LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, August 12, 1971

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

QUESTIONS

PRISONERS' HAIRCUTS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Recently, in the Murray district I was informed that there had been a change in the attitude of prison authorities to the personal appearance of the prisoners. Can the Chief Secretary say whether this is so, whether it was a Cabinet directive and what is the effect of the new regulations on this matter?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The Leader says there has been a change of attitude on the part of the prison authorities. If the honourable member's question refers to the haircutting and shaving of prisoners, the Government has decided that it will not enforce the procedure followed over many years—that the prisoner must have his hair cut short, back and sides, and have a shave every day. The effect of this change in attitude will be an amendment to the regulation (I forget the number), which will in effect be that a prisoner may grow his hair to the length he wishes to grow it, and he need not shave every day. In other words, he can grow a beard provided it is kept clean and the hygiene is above suspicion. Prisoners will be forced to have their hair cut and their beards shaved only on grounds of hygiene and cleanliness. Every case will require a doctor's certificate.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Can the Chief Secretary say whether the recent case of a professor having to have his beard shaved and his hair cut influenced the Government in reaching this decision?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No, it did not.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: If a man wishes to start growing a beard must he give notice of his intention to the governor, or can he grow it for two or three days, shave it off, and then have another two or three days' growth?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I like to give short replies to questions, but I cannot do so when they are double-barrel questions. The choice is left to the prisoner, who can do what he likes when he likes in connection with his beard.

ABATTOIR

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Recently I have asked several questions about the operations of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, and the Minister has been good enough to get the information I sought. In one of the replies to a question I asked regarding a fairly large long-term loan made available to the board, he agreed that he would see that increases, if any, in killing charges would be very carefully looked at. I have noticed in today's press that Executive Council last Thursday approved increases in killing charges at Gepps Cross of 8c a lb. of dressed weight meat, and that that applies to goat, beef, mutton, lamb and pigs: a general increase of 8c. I am a little confused, because the article then gives a schedule of the various increases. The maximum charge has been increased by 15c to 80c a head, which is a considerable increase. I wonder whether the increase of 8c should read as 8 per cent. Is the Minister satisfied that the increases which have been placed on producers for the killing of meat at Gepps Cross are justified? Will he ascertain from the board the grounds on which the increases were calculated? Was it in expectation of further wage rises, or is this merely to service the current situation?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I think I can give the honourable member sufficient information to clear up his queries. In the first place, I have not seen the report in this morning's paper regarding 8c a lb. I know that in its submissions the Abattoirs Board asked for an increase of .8c a lb., bringing the charge from 3.2c to 4c. This is a point the honourable member should keep very clearly in mind. There should not be any reference to 8c a lb.; it is .8c. In the second place, I have had a good look at this problem and I know this cost eventually is passed on to the producer. This is most unfortunate, but I remind the honourable member that it is not my prerogative to fix charges at the abattoir. As he well knows, it is up to the board, which is a statutory body and makes its submissions to Executive Council, and the increases then come into operation. The abattoir has shown a loss for many years, which is most unfortunate, but, like the railways, it is a public utility. It must kill all sorts of stock whenever it is available. If there is a reduction in the throughput through the abattoir, the board has to bear

the loss at that stage. We hope that we will be able to maintain a continuous throughput through the abattoir so that the operation will become profitable soon.

However, this will depend on many circumstances: the losses that have been incurred; the increased wages that have been granted because of the last basic wage increase; and the effect of spending about $300,000 in order to bring the works to the standard required by the Department of Primary Industry. It is most essential that we have these standards otherwise we would not be able to export any meat from the Gepps Cross abattoir to the United States. This is a lucrative market in which many operators participate in South Australia. In my opinion all these changes justify the increased charges, but we must realize that only one charge has affected consumers. I hope this information is sufficient: if it is not I will obtain a report from the board as to why these charges, in the opinion of the beard, were necessary.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a further question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I thank the Minister for his reply. However, I cannot be sure whether the increase on the dressed weight of meat is .8c a lb., as he suggested, whether it is 8c a lb., as printed on page 18 of today's country edition of the *Advertiser*, or whether it is 8 per cent. I should therefore like the Minister to clarify this point.

The Minister also said in his reply that the board had made considerable losses over the years in addition to having to bring its plant up to its present high standard. Will the Minister therefore provide me with the profit and loss figures for the operations of the abattoir during the years 1966 to 1970 inclusive? If the Minister can provide that information for me, I shall be much happier, as I cannot reconcile his two statements.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am surprised that the honourable member does not take my word rather than what is printed in the *Advertiser*. I assure him that the increase is .8c a lb. If the honourable member wants written confirmation in this respect, I shall be happy to supply him with it, as well as to obtain for him the profit and loss statements in relation to the operation of the abattoir for the years to which he referred.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I understood the Minister to say that nearly $300,000 had been spent on the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board's works at Gepps Cross to bring them up to the American hygiene requirements. I draw the attention of the Minister and other members to the Ministerial statement he made on July 21, which appears on page 192 of *Hansard*, part of which is as follows:

The situation is that the Treasurer has given approval in principle for a loan of $300,000 to the board, and one-half of that amount ($150,000) has already been advanced on certain conditions as to security, interest rates and repayment, the remainder being withheld until it is clear that it cannot be raised by alternative borrowings.

If it is true that the board has spent nearly $300,000 on improvements to the works, I ask the Minister: has the additional amount over $150,000 been advanced by the Government, or has it been provided by alternative borrowings?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I give the honourable member full credit for asking his question, although he should realize that the figure of $300,000 has been mentioned many times in press statements by the Chairman of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board (Mr. Joseph). That is the figure he has used, irrespective of where it came from. It did not come, of course, from the Government loan because the board had already spent it. What I said in my statement is true. They are the present facts. If the honourable member looks back over the history of the Abattoirs Board for the last few months, he will find that this figure of $300,000 stated by Mr. Joseph was what it cost the board to bring the standard of the abattoir up to the requirements of the Department of Primary Industry.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I thank the Minister for his reply; the only problem is that he did not answer the question, which is: has the Government advanced to the Abattoirs Board moneys in addition to the $150,000 mentioned in his reply on July 21 for the improvement of the board's works?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: No.

RURAL ASSISTANCE

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I seek leave to make a brief statement in explanation of a double-barrel question I intend to ask the Minister of Lands.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Yesterday the Minister of Lands was kind enough to inform me, on a slip of paper and in his handwriting, that he had a reply to a question I had asked a week or two ago about forms to

be filled in concerning the pastoral industry. Today I received a chit from the Minister (and I realize that I am not allowed to exhibit it) in a printed form, which seems a rather laudable sort of thing. My two questions are: first, has the Minister a reply to my question about the pastoral industry and, secondly, can he say whether the issuing of this chit is to be a new practice?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I shall reply to the second question first. The honourable member received a note from me yesterday in my handwriting but, as he did not ask the question, I doubted whether he could read my handwriting.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I could not ask the question yesterday because the President was a little too quick for me when he called on the business of the day.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The chit the honourable member received today was normal practice with me, but yesterday I did not have this type of chit with me. The honourable member was not the only person who asked a question about the pastoral industry but, because he asked more than one question, I shall give him the reply. However, this will be a reply to some of the matters raised by other honourable members. There seems to be no justification to amend the existing application forms that consist of 23 pages. It is not necessary for every farmer to complete each page, and the following summary illustrates that point. Pages 1 and 2 provide for details regarding the applicant's name and address, certificate that he is engaged in primary production, lands held, dependants, and undertaking and declaration under the Oaths Act. Page 3 has space for the supply of information regarding the rejection by the normal rural financing institutions of application for financial help by the applicant; also the nature of assistance required. Pages 4, 5 and 6 provide for details of cereal cropping during last season and four prior seasons. Page 7 covers income for past three seasons and estimate of income for current financial year, and page 8 expenditure (actual) for past three years and estimated expenditure for current year.

Pages 9 and 10 cover income and expenditure in horticultural and viticultural production for past three years and estimated income and expenditure on this type of production for current year. Pages 11 and 12 cover statement of liabilities, and page 13 concerns hire-purchase/creditors. Page 14 covers description of property and improvements, and page 15 is statement of plant. Page 16 concerns particulars of livestock, implements, machinery, motor vehicles and other chattels not owned by applicant but which are on the property (*i.e.* stock, plant and equipment of share-farmer).

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Or on agistment.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes. I shall continue with the information that is required; it is as follows. Page 17 is statement of assets; page 18, statement of livestock; page 19, livestock trading (current year); page 20, livestock trading and/or grazing operations for past five years; and pages 21 to 23, description of property under offer (where application is for farm build-up) and budget of income and expenditure relating to that property. So, the details are only the normal details that would be required; that sort of information would be required by anyone, whosoever he might be, considering lending money. A sheep/cattle farmer growing no cereals would complete 13 pages. Should he have hire-purchase and unsecured creditors, plus stock and plant not owned by himself on the property, he would fill out two additional pages—15 in all. A wheat/sheep farmer would complete 16 pages, but, if he had hire-purchase commitments, unsecured creditors, plus stock and plant not owned by himself, but on the subject property, two additional pages would be required—making 18 in all. Should any of the applicants require farm build-up, three additional pages relating to the property under offer would require completion.

The size of the forms appears to be causing more concern to Parliamentarians than to the farmer. Members of the administration staff have questioned many farmers regarding the size of the form and the information required, and farmers say that the information required is essential. I can honestly say that there have been no direct complaints made to the authority regarding the size of the form. The application forms used in Victoria consist of four pages, but in addition it is necessary for the applicant to supply a budget of income and expenditure and also copies of income tax returns for the last three years. The Victorian application also carries this footnote:

In any case where insufficient space is available throughout the form please attach separate list(s) which must be signed.

I also understand that in Victoria, after the form has been lodged, further follow-up work becomes necessary to obtain further details; this, of course, adds considerably to the cost of

administering the scheme. Here in South Australia, with the detail available, the committee is in a position to arrive at a decision without further follow-up work. However, this does not mean that, should the committee desire further information, it is not obtained; in such cases the department's field officers are requested to obtain the further information.

Every effort is made to keep costs down without reducing the efficient working of the scheme. It is interesting to note that some farmers in the Pinnaroo-Lameroo areas, who have seen the form used by Victoria for rural reconstruction, say that the form is inadequate. These farmers have praised the form used by this State. The form used by Western Australia consists of 15 book-form pages plus several loose sheets. Regarding the charges for compiling the form, farmers who maintain their own farm records have assured the authority that they have had no difficulty in completing the forms without the aid of an accountant. Advice has been received by the authority that one firm of accountants is not charging farmers for compiling the form; it looks upon the exercise as its own small contribution to the rural industry of the State. Of course, this applies only to the firm's regular customers.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: My question, to the Minister of Lands, concerns the form to be filled in when applying for assistance under the rural reconstruction scheme. I have a letter from a farmer who asks: why is it necessary in the form that has to be filled in for the names of the cows to be included? Also, why is it necessary for the value of his wife's jewellery to be included?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Surely, that would be a facetious question.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: No.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I am not aware that these questions are asked in the form.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Minister of Lands any further information about the number of approvals and the number of rejections of people applying for assistance under the rural reconstruction scheme?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes. I have some figures supplied last week, on August 6. So far, 210 applications for rural reconstruction assistance have been received; 13 were for farm build-up (one of which was under consideration by the Rural Industry Assistance Committee and 12 were pending.) So far, no financial advances have been recommended by the committee for farm build-up and amalgamation. Then 197 applications have been received for debt readjustment and carry-on finance. Of these, four applications have been recommended to receive assistance. Twenty-three applications for debt readjustment and carry-on finance have been refused. One application was withdrawn in favour of the Marginal Dairy Farms Reconstruction Scheme; 34 applications for debt readjustment and carry-on finance are before the committee, and 135 are pending.

Also, 26 protection certificates have been sought. One has been issued and was subsequently cancelled; 9 applications for a certificate have been refused. In the other 16 cases, the committee has been successful in negotiating with creditors for the deferment of proceedings without having to grant a certificate while the committee considered the farmers' applications. It may be interesting to the honourable member to know, too, from which areas the applications for assistance have come. They have come from the following areas: Lower South-East, 11; Upper South-East, 67; Murray Mallee, 17; Lower Murray, 9; Upper Murray, 8; Southern Ranges (Mount Lofty Ranges), 12; Northern Ranges (Flinders Ranges), 7; Central Plains, 7; Yorke Peninsula, 7; Northern (Pastoral), 22; Lower Eyre Peninsula, 18; Upper Eyre Peninsula, 10; Kangaroo Island, 15.

VIRGINIA WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to a question I asked on July 21 with regard to underground water supplies?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: While the honourable member was correct in stating that the Agriculture Department in the early 1950's carried out investigations related to the use of underground waters at the Parafield Research Station, the Director does not consider the problem was solved at that time, and more appropriate research must continue before that stage is reached. I have with me a technical and fairly comprehensive report from the department and will be pleased to make it available for the honourable member's perusal, if he so desires.

VICTORIA SQUARE

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I asked questions on July 15 and July 22 about the site on the corner of Grote Street and Victoria Square. I was told in the replies that the Lord Mayor's Committee on Victoria Square had not so far presented its report to the State Planning Authority or the Government. I was told also

that the Premier, on his recent trip, had taken drawings of a proposed hotel development on that site by Professor Winston, who was brought across from Sydney to advise the Lord Mayor's Committee. I was also told that the Government would not hold up any negotiations set in train overseas regarding this site until the Lord Mayor's Committee's report had been presented and made public.

Press reports have stated that the Government intends to acquire land immediately behind this site facing Grote Street, that the whole parcel will be leased at a peppercorn rent to some developer who can be found, and that in the deal land tax concessions will be granted.

The site facing Victoria Square was bought during the term of the previous Government with the intention of erecting a building thereon to provide public servants with the accommodation they badly needed and deserved. First, before Asian capitalists are handed this site on a plate, or before hotel accommodation is erected thereon for oversea tourists, will the Government undertake to provide public servants with new accommodation? Secondly, if a land tax concession is given, will other South Australians badly in need of land tax concessions (I refer particularly to those facing bankruptcy in rural areas) be given comparable land tax reductions?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That is one of the best political speeches I have heard for some time. However, I will refer the honourable member's question to the Premier's Department and bring back a report, which I hope will not be so political.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a statement prior to directing a question to the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I think the Chief Secretary would agree that there has been considerable press publicity regarding the proposal for the erection of a new hotel complex in Victoria Square. The information in the press has caused many questions to be directed to members of Parliament, and so that we can be in possession of all the facts, and since the question directed by the Hon. Mr. Hill was limited—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It was as wide as the sea.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The explanation may have been as wide as the sea, but the two questions were specific. I am asking for full details. Will the Chief Secretary supply the Council with full details of the proposal put forward by the Government, so that members of this Council will be able to understand the position?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I will refer the Leader's question to the Premier.

INTAKES AND STORAGES

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question relates to the present storages of the metropolitan and near-metropolitan reservoirs in relation to their total storage capacity. I realize that, following the bounteous rains we have had this winter, most of these storages will be full or nearly full, but I should be grateful if the Minister would ask his colleague for the latest storage figures, particularly in relation to the new reservoir at Kangaroo Creek, which I believe last time we were informed was about half full, and the South Para Reservoir, which also takes a long time to fill and, as far as I recollect, was about two-thirds full a month or so ago.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I shall be happy to do that for the honourable member. Actually, the information is in this morning's *Advertiser*, and it was given in reply to a question asked in another place. However, if the honourable member wishes to have the information from the Minister concerned I shall be happy to get it for him, because we cannot put our trust, apparently, in the reports that appear in the *Advertiser*.

DRIED FRUITS

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Some 2½ years ago a scheme was formulated to take the place of the then existing stabilization scheme in the dried fruits industry. The Australian Dried Fruits Association, in collaboration with the Minister for Primary Industry and his officers, hammered out a scheme for a further five-year period of stabilization, one of the conditions of which was that the scheme must pass a poll of growers. The scheme put before the producers was rejected, and as a consequence the industry has, in the past 12 months, suffered quite a deal of hardship because it has had no stabilization scheme. With the

collapse of the international dried fruits agreement, the industry faces a most critical situation. Has the Minister any late details of whether or not agreement has been reached between the producers and the Minister for Primary Industry, and can he say whether a scheme will be in operation for the coming season; secondly, can he give details of how any new scheme might vary from that rejected by growers at the previous poll?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: There are some matters in the honourable member's question on which I think I should get further details, but I can say that the matter was discussed very briefly at the Agricultural Council meeting just recently, when it was introduced by the Minister for Primary Industry. It was then agreed by all States that a new proposal should be put to the growers. Further action will depend on the reaction of the growers. The poll has not yet been held, but I think growers will be asked to vote on the matter very shortly. If the scheme is rejected, another will have to be devised. It would appear that many growers, members of the A.D.F.A., would have liked the previous scheme to have gone through. Nevertheless, that scheme was rejected, and this caused a great deal of consternation in the industry generally. I am hopeful that, in the interests of members of the A.D.F.A., the growers will accept the new scheme, which I do not think varies greatly from the old one. These are some of the technicalities on which the honourable member requires information, and I shall be happy to get it for him. It is very alarming, as the honourable member has mentioned, that on the world scene of the dried fruits industry we find that Turkey, for example, has withdrawn from the international agreement on dried fruits, indicating that if the price of sultanas fell below the suggested minimum price on the world market Turkey would sell at less than that minimum price, thus throwing the whole of the international agreement into utter confusion and causing a great deal of concern in the dried fruits industry throughout the world. I shall be happy to get information on the other matters the honourable member has raised.

SECRET BALLOTS

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a short explanation prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I refer to a report printed in the *Advertiser* this morning to the effect that a Gallup poll indicated 73 per cent community support for secret ballots by unions. It is quite obvious that the disruption to the community through strike action has been serious. In view of the desire expressed by the Government to curb this industrial action, will the Government give effect to the community's desire by introducing legislation to provide for secret ballots for unions?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No.

FRUIT EXPORTS

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Recently the Minister of Agriculture directed an inquiry to the Commonwealth authorities concerning the 25 per cent freight increase being imposed on refrigerated transport overseas this year. Has the Minister had any response to that inquiry? Secondly, has this Government or the Commonwealth Government considered alternative methods of disposal of the Victorian apple and pear crop since export would be impossible because of this high freight rate?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I did answer that question in this Council recently. I brought back a reply from the Minister for Primary Industry to my telegram.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: You have had no further response?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: No. I had an immediate response to my telegram and I read it out in the Chamber a week or more ago. The reply was very prompt and I much appreciated the Minister's co-operation. I cannot give the honourable member any indication of what will be done with the surplus of apples and pears in Victoria, particularly regarding export, but already my department has received inquiries from overseas interests in the dried fruits industry, who have established themselves in South Australia or are establishing themselves here, regarding the possibility of initially drying pears in the Goulburn Valley and then bringing them into South Australia for further drying periods. This is understandable, because the River area apparently lends itself to the drying of apricots or pears more so than does the Goulburn Valley. The main interest to be shown here was that these people were concerned whether restrictions on the entry of the fruit because of the possibility of fruit fly might have to be considered but, on checking with the department, I was able to tell the interested person that, as the fruit was being treated with sulphur for several days before it came into the State, the drying of the fruit would be allowed in the River areas.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking another question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Although there is a market overseas for a considerable quantity of dried home fruits and apples and pears, the methods that have been used in Australia are so hopelessly archaic that we cannot compete with low labour cost countries. Modern mechanization can be introduced for the drying process, which could, at a comparatively cheap cost, be brought to a completely automatic state. The difficulty is that there is within the industry no organization with sufficient funds to conduct the experimental work required for a chain drying system. Will the Minister consider the possibility of setting up an experimental dehydration plant under the guidance of people in the industry to explore what can be done?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I cannot give a positive answer to that question. I would have to consider the whole situation in order to ascertain what it would cost and whether we had the personnel to conduct this project. However, I am willing to consider this matter.

POLICE FORCE

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I quote an item printed in the *Advertiser* recently under the heading "South-East body identified":

The careful restoration of the hands of a body which had been hanging from a tree in South-East scrub country for more than six months has enabled South Australian Police to identify the dead man. His body was found hanging from a gum tree in scrub country about two miles from Naracoorte on June 27. After weeks of painstaking tests to restore the man's hands, a complete set of fingerprints was obtained and circulated to other States.

As there seems to be some doubt about the accuracy of reports in the *Advertiser*, can the Chief Secretary say whether this report is accurate? If it is, I am sure that we should congratulate the Police Force and those involved for an excellent piece of detection. Also, can the Chief Secretary say whether the Government has discussed whether it would be justified in having a system of compulsory fingerprinting of all people in the community as an accurate means of identification?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I was becoming accustomed to double-barrel questions, but this is a treble-barrel question. In reply to the first part, I have no reason to doubt the accuracy of the press report. Secondly, I do not think that any member would need me to explain my admiration and appreciation of the Police Force. If the report is correct (and I think it is) the officers deserve the congratulations of the State. The high opinion of our Police Force is not confined to Australia: it is held in many countries. This morning I spoke to members of a visiting police party from Malaya who have arrived here to inspect the police set-up in Australia and to try to learn something. Reading through the programme I saw that the party wanted to visit Police Headquarters in South Australia, and when I asked one of the gentlemen why they wanted to do this, he said that an officer from Malaya who had been here previously had said that there was much to learn from the set-up here and, as he had been here to learn, he had learned. Cabinet has not considered the question of compulsory fingerprinting. It is a matter of personal opinion: if I expressed my opinion it could be different from the opinion of other people. I have had my fingerprints taken and do not mind who knows about that, because in my case I thought it was worth while. I do not know whether everyone would agree with me. To the best of my knowledge the Government has not considered the compulsory fingerprinting of all citizens.

DENTISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It amends the Dentists Act in two major respects, as well as dealing with several other important matters. The first major amendment relates to the admission of dentists to practice in this State. It has been apparent for some time that the statutory requirements for admission as a dental practitioner are unnecessarily restrictive upon foreign graduates. The Bill therefore invests the board with greater discretion to allow the admission of foreign graduates. The second major amendment is designed to permit the introduction of the "dental team concept" of dental treatment. There is now a need for statutory recognition to be given to the work of trained dental hygienists who perform ancillary functions assisting the dentists in overall treatment and care of a patient.

I shall discuss the other aspects of the amendments in dealing in detail with the provisions of the Bill. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clauses 3 and 4 deal with arrangement and interpretations of the Act, and are consequential upon the following amendments. Clause 5 changes an out-of-date reference to the British Medical Association to the Australian Medical Association. Clause 6 increases the fee for registration and renewal of registration to $10. Clause 7 alters wording in relation to keeping the temporary register, and clause 8 covers registration and temporary registration.

The Dentists Act of South Australia, 1931-1966, recognizes, for the purposes of registration, university dental degrees from Australia, United Kingdom, Republic of Ireland, Malaysia, Malta, New Zealand and South Africa. The proposal would broaden the qualifications which would entitle dentists to be registered, as the aim is to include persons qualified in recognized North American schools. It should be noted here that, although the graduating dental qualification in North America is a Doctorate of Dental Surgery, this is equivalent in standard to the Bachelor of Dental Surgery, Adelaide.

The Commonwealth Committee on Overseas Professional Qualifications is investigating the desirability of making it possible for migrants, whose qualifications measure up to our standards, to be able to practise dentistry in this country. The proposed amendment would make it possible to register a man of outstanding ability but not possessing a prescribed registrable qualification. In the case of such foreign degrees each application for registration would be investigated by the Dental Board and, where necessary, an examination would be conducted.

The University Dental School requested that action be taken to make it possible for oversea dental graduates, not holding registrable qualifications in South Australia, to treat patients during limited appointment to the staff of the university or the backing hospitals. Temporary registration would be beneficial in the following circumstances: teaching, research, and post-graduate studies. Temporary registration would be granted for the purpose of holding a specific appointment and would not be granted for work in general practice.

Clause 9 repeals section 20. These provisions are now included in the new section 18. Clause 10 makes a drafting amendment to section 23. Clause 11 repeals sections 24, 25 and 26, which are now largely rendered redundant. A new section 24 is enacted which provides for the suspension of a dentist to be noted in the register.

Clause 12 repeals the old provisions relating to operative dental assistants and introduces a new Part providing for the registration of dental auxiliaries. We are concerned at the moment principally with the advent of dental hygienists who will be registered under these provisions. The amendment allows for any person already licensed as an operative dental assistant under this Act to be registered as a dental auxiliary without application to the board. Studies conducted by the dental profession into ways and means to increase the availability of dental services have resulted in the development of the "dental team" approach in which trained auxiliaries assist the dentist and work as a team under his direction. The object is that trained auxiliaries, working under supervision, or to the prescription of the dentist, will relieve him of tasks which do not require his special knowledge, training and skill. Thus he can devote more time to those aspects of patient care which require appropriate university education and intensive clinical training and experience. The dental team approach has the support of such international bodies as the World Health Organization and the International Dental Federation.

Section 32 specifically states that dental therapists are not required to be registered under this Part. The therapist is controlled under section 40 (1) (*d*). Control of auxiliaries is to be done by regulation under section 60. Clauses 13, 14 and 15 introduce changes relating to dental clinics in order to fall into line with earlier amendments to the Act. Clause 16 makes it possible for the dental therapist to work in the clinic in the first year of training. Immediate supervision means a degree of supervision that is so proximate that the registered dentist is present personally to give directions. The deletion of "immediate" allows for more flexibility. The addition of subsection (6) covers the work performed by a dental hygienist.

Regarding clause 17, section 43 of the Dentists Act at the present time specifically precludes the use of the word "dental" in relation to any person other than a registered dentist. Because of this restriction, dental technicians called their association the Prosthetic Technicians Association. This title is misleading because the word "prosthetic" has a wider connotation than the range of dental prostheses with which the dental technicians are concerned.

Furthermore, the title does not give the technicians proper recognition of their close collaboration with dentists and the other dental auxiliaries as members of the "dental team". The amendment will allow a greater range of persons and bodies to assume a title including the word "dental".

Clauses 18 to 27 introduce consequential amendments. Regarding clause 28, instead of proclamations being made to amend the second schedule of the Act, it is felt that this would be best done by regulation. It would be possible for the board to regulate, first, registrable qualifications and, secondly, courses of study and duties of dental auxiliaries. Clause 29 allows for the issuing of a certificate to a dentist or auxiliaries upon registration. Clause 30 provides for a consequential amendment. Clause 31 repeals the second schedule to the principal Act which is now no longer necessary.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT secured the adjournment of the debate.

LIFTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 11. Page 686.)

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I support the Bill, which is noncontroversial. The principal Act was proclaimed in 1908 and amended in 1926 and 1934. It was rewritten in 1960. So, over a long period there has been very little amendment to the legislation. Now, 11 years after the legislation was rewritten it has been found necessary to introduce further amendments to bring it up to date. That is understandable, because the various types of lifting equipment have been improved and modernized in recent years. Although today we have many sophisticated pieces of equipment, the principle of lifts was used in ancient times. Indeed, the ancient Egyptians used some form of lifting device when building the pyramids. Ancient documents tell us that the stone masons who built King Solomon's temple used a block and tackle device that enabled them to lift heavy weights to great heights.

Because this Bill is largely a Committee Bill, I shall turn now to specific provisions in it. The Railways Commissioner is no longer exempted from the requirements of the legislation in connection with cranes and hoists. The legislation is binding on the Crown in relation to lifts but not in relation to cranes and hoists. Would it not be reasonable to expect it to be binding on the Crown in relation to cranes and hoists, too? Maybe those pieces of equipment are covered under some other Act. I should like the Minister to explain certain aspects of the legislation that are not completely clear. Section 4 (1) of the principal Act provides:

> This Act shall apply to and in respect of all cranes, hoists and lifts in this State except . . .
>
> (*e*) Any crane or hoist owned by a *bona fide* agriculturist, and used on any farm for agricultural, horticultural, viticultural or dairy purposes.

That is fairly clear: it exempts the primary producer when he is using on his property a machine that incorporates a lifting device. Although fishing is generally regarded as an agricultural industry, it is not covered by the exemptions. Many fishermen operate their nets by a system of trawling, employing a type of winch that would be regarded as a crane or hoist. Can the Minister say whether such fishermen are meant to be exempted from the operation of the legislation?

Many farm implements today are operated by a hydraulic lift. I assume that the manufacturer is covered. If he is not covered under this Act, I assume he is covered under some other Act. Further, the *bona fide* agriculturist is covered by an exemption under this legislation when a machine is being operated on a farm. I am concerned, however, about the position of a machinery agent who probably operates these machines in his showrooms or perhaps at an agricultural show. Will the Minister ascertain where these people stand in relation to the Act? I turn now to clause 14, which enacts new section 14a, subsection (1) of which provides as follows:

> A person shall not operate or be in charge of a crane to which this section applies unless he holds a certificate of competency authorizing him to operate or be in charge of a crane.

In every instance in this Bill, cranes and hoists are referred to. Indeed, there is a definition in the Bill. However, this new section 14a (1) refers only to "crane". Will the Minister say when a crane becomes a hoist, and *vice versa*. I assume that, when it is registered, a machine is registered as a crane or a hoist. As there seems to be some ambiguity regarding this new subsection, I ask the Minister to clarify the situation. It is not clear to me, and I have no doubt that it is also not clear to other honourable members, why "crane" only should be referred to. If the Minister can clear up the matters to which I have referred, I will support the second reading.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD secured the adjournment of the debate.

COTTAGE FLATS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 11. Page 684.)

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (Southern): I rise to support the second reading. People find themselves in necessitous circumstances because of many reasons, some of which are inadequate income, physical inability to earn any longer, loss of support, and loss of relatives. These are just a few factors that create in all communities a group of people who are necessitous through no fault of their own. A Select Committee, which was appointed by this Council to inquire into the plight and needs of pensioners and others in distress, yesterday laid its report on the table of the Council.

It was obvious from the evidence the committee received that one of the outstanding needs of most persons, whatever else, was a suitable shelter over their heads. In this respect, one has to think in terms of size, as such persons obviously want not a mansion but something in which they can be housed and adequately care for themselves. The site of such a shelter would also have to be considered, as it would be no good having it in such a position that its occupiers could not get to shops or in and out of the house except with great difficulty. The basic cost of such houses would also have to be considered because, the greater the expenditure incurred, the fewer that can be built. The general maintenance and the cost thereof must also be considered.

The Select Committee's first conclusion was that there is still a great need for aged persons to be able to obtain non-donor, low-rental housing, and it urged that the South Australian Housing Trust's programme in this respect be developed to the maximum possible extent. Another conclusion was the need to expand and develop proper domiciliary services, which are at present grossly inadequate. These two aspects go together. I refer to suitable low-priced housing and proper domiciliary services, which include not only visiting nursing services, if necessary, but also laundry services, meals such as those provided by Meals on Wheels, library facilities, social workers, and even hairdressing, and chiropody, all of which a normal, active person takes for granted. All these factors taken together enable persons who would otherwise be in necessitous circumstances to continue living in dignity in their own homes.

In some instances the old home, which in the past met the family's requirements, is now too big, and the rates and taxes are sometimes beyond a person's ability to pay. Also, some gardens are too much for one to care for. In the latter years of their lives, many people have difficulty in living as self-managing and self-respecting couples, or as single persons after the death of the marriage partner. The plight of such people can be blightingly necessitous. They need, and cannot do without, a dwellinghouse that is within their financial and physical means. Generally, they do not have $2,500 or $3,000 to put down as a deposit. Indeed, many do not have $200 or $300.

It is worth bearing in mind that not all necessitous persons are aged. For various reasons, such as ailments, some people become needy and necessitous at a much earlier age in life than what one normally considers as old age. For differing reasons, such folk do not always benefit from the provisions of social services legislation. There are also those who, because of desertion and neglect, are painfully embarrassed and in great need. These different groups comprise the people that the cottage flats and similar organizations are meant to help. Where and how such flats for these people in need are sited has been the subject of much thought and careful consideration. In some countries there are council housing estates; in South Australia there are Housing Trust estates. It is worth while having in these estates a proportion of accommodation suitable for those who come within the ambit of necessitous folk but who, with suitable housing, could take their place reasonably within society.

In the past, voluntary agencies have provided much of the living accommodation and associated facilities for elderly and necessitous folk. Although reference to individual isolated bodies would be invidious and in bad taste, I do not think anyone would resent my referring to the Salvation Army, which is held in universal respect for its special devotion to a sad segment of society. With the natural growth pattern of our population, there must be a steady increase in that section of the population which comes and will continue to come into the group of those who are necessitous or aged (or both) and who need suitable housing.

With ever-increasing costs, it becomes increasingly difficult for voluntary agencies to meet the bulk of this growing need, as they have done in the past. Governments are taking

an increasing interest in meeting this need all over the world. However, I hope Governments will never try to take over the whole field of community help because, however anxious they are to do the right thing, Governments cannot provide the personal touch that voluntary agencies alone can. I hope Governments will always find room for and work through voluntary channels. In the last day or so in this Chamber we have had definitions of certain words, including "viable". In thinking of necessitous people, one is concerned with the word "charity". So often it is synonymous with "hand-outs", the crumbs left over from the rich man's table; but the real meaning surely covers concern and personal regard for one's fellow man. This is most truly exhibited by organizations whose only reason for engaging in work such as caring and providing for the necessitous is to show concern and personal regard for their fellow man.

I mentioned earlier the work of the Salvation Army. In Nigeria, West Africa, a year ago a large body of relief workers wore on their arms a band bearing the word of which "charity" is a derivative—"Caritas". Those people were there in the same way as the Salvation Army and other organizations were, trying to serve their fellow men. But the day when all the care, including accommodation, for necessitous people could be left to those bodies unaided is gone. The day when government takes it all over or even supervises it all (if there is any difference between the two) will, I trust, never come.

Government resources are, however, providing increasing measures of help as the financial stringency trims off the ability of some voluntary groups to continue to the degree they have done in the past. These cottage flats form part of that measure. The need for them and similar buildings is widespread throughout the State. Obviously, the greatest need is in the metropolitan area, but the need is widespread throughout the State, in every urban and rural collection of population of any size.

The sum of money provided for in the original Act in 1966 was $50,000 a year for five years. The cynic could say, "That is chicken feed compared with the need." However, money has come through the Home Purchase Guarantee Fund, and matching contributions have been made by the Housing Trust itself, so to an extent the provision of these flats, as we learned on the Select Committee, has led to the problem of their hitting at the total provision of all other housing for other people. Indeed, to a certain extent, it is robbing Peter to house Paul, because money had to be provided direct by a matching grant from the Housing Trust in addition to this direct sum of money provided under the Cottage Flats Act.

Occasionally, I understand, more than the $50,000 allocated has been provided, thus enabling more flats to be built, and all credit to the trust for doing that. Apparently, since its original introduction in 1966, the lending institutions that have operated under the Homes Act have been making different arrangements for securing repayment of their loans, so presumably further operations of the fund by way of commission or payment under guarantee will cease.

It is noticeable in this Bill that 50 per cent more money is being allowed each year during the next five years than was allocated in the past, the rate not exceeding $75,000 a year comparing with the previous $50,000. It is 50 per cent more than in the past but, alas, much of that increase granted will be swallowed up in rising costs and the decreasing value of money. This is a worthwhile Bill. I support it and look forward to voluntary enterprise and government together extending the provisions aimed at eradicating from society, at least as far as some people are concerned, the term "necessitous person". I trust that this Bill will have a speedy passage.

The Hon. C. M. HILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 11. Page 685.)

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I support the second reading of this short Bill which will, when put into effect, bring about a useful change in the administration procedures for the indictment of criminal offenders in the Supreme Court. It is necessary when a person is indicted before the Supreme Court that he be charged on the information of the Attorney-General. I vividly recall many years ago, when I served in the Crown Law Department as an articled clerk, helping to prepare some of these informations, which had to be sent by the Crown Prosecutor to the Attorney-General's office for signature. I remember that, when the Attorney-General was not around for some reason or other (perhaps his Parliamentary duties had taken him out of the State or into

the country), there was always a panic whether or not the informations would be signed in time to be read out in court. Now this procedure, which has apparently been one of long standing, will at last cease, and the Attorney-General will be able to delegate his authority to sign the informations to the Crown Prosecutor, who prepares them in the first place anyhow. It seems to me to be eminently sensible that this should be done. I have always wondered why it was not suggested a long time ago. As the Bill does nothing more than that, it has my complete support.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

LOCAL AND DISTRICT CRIMINAL COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 11. Page 685.)

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): This Bill, too, has my support. It effects the same amendment as the Bill just dealt with, except that in this case it is not the Supreme Court with which we are concerned but the Local and District Criminal Courts.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.43 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 17, at 2.15 p.m.