young people entering into contracts at the age of 18 and the question of young people involving themselves in hire-purchase contracts at the age of 18. I have represented many people for a long time and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker (and I am sure you do not need any convincing on this score), that many people who get into trouble with their hire-purchase commitments are much older than the present age of majority. Indeed, sometimes they are middle-aged or elderly people who have been getting into this sort of trouble for years. So, I do not believe that the question of age comes into it to any great extent. It is acknowledged that nowadays, generally speaking, young people receive a better education and are making a greater contribution to the economy than they did formerly. They are paying their income tax from the time they start work, not from the time they turn 21, and they are paying it on a graduated scale according to the amount they earn.

Mr. Virgo: Liberal Governments throughout Australia are taking more in taxes from this section of the community.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes. The Victorian, New South Wales and Queensland Liberal Governments have all followed that policy. Of course, the kind of tax that seems to suit members on the other side is the surreptitious kind of tax. A person is not sure how much of this kind of tax he is paying and therefore he does not hit at the Government imposing the tax. Furthermore, the kind of tax favoured by members opposite is paid at a flat rate—so the amount is greater for the ordinary family man or person with commitments than it is for a person who has no commitments. In New South Wales the people will pay, not according to their means, but according to their needs, and this is certainly the wrong basis for levying any form of taxation. This is orthodox Liberal Party policy: it takes it from the people who have not got it.

Mr. McAnaney: What about the Reece Government in Tasmania?

Mr. JENNINGS: The Reece Government has proven its popularity by staying in power for a long time without a gerrymander to support it. Of course it raised taxes: there is not a government in Australia of any kind that has not increased taxes over the last 20 years. We all acknowledge that this is inevitable, but we are not talking about the

Budget now. Undoubtedly, one reason why this argument is now becoming much more vehement is that youths are being conscripted to fight in Vietnam. Young people are saying, "I am obliged to go to Vietnam if my marble is drawn."

Mr. Nankivell: They can join the Citizen Military Forces.

Mr. JENNINGS: That would be one way, but some people believe it is immoral to join the C.M.F. if it is only to avoid going to the war.

Mr. McKee: The Attorney-General has done all right that way.

Mr. JENNINGS: The Attorney-General has managed it. The youth of this country is justified in saying, "If I have to fight in Vietnam, or wherever it may be, I am entitled to a say in the running of my country and in its destiny." This is one of the reasons why this argument is becoming more vehement than it has been in the past, and this argument has been raised over many years.

Mr. Langley: All the names have to go in the barrel.

Mr. JENNINGS: I do not think age has much to do with a good many of these things that we are discussing. After all, there is nothing completely sacrosanct about the age of 21: a person does not suddenly get a great burst of knowledge at 21 that he did not have a day or a year before or perhaps, in many cases, five or six years afterwards and in many cases never. I think that on the other end of the scale we can find deterioration, too. I noticed a recent report of the remarks of a gentleman who has given great service to South Australia. He is quoted as having said:

Men have eaten from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, but they have been unable to digest the fruit. In the result, their minds are distended with pride and arrogance and their souls are filled with a vague sense of discomfort and discontent.

Those remarks were made by a man at the other end of the scale, and I would say that this statement, if it is correctly reported (and I have no reason to believe that it is not), shows complete arrogance. I would say that if a young man of 19 or 20 made a statement like that, and the other statements accompanying it which I will not read, he would be accused of being incompetent and arrogant and braggadocio. The same applies to this distinguished gentleman.

I do not see why we should not take the lead in this matter. If we are not going to do it from the Opposition just because it is the

Opposition that has introduced the Bill, then I can assure the House that it will be done when the present Opposition becomes the Government.

Mr. Hurst: That won't be too long.

Mr. JENNINGS: It certainly will not be. I think we have a recent example just a few minutes old of a few members on the other side of the House agreeing that they should take the lead of one of their members who was prepared not to go along with the line of the Premier and his cohorts. On two occasions today some members did not do so, so I think we have some reason for confidence that they might agree to let South Australia take the lead in this matter, despite the fact that it has been introduced by the Opposition, instead of taking the lead in such things as the level of unemployment, the political chicanery that has gone on for the last four or five years, the making of South Australia a low-wage State, and the many other things of which we as a State have no reason at all to be proud.

Would it not be better if some members at least on the other side who have not yet committed themselves to the extent of completely identifying themselves with the Tory element of their Party were prepared to take a lead in something that is valuable to the State instead of things that are shameful and degrading to the State? I support the Bill.

Mr. EDWARDS (Eyre): Mr. Speaker, I oppose this Bill. I am sure that most 18-year-olds are not stable enough in their thinking to be given voting rights. Although perhaps some would be stable enough, the number would be small.

Mr. Hurst: What about those who go away to fight?

Mr. EDWARDS: The moment they join the Army they are eligible to vote.

Mr. McKee: You are wrong there.

Mr. EDWARDS: Any person who is in the services for any length of time is eligible to vote.

Mr. McKee: That is not so. You don't know what you are talking about.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Eyre is making his speech in his own way.

Mr. EDWARDS: The member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) wandered on and got lost in his own importance without saying very much that was relevant to this debate. We on this side of the House do not want any lesson from members opposite, especially the member for Enfield, for we can certainly manage quite

well without his advice. Today, most 18-year-olds are still at university or studying under some other advanced course of education. Therefore, in my view they are still under the influence of their teachers. This could cause a definite opinion opposite to that which a student might have of his or her own at this stage of his or her career. It could be a different view from the one they would express by the time they reached the age of 21. I am not in any way trying to run down our young people, because I believe that today most young people, even at 18 years of age, are taking a great deal of responsibility. I consider it would be better for these young people to become more mature before they had to think about this question of voting. When speaking with various groups of young people in different walks of life, I find that most of them at 18 do not want the added burden of voting rights until they reach 21.

I meet young people in all walks of life, on both sides of the Gulf, and both in the city and the country. So far as I can ascertain, 20,000 young people reach the age of 21 each year, so if we brought in the 18-year-olds we would have at least another 60,000 voters on the roll, and this is something I do not agree with. The provisions of this Bill would grossly upset the balance that we speak of in the electoral reform legislation now before the House and throw it out of order. Much work would have to be done to give these people the vote. All the boundaries that have been thought of would be thrown out of order.

Mr. Hughes: How do you know the boundaries have been thought of? The commission has not been appointed.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am not saying that I will determine the boundaries. A commission has to be set up to do that but, if this Bill is passed, the electoral reform measure will be thrown out of order. The majority of 18-year-old people are still in the city, attending university or teachers college, or engaged in nursing training or in some other form of advanced education. Because of this, the balance is out of proportion. Most of these young people, when they turn 21, will be settled in their careers and will have homes of their own. When they are so settled they will be better able to consider the important matter of voting rights. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

PUBLIC EXAMINATIONS BOARD BILL

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to establish a board to be entitled "The Public Examinations Board of South Australia" and for other purposes. Read a first time.

THE BUDGET

The Estimates—Grand total, \$295,284,000.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 17. Page 1185.)

THE LEGISLATURE

Legislative Council, \$41,494.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): Last evening when progress was reported, I was just proceeding to talk about the Budget in general, but since then I have had an opportunity to check a statement made by the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) about a certain ex-member of Parliament who was alleged to be receiving \$40 a week from our superannuation fund. I do not know why he saw fit to criticize someone unfortunate enough (I suppose one could say) to be receiving something from that fund. He said the amount was \$40. One does not have to be a great genius to realize that a member must serve here for 12 years to get \$40 a week in superannuation. On being questioned by the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson), the member for Light replied that the person in question had paid in between \$600 and \$700. I am amazed that an intelligent—and it was an intelligent member who said it—

Mr. Ryan: Who said he was intelligent?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I think I have cleared up that point: if a member of this place has been here for 12 years, he has paid far more than \$3,000.

Mr. Corcoran: It would be \$4,000.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am being conservative and not ridiculous, like the member for Light. It could be as much as \$4,000 but I am putting it at more than \$3,000. It amazes me that that member criticizes members for contributing to and receiving from our superannuation fund, because on the last occasion that this legislation was amended in this Chamber he supported the amendment. Now he criticizes an ex-member for doing something he was compelled to do, for it is compulsory to subscribe to that fund. I remind the Committee that in all big business concerns there is a superannuation or provident fund, whatever one likes to call it.

These funds are established to entice the right men to take the job that the company wants them to do. There is a Parliamentary Superannuation Fund in order to encourage the right men to come into Parliament to do the job, and this fund provides for the time when they can no longer serve. This was a disgusting exhibition by the member for Light, and anything about him that resembles a man is purely coincidental. In his statements he reminds me of the self-righteous Pharisee who went to an upper room and prayed, "Lord, I thank Thee, for I am not like other men." If the honourable member continues these scurrilous attacks he will come in for some pretty rough criticism from members on this side, because he gives us licence to attack him by the manner in which he attacks others. I turn to the Budget; the Treasurer, in his speech, said:

At June 30 last the deficit disclosed in Consolidated Revenue Account was \$8,365,000. This was built up over a three-year period during which expenditure increased without fully compensating increases in taxation and other revenues.

This is possibly a statement of fact and I do not argue about that, but the Treasurer did not say that it was through the vandalism of the Liberal and Country League that revenue was not increased. This fact should have been admitted. When the Labor Government tried to obtain revenue from those who could afford to pay, the L.C.L. threw out the Bills. In other States the policy is to impose taxation on those who can afford to pay it, but in South Australia the Parliament is constituted to protect the upper crust that exists only to smother its dough and, accordingly, we are compelled to obtain revenue from the less fortunate people. Now, we are to have a receipt duty of 1c in each \$10, based on the duty now in force in Victoria. I nearly said Vietnam.

Mr. Virgo: They are both as corrupt as each other.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: This tax is expected to raise \$1,600,000 this financial year and \$4,800,000 in a full year. Who will pay this? It is useless for Government members to say that it will not be passed on, because we know that it will be. Without doubt it will mean something added to the cost of each article to recoup the trader's expenditure. I believe that some traders will be reluctant to do this but, for their own protection, they will be compelled to do it. To make this possible, the Government will remove further

items from price control. It seems to me to be a remarkable coincidence that on the morning of September 5 we had the insidious action of a recommendation that removed certain articles from price control, and in the afternoon the Budget, which provided for extra charges to be imposed, was introduced. We may well ask whether this was the signal that charges could be passed on, thereby providing traders with the opportunity to take far more than they would have to pay out. This will happen in some cases.

I turn now to what I consider to be an offensive and foolish proposal (one that leaves me cold, for I could not think of a tax calculated to do more harm in South Australia than this one will do): a stamp duty of \$2 on a certificate of third party motor vehicle insurance. This tax is estimated to raise \$840,000 in a full year, and it is a most depressing impost. What effect it will have on the motor industry is difficult to say. However, apart from this proposal's being a departure from what has been a long-established principle of applying motorist taxation to roads, it must have a depressing effect on the motor industry itself, an industry which is all-important to South Australia and which should be fostered. Many thousands of people are directly and indirectly employed in this industry and, without doubt, it is one of this State's major industries. We should be encouraging more and more people to purchase motor cars, in order to ensure that this industry develops. An article appearing in the *Advertiser* of September 12 reports that the President of the Royal Automobile Association (Mr. R. N. Irwin) had written to the Premier expressing deep concern at this form of taxation. The article states:

Stamp Tax Criticized: The R.A.A. has written to the Premier (Mr. Hall) protesting against the proposed \$2 stamp duty on third party insurance certificates announced last week in the State Budget. In the letter, the R.A.A. President (Mr. R. N. Irwin) expresses "deep concern" at the announcement of the tax and asks that the matter be reconsidered by the Government. After expressing disappointment at the departure from the old-established principle in South Australia of applying motorist taxation generally to roads, the letter says:

The selection of third party insurance as a medium of taxation is particularly distasteful when strenuous efforts are being made to keep this already heavy burden within reasonable bounds. The apparent earmarking of the proceeds of this new impost for hospital funds seems illogical and unreasonable when already the third

party insurance premiums must reflect the costs of hospitalization of road accident victims.

Depressing: The possible effects of imposts of this nature on the State's transport system, vehicle manufacturing industry and road development are depressing and very serious.

Other points made in the letter include:

The prospect of substantial finance requirements in the future for road proposals revealed in the M.A.T.S. Report.

Substantial contributions to State general revenue already made by motorists by way of stamp duty on change of car ownership and finance.

The very large contribution made by the motoring public to Federal revenue through the 12.3c a gallon tax on petrol.

The article gives only the text of the letter written by Mr. Irwin, but I could not agree more with the sentiments expressed therein. The Government, with this Budget, is doing its utmost to pull down an industry that has done so much for the State's economy. This is a most restrictive and deflationary measure, introduced at a time when industry and commerce are in need of a fillip. Any Government worth its salt would have presented a Budget, in a year following the driest year on record, designed to give a stimulus to the State's economy. However, even the poor people's overdraft is to be further burdened with an extension of the present hire-purchase duty of 1½ per cent to cover other forms of time payment, leasing, and similar transactions. This is expected to bring in \$600,000 in a full year. Who will pay this? It will be the poor soul who, through lack of finance, must embark on hire-purchase agreements. As it is, most of these people pay through the nose at present for what they need, but they will now have \$600,000 less purchasing power. This will mean that fewer goods will be manufactured and that there will be fewer sales and more unemployment. The poor will not only grow in number but also become poorer, while the rich get richer. In saying this, I am reminded that the figures given in 1965 regarding succession duties showed how the smaller estates were taxed in comparison with larger estates. The larger estates are treated far more favourably, and we must remember that the people who left those estates were better able to avoid paying full succession duties.

Mr. Freebairn: How do they avoid payment of duties?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I should think the member for Light would be a master on this subject.

Mr. Freebairn: You made a loose statement, and I was just asking for clarification.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member is a master of loose statements, and I will not be sidetracked by him. He knows how people can avoid paying succession duties, and I will not assist him. The following table shows a comparison between South Australia and other States of the percentage of an estate that succession duties bear to its total value:

Value of Estate in \$	South	Other
	Australia	States
	%	%
60,000 to 80,000	10.9	11.8
80,000 to 100,000	10.9	13.9
100,000 to 120,000	9.9	15.9
120,000 to 140,000	13.5	18.0
140,000 to 200,000	13.6	21.3
200,000 and over	18.4	23.9

If succession duties on the more valuable estates were increased to the level applying in other States, there would undoubtedly be a great improvement in revenue and a tax would be imposed on those best able to pay. Of course, such people are the people in South Australia who give to the campaign funds of the Liberal and Country League. Consequently they must remain the untouchables, while the ill and the poor must pay more in public hospitals. It is well known that, with few exceptions, it is those who cannot afford to go to a private hospital who go to a public hospital. So, while the rich in this State are permitted to pay less in succession duties than such people pay in other States, the poor in South Australia cop the lot.

The principle, if we can call it a principle, is that the Steele Hall L.C.L. Government is a "steal all" Government—it steals all from the physically ill and the mentally ill people in the lower income brackets but lets the wealthy people off as much as possible in order that the upper crust may spill a little of its dough into the L.C.L. campaign funds. I notice with great interest that the Premier has agreed to attend a conference of Premiers on October 4 in an endeavour to force the Commonwealth Government to adopt a more liberal attitude to the States. I sincerely hope the State Governments are successful, because I think a change of attitude on the part of the Commonwealth Government is long overdue. I well remember, however, that less than 12 months ago, when the then Treasurer, the present Leader of the Opposition, was saying what Mr. Askin and Sir Henry Bolte are now saying, that the present Treasurer said, by way of interjection, "Blame the

Commonwealth Government." How unfair can anyone get? After the present Government had been in office for only a few weeks it was saying what the Labor Government had said, for which statements the Labor Government was unjustly criticized. The present Government is in office because of the greatest confidence trick of all time. We should remember the pamphlet the L.C.L. issued, which said that the Labor Government would increase taxes and charges, thereby implying that a L.C.L. Government would not do so. The very purpose of the pamphlet was to imply that that Party would not increase taxation. Water rates get a special mention. Long before the Minister of Works had time to get to know the personnel of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, he increased water rates. I am not arguing against the increase in water rates: I am simply showing how hypocritical the L.C.L. really is. Its fiscal measures, when associated with the utterances of the past, show it to be dishonest and disloyal to the people of South Australia.

The Liberal Party said during the election campaign that it would get South Australia moving again, trying to give the impression that this State was going downhill under a Labor Government. This should never be forgotten. Just what has happened under the L.C.L. Government? I do not know of one good thing it has done. Let us see whether we can find something that it has done for the building trade. In last Monday's *News*, under the heading "Slump in Work for Builders", the following article appeared:

Employment in the building industry in South Australia at the end of June shrunk to the lowest level for many years. Figures released today by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics give employment in the industry at June 30, as 11,370. This was 398 fewer than at the end of March and 1,097 fewer than at the same time last year.

That was when, so it has been said, we were doing so badly. It goes on:

During the June quarter 1,501 houses were started and 1,738 finished. Commencements were 154 less than in the March quarter and 513 below those of the June quarter last year.

The value of buildings under construction at the end of June was \$112,000,000—an increase of \$1,500,000 on the March figure, but \$6,500,000 down on that of a year earlier.

This is a record that should be looked at. Employment is at the lowest level for many years. There were 11,370 employed in the building industry at June 30 this year, 398 fewer than at the end of March. This is getting the State going again!

Mr. Jennings: Backwards.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes, downhill. This was 1,097 fewer than at the same time last year. The number of houses commenced was 154 less than in the March quarter, so we are going back rapidly at this stage. The value of buildings under construction at the end of June was \$6,500,000 down on this time last year. As the member for Enfield said, South Australia under the L.C.L. is going backwards. No wonder that Party would not say outright during the election campaign how it would raise revenue. If it had been open and honest with the people, it would have finished up in its rightful place on this side of the House, despite the gerrymander.

I have not yet said anything about fluoridation of our water supplies, and some members are perhaps wondering why I have not yet touched on this subject. The Government has announced that it will embark on fluoridation. I think it is about to do this without due concern for the welfare of the people or thought for what they desire. In 1964 a Select Committee, comprising the Minister of Education, the Attorney-General, the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Yorke Peninsula and I, was appointed. The committee heard 19 witnesses, 17 of whom lived in South Australia, and 11 of the South Australians were opposed to fluoridation of the water supply, whilst six favoured it. Of the 30 persons who wrote to the committee or submitted documents, 28 were opposed and two were in favour. The members of the committee were divided on 13 sections of the report. The member for Yorke Peninsula (Mr. Ferguson) and I voted against the recommendation and the present Minister of Education (Hon. Joyce Steele) and the present Leader of the Opposition (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) voted for the recommendation. The resolution was carried on the casting vote of the chairman, the present Attorney-General. On August 26, 1964, the present Attorney-General addressed the House, advocating the setting up of the committee and he made clear that he was pro-fluoride. He went to the committee with a set opinion. In his speech, which is at page 596 of *Hansard* of 1964, he quoted many authorities.

Mr. Lawn: Did you say that this recommendation was decided on a casting vote?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: In the main, the recommendations were decided on the casting vote of the chairman, who, as I have

said, had his mind made up before he heard any evidence. In a speech to which I have referred, he said:

In spite of what I personally believe (and I would be hypocritical if I did not admit at this stage that the great weight of authority is that fluoridation is beneficial)

Later, the Attorney-General, in reply to an interjection by Mr. Shannon, said:

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

Did this not indicate that the present Attorney-General had firmly made up his mind long before he heard any evidence before the committee, and that it was sheer hypocrisy for him to say anything to the contrary? The majority of people who gave evidence before that committee opposed fluoridation, yet it is to be provided by a minority Government that has not considered any aspect of it.

When I left Australia in 1961 to go overseas, I was in favour of fluoridation of the water supply. However, in Canada, the United States of America, and England, where fluoride was being used in the water supply, I learned of all the trouble that those countries were having with it and of all the fears aroused by it. I came back opposed to fluoridation.

I said in this Chamber that, before we went in for fluoridating our water supply, we should mark time and see what the side effects really were. We do not know what they are. There is much medical evidence to say that fluoride has a detrimental effect in certain cases, such as people suffering from kidney diseases or goitre. It produces mottled teeth, disfigurement and deformities. Is this Government prepared, without seeking the views of the people of South Australia, to condemn people with kidney trouble, goitre and ulcers to an untimely death by their consuming fluoride? I believe in a democratic country where

democracy means government for the people by the people. The people should have been consulted before this was done.

Mr. Virgo: We have not got democracy here, though.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: We have not but we should do something about getting it. We should have put this to the people in the form of a referendum because, when we apply what is purely rat poison to the water and we cannot say definitely that we can control it (I heard in Canada that the galvanized piping had to be taken up in the Ottawa Parliament House and replaced with other piping because of pockets of corrosion in the galvanized piping), an overdose of fluoride will affect the people permanently. It is disgusting and disgraceful to ignore the wishes of the people. It was acknowledged when I returned from overseas, because I remember the then Minister of Works (the present Treasurer) answering questions on a number of occasions and saying this—and I admired him for saying it: “Whilst there are certain sections of the people that want fluoride, there is a large section strongly opposed to it.” We should consider both sides of the evidence.

Mr. Broomhill: In the case of the M.A.T.S. Report the Government asked the people for their views on that.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes, and that is the only way to do it. I turn now to a line dealing with the Royal District and Bush Nursing Society, under “Chief Secretary-Miscellaneous”. I notice from the explanation that it is proposed to grant \$57,000 for this financial year, an increase of \$12,000 on last year. While it is an increase for which the society is most grateful, it is not as much as is needed. This is a service that must save the Government many tens of thousands of dollars in a year over and above what it grants.

Mr. Jennings: They are angels of mercy.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes; that is a first-class statement. I regret I am not in possession of the most recent balance sheet of the Royal District and Bush Nursing Society but I know that some branches are having real difficulties. For instance, the Hindmarsh branch, to which I happen to belong (and which was, incidentally, the first branch in South Australia, formed in 1893) has done valuable work over the years. Many thousands of people in the area have been treated and cared for in this home, saving the cost

of hospitalization and at the same time giving the comfort that only a home can give to the sufferers, their families and friends alike.

I have some knowledge of this branch because it is more than 25 years since I first became associated with it. I well remember two people who have acted as Secretary-Treasurer during that period. I refer to the late W. Medlin who served for 14 years as Secretary-Treasurer. The present Secretary-Treasurer (Mr. A. A. Gething), who has served for 12 years, was recently re-elected for another term. At a meeting I attended on September 12 it was made clear that the branch would have to find at least \$1,500 this financial year, but on June 30 it had a balance of less than \$300. Obviously, this branch has real difficulties but it does not despair. In order to meet this expenditure (and to keep the branch going) a special appeal has been made to the people of Hindmarsh, and I am confident that it will be successful. I speak of this to show the importance of the work of the Royal District and Bush Nursing Society and, as a token of appreciation, to acknowledge its services.

I am disappointed at and disgusted with the Budget, which I know will not only discourage but will also disrupt the progress of this State. Only one slight satisfaction can be gained from it: the people who have been deceived by the Liberal and Country League are now disillusioned.

Mr. GILES (Gumeracha): Before speaking to the first line, I pay a tribute to the member for Millicent for his discourse on tourism. I have spoken often about this subject, and I think that we all realize that this industry brings much money into a country. I believe that it is Italy's largest export earner. In South Australia there is a terrific tourist potential. Wherever one travels throughout Australia one compares the various attractions with those in this State, and I think that no place in Australia has attractions that can surpass those that we have in this State. The close proximity of the ranges makes this an ideal situation for tourists.

I realize that much more money has to be spent in this field but the Budget provides for an increase of \$75,964—from \$735,444 to \$811,408. No doubt this is as much money as can be provided at present, and we appreciate the Treasurer's action in granting this increase. I believe that the tourist trade can have much more money spent on it in order

to attract more visitors from overseas and other States, so that the State's income can be boosted.

In his policy speech the Premier said that L.C.L. policy was to bring stability to the State's finances. The Budget has been prepared under most difficult circumstances, and perhaps can be compared with the 1933 Budget, when the then Hon. R. L. Butler was Treasurer. In presenting his Budget, he said:

It may be said that with a reduction of £600,000 in the cost of unemployment and nearly £600,000 in the exchange rate we should balance our accounts.

He further said:

The Budget does not reveal that there has been an improvement in conditions generally. It will be found that there was a deficit of £3,627,714, in 1930-31, and £2,018,876 in 1931-32. That seems to be rather similar to what happened in the last three years. I commend the Treasurer for balancing the Budget and, in fact, establishing a credit. Even though the sum involved is only \$21,000, at least we are not going further down the drain. In his statement, the Treasurer said:

At June 30 last the deficit disclosed in the Consolidated Revenue Account was \$8,365,000. This was built up over a three-year period during which expenditures increased without a fully compensating increase in taxation and other revenues . . . Without these changes in accounting procedures the last three years would have shown deficits on Revenue Account of \$6,834,000, \$6,796,000 and \$7,875,000, or an aggregate of \$21,505,000. Since those three years commenced with \$1,223,000 in hand the net deficit upon the basis of accounting formerly adopted would, at June 30, 1968, have been \$20,282,000 in place of \$8,365,000 as actually shown.

One of the most important aspects of the situation is that nearly \$1,000,000 was spent in service commitments, a sum which would have paid the wages of about 5,000 men. This Budget has been produced by a man who has a sound knowledge of what is involved. We cannot afford to go further downhill; we cannot afford to pay \$1,000,000 in service fees and interest, because that is of no value to South Australia. Between \$17,000,000 and \$18,000,000 has been borrowed from Loan Account, and this reduces our expenditure on developmental works. If such a sum were spent in one year in South Australia, the State would march ahead. We cannot afford to go more deeply into debt. The Budget has been referred to as a vicious document, and it has been said that we are causing deflation by not spending any money. However, if

members opposite examine the summary they will find that \$17,880,233 more is proposed to be spent than was spent in 1967-68. We are spending more money and it is here in black and white. There are only three instances in which the expenditure is reduced. Even though the allocation to the Minister of Works may be \$25,000 less this year, the programme will be just as effective as it was with the sum that was spent last year. This sum of \$25,000 must be related to the provision of \$20,000,000, so there is certainly no great reduction in spending here.

In the line "Premier and Minister of Industrial Development" there is a reduction of \$6,046, but the Premier is such an effective economist on his farm that I am sure there will be no reduction in efficiency. Admittedly we will be receiving more revenue, but we will be spending more money, too. Furthermore, it is estimated that we will finish the year with \$21,000 in the black.

In the north-western border area of Kashmir there is a small group of people called the Hunza people, whom a famous British physician described as the healthiest people in the world. Their good health results from the valuable soil in which they grow their produce, which is mainly fruit. In this connection, I should like to compare the amount of spending involved in various lines of the Budget. The greatest expenditure is on education, and I do not disagree with this priority: education is an absolute must, and \$62,889,000 will be spent in this field alone.

The second highest amount is provided for the line "Chief Secretary and Minister of Health". The next highest amount is provided for the line "Minister of Roads and Transport and Minister of Local Government". We cannot do without roads: we have enough traffic problems as it is, without adding to them. The sum of \$20,000,000 is provided for the line "Minister of Works" and \$19,000,000 for the line "Treasurer and Minister of Housing". Then, we reach the provision of only \$5,289,000 for the line "Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Forests". If more work were done in this field the provision for the line "Chief Secretary and Minister of Health" could be considerably reduced. If members remember my reference to the Hunza people, they will realize that people here eat foods of lower nutritional value and they need more medical services than do the Hunza people.

One of the main complaints of the Opposition has been that succession duties have not been increased. It has been estimated by some of the most successful farm management consultants in South Australia that even the most efficient grazier cannot earn more than 3 per cent on his capital. When a grazier cannot earn more than that, and he is on a large holding, how can his family possibly manage to keep in business if they have to pay two lots of probate over 20 years? How can they do this when they can make only 3 per cent on the amount of capital invested in this property and when the value of land is so high today?

We all know very well that we cannot avoid probate and succession duties. However, our agriculture produced for South Australia in 1966-67 the fantastic amount of \$272,632,000, and if we raise our succession duties and probate to the degree where we force many of these people out of business, the income from this naturally must fall. I do not know whether members opposite appreciate this, but as it stands now there are not many financially successful farmers in South Australia. Members have only to look at any of the stock journals to see the amount of land and the number of farms being offered for sale, and this is because farmers are not making much money off their farms.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Then land should be cheap.

Mr. GILES: Farmers have to do a tremendous amount of work to get this 3 per cent. It would not pay a good businessman to have money invested in a farm when he can invest in guilt-edged securities that will give him a far greater return without his having to do any work at all. Farmers now have to work hard to get 3 per cent, so it is no wonder that they wish to sell properties and leave the land. We cannot afford to have a reduction in food production throughout South Australia, because this will adversely affect our Budget.

I could possibly say more about the Budget, but I will reserve further comment for the lines. I commend the Treasurer on a Budget that is balanced. Any Budget that is balanced and does not go downhill is a sound document, irrespective of what members opposite say. The fact that we are increasing expenditure throughout South Australia should help our employment position. I have very much pleasure in supporting the first line.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): One cannot help feeling that the veneration the member for Gumeracha has for balanced Budgets would stand him in very bad stead in a time of depression. He does not seem to realize that Budgets should be used to assist in the economy of the State according to the state of the economy at a particular time, and he seems to think there is some wonderful sanctity about a balanced Budget. He referred in his speech to the depression of 1933. I advise him to read up on what financial measures had to be taken to get out of the depression. Financial ideas were completely reviewed as a result of the experience during that period, and to talk of balanced Budgets in the way the honourable member has this evening shows that he needs to study what happened during the depression period to which he referred. When we examine the Estimates, we find that the first outstanding feature is that they represent the complete opposite of what members of the present Government, when in Opposition, led the public to expect.

Before and during the last election members opposite continually spoke of State taxation being too high. Their Party issued pamphlets to this effect and, as extracts from those pamphlets have already been quoted by the Leader, I will not repeat them. However, those pamphlets were aimed at what members opposite were pleased to term the little man and, of course, were issued with a view to securing his support electorally, but the little man who was influenced by this misleading propaganda must have had a few different thoughts when he learned of this Budget. It not only raises taxation by a record amount for a full year: it imposes almost all that increase on the little man, the man who can least afford to pay.

Perhaps that man will recognize now that Liberal Party doctrine in this respect has not changed and will not change. This has been emphasized by the Government, which has left untouched the unused capacity for taxation by succession duties, a field of progressive taxation in which the level could and should be raised to that applying in the other States. The member for Gumeracha (Mr. Giles) was concerned about farmers leaving the land because of succession duties, and he asked how succession duties could be raised. I suggest that he go to New South Wales and Victoria and see how the farmers are getting on there with succession duties at those levels.

After all, we are suggesting that these duties be raised only to those levels. We shall be interested to find whether farmers are leaving their farms in droves because they have succession duties at a level to which we wish to take our duties.

Mr. Giles: They are. I was there at Christmas time.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: This field is one in which there are many loopholes that have been freely availed of to avoid even the taxation at present levels, but our friends opposite have a soft heart for this sort of evasion and they refuse to take any action about it. However, if the poor little man tried to oppose the sort of taxation provided for in this Budget, the Government would be down on him like a ton of bricks, talking about the importance of the law being upheld.

The Treasurer has made strong criticism of the Commonwealth Government, saying that that Government's stand, towards South Australia in particular, has been most unreasonable and inconsiderate. Yet, when we were in office it was wrong to criticize the Commonwealth Government! Frequently statistics were thrown up at us, showing us how much we should appreciate the generosity of the Government in Canberra. I recall that, on every occasion when I complained that the Commonwealth Government was not doing what we thought it ought to do for South Australia, we were chided by members of the then Opposition for not expressing our appreciation for some particular sum that had come from the Commonwealth. However, it is a different story today. There has been a complete reversal of form. We were told *ad nauseam* by members opposite that, in our handling of Loan funds, we were following a financial course that was most improper and financially disastrous.

Hansard shows that it was suggested that we were on the verge of being corrupt in our handling of finances, particularly Loan funds: we were crook! Now the present Government is not only following the same course, but following it more intensely. This Government wants a little more of the hair of the dog, and this is quite proper today! No-one would accuse a Liberal Government of doing anything improper financially! Members opposite have the divine right of rule in this State. They have experienced it for so long that surely no-one could accuse them of doing anything improper! Shame on that! All these things add up to a campaign of political

trickery and deception designed to gull the people of this State, thereby enabling members opposite to achieve power. That is what they are really interested in—power.

What confidence can the people of this State have in Parliamentary Government when they see how a group of people can achieve power by practising a complete and sustained political confidence trick and still represent only a minority of the people? There must be a few members opposite whose consciences (or what is left of their consciences) are pricking them just a little. No wonder the word "democracy" has achieved a special meaning in South Australia: in fact, it is a meaning that I should say is of the lowest possible grade in the whole Commonwealth, because it has no real meaning at all in this State, by usual standards. I do not intend to go over in detail the ground so ably covered by my colleagues, but I intend to deal at some length with a few matters connected with education. In last year's Financial Statement the then Treasurer announced that the Labor Government would provide \$49,492,000 for the Education Department. That amount was \$4,322,000, or almost 10 per cent, above the actual payments of the previous year. After allowing for the additional cost over the previous year for special items like major awards and the second instalment of the five-year programme of equal pay for female teachers of \$1,115,000, there remained an increase of \$3,207,000, or more than 7 per cent, to finance the general expansion of the department's services.

Now let us look at this year, when the present Treasurer informs us that the total for the Education Department will be \$53,267,000. Excluding \$200,000 for expenditures on equipment for science and technical training services covered by Commonwealth funds, this provides an increase of \$3,940,000, or 8 per cent above payments in 1967-68. If we follow the same procedure as was listed in the Treasurer's Statement last year and deduct the third instalment (\$400,000) of the five-year programme of equal pay for female teachers and the cost of free textbooks for primary schools of \$550,000, making a total of \$950,000, we find that the increase to finance general expansion of the department's services is only 5.6 per cent, compared with more than 7 per cent last year.

Mr. Broomhill: They put it over the Minister of Education.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Treasurer says that this should enable the Education Department to continue its recent rate of development in staffing and services generally. Obviously, an increase rate of 5.6 per cent will not and cannot do the work that formerly required an increase rate of 7 per cent, and this comes at a time when there should be an increase, not a decrease, in the rate of expansion of services by the department. Members opposite, when they were in Opposition, talked about the reduction of class sizes and complained perhaps about the quality of a teacher here or there and about various deficiencies, as they saw them, in the Education Department, but they are silent this year. Instead of an increase in the amount provided for the services of the department, the amount has been decreased, so that the matters complained about by members opposite not only cannot be achieved but there will be a backward trend. So much for their desire to improve education services. Before the last election members opposite said they would reverse what they called the downward trend in expenditure on school buildings. There was not a downward trend, as I have shown in a previous speech. They continually complained about insufficient expenditure by the department in various directions. Now, they have made available less Loan money for school buildings and have severely reduced the amount provided to maintain what I consider to be the minimum permissible rate of expansion of the department. This is one more instance of a complete deception of the public of this State.

Then we have the classic example of what should not be done in an educational policy: the Government's recent action over student teacher allowances. For several years at every annual meeting of State Ministers of Education (accompanied by their Directors-General of Education) the importance of securing an adequate supply of teachers of quality has not only been emphasized but has been regarded as the top priority objective in education. As the previous Minister of Education, I emphasized many times the importance of this matter and the need for additional funds for teacher education to be made available by the Commonwealth. I emphasized the point at every opportunity, because teacher education and the securing of an adequate supply of teachers of quality is the fundamental, the very basis, of education and of its progress in this State and in the

Commonwealth. One of the first actions of the Labor Government in 1965 was to increase the student teacher allowance, which had remained static for more than 10 years.

To attract students of the best calibre, we established 100 student teacher scholarships worth \$200 a year and 100 matriculation teaching scholarships worth \$200 a year, awarded annually and unbonded. We established the probationary period of six months before requiring student teachers to sign an agreement, and this enabled students to gauge better their suitability for teaching, an important matter. We continually pressed the Commonwealth Government for additional finance for teacher education in the face of adverse criticism from Liberal members of this State and Commonwealth Governments. Eventually, we secured additional finance, more than sufficient to cover the building of a new teachers college at Salisbury. These actions were all part of a concerted plan to achieve an adequate supply of teachers of quality, the basic requirement for good education.

With the present Government in power, we learnt from a statement in the *Advertiser* of August 30 that a regulation was approved by Executive Council on the previous day under which student teachers would have to buy their textbooks and pay for daily travel to and from teachers colleges. The report stated, *inter alia*, that allowances would be increased slightly to compensate. Well, "slightly" has become the operative word now that we know more about it, but we have not heard that word "slightly" used since. Later we found that the regulation gazetted on August 29 was incorrect and not, we were told, as directed. There must have been much muddled thinking over this regulation. On being questioned in the Chamber, the Minister told us that the purpose of introducing this new idea was to equalize the whole matter of allowances. I intend to quote what was said, because some parts of it are particularly interesting. The Minister said:

The whole purpose of introducing this new idea of paying allowances to students is to equalize the whole matter of allowances. It has been found that in the past some students were paid travelling allowances greatly in excess of those paid to other students. The idea of the scheme is to equalize these allowances. Also, I believe that it is better for students because it puts them on a parity with students who receive Commonwealth scholarships. These are subject to a means test, whereas the Education Department's new system of allowances is not. I believe that the new system is far more dignified for students who

are in their late teens and at a stage when they are having to consider budgeting, and in this way they are treated as adults. From the other viewpoint, much work in checking vouchers that students present to departmental officers will be obviated. Also, it will have the effect of making all students equal in that they will receive allowances which will allow them to meet their textbook requirements and travelling requirements between the colleges, universities, and other places to which they must go.

Let us examine some aspects of this statement. Reference is made to equalizing allowances: they will certainly all be equal allowances of \$85, but the impact is most inequitable, as I will proceed to show. We are told that the students will in future be treated as adults, but they were apparently not considered sufficiently adult to be brought in for consultation or discussion on this matter before the regulation was decided on and gazetted. We are further told that the allowances will enable the students to meet their requirements but, obviously, they will not, because there are so many inequities. Some of the students have no travelling expenses, because they live virtually at the doorstep of the college. Therefore, one or two may well profit by the scheme. However, others will be completely on the wrong end of the stick. It is obvious that the use of averages in paying \$85 is most inequitable, as can be seen from examples of students' actual expenditure.

While I do not wish to bore members by quoting many figures, I will quote some, because they show most clearly the absolute inequity of this proposal. The following figures taken at random are actual travelling expenses only of second-year craft girls: \$90, \$80, \$95, \$94, \$77, \$84, \$124, \$83, \$88, \$93, \$69, \$144, \$97, \$41, \$75, \$80, \$89, \$39, \$90, \$72, \$86, and \$55. What a disparity. How inequitable will this proposal be! The following figures taken at random are actual travelling expenses only of first-year arts students (I am not talking about books yet): \$103, \$83.60, \$75, \$60.20, \$280, \$75.60, \$82.80, \$72, \$90, \$80, \$100, \$100, \$96.60, \$150, \$200, \$170 and \$216. These are the actual travelling expenses of students, who will receive an allowance of \$85 for both travelling and books! In the case of the last-mentioned figure (\$216) the student's books cost a minimum of \$99.25, and art equipment, \$200. I understand that students in arts and crafts receive an allowance of \$50 a year for art equipment. As this allowance, according to the Minister, is not affected by the changes,

this student will have to find \$465.25, and to compensate for this expenditure she will be paid an allowance of \$85 for text books and travelling expenses. This is called something that will allow the students to meet their text book and travelling requirements!

Mr. Broomhill: And the Minister said that the students will now be able to do so in dignity.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Of course, dignity in a person is not associated with the question of any allowances he receives: that is poppycock. Dignity is in the human being. The Minister has announced that under the new scheme provision is made for an average expenditure of \$25 for essential text books, the balance of the \$85 being for travelling expenses. Let us consider the cost of books for different subjects and courses. These costs not only vary greatly but they are far in excess of the \$25 referred to by the Minister. Many text books are compulsory. For example, first-year primary course students must take six professional subjects, and they have the choice of two cultural subjects. The following are the costs of some of the text books used by secondary course students at the Adelaide Teachers College: English I, \$24; English II, \$55; English III, \$41; History IA, \$29; History IIIA, \$92; Physics I, \$35; and Physics II, \$47. The minimum textbook cost for first-year art students is \$99.25; for first-year primary course students, \$97.50; for second-year primary course students, \$96.15; for first-year infants course students, \$97; and for second-year infants course students, \$97.91. These examples show how utterly inadequate and unfair these new arrangements will be, yet the Minister, in reply to a question on September 3, concluded by saying:

The students will actually get exactly the same amount overall but it is being spread, I consider, more equitably.

I do not know how the Minister arrived at that conclusion: I am sure no-one else would find it possible to do so. The Minister has said that this scheme will put students on a parity with Commonwealth scholarship holders, but this is not so. Scholarship allowances are not taxed: Education Department allowances are taxed. Scholarship holders do not have to pay for their own medical benefits, because they are covered by their parents' membership: student teachers have to pay. Parents of Commonwealth scholarship holders can claim education expenses as income tax deductions,

and they receive child endowment: parents of student teachers cannot receive these benefits. Commonwealth scholarship holders have much more time available for working during their vacations: student teachers have much more limited opportunities for vacation jobs.

It is not yet clear whether the \$85 is to be paid fortnightly or in a lump sum, but I point out that, if it is paid fortnightly, a first-year student without any funds will be in an impossible position. Also, fortnightly payments are taxable whereas I understand that lump sums are not, so it will be interesting to hear whether the money will be paid in a lump sum. It is not surprising that letters from parents of student teachers have appeared in the press protesting against the change in policy, because these parents act as guarantors in respect of the students' bonds and are therefore responsible in the last analysis if the students cannot meet the liability. Although nothing in the wording of the bond precludes allowances being altered, the parents, when signing the bonds of students entering our colleges, knew the conditions in regard to text books and travelling allowances, and I expect they were most interested in what the conditions were. The booklet *Teaching in South Australia* 1966, which provides information about entering on a teaching career, is still the current volume about this matter that parents read. It says that textbooks are free and travelling expenses over 20c a day are paid. That is what those parents read and that is what those parents, when they signed to be guarantors to these bonds, expected to be maintained. In other words, this is equivalent to a breach of contract with those parents.

The Hon. Joyce Steele: Nonsense!

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Minister can say "nonsense", but those parents will regard it as a breach of contract because they went into this arrangement knowing, as advertised, that this was the situation. That is now altered, and in the last analysis they are financially responsible.

Mr. Clark: What effect will this have on the recruitment of teachers?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I will come to that. The career supplement of the *News* of August 21, only eight days before this regulation was gazetted, stated that the South Australian Education Department had vacancies for young people in the teaching profession and that essential textbooks were supplied

free. I repeat that this was only eight days before the regulation was gazetted. The *Advertiser* of August 20 had a similar statement.

This new proposal will entirely alter the financial position of many students and must cause many parents insuperable financial difficulties. Those who will be hit hardest will be those in the lowest income brackets—typical L.C.L. policy. The effect of the change to these people is similar to a complete breach of contract. I emphasize that that is the effect of it. Legally, it may not be a breach of contract, but the effect is the same.

Obviously, if the new proposal is carried through it will deter many students with parents in the lower income brackets from becoming teachers. Members may be interested to know that an analysis by Education Department officers who carried out research work on student-teacher matters found that 46 per cent of student teachers would have been forced to take an occupation requiring less education had there been no allowances. As the new scheme will make a big reduction in the effective value of the allowances to a large number of students, we will no doubt lose many good students who would otherwise have entered our colleges in the future.

Mr. Clark: We would lose them now if they were not bonded.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Minister has said that overall the new scheme will be just as costly to the Government as the old scheme has been, and that the students will actually get exactly the same amount overall. That is a curious statement, because the Minister also said that expenditure for 1967-68 on student teachers' textbooks and travelling allowances was \$126,500 and \$229,500 respectively, a total of \$356,000. As there are reported to be 3,513 students at our colleges, the cost for 1967-68 averages over \$101 a student, yet we are told that the amount overall will be the same as now. If the students had received the \$85 this year, the total cost would have been \$298,605 instead of \$356,000. Next year it is expected that there will be 4,043 students, which is an increase of 530 on account of the opening of Salisbury and an increase at Bedford Park, and if all these students each get \$85 the total will be \$343,655. That is a saving on this year's expenditure of \$12,345, yet we are told that the amount will be the same overall. If the students next year receive the same treatment

as has obtained this year (that is, an average of \$101 a student) the total expenditure will be \$408,343, so by changing the present arrangements the Government will save \$64,688 at the expense of the students.

In addition, there will be considerable savings in administration. We have not heard anything about that, except that the Minister has said that less checking and work will have to be done by officers of the Education Department. It will be interesting to know how many officers will no longer be employed on this job, and what the savings there will be. I think the savings will be considerable because, as a former Minister of Education, I know that one of the reasons for putting this scheme forward is the administrative saving. It is an untidy and unsatisfactory administrative procedure and certain people want to get rid of it. It is incorrect to say that there will be no saving by the Government in this arrangement.

Other results will flow from this change if it takes place. I have mentioned the loss of good potential students, the financial stress on parents, and a lasting feeling of great dissatisfaction amongst students at a time when they are entering the final term of study. What a good time it is to do this! There will be an intolerable pressure on college libraries to house the multiple copies of textbooks that the Minister has mentioned. Western Teachers College and Wattle Park Teachers College have inadequate library space now, so I do not know how they will be able to accommodate all these multiple copies of textbooks that will be obtained for use by students who cannot afford to buy them. There will be added pressure on the Barr Smith Library, presuming as I am that certain students will be going there, and that library is already under terrific student pressure. We have had complaints for years about the need for expansion of that library.

There will also be great pressure on all premises available for rental near the colleges, as students will try to avoid travel expense by getting rental premises close to the college. It is obvious that the inclination of owners of those premises will be to increase the rents. When the demand exceeds the supply, the price increases, as I am sure honourable members opposite, who are so keen on the virtues of private enterprise, will agree. That is one of their pet doctrines. This will cause students to leave their homes in order to try to save on travelling expenses. This will apply

particularly to the students from a long way away. Some will have to leave satisfactory premises to get closer to the colleges, probably taking premises that are not as satisfactory by so doing.

We have been told that the present arrangements have become unworkable. Why is that? They worked all right for three years and the only change on the horizon in 1969 is an increase in the number of students at Bedford Park and Salisbury and a decrease at Western Teachers College. The figures show that the number at Bedford Park Teachers College will increase from 553 to 885, that the number at Western Teachers College will decrease from 1,023 to 950, that the number at Wattle Park will increase from 752 to 818, that the number at Adelaide Teachers College will increase from 1,205 to 1,233, that Salisbury will have 157 students, and that the total will be 4,043. Why should these changes make this scheme completely unworkable at such short notice? Anyway, if it is unworkable, why cannot an equitable scheme be found to replace it? Why take it out on the students when all the previous work has been done to encourage students, to get the best calibre students irrespective of the finances of their families, and to provide an adequate number of teachers of quality?

The Minister's statements have been most unsatisfactory in many respects and certainly do not present a fair and accurate picture of the results of this change. We hope that better counsels will prevail as the matter is, apparently, still under review, despite the regulations being made without proper consideration and wrongly, in the first place. If this matter is not resolved equitably, we shall certainly move for a reduction in the Estimates at the appropriate time and place as a vote of no confidence in the Government.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE (Minister of Education): I have listened with much interest to what the member for Whyalla has said this evening. I have listened to him carefully, as he was, of course, my predecessor in office. I shall do nothing tonight but reply to the last matter, on which he spoke at considerable length, although I could adequately reply to the comments he made in general on the Education Department, and in particular on the decreases that he says have taken place, and his assertion that the Government is not doing what it proposed to do when it came into office. I want simply to devote myself to that, because I have been awaiting the oppor-

tunity to make this statement in the Chamber so that I could inform members of the true state of affairs and also get the true facts over to the public of South Australia.

It is interesting to hear the member for Whyalla talk on this subject, because he knows as well as I do that this is not a matter that has been considered only in the lifetime of this Government. He knows full well (and he knows the docket as well as I do) that this matter has been under review since 1964 and that certain recommendations were made to him, as Minister. They were made because there was criticism of the present scheme by the Treasury, the Auditor-General, the internal auditors of the department, and the principals and lecturers at teachers colleges. I will give a little of the background and some of the history of this whole matter of teachers allowances so that it can be viewed in its proper perspective.

I suppose book allowances have been available in South Australia for probably 50 years. This is the only State that provides books on loan to student teachers and Western Australia is the only other State in the Commonwealth that pays travelling allowances to its student teachers. It was in 1959 that travelling allowances were introduced. Admittedly, it was the previous Liberal Government that initiated teacher-recruiting in this State, and it was done at a time when there was a great explosion in school enrolments in South Australia. When books were first provided on loan, there were about 250 student teachers, one university and one teachers college in South Australia. These travelling allowances were introduced to help student teachers. I want to put this straight for the record. In doing so I am being very critical of previous Liberal Governments. I consider that an entirely wrong principle was applied when these travelling allowances for student teachers were paid for them to come to work and to go home. What other employee in any State, except Western Australia where the Government pays the same as we do, would receive this allowance?

Mr. Virgo: They are not employees.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: They are potential employees of the Education Department. In any case, it is a bad principle to establish, that people should be paid for travel to their place of employment, and this is exactly what has happened.

Mr. Virgo: They would not go to the place of employment if they were not paid.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Employees are not paid to travel from their home to their place of employment, yet this is what student teachers are being paid today in excess of 20c a day.

Mr. Virgo: What wages do they get?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I will come to that. Student teachers in South Australia are well paid compared with those in other States of the Commonwealth. At present I am dealing with historical facts, and I consider that it was a bad principle to establish, that student teachers should be paid for travel from their homes to teachers colleges and from the colleges to their homes in the evening. It is a different matter if they are travelling from a teachers college to a university or to the Institute of Technology, or between craft centres, or from their college to a demonstration school. This I consider right and proper, but not a payment for travel from their homes and back again in the evening. One reason why this regulation has been introduced, and why the Under Treasurer and the Auditor-General drew attention to the matter, was the fact that the old system was being abused. I received a delegation the other day in my office from the five Presidents of the teachers college associations and they admitted that it was being abused.

Mr. Corcoran: How?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Students can claim for travelling expenses based on the daily rate for travel on public transport, and whether or not they travel by public transport they can claim. Where they travel by car or as a group in a car they still base their claim on the daily rate paid on public transport.

Mr. Broomhill: That is not an abuse.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: These claims have to be submitted every term, and are first received by the lecturer who approves them; they then go through the principal of the college, and thence to the department. The member for Whyalla said he could not see where there was any saving in administrative expenses.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: I didn't say that.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The honourable member said he could not see any saving. He knows as well as I do how difficult it is to obtain administrative staff for the Education Department, yet this system used up the time and services of highly paid administrative and professional staff in supervising it. These people could be released for much more

important duties in the department—and the honourable member knows as well as I do the great difficulty in persuading the Public Service Board to provide all the staff the department requires.

These were some reasons why the regulation was issued and why it was considered in a critical light. Also, we do not know and there is no means of checking, but students could go to sporting activities in connection with the colleges on a Saturday morning and claim for this travel and no-one would know whether it was claimed for travelling in the course of their studies. There have been abuses and I think it is right and proper that they should be spoken of and spelled out in this House this evening.

I have received many letters, and also submissions from the students representative councils, about textbooks, and the sums involved have ranged from small to astronomical figures, all based on the price of new books. The system the Government has employed over a long time is for the loan of free books, the cost of supplying these books varying from year to year. Teachers colleges use many paper-back textbooks, which are replaced as and when necessary. Of course, the same sum is not always involved each year. The students are issued with books and return them at the end of the year and, as has been established, this is part of the free textbook system functioning today in teachers colleges.

The intention now is that students shall be given a composite allowance of \$85 that will cover their travelling and book allowances. They will be able to purchase (nothing has been said about this; the member for Whyalla did not refer to it, although I raised the matter in the Chamber the other day) the existing stocks of books available at the teachers colleges at not more than half price. As is the case all over the world, and certainly in every school and institution that I have heard of, students buy and sell each other's textbooks. They will be able to purchase these good, new books at the teachers colleges at not more than half price (and often at less than that), and I consider that to be a pretty big concession to make on the stocks of books on hand at the moment. In addition, there will be multiple stocks of books, which the member for Whyalla said would over-crowd already over-stocked libraries, but which will do nothing of the kind: As we will dispose of many books in sales to the students, this will provide plenty of space

in the libraries for the books to be provided. It is intended that there shall be multiple copies which, after all, are not always required at once by the same student. These books will be available not only in the libraries at teachers colleges but also in the Barr Smith Library.

Further, students who undertake university courses and who are at the teachers colleges will have sets of the textbooks required for those courses. As I have said, no State in the Commonwealth, except South Australia, makes free textbooks available on loan to its student teachers. Indeed, only one State apart from South Australia makes any contribution at all towards travelling allowances. Never has the Education Department considered that every single item of expenditure incurred by students in the course of their studies should be met by the allowances made to them. These allowances are made with the idea of helping students and their parents, so that those interested may avail themselves of a good tertiary education.

In the United States of America, students are expected to pay for their instruction at a teachers college or at a college of education in a university, and they do not receive any living allowance whatsoever. They may, however, apply for a loan from the United States Office of Education, and that loan has to be repaid. In the United Kingdom, students at tertiary institutions receive maintenance grants that are the subject of a means test. These maintenance grants range from a maximum of £156 sterling for students in residence to £400 sterling for non-residential students, and the maintenance grants include provision for textbooks, equipment and material, and for travel, which is shown as £12. The average living allowances paid over the full course to teachers college students in the various Australian States are as follows: Victoria (which is generally accepted by Education Departments as the State that is ahead of the other States in respect of allowances) pays its students \$1,355 a year; Tasmania, \$962 a year; South Australia, \$893 a year; Western Australia, \$841 a year, plus a travelling allowance in respect of expenses greater than 20c; Queensland, \$689 a year; and New South Wales, \$685 a year. Only two States (Victoria and Tasmania) pay higher student allowances than South Australia pays.

I turn now to boarding allowances, which are payable to country students but also to students living at home who can show extreme hardship. In South Australia the average boarding allowance paid to eligible students is \$250,

in New South Wales \$417, in Western Australia \$290, in Queensland \$266, in Tasmania \$150 and in Victoria \$52. If these allowances are added to the appropriate living allowances it will be found that the results are as follows: Victoria \$1,407, South Australia \$1,143, Western Australia \$1,131, Tasmania \$1,112, New South Wales \$1,102, and Queensland \$955. So, it can be seen that South Australia's combined allowances are the second highest in the Commonwealth. South Australian students doing art or craft courses receive an extra \$50 to cover the cost of their materials. I repeat that these allowances were never intended to cover every expense in the course: they were meant only as a help to students.

Members should realize that many people regard our student teachers as being very well treated, and I have a number of letters to this effect. I have read letters in the newspapers condemning the Government and the Education Department for the changes but, equally, many people have come to me and said that they are the parents of young university students who are not Commonwealth scholarship holders. These parents are meeting every single expense of their sons and daughters, and they consider that South Australian student teachers are on a fairly good wicket.

Mr. Casey: This is why we are attracting better students.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Yes, and we will continue to attract better students. I now want to refer briefly to the comment by the member for Whyalla that what we are proposing to do is a breach of contract. This point of view was put to me the other day when the deputation of presidents of S.R.C. at teachers colleges was introduced to me by the President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, and I was able to say that this matter was covered by a clause in the agreement which all parents signed and which said that this was "subject to the provisions of the said regulations and any amendments or variations thereto". I remarked to him that if we followed out his argument it would mean that we could never alter the *status quo*.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: You could not improve anything.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: No, we could not alter it in any way.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: You could alter it, but it should not be inequitable.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I still believe that the proposition the Government is putting up is equitable. The honourable member mentioned one or two other things to which perhaps I should refer, although I think I have dealt with most of the points he raised. He referred to the advantages that Commonwealth scholarship holders had in that they could work all through their holidays. Well, so can student teachers: there is nothing to debar them working throughout their vacations.

Mr. Hudson: But their holidays are much shorter than the university vacations.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: They have very good holidays, and they can work during those holidays. I think I just overheard someone say that this was splitting hairs, and I agree. Student teachers can work through their holidays, and I am prepared to bet that many of them do.

Mr. Langley: What percentage?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I could not tell you what percentage.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister will address the Chair and not take any notice of interjections.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The point I am trying to develop is that for as long as I can remember not only university students and student teachers but also many students from our secondary schools have worked during their vacations. This is one of the things I think students have always done, and they do it to earn money that they can apply to their studies. The students who do this are usually those who have to pay for all their fees, all their books, and all their travelling expenses.

I do not want to keep the Committee sitting any longer than is necessary. Although I think I have answered most of the objections that have been raised, members who have any more queries can put them to me during Question Time tomorrow. I believe I have given the true facts of this whole situation, and I hope that the public of South Australia will know a little more about this whole thing than they have known prior to tonight.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.25 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 19, at 2 p.m.