

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, October 16, 1968

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

MISS SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The SPEAKER: I notice in the gallery Miss South Australia (Judith Templar), and I am sure honourable members would like me to wish her every success on her forthcoming trip. We hope that she brings back the laurels for South Australia.

QUESTIONS

FESTIVAL HALL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Last week the Premier tabled in the House the report of the committee that he had appointed to examine a site for what was called in the report the festival hall project on the Torrens bank. I have read the report, and it seems that there is no estimate of the total cost or, indeed, of the cost of any particular stage of the project. Also, in the report there is no clear statement on the contents of the proposed facility, although it seems from the map attached to the report that it is intended to be a hall, with space for future development of performing arts facilities. Has the Premier yet obtained any estimate of the cost of the hall or of any stage of the project, and will he say whether it is intended to proceed with the construction of a concert hall or general hall project rather than the facilities that Mr. DeGaetani recommended as being urgent for South Australia?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: This morning I spoke informally with the Lord Mayor, asking him what action the council would take and how soon it could consider this matter. I understand that the Lord Mayor has called together his committee to consider this matter. The Government has not yet officially said that it will proceed with this matter, because obviously it wants to hear the views of the council, and I think that it would be unwise for me to give any indication of costs or detail of the hall until the council has been consulted and its opinion is known to the Government. I have made available all the information that the committee presented to the Government on the siting of the festival hall and, similarly, I will give the Leader other information when it is available.

Mr. VIRGO: I remind the Premier of the report he tabled last week stating that the

Railways Commissioner, in a report to the committee investigating the site, said that his department would raise no objections to railway land at Elder Park being made available as a festival hall site provided that alternative accommodation for existing facilities could be established at no financial disadvantage to the Railways Institute or the Railways Department. More than one building is commonly referred to as the Railways Institute: in addition to the main institute building are three social rooms, a band room, a darts room and, most important, several rooms used for the schooling of railway personnel. A further building houses the Railway Sub-Branch of the Returned Servicemen's League, and I am informed that this building caters for about 20,000 people every year. My concern is that the use of these facilities should not be disturbed. When reporting to Cabinet at the appropriate time, will the Premier undertake that, before any of these facilities are disturbed or removed for the purpose of erecting a festival hall, alternative buildings will be complete and ready for occupation?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I assure the honourable member that, before the buildings are removed and before inconvenience may be caused in any way to the people who now use them, the Railways Commissioner will be fully consulted and alternative accommodation provided. I think it is too early to have that consultation until the Government has an official acknowledgement from the City Council that it approves the site, but accommodation alternative to that now used will be provided.

Mr. CLARK: Can the Premier say whether the City Council does not want to know what its contribution to the total cost of the festival hall project will be? Several councillors have announced strong support for the proposal, provided that the Government contributes all the money for the project. Is the Premier telling the council that the Government will do this?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Although the Government has stated what financial responsibility it will bear, it cannot take for granted that the council accepts the proposed venue. What will happen about the sharing of the cost of the project is a matter for agreement between the Government and the council. It is futile for me to try to answer a hypothetical question, particularly when we do not know whether the council will approve the site, although that site is favoured by the Government and recommended by the committee.

The Government has shown its support and willingness to proceed with the venture by providing \$500,000 for the project on the Loan Estimates for this year. However, we must deal with the matter step by step and, when the council's attitude is known, we will settle the other issues one by one.

Mr. CASEY: I hope the Premier can give me a more specific reply to my question than he gave when replying to the previous questions. Can the Premier say specifically whether the present proposal is for a festival hall only and not for a multi-purpose facility as recommended by Mr. DeGaetani?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The only consideration so far discussed concerns the site. If the honourable member had read the report I tabled he would appreciate that it referred to the siting of a possible festival hall.

Mr. Casey: It is a festival hall only?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: At this moment I am unable to say to what extent the festival hall will be developed initially. Obviously, the honourable member has been able in the past to read Government announcements on this aspect. I think there was one two months ago in relation to costs, for instance. This is a hypothetical question at this stage, particularly before the site has been officially approved. Some of the honourable member's colleagues have been supercilious and critical in the initial stages of the Government's suggestion for a site for a festival hall. I do not know what the honourable member is trying to prove by trying to get replies to questions about problems that have not been discussed with the persons concerned in the construction of the hall, but I am not prepared to go further at this stage than to discuss the site. When the information is available I will table it. I have nothing to hide on this question, but I will not reply to questions before the proper time.

Mr. LAWN: I am concerned that this session so many questions have been asked of the Premier the replies to which he either does not know or refuses to give the House. This afternoon he has been asked three questions about the festival hall. I am concerned particularly with the cost and whether or not the building will be a concert hall or a multi-purpose hall, this matter having been considered by the Select Committee of which I was a member. All the Premier can talk about is the site: he cannot say whether it will be a concert hall or a multi-purpose hall.

Mr. Broomhill: Or what it will cost.

Mr. LAWN: Most important, he is unable to give the cost and, further, he does not know whether the hall will be built in stages. I do not know whether another Minister can give the House this information. There is at present a motion on the Notice Paper in respect of which I am free to vote as I please, and my vote will depend on the information I receive. I am perturbed at the thought that, as a member, I will have to base my considerations on a figure known only to the Government. Members of the City Council are reported as having said that they do not mind where the hall is situated, provided that the Government pays for it. Has the Premier this information, can he give it to the House, or can another Minister give the House this information; or does the Premier wish to treat Parliament with contempt?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am pleased to know that the honourable member has a free vote on the motion on the Notice Paper, for I thought his vote would be tied to that of his Leader. Unlike the member for Adelaide, I am alarmed at some of the questions being asked (not at the answers given), because there is a continual barrage of hypothetical questions and the wrong construction is being placed on statements. There is no point in answering hypothetical questions, for they are asked only in an attempt to trap the Government in respect of any future action it may intend to take. If the honourable member puts the question on notice, he must obviously receive a considered reply that is to the point.

Mr. Clark: He won't get an answer.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: If he wants to know something that has not yet been decided, he will not get an answer. If the honourable member asks a specific question instead of couching his question in a certain way, I shall obtain a reply. It is strange that the matter has become so urgent, when the Government of which he was a member was in office for three years and the only thing it did about a festival hall was try to filch some of the park lands of Adelaide.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable Premier is debating the reply.

BAROSSA PASSENGER SERVICE

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I refer to the effect of the proposed railway service rationalization plan on the Barossa Valley, in my district. The original plan provided for a road bus passenger and parcel service from the

Barossa Valley to Gawler and return, in lieu of the present rail services to and from Adelaide. A deputation introduced by me to the Minister of Roads and Transport some time ago requested that a daily modern railcar service from Angaston to Adelaide and return be continued. This request was not granted, but I was informed last month that it was intended to initiate a daily road bus service from December 1. For many years people in the Barossa Valley have been denied speedy modern rail passenger services, on which the passenger patronage would certainly have been much greater than it is now. I understand that, as certain rail passenger services will be curtailed in other parts of the State, several Bluebird railcars, which are comfortable and speedy, are likely to be available. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport (before his decision is implemented) to consider introducing a 12-month trial period for the use of Bluebird railcars on the Adelaide to Angaston line?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will ask my colleague whether this suggestion is possible and practicable.

MOSQUITOES

Mr. RYAN: Last Thursday I requested the assistance of the Minister of Marine in having the mosquito nuisance at Torrens Island, on land owned by the Marine and Harbors Department, treated as urgent because of the many complaints I had received. This morning the Port Adelaide Local Board of Health informed me that, because of the unexpected burst of early summer, it had received many requests from residents not only in my district but also in the Semaphore District complaining about the mosquito nuisance. In view of these requests, has the Minister had the matter investigated?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I am aware of the problem referred to by the honourable member, because complaints have been directed to me not only from residents and business people but also from, I understand, the Royal South Australian Yacht Squadron, which is situated in that area. As the honourable member requested urgent information, I have now obtained it. Subsequent to a conference earlier in the year that was attended by representatives of the State and Commonwealth Health Departments, the Marine and Harbors, and Agriculture Departments, the Electricity Trust of South Australia and the Local Boards of Health at Salisbury, Enfield and Port Adelaide, a subcommittee was formed comprising repre-

sentatives of the Health Department, the Local Boards of Health at Port Adelaide, Enfield, and Salisbury, together with an officer of the Agriculture Department. That subcommittee was to organize a survey over the summer period to determine the incidence and extent of the breeding areas, and carry out a limited programme of spraying to test chemicals. This was to be done using personnel available from the various bodies represented so that at the end of the survey period recommendations could be made. At this stage the survey is well advanced. I will inform the honourable member as soon as possible of the results of the survey so that suitable remedial action can be taken to overcome this nuisance.

Mr. HURST: Although the Minister has said that a survey is being conducted to try to find the most effective method of combating the mosquito nuisance, I am reliably informed by the Local Board of Health of the City of Port Adelaide that in an area near Magazine Creek that is the property of the Marine and Harbors Department mosquitoes are again breeding profusely, causing much concern to residents, including many of my constituents, and annoying children at school. As it has been established that property owned by the department is one of the specific breeding grounds, will the Minister ask his department to undertake immediate spraying in that area in order to solve this serious problem?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: Certainly, I will take this matter up. One purpose of the survey is to pinpoint the infestation or nesting areas to which the honourable member has referred, and in the past it has been found that aerial spraying is not the complete answer: perhaps it has reduced the incidence, but it has not eradicated the nuisance. One desire of the subcommittee, was to survey and pinpoint these nesting areas and to test forms of treatment other than aerial spraying. Some aerial spraying may have to be undertaken, but new chemicals are being tested in the surveys to ascertain whether they can effectively eradicate this nuisance. Some time ago the member for West Torrens told the House about a mosquito nuisance in his district, and this area is also being studied. However, I will see whether the honourable member's suggestion can be considered. The whole problem of mosquito nuisance will not be solved easily, but the Government desires that the whole matter should be considered thoroughly now so that we may discover effective means to treat it efficiently instead of haphazardly and

in isolated areas as it has been treated in the past.

UNIVERSITY ENTRANCE

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week about university entrance applications?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The University of Adelaide and the Flinders University of South Australia have a common admissions procedure. Under this, in practice, Saturday and Sunday would not be counted in the five days allowed for an offer of admission to be returned. Further, the morning mail after the fifth day would be regarded as coming within the specified period. Every practicable step is being taken to emphasize to candidates the need for prompt acceptance. Delay on the part of candidates offered admission and wishing to accept it would prejudice the position of applicants still under consideration, because of the need to complete enrolment during February.

WINKIE SCHOOL

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question about the staffing of the Winkie Primary School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I am pleased to be able to inform the honourable member that recently an ex-teacher who has returned from overseas has indicated her willingness to accept an appointment to Winkie school for the remainder of this year. She has taken up duty today.

WHYALLA SCHOOL

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Will the Minister of Education find out whether any progress has been made towards securing a site for a third secondary school at Whyalla?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I shall be pleased to do that for the honourable member.

KALANGADOO SCHOOL

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week about the Kalangadoo school oval?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I have been informed by the Public Buildings Department that recommendation has been made for acceptance of a tender for the work of developing an oval at the new Kalangadoo Primary School.

RUTHVEN MANSIONS

Mr. BROOMHILL: Last Monday I had the pleasure of participating in the Labour Day march. As we entered Pulteney Street, I noticed with some concern that many marchers

laughed at the appearance of Ruthven Mansions, which is the building used by the Public Health Department. The roof of the building is covered by weeds as is the guttering from which it appeared that even a tree was growing. As I do not think this sort of thing is a good advertisement for the Public Health Department, will the Minister of Works (and it may be necessary for him to discuss this question with the Minister of Health) say what the Government intends to do with this building in the future?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: Let me say at once that I share with the honourable member his concern at the appearance of this building and the state it is in. In fact, at this time I am actively investigating what can be done to provide better accommodation than, or alternative accommodation to, that provided presently at Ruthven Mansions. This matter concerns the Government and particularly the departments represented by the Minister of Health and me. As soon as I have available a report on what steps can be taken to solve this problem, I will present it to the House.

ROAD MARKING

Mr. GILES: Driving to the city yesterday through the Adelaide Hills, I had a fright as I rounded one corner and found a group of workmen painting a line in the middle of the road. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to make sure that people working on the roads, particularly in the hills, always erect warning signs to alert motorists as to their presence?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will ask Mr. Hill whether it is possible to do this.

EVERARD PARK MAINS

Mr. LANGLEY: Recently I was grateful to receive from the Minister of Works information about the renewal of mains in the Everard Park area at a cost of \$19,000. Can the Minister say when work will commence on laying the new mains?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I will certainly obtain that information. However, I wish to explain to the honourable member that it is not always possible, when giving information about the approval of a project, to indicate the date of commencement of the work. I believe that it is important to inform honourable members as soon as possible when approval has been given and that the commencing date of work can be given later. In this case and, where it is possible, in other cases, I will try to give an approximate time of commencement of the work.

AIR FARES

Mr. EDWARDS: My question concerns a serious matter, which affects all rural airlines in South Australia. I draw to the Premier's attention the fact that the Commonwealth Government intends to introduce a passenger head tax for airline passengers using Commonwealth airports. This tax was foreshadowed in the 1967 Commonwealth Budget speech, and the Commonwealth Government has announced its intention to impose the tax soon. The tax, designed to raise between \$4,000,000 and \$5,000,000 a year, will involve a charge of 50c on each passenger embarking or disembarking at a Commonwealth airport. On many air routes this charge will substantially increase the cost of air travel. An airline in this State is opposed to this new tax and has put its views strongly to the Government. In the case of Eyre Peninsula the new tax would add an extra \$2 to the fare on a flight from Cleve or Ceduna. This represents an 8.5 per cent increase in travel costs. The new tax will increase air travel costs between South Australian ports and Adelaide by an average of 6 per cent and between South Australian ports and Kangaroo Island by an average of 11 per cent. Australian navigation charges, already the highest in the world, have been increased by 10 per cent—

Mr. Hudson: Question!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member must ask his question.

Mr. EDWARDS: Can anything be done to help save our national airlines in the rural areas?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member has expressed his regret at a possible increase in air fares to his district and I, too, express regret at the possible increase in air fares to outlying areas of the State. As I understand it, and as most members realize, the Commonwealth Government is spending far more on air passenger and aviation facilities in Australia than it collects. I have no doubt that this new tax is designed to remove some of the deficiencies in the collection of the charges and is associated with the matter of how much subsidy the Commonwealth Government should pay to the aviation industry in Australia. I will obtain more information and give the honourable member the official view of the Commonwealth Government on this tax.

BEACHPORT WATER SUPPLY

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of October 8 about the investigation of alternative sources of water supply at Beachport?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: The Beachport water well was drilled to a total depth of 1,180ft. without encountering water of satisfactory quality. Due to serious engineering drilling problems at this depth, it was not possible to deepen this well further. The well has, therefore, been plugged and abandoned. There is no reliable data on the quality of the water cut between 1,060ft. and 1,140ft. in the oil well some two miles distant. It is proposed to drill out the cement plugs in this well and test its water supply. If satisfactory in terms of quality and quantity, consideration will be given to using it as a township supply.

TEXTBOOKS

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yesterday, I asked the Minister of Education a question about the provision of multiple copies of textbooks for libraries at teachers colleges, in accordance with promises she had made earlier. As the Minister now tells me she has a reply, I thank her for attending to my question so promptly and ask her to give it.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I am pleased to be able to give the honourable member this information. Regarding the student-textbook ratio the Minister of Education plans to maintain in relation to the multiple collections for each course of study, it is not easy to give an accurate figure for a student-textbook ratio, because of the different character of each teachers college. Adelaide Teachers College and Bedford Park Teachers College students have access to university libraries, whereas students at Wattle Park Teachers College, Western Teachers College and Salisbury Teachers College have to rely mainly on teachers college libraries. The principals of the teachers colleges and officers of the Education Department have discussed this matter of a suitable student-textbook ratio, and 1:20 is the favoured ratio. However, this is a base ratio only; in some courses the ratio for textbooks will be much lower than 1:20, and in other cases the ratio may be higher. The relative cost of textbooks, the extent to which they are to be used, and the level of course are all factors that will be considered by principals in determining ratios for particular books. The principals will keep the Education Department administrative officers informed of

the way in which the proposed new scheme of student allowances affects students in relation to textbooks. Students will be able to buy existing copies of textbooks held in stock at teachers colleges at greatly reduced prices. The multiple collections of textbooks will be used to supplement each student's own set of textbooks.

Regarding the provision the Minister is making for additional staff to administer the multiple collections, additional professional and ancillary staff for 1968-69 has already been determined. A total of 27 additional professional staff (including three lecturer-librarians) and 13 additional ancillary staff (including four library assistants) will be appointed to teachers colleges from the beginning of 1969. When the existing stocks of textbooks at teachers colleges have been sold, book clerks will be available for other duties at the discretion of the principals. The principals have undertaken to implement and administer the scheme of multiple textbooks with the number of existing staff.

Regarding the housing of the multiple collections, arrangements can be made at each teachers college. The sale of existing stocks of textbooks will free space for housing multiple collections. The multiple collections will be housed in bookrooms, stacks, or library, depending on the most suitable arrangement for each teachers college. The new library at Bedford Park Teachers College will be ready during 1969, and extensions to the library at Western Teachers College (South Road) should be ready by February, 1969. The matters raised by the honourable member have been thoroughly discussed by teachers college principals and officers of the administration. The principals are in favour of the new system of teachers college allowances (to which multiple collections of textbooks are supplementary). The principals will watch the interests of their students.

GLENELG PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of Wednesday last about the provision of new playing areas at the Glenelg Primary School consequent on the normal playing area being restricted because of the construction of new buildings at the school?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I regret that I have not the answer in my bag, but I will try to have it tomorrow.

SUPERPHOSPHATE REBATE

Mr. VENNING: A few days ago I asked that the superphosphate companies be requested to extend until the end of January the period during which a rebate on superphosphate deliveries was paid, so that the period would not terminate at the end of December, which could be in the busy period of grain deliveries in South Australia. Whilst returning from Adelaide last week, I read this notice on the Railways Department notice board at the Bowmans railway station:

Super wisdom: Fertilizer delivered by rail in August, September, October, November and December will be where it is needed, when it is needed.

Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture to take up with the Railways Department and the superphosphate companies this matter of "super wisdom" so that this rebate will apply to deliveries until the end of January, not only to deliveries in the months stated in the Railways Department notice?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes.

COMMUNITY HOSPITALS

Mr. HUGHES: In my district, community hospitals are located at Kadina and at Moonta. I refer to a portion of the Premier's policy speech, delivered prior to the election on March 2, concerning community and country subsidized hospitals, which states:

We are concerned with the effect of rising costs on health services, particularly the impact they have on community and country subsidized hospitals. We will undertake a Treasury investigation of this problem.

Can the Premier say whether that investigation has been undertaken and, if it has, what recommendations have been made to the Government by the Treasurer and his officers? Also, if the investigation has not been undertaken does the Government intend to proceed with it and, if it does, will the Premier make available to members the report of the Treasurer?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Government intends to honour its promises and carry out the investigation. The Chief Secretary has discussed informally with me several times the pressure of rising costs on such hospitals, but the report has not yet been made. It will be made as soon as the Government can arrange it and as soon as the present flow of work allows it to be fitted into the programme of Treasury officers. I cannot undertake that the report will be made available to the House, but I will discuss this aspect with the Chief Secretary and inform the honourable member at the first opportunity.

AIR POLLUTION

Mr. McKEE: As the Premier is aware, the Commonwealth Senate Select Committee on Air Pollution recently visited this State to inspect various industrial centres affected by air pollution and to hear evidence. Can the Premier say whether this committee has reported its findings to the Government and, if it has, will he ascertain what its findings are and make the information available?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I am not aware of any report being submitted to the Government, but I will ask the Minister of Health whether he has one. If he does not have one I will ask him to obtain one for the honourable member.

MILLICENT BY-ELECTION

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about the Millicent by-election?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member is too modest: he asked me three questions and I have answers to all of them. The first question (and this arises out of a previous question asked of me by the honourable member) requested the dates on which the Registrar received objections from Messrs. Potter and DeGaris. The answer is as follows:

The dates on which the Registrar received information (not objections as described by the honourable member) were April 1, 1968; April 22, 1968; and May 2, 1968.

The second question asked what investigation the Registrar was required to make in accordance with answer No. 1 on page 158 of *Hansard*, and I refer to a question asked by the Hon. Mr. Banfield in another place. The answer is as follows:

The Registrar as a result of the letters received had reason to believe that the names ought not to be retained on the roll. He was not required by the Act to investigate further as he accepted the information in the letters from Messrs. Potter and DeGaris as sufficient to lead him to believe that the names ought not to be retained on the roll.

The third question asked by the honourable member concerned the time that elapsed before the objections were forwarded to the persons concerned, and the answer is as follows:

The time between the receipt of the information and the lodging of the objections was as follows: first letter from Mr. DeGaris, one day; second letter from Mr. DeGaris, two days; letter from Mr. Potter, one day. A notice of objection was posted to each such elector on the date of lodging.

CHARITABLE COLLECTIONS

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Treasurer a reply to my recent question about collections for charitable institutions?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Chief Secretary has informed me that approved collectors for both the Royal Institution for the Blind and the South Australian Institution for the Blind, Deaf and Dumb carry written authorities and official receipt books. Donors should sight the authority and obtain a receipt for donations. Moneys collected by this means do not attract Government subsidy.

MAIN ROAD No. 30

Mr. McKEE: Yesterday the Attorney-General was kind enough to furnish me with some information which I required concerning council grants for certain road construction work at Port Pirie. However, although I was told that funds had been approved for work on the construction of traffic islands at the junction of Main Road No. 30 and Main Road No. 387 with Main Road No. 23 at Port Pirie, the Attorney-General did not say how much money would be made available for the work to be carried out and whether it would be sufficient to complete the proposed programme this financial year. Will he obtain that information for me?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will try to find out.

YORKE PENINSULA RESERVE

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question about naming a reserve to be dedicated on the southern part of Yorke Peninsula after the late Harold Holt?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have discussed this matter briefly with my colleagues, but it has been decided that it would not be appropriate to honour the late Prime Minister in connection with this reserve, not because of any disrespect to him but because the Government believes that it owes much to members of the Innes family for their generosity concerning this reserve. I found the national park commissioners themselves had already considered this matter and were recommending that the name of the Innes family be associated with the reserve. It is not considered appropriate to implement the honourable member's suggestion at this stage. As the formalities have not yet been completed, it would be premature to announce officially the name of the park.

EGGS

Mr. McANANEY: I draw the attention of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, to the following press report:

Egg producers would get extra payments from the poultry industry trust fund this year, the Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Anthony) announced today. Mr. Anthony said he had accepted a recommendation from the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities to increase payments to the States for exports by egg marketing authorities. The trust fund has been built from a Commonwealth hen levy imposed on producers and does not rely on a Government subsidy. Mr. Anthony said the payments would allow the State egg boards to increase producers' returns at a time when many producers needed higher returns.

Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture how much money is held in reserve and how payments are determined? I point out that in the case of most other primary producer boards the funds collected are paid back on the produce in respect of which they were originally collected.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will submit that question to the Minister of Agriculture.

BUS FARES

Mr. FREEBAIRN: In this morning's *Advertiser* appears an article headed "M.T.T. Traffic Men Get Increases", part of which states:

About 950 members of the Tramway Employees' Association employed by the Municipal Tramways Trust will receive wage increases ranging from \$2.60 to \$4.35 a week as a result of a judgment delivered by Commissioner H. G. Neil, of the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission, in Sydney yesterday. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether this wage rise will be reflected in an immediate increase in bus fares and, if so, how much bus fares will increase to absorb the wage rise?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will seek the information.

RAILWAY LAND

Mr. BROOMHILL: A week or two ago the Attorney-General supplied to me from the Minister of Roads and Transport information that, flowing from the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report, it was recommended that the Grange-Adelaide railway service be discontinued. Since then several complaints have been made to me by residents who have protested about the discontinuance of this service. Therefore, will the Attorney-General

ask his colleague how many people travel on this railway line?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will ask my colleague about it.

BLUE LAKE EXPRESS

Mr. RODDA: Concern is still being expressed by some of the good people who use the Blue Lake express, an overnight service that extends over about 300 miles. Some very distinguished people use this train. From time to time, the matter of better sleeping accommodation on the train has been raised. As the years go by fewer and fewer people use the train, because of the decrepit condition of the sleeping cars which have given faithful service to people over many years. Will the Attorney-General raise this matter with the Minister of Roads and Transport in the hope of having provided for people who use this service some modern sleeping accommodation?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I agree with what the honourable member said about the patronage of this service; in fact, I have used it myself several times. I shall be happy to raise the matter with my colleague.

GOVERNMENT DIRECTORY

Mr. RYAN: I refer to the great confusion amongst the public as well as members of Parliament in relation to where various Government departments are situated. Has the Premier considered a request I made on October 1, that a list or directory be published stating where Government departments are located or where they are likely to be located in the future, because, as a member of Parliament, I cannot find out where they are situated without making numerous inquiries, and this applies equally to members of the public?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: In an endeavour to obtain precise information for the honourable member, his request is still with the Chairman of the Public Service Board who is accumulating relevant information which, when it is compiled, I will bring to the House and supply to the honourable member publicly.

MEASLES

Mr. HURST: Has the Premier obtained from the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question about measles?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Measles is not a notifiable disease in South Australia. Doctors are aware of complications that can arise from the disease. At the 59th session of the National Health and Medical Research Council

in May, 1965, the question of the standardization of notifiable diseases was considered and it was decided not to recommend the inclusion of measles. It is not notifiable in any other State or Territory of Australia.

Mr. McANANEY: In a previous session I asked a question about vaccination against measles and about the difficulty of obtaining vaccine in South Australia, when, at that time, free vaccine was being made available in Victoria. In reply, I was told that there was some doubt about the efficacy of the vaccine. As a result of the Victorian experiment with the availability of free vaccine, will the Premier obtain from the Minister of Health a report on the efficacy of this vaccine and the present availability of supplies in South Australia?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will find this out from my colleague.

HILLS FREEWAY

Mr. EVANS: Can the Attorney-General obtain from the Minister of Roads and Transport the following information about the Hills Freeway: the cost of surveying; the cost of the purchase of properties; and the cost of other works?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will see whether that information is available.

CATTLE VACCINATION

Mr. CORCORAN: On September 18, I asked the Minister of Lands a question about the vaccination of heifers against brucellosis. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Director of Agriculture reports that the problems which have been associated with the introduction of reputedly vaccinated but unearmarked heifers into South Australia from other States have been referred to the Victorian authorities several times in the past. There is no Brands Act operating in Victoria and therefore there is no power to control or enforce any brands or earmarks. The identification of vaccinated heifers has been reviewed by the National Committee for the Control of Brucellosis and Tuberculosis and it now seems probable that all States will adopt the earmark which has been used in South Australia for over 20 years and is now in use in Western Australia and Tasmania also.

DALGETY AND N.Z. LOAN LIMITED

Mr. CASEY: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about Dalgety and New Zealand Loan Limited writs?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I wish to say that I do not intend to comment generally on

matters between a company and a client. If the honourable member supplies me with details of a case, I will inquire about that matter. I suggest that it would be appropriate not to mention names of either client or company in Parliament, at least until inquiries show a real need to do so. I assure the honourable member that if he gives me details on the matter to which he has referred I will follow it up on his constituent's behalf.

RAILWAY CROSSINGS

Mr. EDWARDS: I refer again to railway crossings, this time to the two bad crossings at Ceduna: one on the Eyre Highway, nearly into Ceduna, and the other on the Ceduna-Thevenard road, almost on the edge of Ceduna. Both these crossings are extremely dangerous. Although flashing lights have been sought, I am sure that, if the amber light systems to which I referred recently were installed at the two crossings, they would be adequate for the purpose. I am sure that in all towns on Eyre Peninsula, and in most country towns where white street lights are installed, an amber light at the crossings would help reduce the number of disastrous railway accidents that continually occur. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to investigate this suggestion again, as in a country town the ordinary lights are always white and coloured lights should be very successful at railway crossings?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I remember those two crossings. I will discuss the matter again with the Minister to see whether it is possible to do as the honourable member suggests.

OAKBANK SCHOOL

Mr. GILES: Recently, the foundations of the dressing shed at the Oakbank Area School swimming pool dropped and there are now bad cracks in the walls. I have reported this matter to the Minister of Education, and the officers of the Public Buildings Department have made an inspection. Can the Minister say whether further progress has been made in this matter? As the pool and its shed are used for swimming instruction during the summer, this work is urgent so that the pool can be used for this purpose during the coming summer.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: As I do not have a reply to the question, I will try to get one soon, in view of the approach of summer.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT
BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act, 1934-1965. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is to members on this side of the House and to the overwhelming majority of the people of this State a fundamental proposition of democracy that every citizen in the State should have an equal and effective say with every other citizen in what the law in the State should be. As every citizen has to live subject to the law so, therefore, should he have an effective say in what the law that governs him should be. To the extent that any citizen's right to an effective say in the law that governs him is debased or diluted, he is thereby that much the less a citizen. In any modern community this ought to be axiomatic: there ought not to be an argument about this. This was a principle that our forebears fought for and previously established elsewhere.

Those citizens who are disfranchised from the Legislative Council have no effective voice in the government of this State, as the Legislative Council has in this State a say that effectively prevents the will of the majority from being accepted if those who are represented in the Legislative Council in some measure or other choose by a majority to thwart the will of the majority of the people (and this they have done time and again during the history of this State). There have been many examples during the history of the Legislative Council which have meant that the Council has exercised over the majority of the people a power that is completely contrary to the basic tenets of democracy. This principle has been dealt with by the most influential court in a representative democracy today (the United States Supreme Court) in a series of decisions. The basic principles of one man one vote and one vote one value were laid down by the court in 1962 in the case of *Baker v. Carr*, but in a subsequent decision in 1963 in the case of *Reynolds v. Sims*, the court held that, in the case of State Legislatures in the United States of America, if the people of a State could not all have an equal and effective say in the election of both Houses of the State Legislatures, the people of that State were denied the equal protection of the law and, if the equal protection of the law is denied to citi-

zens, the basic right that is guaranteed to people in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights is denied to the people of this State.

Mr. Jennings: We miss out both ways here.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We certainly do. At any rate, I see signs, from things I hear about meetings held behind closed doors on North Terrace and in another building, that some glimmering of these principles has filtered through to some members opposite, and I hope they will express themselves freely to the people of this State (as they say they are able to do) and vote according to their own beliefs and not according to the opinions forced on them by gentlemen in another place who say, rather than that they should meet the wishes of the majority of the people of South Australia, that they are the men who know what the permanent will of the people is.

Mr. Rodda: No names?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member wants me to mention a few names I shall do so.

Mr. Rodda: You are very generous.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will quote some of the things the United States Supreme Court (a most distinguished judicial body) had to say on the principles to which I have referred.

Mr. McAnaney: What did it say about the way they elect their President? Is that one vote one value?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The United States Supreme Court has not been able to pass on the election of the President, because there has been no means of testing the means of electing the President in that country. The principles that the court has laid down about the election of representative Governments would, if they could be applied to the Constitution in that particular area, be fully effective. The judgment of the United States Supreme Court states:

But representative government is in essence self-government through the medium of elected representatives of the people, and each and every citizen has an inalienable right to full and effective participation in the political processes of his State's legislative bodies.

The reference is not only to the Lower House, but to both Houses of a State Legislature. The document continues:

Most citizens can achieve this participation only as qualified voters through the election of legislators to represent them. Full and effective participation by all citizens in State government requires, therefore, that each citizen have an

equally effective voice in the election of members of his State Legislature. Modern and viable State government needs, and the Constitution demands, no less. Logically, in a society ostensibly grounded on representative Government, it would seem reasonable that a majority of the people of a State could elect a majority of that State's legislators. To conclude differently, and to sanction minority control of State legislative bodies, would appear to deny majority rights in a way that far surpasses any possible denial of minority rights that might otherwise be thought to result. Since Legislatures are responsible for enacting laws by which all citizens are to be governed, they should be bodies which are collectively responsive to the popular will.

"To the popular will"—not repositories in their own minds of the permanent will of the people, regardless of how the people may choose to vote. It cannot be denied that the Legislative Council, as at present constituted in South Australia, is a most undemocratically elected body. It does not represent, and cannot claim to represent, the majority of the citizens of this State. The citizens of this State are not enrolled, except in a minority, for the Legislative Council. The population of South Australia is not effectively represented there. The basis of representation denies to many people an effective voice in the government of the State.

What is the excuse for having a second Chamber, not elected by the popular will of the people? The excuse normally put forward is that we ought to have two Chambers in a Legislature so that it is possible to have a review of legislation; so that it is possible that, if something is done by the Lower House (which determines the Government), it is desirable to have a second look at that so that citizens may have second thoughts about it and, if objections are raised late to what is done by the Lower House, then there is time for representations to be made to the second Chamber so that the matter may be considered a second time.

Mr. Clark: Is that a particularly valid argument?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not think it is much of an argument but, so far as there is any argument for a second Chamber, that is the only one. That is one step of an argument. The second step taken by the defenders of the present franchise of the Upper House is taken on the assumption (because it is never expressed) that, if we are to have a second Chamber, it must be elected by a group of people different from the electors for the Lower House. That assumption is completely invalid. Why must it be elected

by people who are different from the electors of the Lower House? The argument, so far as it has ever been developed, is that the same group of people would be elected to the Upper House.

However, if the function of members of that Upper House is not to represent a minority interest, with a power of veto over the majority, but merely to act as a House of Review, reviewing what may have been done hastily by the other House, since they are a different group of people from the people who sit here, they are able to discharge the functions of a House of Review, even if they are elected by the same group of people: indeed, they can do it better, because they can claim to be just as representative as the representatives in a Lower House but, if they are a minority interest, elected by a minority group of citizens, then a new and vicious principle is introduced into the Constitution, because then they, as a minority group, have a power of veto over the majority of citizens and, therefore, they deny the principles laid down so clearly and in such excellent terms by the distinguished United States Supreme Court.

If we are to have government of the people by the people for the people, then it is the people who must be represented, and represented as effectively in one House as in the other. There is no reason, of course, for all members of the Upper House to be elected at the same time as members of the Lower House are elected, nor is there any reason why they should be elected from the same group of districts. Indeed, I should think there was much merit in returning to the principle laid down in our Constitution originally regarding election of members of the Upper House; that is, that elections for the Upper House be State-wide, not for particularly chosen districts but on a State basis. However, we cannot deal with that in this Bill because, until the districts for the Lower House are determined by another measure before the House, we will not be able to determine the districts for the Upper House. However, we can determine the franchise. For people to suggest in this day and age that a Legislative Council should be constituted in the present form or with some minor modification of that form, retaining a restrictive franchise and a veto by a minority over the representatives of the majority of the citizens of the State, is to run entirely counter to the principles and tenets of democratic Government to which we in other parts of the world pay lip service.

If we believe in democracy elsewhere, why do we not show that we believe in and support

democracy here? Democracy means the people's rule, and nothing more. Consequently, I consider that the members of this House should adopt this measure and send it to the other Chamber seeking its concurrence. In view of the opinions expressed in one place or another by members of this House, there should be no difficulty in obtaining a constitutional majority for this principle and in those circumstances if this Lower House is elected by the people of the State (even though the majority of the people are not always represented by a majority of the members of the House), any constitutional majority of this House must express the overwhelming views of the overwhelming majority of the people in the State, and that must show the other place that the overwhelming majority of the people demand their basic right as citizens. The Bill is quite simple: it has only two clauses of substance. Clause 2 repeals the present section setting out the franchise for the Legislative Council and substitutes for it the following:

The following persons and no others shall be entitled to vote at the election of members of the Legislative Council, namely, all persons entitled to vote at an election for a member or members of the House of Assembly enrolled on the roll of electors for that House in those parts of House of Assembly districts comprised in the respective Council districts.

Under this provision we would have the same roll for the Lower House as for the Upper House. Clause 3 repeals sections 20a and 21 of the principal Act. These sections relate to the residential restriction upon enrolment and the war service enrolment for the Upper House, which are both dealt with in the section relating to enrolment for the House of Assembly and, in consequence, are no longer needed in the Constitution Act if clause 2 is passed. I commend the Bill to the House.

The Hon. R. S. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Licensing Act, 1967. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is brief and simple, and deals with three matters in the Licensing Act. The first is a slight extension of the provision for wine licences. The wine industry is important and valuable, as you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, well know, and in wine-producing areas it is useful to place

before people using the tourist facilities in that area the value of its winemaking industry. For some time I have received requests to move for a minor amendment to provisions relating to wine licences. Honourable members know that, at present the Licensing Act provides that no new wine licence may be granted, but I intend to make a slight exception to that rule, that is, that a wine licence may be granted to permit the consumption on premises of wine and sales of wine by the bottle in the case of *bona fide* museums or art galleries situated in wine-growing districts.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: There is a two-year ban, isn't there?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. Under the wine licence section of the Act no new wine licences may be granted. The Commissioner recommended that no new licences should be granted and that all existing wine licences should end five years after the new Act was introduced. We modified that by providing that a wine licence could continue if the premises were converted to the form that is presently in vogue in Chesser Street in the city where a satisfactory set-up exists. This is desirable from the point of view of the wine trade, from that of the tourist industry, and as a public facility. The court has to be satisfied that the facilities and premises are good and that the wine consumed on the premises is consumed with substantial food. After a five-year period, if a wine licence had been granted under these provisions it could continue, but no new wine licence beyond the 15 existing licences were to be granted. I propose that some new wine licences be granted but that they should be in a restricted area, that is, for a *bona fide* museum or art gallery in a winegrowing district in or close to an area where more than one vigneron's licence has been granted.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: How do you define "district"?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That decision will be in the hands of the court. At present there are a number of phrases in the Act which the court has to define.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Are you giving the court any guidance?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. I think it can make up its mind on this matter, particularly after it considers the intention of the legislation. I admit that I have been slightly surprised by certain decisions of the court, and I intend to do something about this, but I think the court can see clearly

the purpose of the section. It is proposed that section 23 be amended by inserting after subsection (2) the following passage:

except in respect of the premises of a *bona fide* museum or art gallery in or close to an area of the State where more than one vigneron's licence has been granted and unless the court is satisfied that the granting of the wine licence will assist the sale of wines of good quality made in the said area.

In other words, if the court is satisfied that a *bona fide* museum or art gallery is situated in a winegrowing district and that the granting of the wine licence will assist the sales of quality wine grown or made in that district, it may grant the licence. This is only a minor extension of the wine licence provision, but I believe it would assist the wine industry and the tourist industry. The subsequent new paragraph (b) of clause 2 is consequential on the first proposal. The second proposal in the Bill relates to the letting of premises of permitted and licensed clubs. When the Licensing Act was being debated we clearly intended that permitted and licensed clubs should be allowed to let their premises, but that they should not trade in liquor. We included a provision making it clear they were not to trade in liquor. On the principle of *expressio unius est exclusio alterius* it was taken that that would mean that clubs could carry on trading in things other than liquor and could let their premises. However, the court has considered that where it has granted a permit or a licence the premises in respect of which the permit or licence is granted must be in the hands or control of the permittee or the licensee at all times. It was considered that otherwise it would be difficult to enforce the provisions of the Act and difficulties might arise as to unauthorized persons being on the premises. This, of course, has meant that many permitted clubs and some clubs that are now seeking either full or restricted licences are in difficulties about letting out their halls and premises to other bodies which are not interested in licensing or even in the provision of liquor but which use the halls. Returned Servicemen's League clubs that sought permits have been in difficulties about letting their halls to bodies such as the Country Women's Association. In these circumstances, it seems to me that we have to take urgent action to right this situation because, particularly in country districts but also in some parts of the metropolitan area (for instance, the district of the member for Glenelg), there have been difficulties about clubs letting out their premises (premises that

previously provided a home for members of reputable and desirable local organizations).

In consequence, it is intended that sections (or exceptions) be written into the Act in respect of both permitted clubs and licensed clubs (the wording is slightly different in each section because the circumstances applying to permits are slightly different from those applying to licences). It is intended to write the following into section 67 of the Act (the section that allows permits to clubs):

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit the letting out of club premises or any part thereof on occasions other than periods in respect of which a permit under this section has been granted to the club—

because it is undesirable to have the club's premises let out at a time when the permit is operating—

to a person or association not a member of or associated with the club, nor to prohibit the club from catering in food or drink other than liquor for such occasions, nor to prohibit the granting of a permit pursuant to section 66 of this Act in respect of such occasions.

This applies to a period when a permit under section 67 is not operating, because a permit under that section is normally a periodic permit, and, if it has been granted as a temporary permit awaiting a licensing section, it is normally for an area that is not intended to be let out to the public (it would be to a person or association not a member of the club or associated with the club); but if the premises are let out and the club is not operating its permit under section 67, it is desirable that anyone using the club premises should, if desired, be able to obtain a permit under section 66 for a meeting or for entertainment in the club premises, in which case a publican would operate a booth permit in the premises. It is intended that section 88 of the principal Act be amended by inserting an exception similar in principle, as follows:

... but nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit the letting out of club premises or any room or rooms therein to persons or associations not members of or connected with the club for a meeting or entertainment—

that is, anything regarding which a section 66 permit could be applied for—

nor to prohibit the club from catering in food and drink other than liquor for such occasions, nor to prohibit the granting of a permit pursuant to section 66 of this Act in respect of such occasions.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: You have changed your thinking on this, especially in the last year, concerning catering.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. I agreed to an amendment last year concerning catering other than in liquor. I agreed to an amendment being written in simply excluding liquor but not other trading with the public, and I see no reason why a club should not cater other than in liquor. If clubs were to be allowed to cater in liquor, they would be trading to the general public in liquor, and we would be running into exactly the difficulty which the Commissioner in his report was so heavily against—that this was a most undesirable development in South Australia. The other proposal in the Bill is for the curing of an anomaly which has become evident. In the section relating to booth permits under the Act, there is no defence for a person who serves liquor to someone under 21 (that is, no similar defence to that available if he serves the liquor to people under 21 on licensed premises). In other words, if a barman on licensed premises has reason to believe that someone is 21 or over, and that person is at least of the age of 18, the barman has a defence, if he serves the person concerned who turns out not to be 21. But if that barman on the instructions of his employer operates the bar under a booth permit at a cabaret or something of this kind (a permit under section 66), and if a youth comes up to him and says, "I am over 21" and looks to be over 21 but is, in fact, over 18, the barman has no defence at all. This is an anomaly which I am sure was not intended by the House. It was something we overlooked at the time; we wrote the defence into the section relating to licensed premises but not into section 66. Therefore, I intend to extend the defence in section 153 of the Act to the occasions referred to in section 66 and to provide that the defence is available in relation to any offence under section 153 or under section 66 (10).

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

EDUCATION ACT REGULATIONS

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. R. R. Loveday:

(For wording of motion, see page 1761.)

(Continued from October 9. Page 1764.)

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE (Minister of Education): The member for Whyalla (Hon. R. R. Loveday) said, when moving the motion, that it was necessary to disallow the regulations governing trainee teacher allowances to secure continuity in the present arrangements. This, of course, is just what the Government does not want to do: it does not wish to perpetuate an

uncontrollable, cumbersome system which contains undesirable principles and which incorporates features that make the system extremely difficult to administer. Instead, the Government is introducing a new method that will put trainee teachers on a parity with other tertiary students, a status to which trainee teachers have long laid claim.

The method used in arriving at the original additional allowance was the division of the amount provided on the internal estimates of the Education Department for the allocation of travelling expenses and costs of supplying and replacing textbooks on loan to students in teachers colleges by the number of students at present enrolled in the five teachers colleges. This amount was about \$82 and was increased to a round \$85. Because of the representations of the student teachers when they came to see me in a deputation introduced by the President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers and followed by written submissions which I invited them to send to me and which I undertook to consider, and not because of the pressure of the Opposition as claimed by the member for Whyalla, the matter was further discussed by Cabinet. After discussion, the Government decided to base the increased composite allowance on the amount spent. This figure divided by the number of eligible students gave a figure of about \$102, which was then increased to a round figure of \$105—the allowance standing in the regulation today.

I have already said twice in the Chamber, when speaking on this matter (first in the Budget debate and later in replying in the debate on the unsuccessful motion of no-confidence moved by the member for Whyalla), that during the term of the previous Government the sums allocated for travelling and for the purchase and replacement of textbooks on loan to trainee teachers were exceeded by increasing sums in each of the years 1965, 1966 and 1967. It is most important that members on both sides know exactly to what extent these lines were exceeded, and therefore I intend to quote the figures again. In 1965-66 the sum voted was \$210,000, the actual cost was \$248,100, and the excess was \$38,100; in 1966-67 the sum voted was \$255,000, the actual cost was \$327,300, and the excess was \$72,300; and in 1967-68 the sum voted was \$336,700, the actual cost was \$400,000, and the excess was \$63,300. The total amount of excess for the three-year period was therefore \$173,700, near enough to \$174,000. Ministers are charged with the

responsibility of efficiently running departments under their control and it is important to contain the expenditure within the lines originally submitted.

Mr. Riches: You said that finance was not the object.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I will come to that in a moment. I am speaking now about the cost of expenditure over the sum voted for this purpose. Does a Minister turn a blind eye to excess expenditure from year to year and cover it, as was done, by getting an excess transfer warrant, which has the effect of depriving some other branch within the department of funds for a much needed provision, or does she (as in my case) accept the odium which has emanated from misplaced criticism from some sources in the community for doing what she considers to be her proper and responsible duty? I have chosen the latter course and I stand by it. I believe I have won the support of the greater proportion of the general public in doing so.

Mr. Hudson: Whom are you kidding?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I am not kidding; I get around the community, as all members do, and many people have told me that they approve of what has been done. In the long run I believe I will have done the right thing, too, by the trainee teachers themselves. By the very method that has been employed to compute the new increase an average is established. This being so, of course it is obvious that half the students will benefit (and for the information of honourable members I have had relayed to me in the last two or three weeks the delight of a not inconsiderable number of trainee students at their particular good fortune, as they have benefited from this regulation) and, just as obviously, because it is an average, half will not be as well off.

However, on the occasion of the second deputation, which I received in company with the Director-General of Education, I heard representations from the presidents from the five colleges on behalf of specific groups of students within the colleges. These related to hardships of travel suffered by Western Teachers College students because of the division of that college into three different annexes, the problem of M students at the Wattle Park Teachers College, who enter mid-way through the year, and that of new students who enter colleges at the beginning of the year. Both of the latter cases will face some hardship in the purchase of new and

secondhand textbooks before they receive the first instalment of their allowance a fortnight after the college has opened. The suggestion was that these particular students should be paid an advance in the form of a lump sum to help them over this particular period from January 1 in each year until they received the first instalment of their allowance a fortnight after the colleges opened.

Mr. Freebairn: Which students are these?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: These are the M students who commence at the colleges half-way through the year and the new intake students. However, I have heard on the grapevine that the students believe now that there are some inherent difficulties in this particular suggestion, but I await their submission to me on this matter which I undertook, with other matters, to look into to see what could be done. I cannot accept the argument of the member for Whyalla that students, with their parents, have every reason to expect that the conditions on which they entered into their present careers as student teachers would at least be maintained, because clause 5 of the agreement between the Minister of Education on the one hand and the student and guarantor of the student on the other hand clearly states the following (and I will read it from the agreement form):

That the Minister shall during the operation of this agreement pay the student an allowance at the rate fixed from time to time by the regulations (hereinafter referred to as the "said regulations") under the Education Act, 1915-1966.

The member for Whyalla has said that the Government's action is actually a breach of contract, but it is nothing of the kind. What the honourable member suggested would mean that the arrangement for trainee teachers' allowances could never be altered and that the particular agreement in force would have to be perpetuated.

I turn now to the advertisement inserted in the newspaper on Wednesday last week. Of course, I knew that the trainee teachers intended to do this and that they had in fact levied themselves a certain sum to meet the cost of the advertisement. It was, as it said at the bottom, authorized by the State Council of the South Australian Student Teachers and the South Australian Institute of Teachers. The member for Whyalla suggested that what the trainee teachers had been told, regarding their comparison with student teachers in other teachers colleges throughout Australia, was incorrect. I make the point

that it is a very misleading advertisement, but I have no doubt that all members have studied the advertisement carefully. In South Australia, for the first year of training the allowance is \$700; in the second year \$740; in the third year \$800; in the fourth and fifth years \$900. Just to use the first year is most misleading: it should have been \$700 in the first year, with the addition of \$105 to make \$805. The whole purport of the advertisement (and publicity was given to this fact) was to inform incoming students to the teachers colleges of what the conditions would be when they enrolled at college. It was wrong to suggest that it would be \$700 when, in fact, it would be \$805. Officers of the department went to the trouble of contacting every Education Department in Australia to obtain their figures as at October 9. The additional fact about the table is some small wording which states, "From the tables below it can be seen (excluding book or travel allowances)". No special reference was made to the fact that in South Australia travel allowances were being provided at present over and above the first 20c spent. Nor did the advertisement mention that art and craft students were paid an extra \$50 a year to cover the cost of their materials. It stated that, in regard to New South Wales, book allowances ranging from \$22 to \$100 a year were paid. In fact, however, no book allowance as such is paid in New South Wales, but there is a special grant ranging from \$30 to \$42 to cover special allowances.

The advertisement stated that in Queensland a book allowance of \$30 a year was paid, but this is for the first year only in a teachers college. However, in Queensland, all years at the university are paid (that is, for the fellowship courses) but I repeat that for teachers college an allowance of only \$30 is paid for the first year. This was a misleading advertisement because it did not give the kind of information which the students themselves said they were going to provide to students who were thinking of entering the teaching profession. It is interesting to study the table which I gave to the House last week and which appears in *Hansard* showing the various comparisons once again between allowances paid in South Australia and those paid in the Eastern States. Regarding the actual living allowance (\$805), only Tasmania pays more than the allowance paid to students in South Australia, and that by a margin of only \$45. Victoria pays vastly in excess of all the other States in the Commonwealth, so I will not concern myself with

that State. All other States pay very much below the amount paid by the Victorian Education Department. In the second year the only State that pays above South Australia is Tasmania, by a margin of \$55. In South Australia in the third and fourth years of training there is a difference in favour of Tasmania of \$95. Only two States pay higher than South Australia: Victoria and Tasmania.

Mr. Hudson: Have you included Western Australia?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Western Australia pays a book allowance of \$40, plus daily travel over 20c of fares to demonstration schools. In Western Australia, for the first year the figure is \$785; for the second year it is \$785; for the third year \$865; and for the fourth year \$943.

Mr. Hudson: That excludes travel and books?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The book allowance is \$40.

Mr. Hudson: Is that included in the \$785?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I think so.

Mr. Hudson: But the travel isn't?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Travel is not included. The allowances, plus the boarding allowances, give a figure for South Australia of \$1,055, which again is exceeded only by Victoria. The only other State above South Australia is Western Australia, and the margin there is \$25. For the second year the only State above South Australia is Victoria. In the third year, again the only State above South Australia is Victoria, and it is on a par with Western Australia. In the fourth year South Australia is exceeded by New South Wales and Victoria. Only two other States besides South Australia have a fifth year in the teachers college: New South Wales and Victoria, which exceed South Australia in both cases. I do not consider that the implementation of the amended allowances for trainee teachers will either bring about any deterioration in the relationship between the Minister of Education and the student teachers or result in a decrease in the number of trainee teachers seeking entry into colleges in 1969.

It may be the first time that a Minister of Education has had a vote of no confidence passed against her, and it may be the first time that a Minister of Education has been hissed and booed. In this regard it will only be adding another first to an already fairly long list, and I can take it. On the other hand, I believe there are many people in the State who approve of the stand I have taken on this matter, and

I have been supported by the Cabinet. This leads me to another point raised by the member for Whyalla: the pupil-teacher ratio. For the year 1968 there has been the biggest net gain overall to the department of teachers retained by the department since 1964, which was the last full year the Liberal and Country League Government was in office. The member for Whyalla (Hon. R. R. Loveday) will be aware that Ministers of Education are provided with lists of the gains and losses of permanent staff as well as temporary teachers, and the net gain for 1968 is 625 teachers. I consider that this trend, if applied to the pupil-teacher ratio, must indicate an improving situation. If it is maintained, staffing in country schools must also be affected favourably. As all members know, the Education Department is just as interested in the welfare of students who attend country schools as it is in the welfare of students attending city or metropolitan schools. Every effort is made to maintain the necessary staffing and the standards of country schools.

I re-affirm what I undertook to do when I met the students at their last deputation. I have already said that I promised to receive submissions on the travelling problems of the students at Western Teachers College, who were rather peculiarly placed because of the division of their college into three different annexes, and I believe that probably we can do something about this difficulty. I also said that we would consider making an advance grant to M students and to new intakes at the beginning of the year. Further, I said that I would consider the whole matter of sets of multiple textbooks, and this afternoon I have replied to a question asked by the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) with particular reference to that matter.

Although I do not intend to read the whole question asked and the answer given, I think I should tell the House that the arrangements that have been decided upon for the provision, housing and handling of multiple sets of textbooks have been thoroughly discussed and considered by the principals of the five teachers colleges and the administrative officers of the department, and that the decision has been made with the full approval of the principals, who favour the new system of allowances with which the provision of these textbooks is associated.

Mr. Langley: The ones who pay aren't in favour of it.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I have dealt with the matter thoroughly in three speeches

and I do not intend to go over it again for the benefit of the member for Unley.

Mr. Langley: They're not satisfied, I assure you.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I assure the honourable member that half of the students are satisfied, because they will get an improved allowance. It may interest the honourable member to know that a section of the agreement signed by the student, as well as by the Minister of Education and the guarantor, provides:

That the guarantor hereby guarantees that the student shall well and truly perform and observe all her covenants under this agreement, and that the guarantor will clothe, feed, lodge, and watch over the student during the continuance of this agreement in a manner befitting the position and status of the student.

I repeat that these allowances were never intended to meet every single expense incurred by a student in training at any of the five teachers colleges in South Australia. They are intended to help the student, and to help the parents to put the student through the colleges. Many of the teachers college students are better off than Commonwealth scholarship holders attending university, and they are better off than private students, who have to meet the costs of textbooks, fees and travelling expenses, and have to feed and clothe themselves and then look for jobs at the end of their courses. The trainee student ultimately enters a profession that has a very high reputation.

Despite what anyone else may say, the students are trained and are guaranteed a job at the end of their training; they will get entrance to a profession which qualifies them to get a position anywhere in the world and which gives them a chance to hold an honoured position in the community. A further point is that the students choose to enter the profession: they are not compelled to enter it. Many students become teachers because that is the profession to which they have dedicated themselves. A big majority of the teachers enter the profession not to get something out of it monetarily but because they enjoy teaching and want to follow that profession.

I go back to the matter of the provision of multiple sets of textbooks in the teachers colleges and university libraries. I, as Minister of Education (with the endorsement of Cabinet), have taken steps that I consider will meet the submissions that I understand the trainee teachers will make to me in due course. I have not received them yet. The Government intends to set up a committee

before the Estimates are prepared next year, comprising people like the Under Treasurer and the Auditor-General, who were loud in their criticism of the existing method of allocating allowances, the lack of control over travelling allowances, and the provision of textbooks on loan. Also, there could be a representative of the principals of the five teachers training colleges on the committee. I am not saying positively who will be on the committee, but it will comprise people at that level.

Mr. Hudson: Will you put a student teacher on it?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I do not know. These matters will be considered in due course. I am saying that a committee will be set up, that it will be of a high level, and that it will review the method of distributing allowances. This decision has resulted from recommendations made to me and endorsed by Cabinet, not as a result of any suggestions from the other side of the House. Until the present regulation was approved by Cabinet, the matter of student teacher allowances was far too fluid (it was a living allowance, plus travelling allowance, plus provision for the issue of textbooks on loan) to enable these aspects to be dealt with. However, now for the first time the reviewing of student teacher allowances will be considerably easier, because we will be considering a total allowance. I ask members to accept this regulation and to vote against its disallowance.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I support the motion, and it ill behoves the Minister or the Government to say that the changes being made have nothing to do with what the Opposition has said about this matter.

The Hon. Joyce Steele: These steps were taken before the Opposition made any fuss.

Mr. HUDSON: This is the first we have heard of that, and it seems to be a case of trying to adopt a bold front. Apart from that I should think that the role of Parliament was to discuss difficulties or to criticize Government policy, and that the Government should heed Parliamentary criticism. I am not satisfied with the Minister's statement that these things are being done not because of Parliamentary criticism but that they would have been done in any case.

I suggest that the increase to \$105 was the result of Opposition criticism, because it was the member for Whyalla who demonstrated from the figures given by the Minister that the average expenditure on each student for travel and books was not \$85 but \$101 a year. The

final change made by the Government to \$105 was done by taking \$101 to the next \$5, and that was as a consequence of the Opposition's action in Parliament. I challenge the Minister to deny that statement.

I suggest to the Minister that the information she gave to the member for Light this afternoon in a prompt reply to a question (I almost thought that the member for Light was getting favoured treatment) is not completely reassuring, because the ratio of one in 20 is not likely to be satisfactory in circumstances where reading-room space in teachers college libraries is inadequate. Experience at the Barr Smith library or the Flinders University library should not be taken as a guide to establish a ratio. In those institutions the reading-room space available is considerably greater than that in any teachers college. Because insufficient reading-room space is available in colleges some multiple copies will have to be stored away from the libraries, so that special arrangements will have to be made for college students to borrow books and take them away.

Books in heavy demand at the university libraries are placed on a special reserve list and cannot be removed from the library, but this system will not work in the teachers college libraries, because it presumes that there are adequate opportunities for students to read books when the library is open. Both university libraries are open at night as well as during the day, and the reading-room space available is greater. It is clear that next year teachers colleges will have to make special borrowing facilities available to students who wish to use the multiple copies of textbooks. It would be wise if the Minister re-examined the recommendations she has received from her officers. If special borrowing privileges, permitting a student to borrow a book for a few days or a week, have to be instituted because of the inadequate reading-room space, a ratio of one to 20 will not be appropriate. It would be wise for principals of teachers colleges to consult with the staff of the universities to find out the likely use of a particular book, because this will affect the demand for books. I make these points because it is essential that in the first year of the new scheme the Minister should over-provide books in the college libraries. The Education Department, because of the existing stock of textbooks on loan to students, would be able to over-provide multiple copies at no cost to the department.

Mr. Freebairn: That is understood.

Mr. HUDSON: It was not clear from the reply given to the honourable member's question today. The member for Light is aware of the position applying at universities where multiple copies of textbooks are held and where the books are placed on reserve at times of the year when a heavy demand is made on them and they must be read within the library premises. The extensive reading-room space available at the Barr Smith library is heavily over-taxed throughout the term.

Mr. Rodda: Are you suggesting it will be more heavily over-taxed?

Mr. HUDSON: The system at the Barr Smith library is not an appropriate system to be used in teachers college libraries, because the area of reading-room space cannot be compared. Also, the space at the Barr Smith library is already over-taxed, and the changes that have been introduced will further over-tax that accommodation. I hope someone in the Education Department will pay attention to what has been said in this Chamber, because special borrowing arrangements will have to be made within the teachers college libraries.

The Minister, when replying to a question asked by the member for Light today, made it clear that some books will be kept not in the library but in bookrooms. In these circumstances the college libraries will have to arrange to lend books to students for a few days or for a week, so that the rate of turnover of any book in the library will not be as high. Therefore, more multiple copies will be needed in order to satisfy students' demands. It would be the utmost folly if the department sold all the excess stock of books to students next year without keeping a sufficient stock in reserve to ensure that the students' demands could be effectively met.

On this matter, as the department has available to it a stock of books and as the Minister can effectively take out insurance and over-provide, there is no need to lay down in the first year of operation of this new scheme ratios that may turn out to be too restrictive. It would be wrong for principals of teachers colleges to contact a university and to find out from the university what kind of multiple copies were kept there and use that as a guide to teachers colleges, because the university ensures a much higher turnover of any multiple copies by the reserve system that operates. I know the Minister has not paid any attention to the remarks I am making—

The Hon. Joyce Steele: Yes, I have.

Mr. HUDSON: — but I hope someone at least within the Education Department will bother to read my remarks on this matter and will bother to advise the Minister properly, because I do not think the answers she gave the member for Light on this matter are satisfactory. I do not think it is good enough to say there will be a one in 20 ratio which will be greater for some books and less for others. In view of the fact that all the stock of books, which are currently on loan to students will be available to stock the libraries in the first place, I suggest in all earnestness that the department should over-stock the libraries to begin with, and not sell off an excessive number of these books to the students next year. If this is not done and we get extensive complaints from students next year that they cannot use the books in the library because they are always out on loan and there are not sufficient of them, and if it turns out that the Minister, through the department, has sold off all the other stock of books, so that the problem cannot be solved until more are purchased, I for one will want to know why. There is absolutely no reason at all against the Minister's over providing in the first place, and that is what I believe should be done. I hope it will be done, and I hope honourable members opposite will bring pressure to bear on the Education Department to ensure that it is done.

Secondly, I wish to deal with this matter of a breach of contract. No member on this side of the House, least of all the member for Whyalla, has said that a legal breach of contract is involved in what the Government has done in this matter. We are all aware that the small type in the teacher agreements permits the department to make variations from time to time. We are merely saying that the Government has been involved in a moral breach of contract concerning the expectations of students and the parents of students, and that from past experience nothing could have caused any parent or student to think that the Government would change the conditions of allowances for students in such a way as to make many of them worse off. What previous action by any Government could lead a parent or student teacher into believing that a Government would introduce changes to make those concerned worse off? Mostly, they would be aware of the possibility of an occasional review of the whole system of student allowances which would be directed towards making students and the parents who were supporting them better off (not worse

off), and the whole point that the Opposition has been making on this matter is that morally the department and the Government have been involved in a breach of contract.

I listened with interest to what the Minister had to say about the advertisement submitted by the student teachers (the State Council of South Australian Student Teachers) and the South Australian Institute of Teachers. The Minister was able to make one or two points of criticism about inaccuracy in that advertisement, but I point out that if the cap fits one should wear it. The Minister herself on September 18 failed to mention anything about book allowances in the other States. The only comment she made then was that no other State had a lending scheme similar to the one operating in South Australia, and she said at page 1245 of *Hansard*:

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.

That is Western Australia, and in the comparison she made this afternoon, repeating what she had said on October 2, the Minister completely failed to take into account the Western Australian travelling allowances. Those allowances were not taken into account, and if one is going to pay much attention to this great order of priorities and the list of who's who concerning the various States, and if the Minister insists on including the \$105 in the South Australian figure and criticizes the students and the institute for not doing it, when that \$105 includes a travelling allowance, surely the Western Australian figure should be upgraded for travel; but it is not so upgraded. The comparison that should be made, if one is made, is between South Australia and Western Australia. For the first year of training, without a boarding allowance, for South Australia it is \$805 and for Western Australia it is \$785 plus travel plus (I suspect also, despite the Minister's answer this afternoon) the book allowance, because no mention was made of the book allowance being included in that \$785 for Western Australia when the figures were given to the House on September 18 or October 2. It was only in answer to my interjection this afternoon that the Minister said the Western Australian figure included the book allowance, but it certainly does not include the travelling allowance. It is clear, when these figures are examined, that South Australia is running not third but fourth, because the travelling allowance provided in Western Australia

would undoubtedly place Western Australia ahead of South Australia. If I were a student teacher or a member of the institute, I should take the Minister's criticisms of this advertisement rather hard, because her own figures are misleading.

The Hon. Joyce Steele: They were the figures supplied to me by the heads of the departments in the various States.

Mr. HUDSON: Does this figure for Western Australia (\$785) include travel? It does not. There is no mention of travel, and it cannot include travel, because the Western Australian scheme for travel is similar to that of South Australia currently in operation, and the amount varies from student to student. This is the basic allowance without travel but the figure of \$805 for South Australia does include travel.

The Hon. Joyce Steele: It will as from next year.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, but the Minister's criticism of the students was on the basis that the students did not include the \$105 in their figure.

The Hon. Joyce Steele: I said they did not have a footnote mentioning anything about travel. No special reference was made to the fact that in South Australia travel allowances were being provided at present.

Mr. HUDSON: The Minister does not have a footnote in *Hansard* in connection with these tables, and there is nothing about travel in Western Australia.

The Hon. Joyce Steele: When speaking previously on this matter, in the House, I said that the only other State which paid a travel allowance similar to that in South Australia was Western Australia.

Mr. HUDSON: But the Minister did not include the travel allowance that applies when she made tabular comparisons. All I am pointing out to the Minister is that, on any consistent interpretation, even after the \$105 is added on to the figures, South Australia is fourth and not third, because, if the Western Australian figures were upgraded with the travel allowance that applies there, they would be above those in South Australia, and there is no doubt about that in my mind.

Mr. Clark: Before 1965 they would have been lower still.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, although they are lower now if we take the true position. I suspect that, if the \$40 book allowance is not included, that figure as well should be added to the \$785 that applies in Western Australia in the first and second year of training to get

a proper figure there. When figures are being peddled around it is easy to make comparisons. It is all right to suggest that, regarding a footnote, students have committed an inaccuracy, but I suggest to the Minister that she should tell her officers to put her own house in order on that point. I do not think it really matters whether South Australia is third, fourth or fifth in this connection. An important matter of principle is involved which the Minister studiously seeks to avoid and which is this: the average income of the parents of student teachers at our teachers colleges I believe to be substantially less than the average income of parents of other students at tertiary institutions. One of the reasons many students go to a teachers college is that an allowance is provided. Their parents are not in a position to provide for them as well as to pay for their fees while they study at a university.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Departmental research has shown that.

Mr. HUDSON: I have no doubt that it would. For many students, going to the teachers college is the only way they can afford to get to the university.

The Hon. Joyce Steele: You're suggesting that they have only a mercenary interest.

Mr. HUDSON: I am not suggesting that at all; the Minister can ignore the facts of life if she wishes.

The Hon. Joyce Steele: I am not ignoring anything.

Mr. HUDSON: I suggest that the Minister consult her department on this point, because I believe she will find that the income distribution among parents of student teachers involves a much higher percentage in the lower income group than does the income distribution of parents of university students who are not student teachers. For someone who cannot get a scholarship, university fees these days are heavy. Many able students cannot get a scholarship yet still have the ability to go to the university. If their parents receive a low income, those parents cannot afford to pay the fees; parents in the middle income bracket cannot afford to pay the fees as well as to provide a living allowance for their children. This fact alone has forced many parents to make the second best choice for their children when they leave school and to say, "We would prefer you to be able to go to the university without any tie or bond and without being committed, even to be a teacher for three years, but, because of the financial position in which we are placed, the best we can do is to support you if you take on one of these

teacher-trainee scholarships." It is no good the Minister's trying to cover up the position by saying that I am attributing mercenary motives to people. People have to live and support other members of their families.

Mr. Clark: Did you hear the Minister say that 50 per cent were happy because they were getting more? Isn't that mercenary?

Mr. HUDSON: No-one knows whether 50 per cent of the students will get more: that depends on the distribution. It may be that far fewer than 50 per cent of the students will be better off. In fact, the only presumption for suggesting that even 50 per cent will be better off is to presume that students will not buy their books or will buy only one or two. If they buy all the books previously on loan to them, then none of them will be better off. The only way of presuming that some could be better off under this arrangement would be to presume that, as a consequence of what the Government has done in this matter, students will use the library and buy only a few books, spending only \$25 or \$30 in this way. That is all they will be able to afford to spend and any other books they need they will get from the library, borrow from a friend, or obtain in some other way.

I am sure that the Minister is aware that the facts of the matter are that, in many cases, if students were to buy all the books previously provided, the cost to them would exceed \$100 and in some cases it would be much higher than that. As I am a member of the management committee of the University Bookroom, I am painfully aware of the price of books, especially when I come to pay my bill for the purchase of books. Although the Minister has, on various occasions, spoken on this question of student allowances (and we have been led to believe by people that a figure of \$800 a year is a tremendously generous allowance), my mind reverts to the years in Sydney when I taught part-time. I put myself through university, which was a somewhat painful process, and at that time I had an allowance of \$8 a week—that is what I earned from my part-time teaching. Although I was completely untrained and had not been processed by a teachers college anywhere, I managed to get a teacher's job. For a while I taught full-time and then, in order to concentrate more on my university course, I taught part-time, and I survived on \$8 a week, only by dint of not paying anything at home. This was in 1949 and 1950. This was prior to the great inflation. My effective annual allowance of \$400 a year was

worth more than \$800 today as prices have more than doubled since then.

Many of these students today have parents in a much worse financial position than mine were in. My parents were in a position where they could afford to provide board and lodging for me for nothing, but many of the parents today, with sons and daughters at the teachers colleges, must demand of these students that they make a contribution towards their board. Because many of these students who come from the poorer homes in the community have to provide not only for themselves out of their allowance and for their books, travel, clothes and entertainment but also have to make a contribution, often substantial, to their board and lodging at home, they and their parents will be in great difficulty next year.

I remember arranging for one student as a mid-year entry into Wattle Park this year. This student, who travels from Seacliff to Magill every day and who occasionally has to travel from Magill to Wattle Park, has told me that her travel expenses amount to about \$170 or \$180 a year. If this student makes reasonable expenditure on books, this, added to her travel expenses, will mean that it will cost her about \$250 a year, for which the department compensates her to the tune of only \$105. Effectively, she will be \$145 a year worse off. The Minister may say that this is an extreme case, but I point out to her that there are these extreme cases.

Mr. Clark: The student travels from where?

Mr. HUDSON: Seacliff to Magill.

Mr. Clark: I think some of them travel from Gawler.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, but travelling from Seacliff to Magill is probably almost as bad as travelling from Gawler to Magill. I am sure the member for Gawler agrees with my point that students who have to travel these long distances will be much worse off as a result of the change. It is no good the Minister saying, "That is compensated for by the fact that there are people better off." The reason the travel scheme was first introduced was to provide for the disabilities of certain students. After all, it is not so much against the department's interests to do this, because if the student who lives at Seacliff decides to board near Magill, the department is up for another \$250 in terms of a boarding allowance. This is something that is in the department's interests. As a significant percentage of student teachers have parents who are on a lower

income and who have difficulties in making ends meet, and if the criticism that has been made of the existing travel voucher scheme by people such as the Auditor-General and the Under Treasurer is a valid criticism (and I think they have grounds for making the criticism, as it is an unsatisfactory scheme from the point of view of checking and from the amount of administrative time involved), the Minister and the Government should be under some obligation to work out a simpler scheme to replace it and still meet the needs of students.

The Opposition has suggested that there is such a scheme and has proceeded with this motion for disallowance in the hope that at this late stage the Government will finally come to its senses and recognize that it has made a first-class blunder and that it is not too late to rectify the situation. It would not be difficult to provide that travel allowances be paid on a yearly basis and assessed, first, in terms of the distance a student had to travel between home and the college in question; secondly, how much travel was involved for any student between different parts of the college, particularly in the case of students at Western; and thirdly, how much travel was involved for the student in moving from the college to the university. That would apply particularly to students at Western and Wattle Park and, later, Salisbury doing university work. This would not be difficult. In working out such a scheme exact figures would not be needed: something to the nearest \$10 would be acceptable to the great majority of students. All that is necessary in these circumstances is that each student receive a travel allowance in terms of the mileage from home to the college. The exact mileage would not have to be known: as long as it was, for example, between seven and eight miles, the allowance appropriate for that distance would apply. It could be determined as an annual allowance and paid gradually throughout the year as part of the student's normal payment. The only requirement would be for the student to sign a certified statement as to place of residence, and in the statement to guarantee to notify the department of any change of address. I consider that 99.9 per cent of the students would play along with such a scheme, which would meet the needs of the students and the department, because it would be administratively simple: one determination at the beginning of each year as to how far a student lives from the teachers college, and no further administration would be necessary. The

criticisms of the Auditor-General and the Under Treasurer would be fully met.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: If their criticism was valid it should have been cheaper.

Mr. HUDSON: That is correct. This matter is one of the Government's responsibilities. If the Auditor-General and the Under Treasurer can make a valid criticism of the scheme currently in operation, it should not be replaced by something that does not meet the basic needs of the students. Surely it is incumbent on the Minister and her officers to work out a scheme which is acceptable to the Auditor-General and the Under Treasurer and which, at the same time, meets the needs of student teachers. These are real needs; they are not the kind of needs that can be laughed off by saying, "Fifty per cent of them are better off anyway." These are not the kind of needs that can be met by saying, "They will lose their dignity." If every cent counts, dignity is no substitute for the few dollars that is taken away. One or two members of the Government have had to make every cent count. In those circumstances, it does not help to say, "Well, I am more dignified."

The Government has failed lamentably to use its imagination to find an alternative scheme, such as the Opposition has suggested, if it regards the current arrangements as unsatisfactory. Regarding the book scheme that is now being instituted in the colleges, the Government has shown the same lack of imagination and foresight as it has shown in relation to the whole lamentable handling of this matter. I seriously request the Minister to consider grossly over-providing for books in teachers college libraries, and thereby to make sure she has a margin. After all, if the department over-provides and the provision is found to be excessive, it will not matter. The excess can be sold off to the students who commence in 1970. The Opposition has persisted in this matter long and hard and it is continuing to do so. However, it has made but few advances against the Government's attitude.

I do not blame the Minister only, because I think not only the Auditor-General and the Under Treasurer were involved but also the whole Cabinet, because all Cabinet members saw a way of saving a few dollars. The Treasurer would favour any method of saving a few dollars, and other Ministers whose estimates had been cut would also favour saving a few dollars in someone else's department in the hope that it would mean a few more dollars for their own departments. So,

it is not fair to ask the Minister to take the whole blame for this matter: I blame the Government, which has shown a short-sighted attitude and an ignorance of the students' real needs. I think the Government as a whole has shown an appalling lack of imagination and complete inability to work out an alternative. It has just blundered on like a rhinoceros.

Mr. McAnaney: Didn't you use the library at the university?

Mr. HUDSON: In 1950 I was living on an allowance of \$400, which is much more, in real terms, than the \$800 that student teachers will be receiving. On Sundays, quite apart from Saturdays, I trooped along to the public library in New South Wales.

The SPEAKER: I hope the honourable member will not get into a repetition of his argument. The interjection of the member for Stirling was half an hour too late.

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Stirling was at least half an hour too late. I used to use the libraries in Sydney on Saturdays and Sundays. Tomorrow I will ask the Minister of Education whether teachers college libraries will be open in the evening and on Saturdays and Sundays. The hours of the Flinders University library have recently been extended to 10.30 p.m. or 11 p.m., because of the extra demands of the students. Will such hours be kept by teachers college libraries? If they will not be kept, more books will be needed.

It is hard going to try and convince Government members on this matter. As you, Mr. Speaker, clearly explained, Government members are always half an hour behind the times. I hope you, Sir, will see the logic of my argument and support us on this occasion in the full knowledge that the Government can work out a scheme which has imagination, which can be administered efficiently, and which will satisfy the real needs of the students concerned and of their parents. I appreciate that you, Mr. Speaker, have a real responsibility in this matter and that you are aware of that responsibility, so I hope that you, for once, will exercise that responsibility wisely.

Mr. FREEBAIRN secured the adjournment of the debate.

FLUORIDATION

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mrs. Byrne:

That in the opinion of this House a referendum should be held to decide whether action

should be taken by the Government for the addition of fluoride to the water supplies of this State.

which Mr. Evans had moved to amend by striking out "a referendum should be held to decide whether action should be taken by the Government for" and inserting "is desirable" after "State".

(Continued from October 9. Page 1779.)

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I do not want to cast a silent vote on this issue as Government members obviously are soon going to cast a silent vote on what is probably a more important matter. I wish to make my attitude clear and I hope to do so fairly briefly and succinctly. First, I congratulate the member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne) on her courage, initiative and sincerity in moving this motion. A moment ago someone was accused of being half an hour late. I am afraid I am half an hour late, because I wanted to congratulate the member for Barossa at the beginning of my speech. The member for Barossa, however, is not here to hear my opening remarks, so I shall have to make sure that she reads *Hansard* to appreciate my kind remarks about her.

That being clear, I hope, I very much regret that I do not share her views, so I cannot support a referendum on this matter. Nevertheless, I do not believe that the Government has acted correctly in this matter, nor do I believe that a matter like this (whilst I do not consider it appropriate for it to be subject to a referendum) should be subject to administrative action by a Government. It should be done by a decision of Parliament. It is obvious that the Government has no mandate to do what it is doing. My personal view is that the Attorney-General, who we know has been a great proponent of fluoridating public water supplies for many years and who is still probably the strongest link in a weak Cabinet, saw the Tasmanian report and said, "Well, here is an excuse. We will get into it straight away and we will not let Parliament have a say in it. We have the power to do it administratively and we will do it that way." I believe that is probably what happened. Immediately the announcement was made every member received many letters from the anti-fluoridation people.

Whilst I agree that those people are entitled to their views, many of the letters were of a hysterical nature. We are now being inundated with roneoed letters favouring fluoridation, and I am dealing with these letters as a distinguished colleague dealt with letters

that he did not want to read: he "short-handed" them, and his idea of shorthanding them was to put them straight into the waste paper basket. The thousands of letters that I have received from my district, which comprises about 45,000 people, have also gone into the waste paper basket. If the writers of these letters think that, by sending these circular letters to me, they will influence my vote in this House, let me disabuse their minds about that.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Your vote is never influenced.

Mr. JENNINGS: No, I always do what I think is right.

Mr. McAnaney: You can't be right very often, then.

Mr. JENNINGS: I think I am always right. On a couple of occasions when I voted on Party lines although I thought the Party was wrong, I found out soon afterwards that the Party was right and that I had been wrong. The organizer of the sending out of these roneoed letters writes the name of the particular electoral district, in lead pencil, in the top corner of the circular, and he also signs them for transmission to the appropriate member. My friend the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) received one such letter today (I know he will not mind my mentioning this) as follows:

I want fluoridation for this city's water supply, and I support the Government in its actions to introduce these public health measures.

That letter was signed by a person in Bute! I fancy that the member for Wallaroo has probably replied to that constituent, telling him that when Bute is regarded as having city status he will consider his letter.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: I heard that he replied in two words—"You beaut!"

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes. The comments of Mr. J. F. Irwin, President of the South Australian Branch of the Australian Dental Association, are reported in the *News* of September 27 as follows:

Australian Dental Association (South Australian Branch) president, Mr. J. F. Irwin, today criticized members of Parliament over their handling of the fluoridation issue. One would have expected members of Parliament to take the opportunity of learning something about fluoridation before criticizing it, he said. Mr. Irwin was commenting on a move in the State Parliament to delay the Government plan to fluoridate the South Australian water supply. He said the 59 members of Parliament had been invited to attend a dental education conference in Adelaide on October 7 and 8, at which Australian experts would speak on various facets

of fluoridation. Questions on all aspects of the subject would be answered at the conference. Of all the people who have opposed the Government plan in Parliament, only two have accepted the invitation to attend the conference, Mr. Irwin said. One of these is Mrs. Byrne, M.P., who has given notice she will move next week for a referendum on the question—even before she attends the conference at which the question will be discussed. The other is Mr. Whyte, M.L.C. Only 11 other members have accepted invitations to the conference. Twenty four have declined, and the remaining 24 have not even had the courtesy to reply.

Mr. Rodda: We didn't all get letters, though.

Mr. Clark: Mrs. Byrne replied to the invitation.

Mr. Rodda: Did you get a letter?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, but I do not know whether I replied. Although Mr. Irwin is certainly an authority on dentistry—

Mr. Hurst: Are you sure of that?

Mr. JENNINGS: I think we can take that for granted. However, he knows very little about public relations if he wants to influence members of Parliament and yet makes a statement such as that. At that time Mrs. Byrne had not criticized fluoridation, nor do I think any other member had criticized it. Mrs. Byrne attended the conference, and apparently the Hon. Mr. Whyte also attended. Mr. Irwin should have known the interest of members in this matter, because certain members spoke to him on the telephone, and he shows his abysmal ignorance of the duties and obligations of a member of Parliament if he thinks we can attend a conference on a Friday when probably we have had that Friday booked up a month in advance.

Mr. McAnaney: The conference was on a Monday.

Mr. JENNINGS: Well, what difference does that make? If the conference had been held on a Tuesday, I suppose we would have had to adjourn the House in order to attend! In any case, on the Monday the member for Whyalla would have been cycling to Coober Pedy before breakfast! Mr. Irwin knew of my interest in this matter, because I telephoned him immediately the Government's intention was known and had a long and interesting conversation with him. I asked him whether he would send to me and, if he could, to other members any valuable information on this subject, because it was inevitable that we would get many letters, not only from people genuinely interested in fluoridation but also from others whom we could describe as being a little on the fringe. Mr. Irwin

agreed to do that, and as far as I know he sent a booklet to each member. That was at my request. Mr. Irwin will not deny that but, by implication, he criticizes me for not attending this conference. Well, Mr. Irwin knows his profession, and he should acknowledge that we, too, know our job.

Mr. Clark: We all have an enormous amount of material for and against it.

Mr. JENNINGS: We have now. An old definition of a referendum is, "The people who know or can find out asking the people who don't know, and can't find out, what they should do." That is the position in which we would be placing ourselves if we delegated our responsibility on this matter and went to the people to ask their views.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you think that is the case with every referendum?

Mr. JENNINGS: There are different kinds of referenda. Some subjects are suitable to be put to people by way of a referendum, but they are subjects that everyone in the community fully understands, or something which has been put to the people in a policy speech and for which a Party has a mandate. The best example is the case of lotteries in South Australia. One does not have to be interested in the finer things of life or to have a great knowledge of things generally to know whether one favours having a lottery, particularly as the matter was canvassed in this State for at least 15 years before the people had an opportunity to decide it by a referendum.

Mr. Broomhill: You think this is different?

Mr. JENNINGS: It is completely different. People were asked to give their opinions on something on which they were well qualified to vote.

Mr. McAnaney: You still believe in one vote one value?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, and this referendum was based on one vote one value. The previous Government did not give the people an opportunity to decide the issue. The former Liberal Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, said that giving people a referendum on a lottery would be like putting poison in the hands of children. The member for Stirling seems to think that this is something different. Sir Thomas Playford always refused any move for a lottery, which is a simple matter. He opposed a referendum on it despite the fact that the Government elected in 1965 had a mandate to conduct a referendum on that issue, and he opposed the Bill to have a referendum because, he said, it would be like putting poison in the hands of children.

However, a referendum on a lottery is a satisfactory referendum, because people are able to understand the question. In the Tasmanian Commissioner's report on fluoridation, Part K, Terms of Reference, Question 3, is as follows:

Whether it is practicable and desirable to leave the decision whether or not to add fluoride to water supplied to the public to local or other public authorities responsible for such supply and if not to whom should such decision be entrusted?

Mr. Clark: To a minority Government!

Mr. JENNINGS: No, I am entrusting it to a responsible Parliament. The Commissioner said:

This question has posed difficulties. I have interpreted it broadly so as to require from me an unmistakable recommendation as to the political level at which the decision whether to fluoridate or not should be taken. To construe it more narrowly would, I feel, leave unanswered some of the major matters that underlie the question and which have been debated at length before me. I am conscious that a Royal Commissioner is unhappily placed in dealing with matters which involve both political decision and constitutional responsibility. Factors which are political in their content merely are not capable of assessment in an inquiry of this sort nor is it part of my function to say whether they should or should not be allowed to modify recommendations which I make based on technical considerations of benefit to be achieved and efficacy in its provision. In what follows I seek to place considerations of the latter kind in a traditional context of administrative and constitutional responsibility.

As such, the decision should be one of Government taken in and by the lawfully constituted repository of sovereignty in the State which is Parliament. To me the question asked admits of no other answer. In a unitary constitution founded on traditional principles of British constitutional law, Parliamentary sovereignty is unique and indivisible; whatever be the responsibilities that may be kept in mind in its exercise, it—sovereignty—is shared with no other body, not even the electorate.

The member for Adelaide had something similar to say yesterday when he suggested that the Speaker gave a reason why he voted a certain way on a matter only recently.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order in referring to that.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes. I thought that you, Sir, would soon pull me up on that. However, I am now pointing out that those honourable members making derisive remarks about what the Tasmanian Commissioner said were loud in their plaudits of the member for Adelaide yesterday when he said something similar. The Commissioner then said:

I do not feel called upon to discuss the political theory of a referendum at length. I have referred to the fact that they have no place in the constitutional theory and structure of a unitary State in relation to matters within its sovereignty. In such matters Parliament has legislative supremacy and I would add, with respect, responsibility. Neither is shared with, though they derive from, the electorate. A referendum is an innovation of federal unions of otherwise sovereign States. They no doubt reflect the uneasy union in which such federal bodies are often conceived and do so by reposing, generally as to a limited class of matters only, ultimate sovereignty in a body which may be the electorate at large, but which at any rate is other than the Parliament or elected assembly. In federal unions of States they serve political purposes quite removed from the exercise of constitutional powers of Government in unitary constitutions.

What I read there was the Commissioner's view on referring matters of this nature to a referendum.

Mr. Broomhill: On legislative matters.

Mr. Clark: That has no fluoride in it, anyhow.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow these interjections to continue. They are not helping the honourable member. If members do not agree with what the honourable member is reading, I suggest that they write a thesis on the Commissioner's findings and forward it to the member for Enfield.

Mr. JENNINGS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I received a thesis from any of those sources, it would be short-handed straight into the wastepaper basket. I know that members on this side of the House do not often have the opportunity of interjecting when I am speaking so they are taking advantage of the present situation. If a referendum is held on this matter, as I have already said, it will mean that we shall be abrogating our responsibilities as members of Parliament. If we had a referendum on any or every matter in dispute, we might as well not have a Parliament; we could just say, "All right; it would not be a bad thing if we were kept on in our jobs at the same salary for life", or something like that. All we would have to do would be to say, "We will have an Executive appointed to hold a referendum on any contentious subject and we will let the people decide for themselves what we shall do."

When I began speaking, I said I did not like the high-handed way in which the Government was dealing with this matter by acting administratively instead of legislatively. I congratulated the member for Barossa on her courage and initiative in moving this motion. I regret

having to oppose her on it. However, we shall agree in the future on much more important matters than this. The breach, if any, shall soon be healed. If we support the amendment, Parliament will have an opportunity to decide the issue and that, I think, will overcome the Government's high-handed action of rushing to introduce fluoride into the water mains without the matter being properly considered. It is not my fault that I have spoken for so long: the fault lies in the rude interjections I have received from members on this side of the House.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands): I support the amendment that the addition of fluoride to the State's water supplies is desirable. The controversy over this matter has raged all over the world for probably 20 years, at least since the first fluoride was added to water somewhere in the world. In that time, the argument has continued and, as one argument started on one side of the world has been picked up and used in other parts of the world, so it has become something of an international debate. Like many other people who have no technical knowledge of this matter, I am guided by the experts. In this case, I desire to see who the experts are and whose opinions I am to consider, and I particularly desire to know whether the experts are divided on the issue. Concerning matters on which the experts are seriously divided, the layman is naturally cautious. However, this is not such a divided issue: almost every dentist is in favour of the addition of fluoride. Of course, we greatly respect our dentists in Australia; we afford them a high standard of education and training; and they are respected by the community.

Naturally, one wishes to know whether fluoride will cause any harm medically to people who consume it in the water supply, but the majority of doctors support the dentists in this matter. The medical profession in South Australia, in which we have great confidence, is so overwhelmingly in favour of the addition of fluoride, and has been so forthright in saying that there is no need to fear medical harm, that I think we must be influenced accordingly. None of the doctors or dentists stands to gain in this matter. Those who stand to gain particularly are the children, for many agree that the dental health of our children is poor. Although we live in a country whose people are considered among the healthiest and strongest physically in the world, there is much room for improvement concerning den-

tal health. Where fluoride has been added to water supplies in various parts of the world, controversy has often arisen, but in almost every case doctors and dentists have said that the addition of fluoride has led to a marked improvement in dental health, and few professional people are opposed to fluoride.

The names of those who are opposed to it are becoming known to all of us, for they crop up repeatedly in debates that take place around the world, and the people concerned are dealt with in the Tasmanian Commissioner's report, as far as I can see, in a fairly devastating way. I have read the journal of the American Dental Association, which reports that that body has examined the histories of some of the people opposed to fluoridation. Some of the literature I have seen emanating from those opposed to fluoridation is plainly ridiculous. I am ready in this matter to follow advice of our experts—members of our highly qualified dental and medical professions. The question then arises: what does one do about introducing fluoridation? The member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings), criticizing the Government, used the term "high-handed". As members of the former Labor Ministry would know, it is difficult to win when in Government; if we take action, which we are entitled to take (it is our duty to govern in the best way possible and within the permitted bounds), we are sometimes accused of being high-handed. I can imagine what the member for Enfield would say to a Government's bringing matters unnecessarily before Parliament. Had the Government, knowing full well that an administrative decision was involved here and that it had power to act, introduced the matter into Parliament as the subject of a debate, I think the member for Enfield would have made a powerful denunciation of our time-wasting. This Parliament probably has the freest system of any democratic Parliament in the world.

Mr. Virgo: Don't let us kid ourselves that it is democratic.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: We have two Houses comprising 59 members in all, and everyone has an opportunity to speak for as long as he wishes in the widest possible terms. In fact, members are almost able to make speeches during Question Time. I do not know that one would find a Parliament elsewhere that was so easy-going in relation to allowing members to say what they thought as often as they wished to do so. In this

case, as the Government has taken an administrative decision, which is now being legitimately debated in Parliament, why accuse the Government of being high-handed? I am against referenda, for to my mind the subjects of referenda are almost always subjects that should be dealt with by Parliament itself. The people expect us to govern and, although we may expect the people to criticize our decisions at times, we are not expected to refer to them all sorts of question, saying, in effect, "We can't make up our minds; we'll leave it to you." The big problem with referenda relates to informing the public fully on the particular issue involved. The public can clearly and intelligently make up its mind on many questions that do not involve obtaining considerable technical information. The addition of fluoride to the public water supplies should be a matter for grave and profound study, at least as much as members of Parliament are able to give it. Indeed, they can give it much more profound study than can the members of the public. Perhaps all of us do not study these subjects as much as a professional man would, but at least we have the opportunity to make those studies in a fairly profound manner, and it is our responsibility to stand up to the decisions. However, if we put this sort of question to a referendum we could find that the issue becomes completely clouded by information, some good and some false.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you think Parliament ought to decide the question?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Certainly.

Mr. Clark: Why were we denied a vote on it then?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: If the honourable member was here a few minutes ago he would not have asked that question; nor would the member for West Torrens.

Mr. Broomhill: But you have not answered it yet.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member says I have not answered it; I have not answered it in the last three minutes, the time during which he has been in the House. However, I have discussed it before, and if he reads *Hansard*, he will see what I have said. I would like to spend more time answering it if I thought it would do any good, but I am convinced from the attitude of the member for Gawler that he is not prepared to listen to my argument.

Mr. Clark: I am indeed.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I spoke about this a few minutes ago, and if I repeated what I said he would not accept it.

Mr. Clark: I based my whole argument on this when I spoke—

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This is a free and easy Parliament, and probably no other Parliament in the world gives as many opportunities for expression as are given to members here. I will not carry on with this, although the honourable member appears to be showing an interest in it.

Mr. Clark: I am genuine, too.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Then I will repeat some of what I had said.

Mr. Broomhill: It is no good letting the Minister of Works prompt you. We were not satisfied with what he had to say about it.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member is displaying an uncharacteristic attitude, because he does not generally try to lead speakers off the track, although it appears that he is doing so this time. I only asked my colleague whether there was any urgency about my finishing tonight, because I have not got a planned programme. The honourable member just walked in and started tackling me about matters which I had referred to a few minutes before his arrival. I notice the Government was criticized for being high-handed in this matter, and I pointed out that the Government has certain powers and responsibilities, and that it carries out those duties.

The SPEAKER: I do not think I can allow the Minister so much repetition. There is too much of it.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: All right, Sir.

Mr. Clark: We will go to the trouble of reading it in *Hansard*.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I thank the honourable member for that, because that is the only way he will find out. I would have been glad to help him but he will have to read it now and do the best he can. A referendum is suitable only where people can be widely informed on a subject, and I believe a referendum in this case is not the correct way to decide the matter.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you think the Minister is unable properly to inform the public?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: There is too much information necessary for anyone to make up his mind about such a question on a referendum. The question requires quite detailed technical information, such as that available to members of Parliament. Although

we are not experts we are able to read up on these matters fairly carefully. I notice that the supporters of referenda are always arguing that we should have them and they point out the number of places in the world where the fluoridation of water has been discontinued. However, they never say what part they themselves or their supporters played in the change of heart of a community's water administration. So often a referendum is held or some kind of a decision is taken to stop the fluoridation of water as a result of very intensive campaigning by the people opposed to fluoridation. Indeed, towns in many parts of the world have discontinued the addition of fluoride to their water supply, and this has been the result of intensive campaigning by the anti-fluoride groups. Every time we have this debate they say, "Which towns have changed their minds on this matter?" But they never admit the part that they themselves have played in campaigning for such a referendum. I believe it is easier to cloud the issue with false information in this issue than in almost any other that I can think of. Some weeks ago information was sent to me by an anti-fluoride group (I do not know which one), which information contained many charges about radiators in motor cars rotting out. I think the gutterings on Parliament House have fallen off and have had to be replaced, and there have been all sorts of charges of people dying as a result of fluoride poisoning. As fast as these accusations are made the serious-minded group in favour of fluoride try to trace the facts and as soon as they are able to do that, they find that the particular instance had been misrepresented. So another instance arises and more charges about fluoride poisoning are levelled. This means, of course, that there is an endless stream of new charges about the dangers of fluoride.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you think—

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member for West Torrens has interjected enough, but perhaps I will give him one more go.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you think in all these places where there has been a referendum all these people have been wrong?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I do not know what the result of the referendum was. Is the honourable member asking whether people have been wrong when they have reversed their opinions?

Mr. Broomhill: Yes.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I think they have been wrong in discontinuing the fluoridation of water supplies. In fact, a town in western America has reversed its decision twice. First it had fluoridation and then, as a result of criticisms of it, it discontinued the addition of fluoride to its water supplies. In three or four years the dental health of the children deteriorated to such an extent that that town altered its policy again and it now adds fluoride to its water. I do not think another referendum would succeed there. A much longer campaign caused the town to change its mind. It has changed its mind twice.

Mr. Hudson: Which town was this?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have sent for the magazine, so I shall be able to give the town's name when I receive the magazine. The honourable member is laughing.

Mr. Hudson: Just a kindly chuckle.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I presume the honourable member is suggesting that I am making it all up, but I shall give him the name of this town as soon as the information arrives. Referenda are suitable for deciding issues on which the public can make up its mind without having to possess much technical information. As members of Parliament we are not living up to our responsibilities if we agree that a referendum should be held on fluoridation. We should stand up for our own opinions and tell the people what we are going to do and why we are going to do it. We should accept the full responsibilities of members of Parliament. If the amendment moved by the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Evans) is not carried, we shall have to decide whether there should be a referendum, and I say most definitely that we will be abrogating our responsibilities if we hand this matter back to the people and say, in effect, "Parliament cannot make up its mind." The dental health of our children largely depends on what we do.

Mr. Broomhill: And on what they eat.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: We know very well that only a few children will take fluoride in the form of tablets. Consequently, it can be administered effectively only through the water supply. We owe it to the younger generation to see that its dental health is improved by fluoridating the water supply. Therefore, I support the amendment.

Mr. GILES secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 15. Page 1897.)

Mr. VIRGO (Edwardstown): Last evening I said that the sentiments that the present Treasurer had expressed almost three years ago were extremely appropriate to the present position. Again I draw the attention of Government members, particularly the Premier, to this newspaper report (because I am restricted to that) of his policy speech of February 14 last:

When we are elected to Government, our first task will be to restore stability in the State's accounts.

Presumably, this is what the Government now pretends to do. The Premier explained how this would be done by saying:

We will do this by arranging a careful priority of spending, by making sure that we get value for our money in our spending, and by securing more money as a result of increased activity in industry and commerce.

Mr. Broomhill: What about stamp duties?

Mr. VIRGO: The Premier did not say one word about getting more money from increased stamp duties, increased hospital charges, or increased liquor licence fees. We had only the statement that the Government would secure more money as a result of increased activity in industry and commerce. However, we all know that there has been no increased activity in either sphere.

Mr. McKee: There's been a decrease, if anything.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes. The Premier even went so far as to say:

Take no notice of the sceptics who say we cannot do this.

Who were the sceptics? They were the people who were realistic enough to know that the Premier, in delivering his policy speech, either had his tongue in his cheek or was deliberately misleading the public.

Mr. Hudson: Only misleading?

Mr. VIRGO: Well, Standing Orders preclude my using the word I should like to use, and we all know exactly what is is.

Mr. Ryan: What is the first letter?

Mr. VIRGO: I have already used the word. I have already accused the Premier of being a certain type of person, and that applies also on this occasion.

Mr. Hudson: Does this relate to telling the truth?

Mr. VIRGO: It is a name given to people who do not tell the truth.

Mr. McKee: Is it a four-letter word?

Mr. VIRGO: Yes. I consider that the Premier is deliberately misleading the people

regarding finance. When he was questioned at meetings, following the delivery of his policy speech, about where he would get the finance, he would not answer. The implication was, "Wait until we get into power, and we will do certain things." The present Leader of the Opposition, who was then Premier, referred to this brown paper parcel that was full of surprises. And, boy oh boy, it is full of surprises for everybody!

Mr. Corcoran: It is full of nasty surprises.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes, it is full of nasty surprises.

Mr. Hudson: It was not really opened until June 22.

Mr. VIRGO: Of course, the Millicent by-election had much to do with it. Members opposite were not prepared to open it before that by-election; they were hoping to capture the seat of Millicent and get a constitutional majority so that they could resume the previous dictatorship that had lasted until 1965, when finally the people overcame it with the 56 per cent vote necessary for the Labor Party to succeed. I am reminded of a little pamphlet that the L.C.L. produced called *The Voice of South Australia* stating that, if State taxation was too high, it was caused by the Labor Government. We should refresh ourselves on a few points the L.C.L. made:

An 81-year-old retired South Australian says, "State taxation is too high".

We do not know who it is; it is just "an 81-year-old retired South Australian".

Mr. Broomhill: Of course, he feels much older today.

Mr. VIRGO: He was happy that the L.C.L.-dominated Legislative Council would not allow the State Labor Government to introduce fair succession duties. He could be one of those people—I do not know.

Mr. Clark: He would not be happy now.

Mr. VIRGO: No, because he is now getting it in the neck. The tragedy is that the L.C.L.'s method of levying taxation is to tax everybody at a flat rate. In that pamphlet was the following comment from a 38-year-old school teacher;

Labor has put up rates and prices, which hit the little man they are supposed to protect. I am wondering what this 38-year-old teacher has to say about the way this Government has treated student teachers and school teachers.

Mr. Broomhill: No-one opposite told us anything about that.

Mr. VIRGO: No. Members opposite were dumb last night and apparently they are not going to be much better tonight. They have been told to "shut up".

Mr. Hudson: I think one is allowed to speak tonight.

Mr. VIRGO: I am pleased that one member of the Government Party will say something because, so far, the only speech we have heard has been from the Treasurer.

Mr. Lawn: I understand that the member for Eyre (Mr. Edwards) will speak.

Mr. VIRGO: I shall be delighted to hear him. There are some other hypocritical claims that the present Government made when in Opposition, when it referred to the 33-year-old record librarian, who said that the Labor Government had increased taxation, including stamp duties and land tax. What does this record librarian say today? The most hypocritical of all these claims, however, is by a 29-year-old housewife—unnamed, of course; no-one knows who these people are. They are probably a figment of the imagination of whoever is the publicity officer of the L.C.L.

Mr. Broomhill: Is that the Attorney-General?

Mr. VIRGO: No. They employ a man who previously was in private practice and whom we attempted to interview on many occasions but could never find sober. The 29-year-old housewife is alleged to have said, "I don't like the Labor Government because it didn't mention before the election the putting up of land taxes, and the blaming the other Party for its mistakes." I think that is the complete indictment of the present Government. It mentioned not one word about increased taxation before the election, but what is it doing now? The Government members spoke during the Budget debate but they have not said much during this debate other than making one or two odd interjections, and the member doing the interjecting was told to pipe down. Government members are saying it is the fault of the Labor Government—"The Labor Government put us in this position; we have to get the State out of it." What ballyhoo!

Mr. Edwards: You're talking ballyhoo.

Mr. VIRGO: If the member for Eyre wishes to get up on his feet and try to defend his Government, I hope he will. It is time someone spoke up for the people of this State, who are not impressed with what members opposite are doing at present.

Mr. Clark: Even the member for Stirling is quiet.

Mr. VIRGO: Of course he is. Much has been said about the supposedly bad position in which the Treasury was left by the Labor Government and about our Government's extravagances.

Mr. Venning: Hear, hear!

Mr. VIRGO: Let the honourable member have the guts to stand up and take away the four weeks' annual leave the Labor Government provided; let him have the guts to get up and take away the equal pay provided for teachers; and let him have the guts to get up and say, "We'll take away the service pay from State Government employees." If these are the things that have put the State's finances in a perilous position, I am proud that the Labor Government is responsible. The people who are working for this State and who have made the State what it is (the Government employees) deserve more than they ever received under the Playford Liberal Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much interruption.

Mr. VIRGO: It took a State Labor Government to provide decent conditions for Government employees and, if Government members have the courage of their convictions, let them stand on their feet and take these things away. We saw the Minister of Works rushing in (more power to his e!bow) the other day to allow the flow-on of the \$1.35 wage increase.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Don't you agree with it?

Mr. VIRGO: I completely agree with it. I said "more power to the Minister's elbow", but let us not be hypocritical in saying that the State's finances are in a poor condition because of the conditions given the workers. If we had no workers, we would not have a State and members of this House, including me, would not be sitting where we are sitting today.

Mr. Allen: Who are the workers?

Mr. VIRGO: I am sure the member for Burra is not one of them. Every hive must have its drone.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much interruption. The member for Edwardstown is entitled to be heard.

Mr. VIRGO: I thank you for your protection, Mr. Speaker. One of the important things that, unfortunately, the Government, the Treasurer and, more particularly, the Premier are losing sight of when they continually talk of the need for a better State-Commonwealth financial relationship is that, the more the States impose taxes of this nature on the people, the less chance there will be of getting a better deal from the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. McKee: Do you know they have been instructed to do this by the head office in Canberra?

Mr. VIRGO: I am not sure whether they have or not, although it would not surprise me in the least if that were so because, although we hear so much of the free vote from members opposite, we have yet to witness it.

Mr. Hudson: Do you think Mr. Gorton postponed the election because of what this Government was doing?

Mr. VIRGO: I do not know why he postponed the election, but he was very wise to do so.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in the Bill regarding the Commonwealth election.

Mr. VIRGO: I return to the Treasurer's second reading explanation, on which we should compliment him because he used some very apt words. He said that the Bill gave effect to the announcement in the Budget speech relating to the imposition of a stamp duty. If ever there was an imposition, this was it. The greatest worry regarding this Bill is the second paragraph of the Treasurer's explanation, where he said:

Apart from the fact that receipts for salaries and wages and for superannuation pensions and like payments are exempt from duty, the Bill follows very closely the Act that has been in force in Victoria since February this year. This State is obviously becoming a satellite of Victoria. The great Sir Henry Bolte, when he comes out with some scheme—

Mr. Casey: Did you say "great"?

Mr. VIRGO: He thinks he is great. South Australia immediately looks at it and our Premier and Treasurer say, "Look! Bolte is getting some more money on this scheme. Let's get in and have a serve of the cherry".

Mr. Law: That is because our Government cannot think for itself.

Mr. VIRGO: Of course, and this State is becoming a satellite of Victoria. I took the trouble of having a look at what happened in Victoria when this Bill was introduced, and I know of at least one Government member who has done likewise. As our Treasurer has said, our Bill is fashioned on the lines of the Victorian Bill. On October 24, 1967 (at page 1185 of Victorian *Hansard*) Mr. Holding said:

The Opposition is opposed in principle to the proposed tax because its concept is bad. It is not a progressive tax, and its burden will not fall clearly and equitably within the community. The tax will fall equally and without discrimination on all members of the community. It will impose the same economic burdens upon the lower-income groups, the pensioners and the people least able to afford

it as upon the people in the higher-income group.

I do not think anyone could sum it up better, and I invite Government members to contradict it, if they can. I challenge Government members to deny that this measure will impose the same burdens on the pensioners and the poor people as it will on those who can afford to pay the additional tax, those who are today cheating the State of revenue. The statement made by the Treasurer when he was foreshadowing this tax is well worth consideration. He said:

If, by virtue of significantly increased wage awards, or for any other cause outside our control, there should be a threat of an ultimate deficit for this year, the Government will move immediately to renew its application to the Commonwealth for supplementary finance, and will press this to the stage of a formal application under the Commonwealth Grants Commission Act, if necessary.

There has been a significant increase, although certainly not a sufficient increase, in awards. As I said a few moments ago, more power to the elbow of the Minister of Labour and Industry for seeing that the Arbitration Court's decision was immediately applied to South Australian workers. Some people have suggested that the Minister's action was only an effort to avert industrial trouble, but I hope the Minister had the interests of the workers at heart. The Treasurer went on to say:

The Government would also be disposed if necessary, to submit to Parliament supplementary proposals which would not only authorize the unavoidable expenditures but would propose ways and means to finance them. What those ways and means may be if the Commonwealth will not assist it is not possible to forecast, but it must be apparent that this State and the States generally cannot indefinitely concede to the Commonwealth a complete monopoly of all forms of income tax if it does not offer adequate alternative resources—

and here is the dangerous sentence—

This comment applies to the possible subsequent extension of the new receipts duty to wages and salaries as well as to other taxes of a like nature.

So, we have been served notice that, if there are any award increases—and there have been—and if the Government mishandles the finances as it is doing at present, it will have no compunction about coming back and saying, "This tax will apply to wages and salaries." The State Government is entering the income tax field for no other reason than that the Victorian Government has entered the field. This Government has no mandate whatever to do these things: it is not even a Government representative of the majority of people, and

not one word of increased taxation was spoken during the election campaign by Liberal members. The most significant point—and here is another indication that the present Government follows the Victorian Government—is that, when a Bill on this matter went through the Victorian Parliament, the only member allowed to speak was the Premier, Sir Henry Bolte. He would not allow any other Government member to open his mouth, just as the Treasurer in this Parliament silences Government members on this issue.

Mr. McKee: One Government member is to be allowed to speak.

Mr. VIRGO: I hope so, because several Opposition members have spoken without any indication at all that a Government member desires to speak.

Mr. Broomhill: How can they support this proposal?

Mr. VIRGO: They cannot, because it is indefensible. However, they will have to accept the responsibility for its outcome. This is the thin edge of the wedge because, as the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) said last night, we are starting off now with 1c in \$10 as a turnover tax. Members must not kid themselves that it is a stamp duty, because it is a turnover tax, and we will soon reach the stage where, as in other countries, there will be a turnover tax of 3 per cent, 4 per cent or 5 per cent. The field is unlimited for an unscrupulous Government.

Mr. Hudson: Would you describe this Government as "unscrupulous"?

Mr. VIRGO: Yes, and irresponsible, and unrepresentative of the people of this State.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: You can do better than that.

Mr. VIRGO: Yes, I can, but I am certain that you, Mr. Speaker, would regard some of my adjectives as unparliamentary, and I do not wish to place you in the position of having to call me to order for using unparliamentary language. Finally, I say that this measure can become effective only if every member of the Government supports it and you, Mr. Speaker, give your casting vote in favour of it. Therefore, let it be quite plain: no member of the Government can go out of this House and blame the Treasurer for imposing on the people a tax of this nature, because every member who votes for it has to accept the responsibility for its imposition.

Honourable members should think carefully and well on whether they are prepared to go back to their electors and explain why they imposed this taxation on the people. It will be no good their going back to their electors

and merely saying, "We had to do it to balance the Budget and to pull South Australia out of the financial mess caused by the Labor Government," because that has worn out completely, and members opposite will personally have to accept the responsibility in their own districts for this action. I hope the mere fact that they have been silenced by their Treasurer will not lead them into a position of false security in which they believe that they can go back to their districts and blame the Treasurer for this action. They, by their votes, will accept the responsibility and will answer for this action, so they should think wisely and well before they do this. I remind Government members that it requires only one of them to show some common sense and vote against the Bill for it to fail, in which event this issue will never come about.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): The honourable member who has just resumed his seat has talked a lot about gutless wonders and such things as that, but I am sure that while he remains in this House we will never be short of tripe. I have been in Parliament five years now, and in my early days here I found it a courteous and respectful place in which we sometimes had differences of opinion. I think that in those days our politicians as a whole were held in fairly high esteem. There was no shortage of employment, and everyone in South Australia, whether an employer or an employee, could work. The member for Edwardstown should learn that there are only employers and employees, for we all work. Most people perform a useful function in our economy, although some employers and workers may not pull their weight. The member for Semaphore (Mr. Hurst) came here screaming about workers but he has not spoken that way since I reprimanded him.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much interruption.

Mr. McANANEY: When I first went on a farm, I did not know much about how to milk cows, but when the milking machine broke down one night I had to milk 80 cows.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think milking of cows is mentioned in the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY: The Liberal and Country League Opposition offered constructive criticism, but did not abuse the Government or call it dishonest or crook.

Mr. Lawn: You told us we were robbing the trust funds.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members to restrain themselves.

Mr. McANANEY: I support the Bill with a clear conscience and I admire the Treasurer's courage in acting to balance our Budget. Every responsible Treasurer will balance his Budget on day-to-day expenditure.

Mr. McKee: What about the Commonwealth Treasurer? Hasn't he got a deficit?

Mr. McANANEY: The member for Port Pirie has never been called a financial genius, and I may say that I have never asked to be called that, because I do not think I am. The Commonwealth has a Budget surplus of some \$1,000,000,000 for day-to-day expenditure. I should be much happier if we had 39 bookkeepers in this Parliament.

Mr. Corcoran: I think you'd make a better bookmaker.

Mr. McANANEY: I will lay the odds against the honourable member's ever being a successful administrator. He needs to learn more than he learnt last time. I do not like this tax or this way of raising taxation. I have been reprimanded for speaking against this type of legislation in the last Parliament. That was when the Bill provided for a receipt for every transaction, even if one was not needed. That meant a waste of manpower. The then Minister of Roads said in another place that that would be good for the economy because it would create more employment. I have never heard such rubbish in all my life.

On the contrary, if people were paid for doing nothing, the economy would break down. It would not help the economy. To improve the living standards of the people of South Australia, we need to create conditions under which a maximum return can be obtained for goods produced. Even Mr. R. J. Hawke, the industrial advocate of the Australian Council of Trade Unions, said in court that the wage earners get a more or less fixed percentage of the gross national product of Australia. That proves my point: if we want to give them a week's holiday, why not give them six months? I should like to see them get six months, but it would halve production.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must be allowed to continue his speech without interruption.

Mr. McANANEY: Unless taxes are increased, less money will be available for education. We have to collect taxes from some source. We are at present suffering from the effects of the last three years of Labor Government. The State's population has not increased by very much (owing to the Labor Government's policies) and we got the same amount of tax reimbursement from the Commonwealth

this year as last year, but it is really proportionately less. The reason was that South Australia's economy had run down, and we did not get as much as we would have if we had had a steady upward trend in employment, etc.

We have to face facts. Members opposite did not increase the sum available for education in proportion to their increased income in South Australia. They claim they did certain things, but fewer goods were being produced then, and less money was available for education; so this tax had to be increased. I am not very keen on it. I am being honest about it. It is not what I would have done had I been the dictator of this Parliament, but I am a member of a Party. However much I disliked this tax, I would not vote against it, because what would be the alternative?

We are providing more employment and more goods are being produced. Already, there is an indication that the employment figures are better for this time of the year than they were during the last two years. We need to restore the confidence of the people. If members opposite do not keep on running down South Australia, we shall create more confidence in the way things are going. How can we increase taxation at other levels? I think the Leader of the Opposition said that land tax was a good tax, a progressive tax; indeed, the higher the value of the land, the more tax one pays on it.

Mr. Virgo: What has land tax got to do with this?

Mr. McANANEY: The member for Edwardstown referred to succession duties and I can refer to land tax. Increasing land tax is said to be a progressive measure, but who pays it? People occupying little or more than half the Adelaide city square pay this tax, which increases the price of goods bought in the city by the poorer people whom members opposite say they are protecting. One city firm in particular has earned in four years out of the last five 7.5 per cent before tax on its sales. The Labor Government increased land tax during that period, and the increased tax affected the price of many commodities. This tax has a similar effect to that of a duty on receipts, and they are both lousy taxes in my opinion. Members opposite say we are hitting the small man.

Mr. Corcoran: Of course you are.

Mr. McANANEY: Most of these indirect taxes are passed on and directly affect prices. I remember at about the first political meeting I ever attended complaining about the incidence of indirect taxation, and a politician

present turned around and said it was the easiest way to fool the people and to get money out of them. Both sides are doing this. Although indirect taxation may be the easiest way to fool the people, it is also the easiest way to fool oneself, for indirect taxes cause an inflationary increase in prices. The price of everything the Government buys is increased, and the authorities do not receive the increases they think they are receiving.

Mr. Virgo: Keep going, and you'll talk yourself into opposing this Bill.

Mr. McANANEY: I should like to oppose this form of tax, but what would be the alternative? In any case, with 39 members in this place, it would be a shame if the House lost the only accountant it has. Figures have been produced to show the decline in the income of the primary producers, who certainly are not the ones who should bear this tax. I am prepared to stick my neck out and say that the primary producers incur more debts than any other section of the community regarding this tax. Having been a farmer, I point out that the proceeds of what a farmer sells represent his gross income, and a certain proportion represents his wages, if he is fortunate enough to make wages, and not many farmers are. Farmers pay duty on everything they buy, the same as other wage earners do. Therefore, as a section of the community, the farmer will be hit harder than any other section.

Mr. Casey: Doesn't the manufacturer have to pay it, too?

Mr. McANANEY: He receives protection from the Tariff Board, and is making reasonable profits, to such an extent that the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission has stated that he is able to pay another \$1.60. I do not argue about that, because the manufacturer and the wholesaler can pass it on whereas the primary producer cannot. The member for Unley led the Leader of the Opposition up the garden path last night, and the Leader took it hook line and sinker. He did not realize what he was saying. The member for Unley interjected and said that, if someone tore up to the shop six times and spent 10c each time, he would have to pay 1c extra each time he bought something. Apparently the Leader had not read the second reading explanation, and he probably thought that one of his back-benchers had come to his rescue and given him a new idea. In his second reading explanation the Treasurer said:

However, a private person who does not carry on a trade, business or profession is exempted from payment of duty in respect of any receipt for an amount not exceeding \$10. Such a private person needs to give a stamped receipt where the amount received exceeds \$10, and in such case duty at the rate of 1c for each \$10 or part thereof must be paid by impressed or adhesive stamp.

That is what I objected to in the previous Bill. It is not a good way of doing it. Each person or firm has to give a receipt for each little item but, if one asks to make a monthly or a three-monthly payment, one pays the tax on the turnover.

Mr. Corcoran: What happens if you do not?

Mr. McANANEY: Nobody would be stupid enough to write out a receipt for every one. The Treasurer continued:

There is no exemption in respect of money not exceeding \$10, and every such person and every corporation must pay duty on all amounts received (unless specifically exempted) at the rate of 1c for \$10, or part, of each amount received. However, such persons or corporations may elect to pay the duty on the basis of a periodical bulk return, in which case the duty is calculated at the rate of 1c for every \$10 of the total amount received for the period covered by the return and the duty so calculated is to be payable to the Commissioner of Stamps by cheque or cash at the time the return is lodged.

Do members think that a man who runs his own business and who has the ability to save and to perform a function would be stupid enough not to put it a monthly return? If he did not, he would not be capable of running his business.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much interruption. I will have to take other steps if members will not obey the Chair.

Mr. McANANEY: An article on the Victorian situation states:

Union officials said there had been few complaints about either the size or the administration of the tax received at the Melbourne Trades Hall, though it was suspected as the "thin end of the wedge" for higher, flat-rate State taxation.

So, they say there is little administrative difficulty. The article reports a spokesman for the stamps office as saying:

"Naturally we get some queries, but we get these with any tax, even on some years old," he said. The Stamps Office is administering the tax with only a small number of extra staff. The general manager of the Victorian Chamber of Manufactures, Mr. A. N. Curphey, said the tax was still "highly unpopular" among chamber members and dangerous because there was no guarantee that it would not be increased. If it is desired that services be increased and an extra week's leave be given, the necessary

finance must come from somewhere and, until Commonwealth-State relations have been straightened out, the State Government must impose these taxes. Another way of collecting extra taxation is through charges on motor vehicles, but revenue collected in this way must be used for roads, after administrative expenses have been deducted.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you support the extension of this tax to salaries and wages?

Mr. McANANEY: I will tell the honourable member later how I would collect this amount. If we had 39 accountants here that is how it would be done. Imposing stamp duties is a way of obtaining revenue without causing large cost increases, but it is bad when a stamp duty on a transfer or a mortgage imposes a burden on young people building a house. There must be a limit to such a duty, otherwise thrift will be discouraged.

Mr. Virgo: Are you going to vote against the Bill?

Mr. McANANEY: If there was an alternative I would vote against it, but I am not going to throw South Australia to the mercy of members opposite. I have been rubbished about my remarks in this House about succession duties. I will stand by what I said: possibly on the bigger estates there is room for higher duties. However, I defy members opposite to show where I said at any time that I would support any overall increase in succession duties. What I have said in this House is that succession duties should never be imposed on small estates that would return only an amount equivalent to the age pension. The only thing I have ever advocated in this House is a re-allocation of the various rates of succession duty. I have never advocated a bigger overall increase from succession duties.

Mr. Virgo: If you say this tax is wrong, why don't you vote against it?

Mr. McANANEY: Some \$39,000,000 or \$40,000,000 of our taxation reimbursement money goes towards meeting losses on services provided by the Government, and in my opinion this is where this money should be collected. Last year, the then Government made a \$6,000,000 loss on the waterworks, although possibly not such a big loss will be incurred this year. This position seems to me to be ridiculous. If I want to buy a kitchen suite, I have to pay a tax on it to pay for a loss on the water that somebody next door is using. On a farm that I was on I spent almost \$10,000 in four or five years providing my own water. I am not complaining about that, but the fact is that I do not get any

water services from the Government, yet I pay a tax like this so that the Government can make up for the loss on the waterworks.

It has been said that we cannot make people pay for water according to the quantity they use because if we do that we lose the rates from the people in Adelaide. However, I think those people could be charged some flat rate, because they must have this water for fire protection for their buildings. In any event, any additional tax incurred by business houses is passed on in increased costs, so ultimately this tax comes down to and is paid by the people in other areas. This is where we should balance the Budget, for this \$39,000,000 is where we should tackle it. A good example can be seen with the Electricity Trust, which pays its way at no cost to the taxpayer. The member for Whyalla (Hon. R. R. Loveday) spoke yesterday about how badly we had treated the country people of South Australia, but if we drive around Australia in a motor car we soon see that the best country homes are in South Australia. Where does electricity go out farther, and where is there a bigger water service, than in South Australia? All this was provided by a Liberal Government.

Mr. Langley: Your Party voted against some of these things.

Mr. McANANEY: Our sewerage system is the best in Australia and, indeed, is the envy of the other States. When there was a great deal of talk three or four years ago about the Commonwealth Government taking over education, figures that were taken out showed that millions of dollars would have to be spent in New South Wales to bring the standard of education there up to the South Australian standard.

Mr. Virgo: What about talking about stamp duties and about this Bill?

Mr. McANANEY: It would have been a tremendous undertaking on the part of the Commonwealth to bring education services up to the level of what they are here. I commend the Treasurer—

Mr. Virgo: You're a hypocrite.

Mr. McANANEY: That is not so. We must raise taxation if we are committed to certain expenditure. The Leader of the Opposition has said that a new Government will be committed to retain this tax, but when a new Government comes into office it is committed heavily to raising taxation to meet expenditure.

Mr. Virgo: This is what happened when we came into office after Playford's wild spending sprees.

Mr. McANANEY: The most difficult year for any Treasurer in South Australia was 1964-65, when this State received from the Commonwealth Government in taxation reimbursements and grants \$78,100,000, compared with \$79,600,000 received in the previous year. Nevertheless, that genius of finance so handled the situation in 1964-65 that employment increased by, I think, 20,000. It certainly increased by more in that year than in the three years of the Labor Government.

Mr. Clark: Then he left the Labor Government to pull the State out of a hole.

Mr. McANANEY: Although the Treasurer at that time increased certain taxes, he received benefit from some of the increases for only six months and from the increased charges on stock exchange certificates for only three months, whereas in the next year the Labor Government got the benefit of those increased taxes for a full year and received \$86,400,000 from the Commonwealth Government, an increase of \$8,300,000. If the Labor Government had had an accountant in its ranks, it would have been sitting pretty then. The member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) may say that I am criticizing the Under Treasurer, but I am criticizing the Labor Government, because the Treasurer of the day must take responsibility for what his Government does. When members opposite were in Government they increased taxation in every way they could in their first year of office. They increased water charges and wanted to increase succession duties.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr. McANANEY: Although the Leader of the Opposition has said that by raising these taxes we are upsetting the economy, we are merely taking from one and giving to someone else so that we can provide such things as the extra week's leave that the member for Edwardstown talks about. I do not object to this leave, but Joe Blow has to pay receipts duty on his wages so that Jim Brown can have that extra week's leave. We must face up to that fact. If we are not careful, we shall tread on Jimmy Brown's toes! We return to the point I am trying to make, that in that first year about \$5,000,000 was taken out of circulation. By January the Labor Government had credited to its Budget Account a sum of \$5,000,000. The Leader of the Opposition quotes Keynes to us. Apparently he can understand the theory of it but does not put it into practice. There was this

\$5,000,000 out of circulation just at the time when young people were seeking jobs, in that first January. That is when South Australia began to go down; we stopped there; we ran into unemployment. There will need to be some wise handling by our Treasurer before we can achieve a sound financial position; then we may get somewhere. I am not speaking against the action of the Treasurer or the Government (who found it necessary to impose this tax) when I say I do not like indirect taxation, generally. At the Commonwealth level it yields \$1,972,000,000. Some of this is not an inflationary tax and, therefore, possibly can be accepted. There is excise duty of \$900,000,000, not necessarily inflationary; it may mean that we drink less wine. Sales tax takes \$597,000,000, and this is definitely inflationary. Governments fool themselves when they impose this type of tax to get in revenue, because at the same time their expenditure is increased. The present Commonwealth Government points out that it is restricting the lending of the banks at the moment because of the demand inflation that we may be facing, and it has accomplished this restriction by increasing the interest rates, but this causes cost inflation. The Commonwealth increased company tax this year as a possible restraining influence on the community: \$40,000,000 will be collected from that source, a 2½ per cent company tax, which is about equal to the total receipts tax in all States to be collected. This company tax is passed on. I am advocating direct taxation, because indirect taxation does not give the expected benefits; it is harmful to the community. However, direct taxation, where people realize the extent to which they are being taxed, cannot be too high or we will destroy incentive and upset the production of goods required to give us a good standard of living. I strongly support the Treasurer in the firm action he has taken. He has faced up to the fact that the Budget must be balanced, if we are honest.

Mr. Clark: Why?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McANANEY: It is not an honest practice to have a deficit even in one's day-to-day housekeeping. It cannot be done on a personal level or at Government level, although I do not wish to give a discourse on the functions of credit, in which this situation can be handled. However, members will recall what happened when the sales tax on motor cars was increased in order to slow down the economy slightly. The whole economy is affected by this sort of taxation. A sound

Government is one that balances the Budget and controls the credit resources of the country, for that creates a demand for labour equal to the capacity to produce or to the willingness to work, and the result is a higher standard of living. If the member for Edwardstown looks at the results of the relevant Gallup poll, he will see that the people of Australia want, first, better education and more hospitals, and that they want shorter hours, etc., least of all.

Mr. Virgo: You're completely out of touch.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

Mr. McANANEY: Some members of this House seem to think that Gallup polls are inaccurate, but it has recently been indicated that people prefer to work 40 hours a week and to have more goods available to working shorter hours and having fewer goods available. I support the Bill.

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent): I have listened with great interest to the member for Stirling.

Mr. Virgo: How could you?

Mr. CORCORAN: I had to, because I succeeded him in the debate. What I heard was really a series of contradictions.

Mr. McAnaney: Bunkum!

Mr. CORCORAN: No bunkum at all. The member for Stirling has made it quite clear that he objects to this form of taxation. Although he said he did not favour this form of taxation, he commended the Treasurer for introducing the measure, and if that is not a contradiction I do not know what is. The honourable member continually repeated the statement that we had granted an additional week's leave to certain employees, so he seemed to regard this as the basis for the present financial difficulties of the Government but, again, he erred in his remarks. It seems to me that, if we follow his argument through to its logical conclusion, the member for Stirling believes in reducing annual leave as a means of solving the State's financial problems and of increasing the hours that people work.

Mr. McAnaney: Don't twist the truth.

Mr. CORCORAN: Why does the honourable member insist that the extra week's leave previously granted has caused the problems to which he has referred? Does he believe that if we reduce the annual leave granted to employees in this State our problems will be solved?

Mr. McAnaney: I never said that.

Mr. CORCORAN: No, but the honourable member implied it. The previous Government

made this extra week's leave available to people because it thought they were worthy of it; we still think they are worthy of it and that this will be further borne out in the future. Therefore, we make no apologies for having made this extra leave available to employees. In fact, we wished the application could have been more widespread. The honourable member said he had heard a lot of tripe and that we no longer had courtesy or respect. He said this because the member for Edwardstown criticized this Government strongly for the action it had taken. It is his right to criticize. Indeed, he did it so effectively that it upset the member for Stirling, the only member opposite, apart from the Treasurer, who has seen fit to support this important measure that will raise \$4,800,000 in a full year.

Mr. Riches: Nearly enough to build the festival hall.

Mr. CORCORAN: Yes. He said he was a farmer and that when he went on a farm he did not know how to milk a cow. The people of this State are the milking cows and the Government is expert at milking, because it has really got stuck into the milking cows this year.

Mr. McAnaney: But who gets the milk?

Mr. CORCORAN: If one receives something from the Government, one pays full tote odds for it. He got on to the situation in the metropolitan area where, he said, people should pay a flat rate for water. He, the Treasurer and the Minister of Works know that if that were the situation we would be in grave difficulties. In Victoria, Sir Henry Bolte has been fit to remove land tax, the tax to which primary producers object so strongly, and he has laid it on to the business community in Melbourne. Does the honourable member for Stirling disagree with that? I see he does not answer; he does not know what to say because he may offend those people he is supposed to represent. However, I will give the honourable member some marks for saying that he does not like this form of taxation. I suppose, too, we should commend the Treasurer for saying that he does not like any form of taxation. Neither do we, but we realize it is necessary for the Government, with this measure and others, to raise finance in order to maintain the expansion of this State and, indeed, to increase it. However, we object to its method of doing this. Even the member for Stirling joined issue with him here. He said he disagreed with the

Government's method and said it should employ others. He then outlined his ideas. We have said that the Government should plug the loopholes that exist in the succession duties legislation that allow people with assets of up to \$100,000 to avoid succession duties. I refer to those people who have assets such as shares, which are readily divisible. I agree with members on this side who have spoken about the Government's method of raising finance and the fact that it has avoided taking steps to raise additional revenue from this source. Members realize it is necessary to do something to plug the loopholes in the legislation, and I am sure that the Treasurer, after due discussions with his Under Treasurer, will possibly suggest to the Government that something must be done about this. I hope he does, because it is sad to see taxation imposed by this Bill before the succession duties legislation is tightened up.

Much has been said about the statements made by the members of the present Government prior to March 2. Indeed, the member for Edwardstown and others referred to the fact that the then Premier (now Leader of the Opposition) said that the present Premier was presenting to the people of South Australia a brown paper parcel marked "Secret; not to be opened until after March 2; full of nasty surprises", and that is exactly true. I draw the attention of the Premier, the Treasurer and all other Government members to the following article in the *News* as late as June 18, 1968, prior to the Millicent by-election. I am reported as saying:

Informed observers predicted heavy tax measures in the State Budget to be introduced in September.

The article continues:

Mr. Corcoran said the Liberal and Country Party, under Mr. Hall's leadership, had refused to indicate what taxation measures would be introduced in the coming Budget.

I point out that I was exactly correct. Referring to the L.C.P., I am reported as saying:

It had not been open about its proposals, but those who watched the position most keenly were sure heavy imposts would be sprung on the people.

An article headed "Hall claims A.L.P. panic", in a later edition of the *News* of June 18, states:

The Premier, Mr. Hall, said today Mr. J. D. Corcoran, the Labor candidate for the Millicent by-election, was panicking in his forecast of impending heavy State taxes. Mr. Hall was replying to Mr. Corcoran's statement, earlier today, that informed observers predicted heavy tax measures in the State Budget in September.

Without knowing the outcome of next week's Premiers' Conference and Loan Council meetings it was premature to forecast the State Budget, the Premier said. He and the Treasurer, Mr. Pearson, would go to Canberra next week for these important financial talks.

Afterwards the Government would frame its financial policy for the forthcoming year. "This policy will be vitally affected by the deal we get in Canberra and by the very great deterioration in finances which has been handed on to us by the Labor Government, of which Mr. Corcoran was a member," he said.

Even at that stage the Premier was not telling the people of this State what he knew, in fact, would happen in this Budget. As I pointed out in an earlier debate, three months prior to the Labor Government's leaving office it had a forecast to the exact cent of what it would receive as a result of the Loan Council meeting and the Premiers' Conference. So, there was no need to wait for the Loan Council meeting or the conference to ascertain our financial position. This is the sort of deal the people have had from this Government: one of deceit. The Labor Government, prior to the election, told the people it would be necessary to increase taxation and it told them specifically how it would do it.

Mr. Virgo: It was honest.

Mr. CORCORAN: Yes, and the people recognized this: the Labor Party received 53 per cent of the total vote. The Liberal and Country League told the people nothing, yet even in these circumstances it received 43 per cent of the total vote, which was sufficient to enable it to take office. The L.C.L. proved to the people how deceitful it was, and I hope the people will learn their lesson.

What disgusted me was not so much that the Government had to do this but the deceitful way it went about it. It took advantage of its coming to office by imposing a regressive tax that will hit the people who can least afford to pay it. The more one looks at this Bill the more one realizes that it is the ordinary, everyday person who will pay most of this impost. We say that it is unjust, particularly when we bear in mind the present situation in regard to succession duties. I am disgusted that the people were not warned and that, consequently, they had no opportunity to judge the issue before the general election and before the Millicent by-election. Furthermore, we have another threat hanging over our heads—and this time the Treasurer can claim credit that he has warned the people that they can expect the receipts duty to be imposed on wages and salaries. At least he has been honest about that.

Mr. Virgo: For the first time.

Mr. CORCORAN: At least that is an improvement.

Mr. Virgo: What would it have been like if we had lost Millicent?

Mr. CORCORAN: I shudder to think what it would have been like. We know at least that we can expect this. I tipped in June that there would be heavy taxation this year, although this was denied by the Premier. It is my tip again that before the end of this year or early next year we will see this receipts duty extended to wages and salaries.

Mr. Broomhill: The member for Stirling has admitted that.

Mr. CORCORAN: Yes. We will see whether I am right or wrong. The Treasurer, in his Budget speech, said:

The Government would also be disposed, if necessary, to submit to Parliament supplementary proposals which would not only authorize the unavoidable expenditures but would propose ways and means to finance them. What those ways and means may be if the Commonwealth will not assist it is not possible to forecast, but it must be apparent that this State and the States generally cannot indefinitely concede to the Commonwealth a complete monopoly of all forms of income tax if it does not offer adequate alternative resources. This comment applies to the possible subsequent extension of the new receipts duty to wages and salaries as well as to other taxes of a like nature.

I am not sure about these "other taxes of a like nature", but I know what the Commonwealth has done and I know what we can expect, possibly soon, in this State. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I rise to say only a few words about this Bill. I commend the Treasurer for trying to correct the financial difficulties he found when he entered the Treasury. Although we have heard much from the Opposition, I do not know that it has been terribly constructive. My friend and colleague from the South-East (Mr. Corcoran) has said we have been deceitful, but I do not know whether he really believes that.

Mr. Corcoran: It is in the newspaper.

Mr. RODDA: We have been charged with being full of deceit and, by interjection, the honourable member was prompted into saying, in effect, that had we won Millicent this tax would have been bigger and better. However, we did not win Millicent.

Mr. Broomhill: Do you think this tax will be applied on salaries and wages?

Mr. RODDA: The Treasurer's Bill is indeed a long and complicated document.

Mr. Clark: Painful, too.

Mr. RODDA: Yes, it is, and there are very good reasons for these pains. With the exception of my friend the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo), all members opposite took part in the milking that went on in the dark three years preceding this one, for the Labor Party really dried the cow out in the Thirty-Eighth Parliament. The Treasurer requires revenue to stabilize South Australia. All States are having difficulties, and the position in South Australia would be the same if members opposite were in Government. We should appreciate all the implications and responsibilities of Government.

The member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) was not correct when he said that Government members were not allowed to defend their Treasurer and that they would remain silent while the measure went through. That honourable member was also incorrect when he said that not one Government member of the Victorian Parliament spoke in support of taxes similar to these introduced by Sir Henry Bolte, because Mr. Stokes, a Government member of the Victorian Parliament, said, as reported at page 1202 of *Hansard* of October 24, 1967:

I am in favour of the proposed tax, which has two great advantages. No individual in Victoria will be unduly harmed by this tax. I am one of those back-bench members of the Government who can see a lot of good in the measure, and I rise to the defence of the Treasurer.

It has also been said that this Bill hits people who can least afford to pay, but credit must be given to the Treasurer for spreading this tax over the whole community. We believe in taxing those who earn most. The member for Unley (Mr. Langley) may chuckle, but we will soon have stability if everyone puts his hand to the wheel in time of crisis. These measures face squarely up to the present situation. After all, we are all workers and we will all pay according to circumstances. I support the Bill.

Mr. CASEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.5 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 17, at 2 p.m.