HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, November 8, 1966.

The SPEAKER (Hon. L. G. Riches) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

OFF-SHORE BOUNDARY.

Mr. HALL: Can the Premier say what measures he is taking on behalf of the Government to resolve the dispute that exists in respect of the extension of the off-shore boundary between South Australia and Victoria? What is he doing to see that the disputed territory may be once again claimed fairly by South Australia so that it will become available for companies to drill for oil?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Discussions have taken place between Mr. Wells, Q.C., and the Victorian Solicitor-General to see whether the boundary between the two States could be agreed for the purposes of the off-shore oil legislation. A number of proposals have been examined, but no final proposal has been made at Ministerial level. No letter offering to ''split the difference'' has been received from Sir Henry Bolte. The Government is prepared to continue talks at officer level to endeavour to achieve a basis for settlement that will fully safeguard South Australia's rights.

QUORN-HAWKER ROAD.

Mr. CASEY: A few weeks ago the contracting firm working on the road between Quorn and Hawker completed its contract and left behind a magnificent stretch of road between Quorn and Gordon. To all intents and purposes, this road is ready for sealing, but unfortunately there does not seem to be any move by the Highways Department to seal it. I have been approached on this matter by numerous residents of the district, and the latest approach to me is in the form of a letter from the local branch of the Stockowners Association which states in no uncertain terms that, even though this road has been left open for traffic in order to consolidate the base, it is deteriorating very rapidly indeed. Will the Minister of Lands take this matter up with the Minister of Roads and ascertain when the Highways Department intends to seal this strip of road?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to obtain a report from my colleague as quickly as possible.

CAPE TULIP.

Mr. HEASLIP: Several years ago, the District Council of Port Germein drew my attention to the menace of cape tulip in the Wirrabara forest area. The council launched a campaign (in which the Wirrabara forest staff, private landholders and the council were concerned) to cut down the spread of cape tulip and to try to eliminate it. Each year I have inspected the area and have received a report from the Weeds Officer of the council (Mr. Rowe) in which he expresses appreciation of the co-operation of the various people taking part in the campaign. I have now received another report, in which he makes the following recommendation:

> I would like to see the programme of the Woods and Forests Department started at an earlier date for a more effective cover. I feel too that with the present unit, only using a centrifugal pump, not really suitable for high pressure hand line operation, many man hours could be saved and a more efficient job done if one of the twin piston high pressure pump units with proper trigger hand guns was purchased for the job. I venture to say that with such a unit, over and above the present system, two men (one driver and one sprayer) could do the same area in less time and more efficiently, thus resulting in a saving of cost to all concerned.

As I have already referred this report to the Minister of Forests, has he had time to consider the recommendation and, if he has, can he do anything about the matter?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The honourable member was good enough to show me the Weeds Officer's report, which I referred to the Conservator of Forests. Last week, both the Conservator and the Deputy Conservator went to Wirrabara to examine the situation and to see just what could be done about it. They have now furnished me with the following report:

> There is no doubt that the control measures being carried out annually are significantly reducing the incidence of the weed, and spraying will be continued to prevent the danger of any further spread; eventually it is hoped to eradicate it. The equipment referred to by the Port Germein council's Weeds Officer has been inspected by our district forester at Wirrabara, and he will be reporting shortly on its possible application to our work.

I was particularly interested to hear about the equipment to which the Weeds Officer referred. It appears as though it can be purchased at a reasonable price, and, if it can be, I believe it could be quite an advantage.

CITRUS.

Mr. CURREN: Recently I have received a letter from Mr. E. H. Muller of Rosedale, *via* Gawler, in which he draws my attention to a quotation from the Barclay's Bank (London) publication *Overseas Review*. On page 59, under the heading "Israel", and the sub-heading "Citrus", the following article appears:

Next year's citrus export target will be 17,000,000 to 17,500,000 crates compared with last season's 15,250,000 crates. Israel is faced with stiff competition from increasingly productive plantations in Cyprus and Spain, and negotiations are proceeding with Australia and New Zealand so that Israel's citrus may be exported to these countries.

I forwarded this letter to the Minister of Agriculture and, as I understand he now has a reply, I ask him to give it.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Chief Horticulturist reports:

It is well known that Israel's citrus production is increasing and that they are seeking markets in the Southern Hemisphere. They have developed a port near the Persian Gulf with a view to shipping to South-East Asia and nearby countries. In past years there have been occasional rumours of Israel oranges coming into Australia but I am not aware that any have been received. Very seldom are Australian markets short of citrus fruits and when they are it is only for a brief period usually in between the end of the valencia crop and the beginning of the navel crop. It is unlikely that it would be profitable for Israel to sell on the Australian market.

The Commonwealth quarantine requirements for the importation of citrus fruit from Israel are that approval may be granted subject to fumigation or cold storage as a sterilization treatment against fruit fly. Alternatively, citrus may be imported into Australia if it is accompanied by a certificate that it was grown at least 50 miles from the nearest fruit fly infestation. There must be also a Government assurance that the disease mal secco is not present. The fruit must be in clean cases which themselves must be free from insect pests. These requirements would add to the cost. New Zealand, which is a good market for Australian oranges, would probably receive oranges from Israel under similar conditions to those set out for Australia. Our experience with New Zealand indicates that while showing a preference for Australian oranges, they will purchase good quality fruit from any country providing the price and quality are satisfactory. During the early part of the year (January-May) Australian oranges are not available for export and it is likely that New Zealand would import from Israel or other sources during that period.

This bears out the importance of controlling the citrus industry, particularly as regards costs and quality of fruit. We are being threatened in South-East Asia with competition from a country that can produce fruit more cheaply than we can. Australian citrus fruit has a good name and I believe that to maintain that good name we should be most particular to see that only the highest quality fruit is exported.

SITTINGS.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Several weeks ago I understood the Premier to say that the Government intended to adjourn the sittings of the House on November 17, to February 28. Since then, on October 27, the Chief Secretary said, in reply to a question, that the Government intended to prorogue Parliament on November 17. Can the Premier clarify the position?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Parliament will meet at 2 p.m. on November 17, but I do not know at what time it will adjourn at that sitting. However, it will adjourn until the resumption in February.

PORT BROUGHTON ROAD.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Roads to a question I asked last week regarding the Port Pirie to Port Broughton road?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports that there has been little progress on the reconstruction and sealing of the Port Pirie to Port Broughton road because departmental funds have been committed to other roads considered to have higher priority. During the current financial year, the District Council of Port Pirie has almost spent an allocation of $18,500 on reconstruction south of Port Pirie, and it is expected that further funds will be available to the council during next financial year to enable two to three miles to be sealed. It does not seem that construction can be accelerated until at least 1968-69. Consideration is being given to employing a departmental gang on the road during that year.

HOSPITALS.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Premier a reply to my question of last week about the statement made by the Minister of Health concerning hospitals?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The honourable member for Burnside alleged in this House that the Chief Secretary, in some private conversation with someone whom she did not name, in some place and at some time she did not specify, had made a statement completely opposed to the policy of the Government. I promised a full investigation of this scandalous imputation, and to that end I wrote to the honourable member asking her for information which would allow us to check the truth of the statement which she made under privilege in Parliament. I received the following letter from her:

> Thank you for your letter of November 2. I have since approached my informant and while she adheres completely to the statement which she previously made to me, she does not desire me to disclose her name as she is a prominent hospital worker and considers she may suffer some unpleasantness as a result. In any case I cannot see that this information is material and would assist you in whatever investigations you desire to make. I understand the Minister has not publicly denied making the remarks attributed to him.

I consulted my colleague the Chief Secretary, who has furnished me with the following statement:

> The member for Burnside alleges that in some private conversation, about which she will give no details, I said, "We have not the slightest intention of building another teaching hospital.'' I have never said those words, or anything like them, to anyone at any time. If the person to whom the honourable member alleges I made the statement actually exists (as to which I entertain the gravest doubts), then I challenge the member for Burnside to bring that person forward. The whole allegation of the member for Burnside is completely contrary to what the Government and I, as the responsible Minister, have been both doing and saying. The land has been acquired for the teaching hospital, the site chosen, and the planning committee established. Only as recently as October 24 I spoke on this matter at the Convention of the Australian College of General Practitioners, and the *Advertiser* report the following morning reads:
>
>> The Chief Secretary said yesterday that . . . the establishment of a new teaching hospital at Bedford Park would help relieve the shortage of general practitioners.
>>
>> Mr. Shard said planning for the proposed Bedford Park teaching hospital was on schedule. By the early 1970's it would go a long way towards providing more of the doctors required in the community.

Mr. Speaker, that should make the Chief Secretary's position quite clear. For myself, I have never previously known a member of this House make an accusation against a Minister or another member on the basis of an alleged private conversation with some anonymous person. To do so is, in my view, completely contrary to the traditions of this Parliament and in breach of the standards of personal responsibility and integrity which the public should be able to expect of members of this House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Although it would be improper for me to canvass the grossly unfair reflections cast on the member for Burnside by the Premier, I ask the honourable gentleman, arising out of the answer he gave her, what the time table of the Government is for the erection of the new teaching hospital to which he referred.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall try to get a report on the matter and bring it down as soon as possible.

DARLINGTON PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. HUDSON: The Darlington Primary School building, which was erected in 1962, has since been subject to severe cracking and the soil in the vicinity has been found to be unsuitable for the erection of a two-storey building. Last year I asked questions of the Minister of Works and of the Minister of Education about the cracking that was evident in the building and asked for an investigation so that remedial action could be taken. At that time the reply was that some movement was still taking place, that the matter was under investigation, but that until the movement had ceased remedial action would not be taken. On visiting the school recently, I noticed that the cracking had become worse, and was informed that teachers and parents were concerned for the possible safety of the children, particularly as the main Adelaide fault line runs nearby. As I made a further approach to the Minister of Works last week (as he will remember), will he obtain a complete report on the situation at this school and on the Public Buildings Department's proposals to rectify the matter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As a report from the Public Buildings Department reached my desk only a few minutes before I left my office this morning, I intended to study it more closely so that I could give the honourable member the fullest possible details. True, he raised this matter with me late last week, following which I took it up with the Director of Public Buildings. Immediate attention has been given to the matter; at this juncture it is believed that no immediate danger exists to students or teachers, although it is acknowledged that further investigations and work will have to be undertaken. Immediate attention will be given to tidying up by soft-puttying the cracks, but I assure the honourable member that this is not the end of the matter: full inquiries are being made and the necessary work will be undertaken in order to effect repairs.

AUDITORS' CERTIFICATES.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Local Government a reply to my recent question about the revocation of local government auditors' licences?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Minister of Local Government reports that the regulations under section 83 of the Local Government Act dealing with local government auditors were redrafted and came into force in November, 1965. One of the principal amendments made to the previous regulations was to give the Local Government Auditors' Examining Committee power to revoke a certificate when, in its opinion, the holder had failed to exercise the office of auditor to any council in a competent manner. The former regulations only gave the committee power to revoke a certificate when, in its opinion, the holder was not a fit and proper person to hold a certificate. Legal advice received indicated that this power should be used only where the personal character of a holder was in doubt; it should not be exercised purely on the grounds of competency.

As a consequence, the committee was unable, until the local government auditors' certificate regulations, 1965, came into force, to deal effectively with cases of incompetent work. The answer to the question asked by the honourable member is that in the past five years only one local government auditors' certificate has been revoked. A further case for revocation of a certificate is at present under consideration. However, arising from reports on investigations, the committee took action which resulted (in 1962) in one auditor resigning all of his appointments and surrendering his certificate and (in 1964) in one auditor undertaking to resign his appointments to seven councils, thereby reducing his audits to three only.

KULPARA-PASKEVILLE ROAD.

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Roads a reply to my recent question about work being undertaken on the Kulpara-Paskeville Road?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports:

It is intended to continue the reconstruction and sealing of the Kulpara-Wallaroo Main Road No. 38 through Paskeville to the railway crossing on the eastern side of Kadina. Work should be completed by December, 1967.

MOORLANDS INTERSECTION.

Mr. NANKIVELL: A fatal accident occurred on Friday at the intersection of Highways No. 12 and No. 8 at Moorlands. I understand that it is difficult to interpret the right-of-way rules at this intersection, although, in saying that, I do not know whether this matter is *sub judice*. However the road from Tailem Bend to Moorlands is contiguous with the highway to Pinnaroo; in other words, the Bordertown highway deviates from that road. At this corner many misunderstandings concerning the right of way occur, particularly as Victoria has a system of major and minor roads, the right of way being given to people on the major roads. Indeed the recent accident involved people from Victoria and South Australia. Will the Premier obtain a report on the number and nature of accidents that have occurred during the last 12 months at this junction or at the corner immediately adjacent to the junction? Also, will he obtain similar information regarding a corner in the township of Coomandook?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: We learned of the accident with much regret, and our sympathy undoubtedly is with the friends and relatives of the victims. I will take up this matter with the Minister of Roads, and I will also see whether the Highways Department has a recommendation to make.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I appreciate the Minister's offer to take up with the Highways Department the matter concerning the Moorlands corner. However, will he ask the Minister of Roads whether provision for redesigning the junction has been made in the plans that have been drawn up to enable the department to reconstruct the section of road between Moorlands and Peake? An indication has already been given that this work is to be undertaken in the next financial year. Also, I am particularly interested to know whether consideration has been given in these plans to altering the radius of the corner of Highway No. 8 at that point. This is a sharp corner where I believe many cars roll over, quite apart from the other dangers arising from the junction itself. Will the Minister ask his colleague whether consideration has been given to altering this corner when work is undertaken on the reconstruction of Highway No. 12? If there are any doubts on the matter, will the Minister ask his colleague to have the Road Traffic Board examine the corner with a view to recommending what should be done in the interests of the travelling public? I am sure that, when I obtain the figures I have requested, honourable members will see, from the number of accidents that have taken place at this corner over the last 12 months, that this is a dangerous corner.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am sure that my colleague would share with the honourable member the concern he has expressed about this corner and about the obvious dangers existing there, which are well known to me. I shall be happy to take up the matter and to obtain a report for the honourable member, particularly as to any work that might be carried out immediately to fit into a reconstruction plan next year.

HOLDEN HILL INTERSECTION.

Mrs. BYRNE: On October 26 I asked a question concerning the Highways Department's plans for Valiant Road, Holden Hill, in the scheme outlined by the Highways Department for seeking greater safety at the intersection of the Main North-East Road and Grand Junction Road, Holden Hill. Has the Minister of Lands a reply?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports:

Due to the angle at which Valiant Road joins the intersection of Grand Junction Road and the Main North-East Road, it was found impracticable to design the roundabout to permit safe ingress and egress to Valiant Road without having adverse effect on the main movements round the island. It is consequently intended to close Valiant Road for a short distance from the intersection and to create a turning area adjacent to the last property in Valiant Road. Traffic wishing to gain access to Valiant Road can do so *via* Avocet Street or Lowan Street.

MURRAY RIVER SALINITY.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: On October 19 I asked a question regarding the last meeting of the River Murray Commission which was chaired by the Commonwealth Minister for National Development. At that meeting the commission decided to plan a future policy on salinity in the Murray River. Has the Minister of Irrigation a reply?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief (who is the South Australian representative on the River Murray Commission) reports:

The commission has been investigating this important question for some time, particularly in regard to the systematic and co-ordinated collection of data to enable a clear picture of the problem to be obtained. At a meeting held on September 23, 1966, the commission decided to engage a specialist in this field as a consultant and attempts are being made to obtain the services of a consultant with the necessary knowledge and background. The position has been offered to a well-known and experienced engineer, but he has not yet advised whether he will accept this assignment. Failing this, efforts will be made in other directions to obtain a suitable man.

Incidentally, I point out that Mr. Dridan's appointment as the State's representative on the River Murray Commission does not expire until December 31 this year. Mr. Beaney will take over the position on January 1, 1967.

SHEEP DIPPING.

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to a question I asked last week concerning the dipping of sheep?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Stockowners Association of South Australia has supported the proposal to withdraw the compulsory dipping notice for a trial period of two years, provided that more vigorous action is taken to clean up infected flocks. The Australian Wheat and Woolgrowers Association and the Australian Primary Producers Union have not expressed any further opinion since their executives discussed the proposal with me in July. It is noted that the provision for compulsory dipping has now been withdrawn in Victoria.

GAS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Is the Premier conversant with the agreement announced last week for the sale of natural gas to the South Australian Gas Company by the companies at present operating the Gidgealpa-Moomba field? If he is, can he say whether the agreement is based on the assumption that the Government is to build the pipeline or whether it is based on the assumption that it is to be built by private interests?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Gas Company has not presented any report to me on the matters associated with its proposal to enter into an agreement concerning the use of natural gas. However, I think I can safely say that the company would be under the impression that the Government would build the pipeline. At present, all we are waiting for in order to commence this operation is an appropriate reply from the Commonwealth Government. I think I can say in fairness to South Australia that a very long time has elapsed since I first mentioned this matter. In fact, it goes back to June, and I would have thought that long before this time, with all the evidence that has been submitted to the Commonwealth Government, the Prime Minister would have been able to give a positive assurance on this matter, for it is a developmental project in the interests of this State. I go further and say emphatically that, if ever this State is to be able to use any of its natural resources, this pipeline is one thing that it must have. If South Australia is to continue as a State, it is essential that this money be made available for this developmental project. Although the Gas Company has not communicated its proposals to me, I have some idea of them. I think all the people of South Australia, including the honourable member for Gumeracha, desire the Commonwealth Government to finance this gas pipeline in the interests of this State.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (on notice):

1. Did the Government agree to the postponement of drilling operations at Moomba? If so, for how long?

2. How many drilling plants are now engaged on petroleum exploration in South Australia?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. None; but equipment is currently being moved for the purpose of further drilling operations in South Australia.

CARRIBIE BASIN.

Mr. FERGUSON: Recently I asked the Minister of Works a question about the development of the water basin in the hundred of Carribie. Has he a reply?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As assumed in my earlier reply to the honourable member, the report from the Mines Department on drilling operations in the Carribie Basin has been received by the Director and Engineer-in-Chief and is now being studied. In answer to the honourable member's question, the Director and Engineer-in-Chief has now forwarded the following report from the Engineer for Water Supply:

The report confirms that the basin is of small extent and carefully controlled development would be necessary to prevent ingress of sea-water. An investigation into a scheme for the development of the basin has not yet commenced, due to the pressure of other work and staff limitations. A considerable amount of work will be necessary to examine the most effective method of utilizing the water available and determining whether it is economically sound to develop this basin. Loan funds likely to be available to the department are fully committed for a number of years and it is therefore necessary to use available staff on urgently required approved works. The investigation will be commenced as soon as possible, but it is not expected that it will be completed for at least 12 months.

ANSTEY HILL ROAD.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my question of November 1 about the inadequate fencing bordering the Anstey Hill road?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague reports that it is intended to recommend the calling of tenders for the erection of a further length of guard rail on the Anstey Hill section of the Lower North-East Main Road No. 93 within two weeks. A length of about 5,000ft. will be treated, and this work will complete the provision of safety fencing on all of the Anstey Hill section requiring protection.

PINE TREES.

Mr. RODDA: I am concerned about the completion of a new roadway in the Naracoorte Caves area. I believe that a delay in the work has taken place because a portion of land on which there are about 30 or 40 small pine trees growing has been excised for the Woods and Forests Department. Apparently the department has expressed a wish to obtain the land so that the pine trees can be used as Christmas trees. Consequently, although most of the work has been done, work on this small area has been held up for the reason to which I have referred. Can the Minister of Forests say whether the land is being held to enable the trees to be sold as Christmas trees, thereby delaying the completion of this important work?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I know nothing of the situation to which the honourable member refers, but I will get a report on it.

CONCESSION FARES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to ask a question of the Premier (as it is a matter of Government policy) concerning concession fares for university students. To explain my question I shall quote the following two paragraphs from a letter which I received some months ago and which I subsequently embodied in a letter to the Premier:

I am a university student, aged 18. On my nineteenth birthday, while my small income from my Commonwealth scholarship remains static, my bus fares will more than treble, as I shall no longer be eligible for a bus pass. On an income of $6 per week this is difficult: for those supporting themselves by vacation jobs, of pocket money from their parents, it can be catastrophic. My best friend wept on her nineteenth birthday. She is doubly penalized, as unlike our friends from Springfield, who have easily arranged rides with business men driving to the city, her parents are not rich and she lives in a poorer district with few cars. And the age limit is not our only trouble. As our passes are only valid until 6.30 p.m., we have direct financial discouragement from studying in the libraries at night, with essential books. Don't you think this is more serious than the odd use of a pass to go to the pictures would be, if the limit were extended till 10 p.m., when the libraries shut?

In my letter to the Premier, I asked the honourable gentleman whether the Government would consider, in the light of this matter (and I think the same experience could be reproduced many times), extending further the concessions to students, and the honourable gentleman, in his reply, canvassed some improvements that the Government had introduced and said:

The matter you have raised will be kept under review for any future extension which may be practicable.

I point out that since he wrote to me at the beginning of April bus fares have risen again quite steeply. I have now had an approach along the same lines from another student living in my district. Therefore, I ask the honourable gentleman whether the Government has been able to consider this matter again (especially in the light of the recent steep increase in bus fares) and, if it has, whether it intends to introduce further concessions for university students. If the matter has not been reconsidered, will the Premier have it reconsidered by Cabinet with a view to increasing concessions?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I wonder whether there was a further ''if'', ''but'', or ''why'' that should have been included in the question. I believe the honourable gentleman could have made his question quite clear without incorporating in it the details from the letter to which he referred. However, in view of what I said earlier, I am prepared to have the matter further considered.

LAKE LEVELS.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of last week about the lake levels at Lake Albert and Lake Alexandrina and about the date of closing of the barrages.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief has forwarded the following report from the Engineer for Irrigation and Drainage, which is dated Friday, November 4:

The present run of freshet in the river is easing at Lock 9, the flow being recorded as 5,600 cusecs. The flow at Lock 1 is 8,500 cusecs. Present indications are that the barrages should be closed by mid-December. The recorded reduced levels today at Goolwa and Tauwitchere Barrages are 109.45 and 110.10 respectively. Normal level for the barrages is 109.50.

SCHOOL WINDOWS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On October 11 last, I asked a question concerning the reduction in remuneration being paid to Mr. S. J. A. Asser who has a contract for cleaning at the Mitcham Girls Technical High School. The Minister of Education has now written me a letter drawing my attention to the answer he gave to the honourable member for Flinders last week explaining why, even though some cleaners were not cleaning windows, their remuneration had been reduced, and was reduced at the same time as the remuneration of those who were cleaning windows. Mr. Asser received a letter dated September 12, apparently written on the assumption that he was cleaning windows, because it started off:

It has been decided that, as from October 1, 1966, you will not be required to clean windows and this work will be omitted from all cleaning contracts.

I asked how such a mistake occurred, and, even in the light of the explanation given to the member for Flinders last week, I now ask whether the right thing has been done in Mr. Asser's case, in view of the letter he received.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The correct thing has been done, and I thought this was explained in my answer to the honourable member for Flinders. If the honourable member looks at that answer, he will see the following:

The method of paying for school cleaning work prior to the decision to cease cleaning windows was adopted many years ago, and the last detailed review in the method of calculating the rate was in 1953. Under this method a flat rate a square foot was paid for the total area of the floor and window space cleaned. At the time this method was adopted the window area represented only a small proportion of the total area to be cleaned, and for this reason it was considered expedient to adopt a method which gave a fairly generous rate for window cleaning. Some time after the adoption of this method, pressure was brought to bear on the Education Department to increase the rates for cleaners who had no window cleaning. The argument advanced in favour of the increase was that, as windows had to be cleaned only three times a year, the cleaners of the windows were receiving money in return for far less effort than those with only floor area. Eventually it was agreed that an allowance of 8 per cent on the rates of cleaners who were required to clean floors only should be paid. Modern trends in building, with greatly increased window space in relation to floor area, resulted in the old method of payment becoming quite unrealistic in relation to the work done.

In other words, the people who cleaned only floors got an 8 per cent loading, because the others who did clean windows were correspondingly much better off. Naturally when the amount for window cleaning was cut out, so was the 8 per cent loading.

Mr. Millhouse: Why did Mr. Asser get a letter as if he were a window cleaner?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Letters were sent to everybody, irrespective of whether they cleaned windows or not, because those who cleaned only floors had the 8 per cent loading.

WATERVALE WATER SCHEME.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: My question arises from the following letter I have received from the Clerk of the District Council of Upper Wakefield:

> In previous correspondence mention has been made of the township of Watervale being connected to the Engineering and Water Supply mains at Clare or Auburn. My council is most emphatic in the belief that the connection should be made to the Warren trunk main, and so serve an additional number of landholders in this district. It would be most appreciated if a separate line could be laid from the Warren main and connect direct to Watervale passing to the west of the township of Auburn.

I have asked several questions about the water service to Watervale. As I know the Minister of Works has been planning for a scheme for some months, will he ascertain what stage the scheme has arrived at?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: There are a number of parts to the honourable member's question. First, he agrees that proposals have been made for a scheme at Watervale and Auburn, but there seems a suggestion that there should be a variation from the original proposal. I assure the honourable member that the Engineering and Water Supply Department, like the Government, is anxious to give the greatest possible service to the greatest possible number when it lays its mains. This possibly goes without saying, because the more people served, the better revenue return from the expenditure incurred. I will have the honourable member's question investigated, and let him have a report as soon as possible.

FARM SAFETY.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of October 20 relating to farm safety?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Minister of Labour and Industry states:

> An advisory committee on safety in rural industries has been appointed in New South Wales consisting of a Technical Officer of the Department of Labour and Industry as Chairman, two representatives of rural employers, one representative of the Australian Workers Union and the Agricultural Engineer of the Department of Agriculture. The functions of the committee are to constitute technical subcommittees to carry out investigations and make recommendations on safety provisions in the various rural industries, and to inquire into rural safety generally. Recommendations of the subcommittee are considered and collated by the advisory committee, which then makes appropriate submissions, where necessary, to the Minister of Labour and Industry.
>
> Although no action has been taken in South Australia to form a similar committee, the Director of Agriculture and the Secretary for Labour and Industry have had discussions concerning action which can be taken in this State in an endeavour to reduce the number of fatalities and serious accidents caused by tractors. These discussions are continuing between officers of the two departments. The reason why Mr. Freebairn did not have precise statistics regarding accidents on farms is that there are none available. Because of the large number of self-employed persons who work in agricultural industries, the normal source of obtaining information concerning accidents at work, viz., workmen's compensation claims cannot be used, as a self-employed person does not have to insure himself.

RAILWAY STAFF.

Mr. HALL (on notice):

1. In view of the intention of the South Australian Railways Commissioner to move the transfer staff from Terowie to Peterborough when the Port Pirie to Broken Hill railway line is standardized, will any action be taken to provide additional houses at Peterborough?

2. Will any attempt be made to alleviate financial hardship which may arise as a consequence of this change?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Railways Commissioner reports:

1. No.

2. Consideration will be given in respect of railway staff at Terowie, who now occupy their own houses in that township and are required to transfer to another station, where such transfer will involve particular employees in financial hardship.

CITRUS INDUSTRY.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has Mr. G. D. Eitzen been refused a licence as a packer under the Citrus Industry Organization Act?

2. If so, why was he so refused?

3. Is the Citrus Organization Committee now prepared to grant Mr. Eitzen such a licence?

4. What action has the Government or the Minister or any Government officer taken to assist Mr. Eitzen?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. Because he did not comply with the policy of the Citrus Organization Committee.

3. Yes; if he complies with the policy of the Citrus Organization Committee.

4. Mr. Eitzen was offered employment in the Agriculture Department, but he declined the offer.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. In view of the judgment in the case, *Kalliontzis and another v. The Citrus Organization Committee of South Australia*, is it proposed to take any action to have Mr. and Mrs. Kalliontzis, or either of them, granted licences under the Citrus Industry Organization Act either as wholesalers or as packers?

2. If no action is proposed, why not?

3. How many persons have been refused licences by the Citrus Organization Committee as either wholesalers or packers?

4. How many persons have been licensed by the Citrus Organization Committee as packers?

5. Have any of these been warned that their licences will be terminated and not renewed?

6. If so, how many were so warned?

7. When will these licences be terminated?

8. Where are the persons so affected operating as packers at present?

9. What are the reasons for the intended termination of their licences?

10. Does the Government propose to introduce legislation to amend the Citrus Industry Organization Act?

11. If so, what amendments will be proposed?

12. In particular, will amendments state clearly whether it is or is not intended to authorize the committee to deprive some sections of the industry of their livelihood?

13. Is it the intention of the Government to provide for compensation for those so deprived?

14. Is it intended to amend or repeal section 20 (6) of the Citrus Industry Organization Act?

15. If so, what provision will be made for appeals?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The replies are as follows:

1. If Mr. and Mrs. Kalliontzis comply with Citrus Organization Committee policy, they will be granted a licence.

2. *Vide* No. 1.

3. See first Annual Report of Citrus Organization Committee tabled in Parliament on November 1, 1966.

4. *Vide* No. 3.

5. No; but some provisional licences have been issued and the holders have been informed of conditions on which they will be granted full licences.

6 to 9. *Vide* No. 5.

10. Yes.

11. Details will be revealed in due course.

12. *Vide* No. 11.

13. No.

14. *Vide* No. 11.

15. *Vide* No. 11.

WEST BEACH PRIMARY SCHOOL.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on West Beach Primary School.

Ordered that report be printed.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (REGISTRAR).

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1964. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It amends the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1966, and the principal amendments proposed are designed:

(*a*) to confer additional powers on the Registrar, an inspector, a police officer, etc., with regard to inspection of motor vehicles on an application to register or transfer the registration of a motor vehicle;

(*b*) to confer power upon the Registrar to refuse to register a motor vehicle pending investigation as to the correctness of the particulars in the application for registration, and for the Registrar to issue a permit permitting the applicant for registration to drive his vehicle on the road without a registration label pending the results of his investigation into the particulars disclosed on the application;

(*c*) to extend the period of limitation in which prosecutions may be brought under the principal Act to two years.

The amendments proposed in paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*) above are intended to give the Registrar wider administrative powers to deter or prevent the registration of stolen vehicles in this State. The absence of such powers to date have resulted in criticisms that the law in regard to registration of motor vehicles in South Australia is unsatisfactory, since it permits vehicles stolen in this State and other States of the Commonwealth to be registered here with comparative ease. Car thieves operating in other States have become aware of the defects in our existing law, and have been taking advantage of them to register here vehicles stolen in other States, particularly in Victoria and New South Wales.

When the Registrar has statutory authority for these additional powers he would put the following administrative procedure into effect with regard to secondhand vehicles. When a person applies for registration of a secondhand vehicle he is required, under the existing law, to state the previous registered number and the previous owner's name. The Registrar would check these details with his records before granting registration of the vehicle. If they agree with each other, registration would be effected forthwith. If they do not agree or if the applicant is unable to quote details of the previous registration, he will be required to produce the vehicle for inspection. A check will then be made against the list of stolen vehicles before registration is granted. All vehicles coming from other States would automatically be inspected.

So much for the registration of secondhand vehicles. With regard to registration of new vehicles the following procedures will be adopted to prevent or deter the registration of fictitious new vehicles. Any new vehicle, stated by a person representing himself as the owner thereof to have been purchased interstate or the origin of which the Registrar is suspicious (for example, if stated to be purchased from an unknown firm), will be inspected. This will apply to metropolitan applications and applications made in his department over the counter. The detection of any stolen vehicle registered by means of a 14-day permit in the country will be a matter for the police who issued the permit. The Registrar will identify, on the daily list of registrations supplied to the police, each new vehicle, which is not registered by a firm on behalf of a client. If, from a survey to be conducted on a later date, this procedure is not fully effective, alternative means to close up any loopholes will be examined.

This new procedure would it is anticipated, provide a safeguard at least as effective as the proceedings followed in other States and at far less cost. The number of inspections required should be comparatively few in number and should not impose undue strain on the Motor Vehicles Department or the police. The adoption of these proposals will, I may mention, in no way affect the introduction of the *alpha-numero* registration system which, as I have informed honourable members, the Government intends to introduce as soon as practicable. Clause 3 amends section 24 of the principal Act and enables the Registrar to refuse to register a motor vehicle pending investigation by him as to the correctness of the particulars of the application for registration of the motor vehicle. The purpose of this clause is apparent from my earlier remarks on the new procedure for inspection of motor vehicles.

Clause 4 inserts a new section 49a in the principal Act and enables the Registrar to issue a permit, enabling a vehicle to be driven on roads (instead of issuing a registration label), to any applicant for registration whose application for registration has been refused under section 24a (2) of the Act, pending investigation by the Registrar as to the correctness of the particulars disclosed in the application. This provision would ensure that an applicant for registration of a motor vehicle would not by reason of the refusal of the Registrar to register the vehicle be prevented from driving his vehicle on the road. Subsection (2) of this new section provides that a permit will remain in operation until the expiration of the date shown thereon and also provides that such permit shall not be of any force unless it is placed in the position where a registration label should be placed.

Clause 5 amends section 135 of the principal Act by striking out subsection (4) thereof. The provisions contained in this subsection will now be covered by the general limitation provision contained in clause 7. Clause 6 amends section 139 of the principal Act and confers upon the Registrar or an inspector or member of the Police Force additional powers of inspection for the purpose of verifying particulars disclosed on an application to register or to transfer the registration of any motor vehicle and also to require any person to produce a motor vehicle for inspection at a specified place and time for any of the purposes mentioned in this section. With regard to the amendment proposed in clause 7, the position as the law now stands is that proceedings for an offence under the Motor Vehicles Act must be brought within six months from the time that the offence was committed. This period of limitation is laid down by section 52 of the Justices Act and experience has shown that this period is insufficient for the purposes of the Motor Vehicles Act.

It is considered that a more appropriate period of limitation would be two years. With the introduction of the new inspection procedures proposed in this Bill it is expected that many changes of engine numbers and changes in weight, particularly in some commercial vehicles, will be revealed. If these changes occurred more than six months ago, no prosecution could be laid under the existing provision with regard to limitation of action. The increased period of limitation proposed in the clause would enable prosecutions for offences that have occurred within the last two years to be brought. It should also be mentioned that where the weight of vehicles is increased and the Registrar is not advised Government loses revenue on the registration fees that are payable. In commending this Bill for the consideration of honourable members, I stress the importance of its provisions, bearing in mind accusations that have been levelled against the Government for not further tightening up the legislation relating to stolen vehicles, particularly to the sale in this State of vehicles brought from another State. I think that members, on examining this measure, will realize that the Government is trying to protect the interests of the motoring public.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

POLICE PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Police Pensions Act, 1954-1964.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

As honourable members know, Parliament recently enacted amendments to the Superannuation Act which provide the following principal variations:

(1) The statutory Government subsidy was raised to a 70-30 basis.

(2) Widows' pensions were raised to 65 per cent of members' pensions.

(3) Children's rates were raised to a standard rate of $208 per annum.

(4) Opportunity was provided for age 60 retirement of men, and age 55 retirement of women, at full rather than reduced pension rates.

(5) Pensions were converted from bimonthly to fortnightly payments.

It is appropriate that the Police Pensions Act, which provides for pensions at age 60 because of the compulsory retirement by policemen at that age, should be brought into line with these improvements. The Bill is designed to bring its provisions into line with them. To bring current contribution rates to a 70-30 subsidy basis, if members' pension entitlements were to be left unaltered, reductions of the order of 23 per cent to 25 per cent would be appropriate. However, the Police Association stated that its members desired that, instead of being granted the full benefit of such reductions, their basic pension entitlements should be increased in line with salary increases since the basic pension was reviewed in 1964, with some allowance for prospective increases in salaries that might arise from a log of claims now being considered. On these grounds an increase of about 9 per cent in basic pension entitlement seems appropriate, and if this is allowed then reductions in contributions of the order of 16 per cent to 18 per cent are proper.

Whilst a basic pension rate is provided in the Act for police officers below the rank of sergeant, loadings for both contribution rates and pension entitlements are provided for sergeants and commissioned officers. However, these loadings are at present not adequate to give such officers retiring benefits, including their lump sum payments, as high as the equivalent of 50 per cent of retiring salary. This possibly was not unreasonable when other public employees could retire at 60 only at reduced pension rates below 50 per cent of retiring salary. But now that other public employees can subscribe for full pensions at age 60 retirement it is reasonable to raise the loadings for higher paid police officers so that all can receive comparable benefits. The association representing these officers has expressed their desire to contribute for these increased benefits rather than to receive reductions in contributions arising from the increased Government subsidy. Appropriate heavier loadings are extended in the Bill to include also the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner who are entitled to retire at age 60 although not obliged to retire until 65.

Because those police officers of the rank of sergeant and above who have already retired on pension did not have the opportunity to subscribe for benefits as high as the equivalent of 50 per cent of the retiring salaries, provision is made for the loadings to their basic pensions to be increased by one-half. This will give them loadings generally consistent with the increased loadings for which present higher paid officers will be permitted to contribute. In the 1964 amendments provision was made for contributions to commence compulsorily from age 21 but no provision was made for an option to commence earlier. As an occasional junior officer is married and may desire the opportunity to contribute before age 21, provision is proposed to allow this on an optional basis. I would remind members that when dealing with the South Australian Superannuation Fund amendments I indicated that the Government proposed to examine existing pension rates, and particularly those of long standing, to ascertain whether it would be appropriate and practicable to grant relief in cases of hardship arising from progressive depreciation of the value of the pension. Increases in existing pensions from the Superannuation Fund were restricted in the recent amendments to those arising from bringing the Government subsidy up to the standard 70-30 basis and from bringing widows' pensions up to 65 per cent of members' pension rates.

The same general approach is proposed at present with police pensions. Moreover, the same re-examination is being made of long-standing police pensions to ascertain the extent to which it would be appropriate and practicable to increase them in cases of hardship arising from depreciation of their value. The overwhelming difficulty in this is the problem that over a considerable range an increase in such a pension does not bring any benefit to the pensioner, for, if he is entitled to some Commonwealth supplement through old age or widow's pension, he simply loses the amount of State pension increase by a corresponding reduction in Commonwealth supplement. The Victorian Government has, I believe, made some effort to overcome this problem, and the methods adopted and their measure of success are being studied. The Government is also being hampered in this study by the fact that it is finding considerable difficulty in securing a new Public Actuary, and in having up-to-date valuations made of the Superannuation Funds. As soon as investigations can lead to some adequate conclusions, the Government would propose appropriate action to deal with the matter of possible hardship arising in long-standing pensions.

I deal now shortly with the clauses of the Bill: Clause 5 provides for the new basis of Government subsidy of 70 per cent to which I have referred; and clause 6 makes the necessary provision regarding the commencement of contributions, and gives an option for a member to commence before reaching the compulsory age of 21 years. Clause 7 gives effect to the reduction in contributions, and to the higher loadings for members of the rank of sergeant and above. Clauses 8, 9 and 10 give effect to the increases in basic pension benefits payable on retirement in the future. These are increased by about 9 per cent. Clause 11 is a machinery provision resulting from the adoption of decimal currency and the provision for fortnightly payment of pensions. Clause 12 increases the pensions and benefits payable to future widow pensioners and for their children. The increase in pensions is about 18 per cent arising from an increase of about 9 per cent in the member's basic pension and a one-twelfth increase in the proportion of a widow's to a member's pension. All children's allowances are to be increased to $8 fortnightly.

Clause 13 removes from the principal Act special provisions concerning the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner now no longer appropriate in view of the new provisions raising their entitlement at age 60 to pensions and benefits broadly equivalent to half salary. Clause 14 provides for the increases in entitlement for present members of the force of the rank of sergeant and above to approximately the equivalent of half salary. Clause 16 (1) provides for existing pensions of retired members to be converted to a fortnightly rate by dividing the present annual rate by 26. Clause 16 (2) likewise converts existing widows' pensions to fortnightly rates. By using a divisor of 24 this at the same time raises all existing widows' pensions from a present 60 per cent of members' rates to a future 65 per cent of members' rates. Clause 16 (3) applies to pensioners who at retirement held the rank of sergeant or higher, and provides for pension increases generally to them in accord with the increases in loadings now to be permitted to present contributors of the rank of sergeant and above. Clause 16 (4) raises existing children's allowances to $8 a fortnight.

Clauses 17 and 19 relate to decimal currency. The former also increases the amount which may be paid without probate or letters of administration from $200 to $500. The remaining clauses of the Bill are of a formal or consequential nature. The immediate amendments proposed in this Bill and the deferment until later of the matter of other long-standing pensions have the full concurrence of the Police Association and of the representatives of the commissioned officers, with whom full and frank discussions have been held. They have specifically requested that these proposed amendments should be expedited. Accordingly, I would hope that members of both sides will be prepared to give this Bill speedy and favourable consideration in the interests of those who will benefit.

Mr. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADELAIDE WORKMEN'S HOMES INCORPORATED ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (HOUSING IMPROVEMENT AND EXCESSIVE RENTS) BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1932-1965. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The principal object of this short Bill is to provide workmen's compensation protection to waterfront workers while travelling to and from places of pick-up. The Act at present covers travelling between place of residence and place of work and, of course, workers are covered while in actual employment. In practice, waterfront workers report to pick-up centres where they may or may not be engaged. If they are engaged then the cover applies, but there is no provision for cover between place of residence and place of pick-up. This anomaly does not exist in either New South Wales or Victoria where specific provision is made.

Accordingly, clause 4 makes provision along lines almost identical with corresponding sections in the Acts in those States providing that a person is deemed to be employed while in attendance at a place of pick-up for the purpose of being selected for employment, while travelling to a place of pick-up for such purpose, and, in the event of non-selection, while travelling home. Such a person is deemed to be employed by the employer who last employed him in his customary employment. Clause 3 makes the necessary consequential amendment to section 4 of the principal Act.

Clause 5 provides that the amendments shall apply in relation only to injury occurring after the commencement of the Bill.

Clause 6 deals with another matter. Last year a new section 28a was inserted in the principal Act, the intention of which was to provide for compensation to be paid at current rates. The new section was drafted at a managers' conference between both Houses. The Government has been advised that it is ambiguous and, accordingly, clause 6 amends this section so as to make it quite clear that current rates for death or total or partial incapacity shall be at the rates ruling at the time of death or incapacity as the case may be. Total liability for an employer is not affected, nor are lump sum payments or payments for table injuries. In other words, current rates will be applicable only in the case of death or partial or total incapacity, that is, payments for death and weekly payments for incapacity.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROWLAND FLAT WAR MEMORIAL HALL INCORPORATED BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to enable a certain piece of land comprising about half an acre to be vested in an association known as "Rowland Flat War Memorial Hall Incorporated" for the purposes and objects of the association. The land in question is situated at Rowland Flat. It was conveyed in 1859 to certain named trustees for religious purposes. The original deed provided that the land should be used for the erection of a chapel, school, dwellinghouses for a minister of religion, schoolmaster and officers, and for use as a cemetery. It was expressly provided that the land could not be used for any other purpose. From time to time new trustees have been appointed, and at present there are only two.

The land has never been used for any of the original purposes and is in fact not used at all. It is the desire of the trustees that it should now be used as a site for a war memorial hall. For this purpose it is desired to vest the land in Rowland Flat War Memorial Hall Incorporated, an association incorporated under the Associations Incorporation Act having as its objects the establishment of a memorial to 1939-1945 defence personnel, the provision of amenities for returned personnel, and the promotion of recreation for subscribers and the general public.

The trustees cannot divest themselves of the land or, as I have said, use it for purposes outside those set forth in the original grant, and have requested the Government to introduce this Bill to enable the land to be used for what appears to be a laudable purpose. The Bill vests the land in the association and by clause 4 requires the association to hold and deal with the land for the objects of the association as set forth in its rules. Clause 5 discharges the existing trustees from their obligations as such. The Bill, being of a hybrid nature, was referred to and considered by a Select Committee in another place in accordance with Joint Standing Orders, and the committee recommended its passage in its present form.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER secured the adjournment of the debate.

MONEY-LENDERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 13 (clause 3)—Before "by" insert "(a)".

No. 2. Page 1 (clause 3)—After line 20 insert new subclause as follows:

"(b) by inserting after the colon sign at the end of paragraph (f) in the definition of "money-lender" the word "or" and adding thereafter the following new paragraph:

(g) any person or company lending money solely on mortgage of land where the rate of interest in respect of such loan does not exceed twelve dollars per centum per annum."

No. 3. Page 2, line 25 (clause 5)—Leave out "multiplying" and insert "deducting the amount of stamp duty lawfully paid upon the contract from".

No. 4. Page 2, line 26 (clause 5)—After "contract" insert "and multiplying the difference so determined".

No. 5. Page 2, line 41 (clause 5)—After "contract" insert "less that proportion of the amount of stamp duty lawfully paid on the contract which the total amount of interest so attributable bears to the total interest chargeable under the contract".

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I ask the Committee to disagree to amendments Nos. 1 and 2. Amendment No. 2 is the more important and, although on the surface it sounds reasonable, where do we commence and where do we conclude? Undoubtedly much lending has taken place. However, in this case the amendment would deprive the borrowers of the necessary protection to which they would be entitled. I believe many persons and companies could be involved in the matter and, under the circumstances, the Bill as it was passed in this place provided a wide protection for those investing money.

Mr. McANANEY: I believe this is a worthwhile amendment as it specifically relates to the mortgage over land, a mortgage that sets out particulars and restricts the amount of interest. If this were the usual business of money-lending then the Premier would have had a point. However, without the amendment, the Bill would affect people unjustly. Individuals (not money-lenders) lending money on second and third mortgages at reasonable rates of interest would be called money-lenders without advantage at all to borrowers. I could not ascertain why the Premier opposed the amendment. As it is a good amendment, I ask the Committee to accept it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am surprised that the Premier has not risen to answer the member for Stirling, who has pointed out (and I support him in this) that there is much merit in the amendment made in another place. Although I must confess that I did not hear the whole of the Premier's explanation, I did not think he made out a case for the rejection of the amendment. Undoubtedly it was carried after due consideration in another place and, before we reject it out of hand, we should at least know why we are rejecting it. I ask the honourable gentleman to explain, in rather more detail than he has deemed it necessary to explain it so far, the reasons why he is asking the Committee to reject the amendment.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I point out that I am not compelled at any time to answer questions if I do not consider they have merit. Regarding a mortgage over land, where do we commence and what will be the deciding factor? We should consider real estate transactions taking place at present. Having regard to the extension of certain privileges in this case, the Government asks the Committee to reject the amendment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I cannot accept what the honourable the Premier has given as a reason for the rejection of this amendment, which the Council has made. I must confess I did not understand what the honourable gentleman was trying to say.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: Surely I cannot be held responsible for that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think the Premier can be, because he was the one making the explanation and I was doing my best to follow it. I do not know whether any other honourable member could understand it, but I do not feel justified in voting against the amendment unless I understand why I am voting against what seems to me to be a perfectly good amendment. I ask one of the Ministers, even if it is not the Premier himself, to explain why the Government asks that this amendment should be knocked out.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): I should not have thought it necessary to reiterate what the Premier said on the amendment.

Mr. Millhouse: Perhaps you could put it more clearly.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member would listen to what is said with a little more care than he has exercised, he would not be saying what he is now. The Legislative Council's amendment No. 2 amends the definition of money-lender by inserting the following exception:

Any person or company lending money solely on mortgage of land where the rate of interest in respect of such loan does not exceed twelve dollars per centum per annum.

The honourable member, in his practice, must know that some substantial organizations deal solely as money-lenders; indeed, one of them, associated with a prominent member of our profession (and the honourable member knows the company to which I am referring), deals solely in the mortgages on land and should properly be registered as a money-lender, so the protection given by the Money-lenders Act is there for the borrower. There are many companies associated with land agents' offices where private persons have invested their money for the purpose of money-lending on mortgage, and again, in those circumstances and in view of complaints received by the Land Agents Board, it is eminently desirable that the protection of the Act be given to these borrowers who pay not more than 12 per cent (which is not a low rate of interest). Under this amendment, the protection of the Money-lenders Act will apply to practically nobody borrowing money on mortgage; that is an extraordinary situation. I can credit certain members of the Legislative Council, in view of the areas of their support and the basis on which they have been elected, to give this type of fillip to certain interests in South Australia, but I cannot see how this proposal has the slightest merit.

Mr. Shannon: Are not the words "lending money solely on mortgage" restrictive?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: To a certain extent. It would mean that hire-purchase companies could not come under this, but many companies that are registered lend money solely on mortgage.

Mr. Hudson: A hire-purchase company could set up a subsidiary to lend money solely on mortgage, and then come under the Legislative Council's amendment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, a hire-purchase company could set up a subsidiary company. Although it was associated with a hire-purchase company, its contract would not be a money-lending contract and the borrower would not have the protection of the Money-lenders Act.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am particularly grateful to the Attorney-General on this occasion for expounding the meaning of this amendment and the reasons why the Government asks the Committee to reject it. I must admit I could not understand the explanation given by the Premier, but the Attorney, exercising his gift of clarity, has made it clear and, although I am not really convinced that it is something we should knock out, in view of the fact that it was a new matter introduced into the Bill in another place, I am prepared to go along with his explanation of why the Committee should not accept the amendment, for which I am appreciative.

Amendments disagreed to.

Amendments Nos. 3 *to* 5.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I ask the Committee to agree to these amendments. I am sorry that the member for Mitcham is not here at the moment, because there seems to be more known in the legal world about the need for these amendments and, unless we have the Attorney-General to explain the amendments, I take it the member for Mitcham will not accept the explanation. I ask the Committee to agree to the amendments.

Amendments agreed to.

The following reason for disagreement to Amendments Nos. 1 and 2 was adopted:

Because the amendments would deprive borrowers of a desirable protection.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (REGISTRATION).

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's alternative amendment:

Page 4, line 25 (clause 11)—Leave out "substantially similar provision to this Part" and insert "provision adequate for meeting the requirements of this Part".

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): As this matter has been dealt with, I suggest that the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am surprised that the Premier has accepted the amendment. I suggest that it be disagreed to because it does not make sense. I cannot see how we can expect the law of any other State or territory to make adequate provision for a requirement of a Part of a South Australian Act. I think I know what the amendment is driving at, but it is not suitable: it is grammatically and syntactically inaccurate.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I accept the explanation of the honourable member and was mistaken in asking the Committee to accept the amendment. Having had more time to consider it and following the honourable member's reasoning, I ask the Committee to reject this amendment, because it obscures the meaning of the clause.

Alternative amendment disagreed to.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Messrs. Coumbe, Dunstan, Millhouse, Ryan, and Walsh.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 4. Page 2005.)

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): At the outset, I point out that the Bill contains no provision to which I object. It relates to the administration of the medical profession, particularly to the system of registration, and to increasing the Medical Board's powers. Whereas previously a member of the Australian Medical Association was merely appointed to the board without election, he is now elected by the association and recommended for appointment to the board. The Bill contains wise provisions; for instance, the board is given the right to inquire into the conduct of members of the profession and to assess whether or not the person responsible for such conduct should be censured, and whether a fine or penalty should be imposed. At present such an inquiry can be conducted only by reference to the Supreme Court, but the board can now act in these matters, although the medical practitioner concerned retains his right of appeal. Therefore, any application made to the court results in a second consideration of the matter.

Provision is also made for the board to assess whether fees charged by a medical practitioner for his services are fair and reasonable and to require, if necessary, compensation to be made to a patient who, in the board's view, has been overcharged. I reiterate the wisdom in the considerable widening of the board's powers in this way; indeed, the board should have these powers. Under a provision relating to deregistration, the board is given the power to consider cases prior to any deregistration. Naturally, medical officers should not be mischievously deregistered, especially when they are so scarce. Recently, a medical practitioner in the Adelaide Hills was deregistered under the existing Act, as a result of which the district he previously served is now without a medical officer. That is most unsatisfactory, particularly when the district concerned is served by a hospital to which substantial additions have recently been made. Indeed, that might have been a case which, under the Bill, the board would have considered more leniently than the court was able to consider it in the circumstances, and deregistration might not have been recommended for the period of time recommended by the court.

The Bill also provides for the progressive registration of specialists; in other words, people now recognized as specialists will be accepted as such, but the board will progressively require that applicants can substantiate the fact that they are, in fact, specialists by reason of the higher degrees or diplomas they may hold in support of their applications to practise as specialists. Ultimately, it seems that all specialists will be required to follow this procedure, and power is given to the Governor by proclamation to make it impossible for anyone to register as a specialist without complying with this provision. The provision receiving most publicity was the fact that the board had been given considerably increased powers in regard to registering foreign doctors. According to the *Advertiser* of September 15, this was a Bill to recruit foreign doctors. Although that may be true in a sense, I do not think it is the fundamental reason for the introduction of this measure.

Mr. McAnaney: Is it guaranteed how many will be recruited?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I understand that 18 people at present believe they have qualifications entitling them to practise medicine in this State. These people having migrated to this country from Europe, their qualifications were not previously recognized by the board. I think most of the people concerned were originally told that they would have to undertake at least three years' medical training before they could be accepted into the profession. I believe the provision relating to the restriction was inserted in the Act in 1951 or 1952. However, I understand some of these people are still interested in becoming qualified practitioners, and it is now intended that their qualifications will be studied more closely with a view to ascertaining whether a requirement involving three years' training, plus possibly 12 months or more as a medical officer in a hospital, was not too harsh an imposition to place on these people. I presume the Bill also provides for people now practising medicine in a foreign country which does not have a reciprocal arrangement with Australia in respect of medical training to be recruited to the medical profession here. The Bill contains certain safeguards in this respect (and I think rightly so) to ensure that a person entering this country and wishing to practise is conversant with the conditions and can show that he can understand us (I am considering the case of a European person), and that he can, in turn, make himself understood to us. We must be satisfied that such a person can conduct a consultation without difficulty. I believe that the purpose of this provision is to protect the people on whom the doctor might practise; the doctor must have not only qualifications acceptable to the assessment committee but also residential qualifications to ensure that he can understand likely working conditions.

I am particularly concerned about the aspect that suggests that we intend to re-assess these people to remedy deficiencies existing in general practice in the country. Indeed, the Chief Secretary, in another place, referred to a cadetship scheme that was being implemented by the Government. Although no other mention was made of this scheme, I believe it is being inaugurated to provide financial assistance to people in training so that they may qualify; they will then be appointed for a period equal to the period during which they were assisted. I can see nothing wrong with this, provided we can be satisfied that these people are competent. It is wrong to suggest that migrant practitioners, even British practitioners, should enter solo practice in the country without our being satisfied that they are fully conversant with the conditions and competent to deal with emergencies without the skilled assistance of specialists to which they may have been accustomed. These people must be completely competent in their own right to discharge the responsibilities of a solo country practice and, if that condition is met, I commend the principle behind this amendment. This is a belated measure because most of the people concerned have been here for a considerable time; there may be an additional 10 medical practitioners available for country practice as a result.

The purpose of this amendment is to provide additional country medical practitioners. I must thank the Chief Secretary for a copy of the report of the committee inquiring into facilities for training medical practitioners in South Australia. Some sections of this report support the points I made concerning this matter in another debate. Table 3, which deals with the period 1957 to 1965 shows some alarming trends. In 1957 there were 495 general practitioners, this figure being 57.4 per cent of all registered medical practitioners. In 1965 there were 565 general practitioners, 45.07 per cent of all registered medical practitioners—a decrease of 13 per cent. During that period the percentage of specialists remained almost constant, and the number of salaried officers rose from 190 in 1957 to 441 in 1965, the percentage rising over that period from 22 per cent to 35 per cent. It is interesting to see what has happened to those salaried officers. It seems that there has been a substantial increase in hospital staff and in the number of State Government officers; the Repatriation Department and the University of Adelaide have also taken their share; some have become professional officers and some are engaged in research work.

Table 7 of the report shows other interesting trends: not only has the percentage of general practitioners decreased but it is feared that it will continue to decrease. In 1965 we were in the happy position of having one medical practitioner to every 835 persons, which was a decided improvement over the situation in 1957 when there was one medical practitioner to 1,012 persons. However, in 1965 there was one general practitioner to 1,857 persons, whereas in 1957 there was one to 1,764 persons. Therefore, although the figures show an increase of 390 in the number of medical practitioners between 1957 and 1965, and an improvement in the doctor-population ratio, it seems that an increasing percentage of those being trained are going into some field other than general practice.

Mr. Clark: Are there any figures in the report regarding specialists?

Mr. NANKIVELL: The percentage of specialists has remained fairly constant since 1957: it was 20.6 per cent in 1957 and 19.77 per cent in 1965. Although the percentage is constant, the number over that period has increased from 178 to 248. It would appear that the tendency is for many of those now graduating in medical science (and I think we must think of them as graduating in medical science rather than as medical practitioners) to accept salaried jobs in a complex of hospitals, in research work, or in some other function in Commonwealth or State Government departments, thus making them salaried officers and not doctors serving the community in general practice. Considerable fears are expressed by the College of General Practitioners that this trend will continue.

Another interesting matter dealt with in the report (and I know the Minister of Education is aware of my interest in it from questions I have asked him) is the development of a case for a new medical school and training hospital associated with the Flinders University. This case has been developed as a result of a comprehensive survey of the position as it now stands and as it is projected in 1975. A tremendous amount of work has been done by the committee that prepared this report, for which its members are to be commended, for the report makes it patently clear that, with the rebuilding of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, two complete training units were lost and had to be replaced by extensions to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Therefore, all that has happened as a result of the extensions that have been made at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and of the rebuilding of the Royal Adelaide Hospital is that we are now in the same position as we were in previously with a restricted capacity of 120 students at the University of Adelaide and with possible graduation for general practice in South Australia of about 95. Apparently this number is nearly 100 each year, but five are from South-East Asian countries (probably under the Colombo plan).

There is a fairly constant figure of about 30 to 35 doctors who come into this country from overseas each year. Also, about 15 doctors on average come from other States to practise in South Australia temporarily. However, as the figures in the tables show, these doctors alone will not provide the number required to maintain the present level of doctor to population ratio. If, in 1975 (which is the year in which graduates are first expected from Flinders University), we were able to graduate, as expected, 45 medical practitioners or medical scientists, we shall be able to maintain a slightly better position than we are maintaining at present. The projected figures show that, if we continue to graduate 95 doctors from the University of Adelaide plus an additional 45 doctors from the Flinders University, and maintain the present immigration from other States and overseas of about 45 doctors, and if the existing registrations are maintained at 185 doctors (that is the total of those who graduate plus immigrants) then, taking into account renewals of registration and withdrawals from registration as a result of retirement or other causes, in 1976 the position could be much the same as it was in 1957, with one general practitioner to every 1,742 people.

It is projected that by 1986 this ratio will have improved to one medical practitioner in general practice to every 1,617 people. Of course, this figure allows for 45 per cent of the doctors who qualify in medicine to go into active general practice, because that is the figure that has been established over the last few years; it allows for substantial increases in the number of medical practitioners trained with only 45 per cent going into general practice. This is a matter to which I should like our members on the board of the Flinders University and other boards of education to give some thought. These proposals put forward by the College of General Practitioners tend to emphasize medical training more for general practice than for medical science. This is a real concern of the College of General Practitioners which is doing a tremendous amount of work in the community at present in trying to assess the position and to recommend what should be done.

The new registration requires 12 months as a resident medical officer. However, it has been suggested that, if each of these officers were required also to serve two additional years in general practice before they specalized or went into some other field, many of these problems would be overcome more or less permanently. This will require a change of thinking on the part of persons responsible for medical training in the State. I believe the pressure will come from the A.M.A., which is the proper channel through which it should come. I bring this matter to the attention of those who are responsible to this House for what happens at the two universities. As a matter of policy, the Government should consider changing the requirements under the Act for registration to put into effect the proposals to which I have referred.

There are also suggestions that doctors should not be sent solo into practice, but should be attached to clinics. A possible solution to medical practice in the country (if it were possible to do so) would be to create clinics, where sufficient people warrant them, thereby providing country doctors with the opportunity to roster work, obtain adequate holidays, and have adequate time for additional study, which is important if they are to keep up with the latest trends. It seems clearly established that, unless a medical practitioner goes to the country after his children are educated, the most that can be expected is that he will stay in a country area for about 10 years. After such a time, he runs into problems relating to the education of his children. Others want to take a further academic interest in medicine, advance their studies and, perhaps, take higher degrees to specialize. We must think in terms not of permanency in the country now but in terms of the turnover in a 10-year period. If this suggestion of a compulsory two-year period in general practice for medical graduates was accepted, it would assist considerably by giving relief to those working in the country who need time to improve their knowledge of medicine, as well as providing adequate time for recreation and leisure. If the Government really wants to see services improve in the country, I think that this aspect warrants serious consideration. With those comments on the Bill, I support the second reading.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I rise to support this Bill. I understand that the Medical Board, the Australian Medical Association, the University of Adelaide and leading members of the profession are happy with the Bill, which has already passed through another place. I have not heard any comments, either favourable or unfavourable, from people who I believe would be interested in the contents of the Bill. There is another Bill at present on the Notice Paper which provides for the setting up of a school to train nurses, and this Bill too, of course, envisages action to improve another branch of medicine. I doubt whether either of them will produce any concrete improvements in their respective branches in the near future. I hope I am wrong in saying that, I am curious and concerned, as are many people in the community, especially in view of the need to provide more hospital accommodation in South Australia at present.

I feel that this Bill makes several important points; first, we must obviously provide more doctors to meet the needs of the increasing population in South Australia. Secondly, I believe we must make strenuous efforts to provide more facilities to train doctors, thereby providing the people with more medical practitioners. This can be done only by making more money available to the universities. We know that there are difficulties in providing more funds for these purposes. The medical school at the University of Adelaide is being used to the limit of its capacity, and, as the previous speaker said, we lost two training units with the rebuilding of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. These have not been made up and cannot be made up at present; therefore, we are in the position of not having additional facilities to train young doctors. It is imperative, therefore, that the second medical training school, to be established at Flinders should go ahead as quickly as possible. We realize that the establishment of this training school must go hand in hand with the provision of the teaching hospital to be established adjacent to Flinders.

I believe the Government is concerned to provide these facilities, and the lack of funds to do all the necessary things is the concern of the people in the community, particularly those associated with universities who have the responsibility of building up these resources and providing the necessary training units. I feel that the application of quotas (which have applied for a long time at the University of Adelaide) is a major contributing factor towards the shortage of doctors in South Australia, and it is only by making more money available to provide more training facilities that we will solve this problem of the shortage of doctors in the community. Although the other steps envisaged may be productive of a few extra practitioners, it is the provision of a new training hospital and training school that will solve this problem. There is a limit of 120 students in the first and second years of the medical course at the University of Adelaide; this means, therefore, that only 95 students can enter the first year after they matriculate. I think these points have to be borne in mind in any scheme the purpose of which is to provide more doctors in South Australia.

I consider that the provision in this Bill, which sets out to attract some of the foreign doctors in South Australia to undergo an extra three years at the university, is a difficult one to accept. Many of the people who came to South Australia in the days following the Second World War had degrees from universities in Europe whose standards were not recognized as being acceptable in South Australia, but I believe that the time has passed when any great benefit could accrue from making special provisions to enable these doctors to undergo the extra three years that would enable them to practise. By now the doctors are getting a little old and, therefore, there would not be the attraction for them to undergo the extra training suggested. After the war, the Commonwealth, following short refresher courses, appointed some of the new-Australian doctors or other migrant doctors who came to this country, and admitted them to be registered provided that they practised in remote country areas, or that they were prepared to go into the Territories administered by the Commonwealth Government. When I was in New Guinea in 1961, I met some of these doctors who had European training in countries where there was reciprocity between the universities in these various countries, and had accepted work under these conditions. They were doing magnificent work in remote areas and in native hospitals, serving communities where it was impossible to attract Australian graduates. I think this also applied to the Northern Territory and some remote areas in Australia. I believe that the day has passed when we could recruit any people from this category. I do not think South Australia, and perhaps Australia as a whole, is getting many medical practitioners amongst the European migrants who come here. Conditions have changed in Europe with more opportunities available to them, so that they are happier to stay in the country in which they gained their degrees. If they come here they have to undertake a three-year university course, so that obviously few recruits will be gained in this category. Fewer British doctors are coming to Australia now than came previously, and this is evidenced by the unsuccessful recruiting schemes that the States of the Commonwealth have undertaken to try to encourage young British doctors to come to this country.

Conditions under the National Health Service in Britain have improved and medical practitioners are enjoying better conditions under that scheme than they did when it was first instituted, so that fewer doctors are available from that source. I read a suggestion that there should be a cadetship course set up that would add 10 qualified people to the roll of medical practitioners in the next five or six years. To have one extra practitioner would be of great benefit, but if only 10 are to come out of the scheme in five or six years it makes one realize how difficult the situation is. They would be under bond to the Government for the same time as it took them to complete their course, and they would then have to go wherever the Government sent them. I doubt whether this method will attract many more people to the profession. We have no guarantee that, after their bonding period has been completed, these cadets will not return to the cities, because they will be mainly young people. We want experienced people to go to the country, not the young practitioner who has just finished one year of post-graduate work. They will have to serve a large area and, because they are responsible for the medical health of the community in which they live, they need more experience to be able to cope with any contingency that arises.

Mr. Shannon: The more isolated the area, the more complex is the problem.

Mrs. STEELE: Of course. There are not the resources available to draw upon in remote country areas. Country people need a more experienced medical practitioner rather than a young person who has just finished a cadetship or an internship. Country people would prefer the older, experienced, and mature man as their medical practitioner, rather than a young person, however brilliant he may be. I realize that this whole question is not easy to solve, and that the problem is not peculiar to this State as every State in the Commonwealth is suffering from a shortage of doctors. I should not be surprised if this problem did not apply in oversea countries. One cannot help drawing attention to the difficulties that may arise in the future, even if the Government's ideas are put into effect, as they can only be effective to a certain degree. Dealing with the registration of doctors, the onus is to be placed on the Australian Medical Association (South Australian Branch) to nominate a medical practitioner as a member of the board, bringing this provision into line with provisions in the United Kingdom and in New South Wales.

Another innovation is that the members of the board are to have a longer tenure of office. The effectiveness of any board is enhanced by a blending of new blood with old, with more experienced members. This is a good provision, because it uses the experience of members to the advantage of the working of the board. Another clause safeguards the registration of medical practitioners registered prior to the passing of this Bill. The most pertinent clause states that, in future, registration requires service by new medical graduates for a period of 12 months as resident medical officers, and this is a wise provision. It was not so long ago that immediately a young medical graduate left the university he took a position as *locum tenens* to a hard-worked doctor in the metropolitan area or to one in the country. That doctor needed a break, and the young medical graduate went out without any general practice or experience to act as a *locum tenens* in an established practice. For some time now medical graduates have had to do a year's internship in an approved hospital before practising in the community and this is a wise provision.

The Bill also sets out the board's requirements for registration which cover a multiplicity of conditions; one, in particular, ensuring that the medical practitioner who is guilty of misconduct, or otherwise unfit for registration (or who may have been deregistered in another State or country), may be refused registration in this State on those grounds. Another clause relates to the payment of registration fees, and places the obligation on the practitioner concerned to keep the board notified of his whereabouts; otherwise, after a certain period, his name may be removed from the register of medical practitioners.

A medical practitioner could once pay a fee that assured him of life membership as a registered medical practitioner, but this will now no longer apply, and an annual practice fee will simply be payable by all practitioners. Those, of course, who have already paid a fee entitling them to life membership will not be affected by this new provision. The Bill also provides for limited registration, which is a new development applying to those who have passed the necessary examinations, but who have not been admitted to a degree. The provision also applies to those who have not fully complied with the requirement to serve 12 months as a resident medical officer at an approved institution. People coming into these two categories can practise medicine and surgery only at an approved institution as defined in the legislation.

In addition, persons holding foreign degrees in medicine and surgery who are engaged in teaching, research or post-graduate study may also be admitted to limited registration. The board is given power to impose restrictions in these cases and to issue a limited certificate in the first place for a period of not more than two years. However, that period may be extended for a further year whilst the person concerned is practising in the categories I have mentioned. In this period, the person with a limited certificate will be recognized as being fit to be registered under the Bill. As I have said, I think much wisdom exists in the provision that limited registration should be granted to graduates admitted to the degrees of Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery who are not able to engage in general practice.

Another clause relates to people adjudged to be suffering from a mental or physical infirmity and considered unable to practise satisfactorily. This also relates to cases in which it is considered that the practitioner may not be able to practise in the interests of the public. In this instance, the board is empowered to remove such person's name from the register. Although the person may appeal, he is given only 28 days to do so, and I am wondering whether, in the case of a practitioner who is seriously ill, that period is sufficient, for it may well take longer than 28 days for him to be fit and able to resume practising. I believe the Government may do well to study that period and to consider whether it cannot be extended to give the person, at present thought to be incapable of practising, a little longer to appeal against the board's decision to deregister him. I believe that these general provisions relating to registration are acceptable to the medical profession as well as to the public.

It is now intended to set up a register of specialists, which is a forward move. Many Adelaide specialists who are giving excellent service in the field of medicine in which they are particularly fitted to practise have graduated from general practice to specialist status simply because of their experience or particular interest in a branch of medicine or surgery. They have often gained no post-graduate experience whatsoever. This legislation will, of course, protect those already practising as specialists or those who work partly as general practitioners and partly as specialists. In addition, the Bill may help to remove an anomaly in the eyes of people in the community who are sometimes bewildered by the access to specialist rank of doctors who have been long known to them and respected as general practitioners, but who have not, to public knowledge, undertaken any post-graduate studies. South Australia now has a post graduate foundation that arranges lectures by doctors from overseas as well as from other States. I understand that, in addition, practitioners admitted to the degrees of Fellow of the Royal Australian College of Surgeons and Fellow of the Royal Australian College of Physicians work in post-graduate studies here in South Australia and sit for the final examinations in another State.

Specialists principally comprise men and women who have visited oversea countries where a technique of interest to them may have been developed; many of them serve in hospitals in the United Kingdom and America where they can study the special methods and branches of medicine and surgery that have been developed. The public generally accepts these people as being those of specialist status. I think, too, that the Bill will remove much doubt that has existed about specialist status under the National Health Act, bearing in mind the forms that have to be filled in by people when submitting claims for national health benefits, which require details as to whether a specialist or general practitioner has been consulted. Sometimes, of course, a doctor may practise as a general practitioner for part of his time and as a specialist at other times. One might say, however, that the medical practitioners with years of experience in general practice often make the best specialists of all. Some medical practitioners of high standing are without doubt well qualified to specialize after years in general practice. In general practice, doctors must come to grips with human problems, such as their patients' living conditions and financial hardships. These facets of general practice provide valuable training for the doctor who later decides to specialize. This legislation will come into effect on a date to be proclaimed, and this is natural, to allow time for the compilation of a register of specialists. The compilation of this register may involve difficulties. Of course, it is expected that eventually those who qualify for registration as specialists will have obtained higher degrees or diplomas in medicine or surgery.

I turn now to the provision for the resolving of differences of opinion concerning accounts rendered by medical practitioners, and I am sure that this provision will be welcomed by the community which, probably wrongly, sometimes feels that doctors overcharge for services rendered. This clause is sound; it will meet with general approval. It is right that the board should have power to examine such claims and to accept or reject them. The board is, of course, given the power to reduce charges if it is established that they are unreasonable. Under this provision, the board will be able to hear both sides of the argument, and this is in accordance with British justice.

I now turn to the assessment committee, and the foreign qualified medical practitioner. The first reason for this part of the legislation is the shortage of medical practitioners; secondly, there is the difficulty of obtaining the services of doctors in country centres; thirdly, the desire of many young doctors to engage in post-graduate study overseas, which deprives the State of their services while they are absent; fourthly, the establishment of quotas at universities. The existence of such quotas is regrettable. I believe that at the heart of all our problems is our inability to provide the facilities to enable everyone who wants to do so to study at the university of his choice. I realize the quota system has operated for several years, but it is a pity if we have to accept it eternally. We should look ahead and make provision so that everyone who wants to study medicine can do so. The quotas now being established for almost all the faculties, especially at the University of Adelaide, frustrate the young capable student, anxious to proceed to tertiary education, who has nurtured a desire to practise a profession for years and then finds, on matriculation, that a quota has been established and his qualifications are not as high as those of the next fellow. Consequently, he must, at that late stage, reconsider his aims and often, because of quotas in other faculties, he is forced to abandon his ambition of attending a university and he takes up some other occupation. Because conditions in Britain are much better, under the National Health Service, there has been a failure to recruit medical practitioners from the United Kingdom.

Mr. Nankivell: Will we be able to recruit the 30 a year that are required?

Mrs. STEELE: I doubt it, although some doctors overseas with young families may believe that Australia is a good place in which to bring them up.

Mr. Nankivell: They have been budgeting on a figure of 30.

Mrs. STEELE: I do not think we can afford to anticipate that we will get even small numbers of graduates from other countries; it would be foolish to depend on that source. We all know what happens sometimes to budgets (even women, in the affairs of the home): things do not always work out as planned. It was pointed out that the ratio of medical practitioners is now one to 1,857 people, and in 1986, even with this budgeting for increased numbers of new graduates and people from overseas, the ratio will be one to 1,828, which is only slightly better. Therefore, something drastic must be done, but I believe that the answer lies within ourselves. We must provide for the necessary increase, and we cannot afford to depend on whatever intake there might be from overseas.

There are about five conditions that qualify the acceptance of foreign medical graduates for practice in South Australia. First, if there is no reciprocal registration with the country of their origin, they must satisfy the board that they have degrees and qualifications, which must not be lower than South Australian standards to meet the requirements of the Medical Practitioners Act. Secondly, they must have an adequate knowledge of English. Thirdly, the applicant for registration might have qualifications or experience in medicine or surgery of international standing. Fourthly, they must be of good character; and fifthly, they must have particular skills that could benefit South Australia. Those are the factors that will permit a medical graduate from another country to be acceptable to the Medical Board of South Australia. However, if a foreign doctor does not meet any of those five requirements then he is referred to the Foreign Practitioners Assessment Committee, the powers and authority of which are clearly set out in the Second Schedule.

I believe it is wise to stipulate a period of three months residency in South Australia, which is one of the requirements of the committee. There is a necessity for intending applicants under the scheme to familiarize themselves with the conditions, standards and requirements of the medical profession in South Australia, because they might find (and this would save any waste of time by the assessment committee) that they do not like the conditions or do not measure up to the qualifications and requirements needed by the medical profession of a person practising in South Australia. The period for registration of foreign medical practitioners will initially operate for six years but can be extended by the board if it sees fit. By introducing the Bill, I believe South Australia is, to some extent, taking advantage of experience in Victoria, where similar provisions have been introduced. Finally, I reiterate (as I think this is probably the most important point) that I am certain that the answer in South Australia lies in the fact that it is our job to provide the facilities that will attract people into the profession, and to make sure that our facilities are sufficient to enable all who want to practise medicine to enter the universities, so that the people of South Australia will be well-served in the field of health by the medical practitioners of the future.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I compliment the Government on introducing the Bill, which I wholeheartedly support. It is a source of amazement to me to see Opposition members in this and another place laud the contents of a Bill such as this, which was introduced by a Labor Government. For years, Opposition members had the opportunity to introduce legislation such as this. Since I have been a member, the suggestion to do something constructive along these lines has often been made. However, the previous Government did not do anything about that suggestion and did not face up to the reality of the problem that faces South Australia today. Ever since migration to this State commenced, that policy has been referred to as an important adjunct to the development of the country. It has been said that what we need are more skilled migrants. Basically, that is true. However, the previous Government lacked the foresight to provide the essential services. Probably the most essential service required by people is the medical service. Nevertheless, this State had to wait until a Labor Government came into office before legislation of this type was introduced.

Mr. McAnaney: How many extra doctors will this legislation provide?

Mr. CASEY: It is all right for the member for Stirling to raise hypothetical questions. He plucks questions out of the air and expects the member on his feet to come up with some answer. However, to answer most of his questions one would need a crystal ball. Over the last three or four years, I have watched intensely the movement of doctors in South Australia because areas in the Far North, the South and on the West Coast need doctors badly—they have needed them for years.

Mr. Clark: And in the Murray Mallee.

Mr. CASEY: Yes, and we could see what would happen eventually. There is a limit on how long a doctor can practise on his own in an isolated area. However, no provision was made at any time in the past to overcome this problem. I can remember talking to senior doctors in Adelaide about this matter four years ago. Only last year, I raised it with the former President of the Australian Medical Association and tried to gauge the feelings of that association on the problem. I found these people understanding and willing to co-operate. I believe the Bill is the outcome of all the negotiations that took place between the Government and the A.M.A. in South Australia. The Bill will benefit not only the A.M.A. but the people generally, because medical attention is lacking throughout the State. As the member for Stirling is good at hypothetical questions, perhaps he could tell me how many doctors from other countries have slipped through our fingers in South Australia and could have been practising here today had a Bill such as this been introduced 10 or 15 years ago. I know of a case of a medical practitioner, who was recognized as a brilliant doctor in his field, coming from Europe but not being allowed to practise in this State because his degree was not recognized by the University of Adelaide. Now, that man is a lecturer of medicine in one of the largest universities in America, and has written books that are used by students in the University of Adelaide. Things like this should not happen, and under the Bill will not happen again. Many people from Europe claim to be doctors, but under our ratings would not be classified as health inspectors. Their qualifications will be assessed, and they will not be accepted unless they have the necessary qualifications. The members of the A.M.A. argued that the standard of the medical practitioner should not be lowered in this State, and the Bill adequately provides that this will not occur. Since the Bill was introduced the Government has received inquiries from medical students at the University of Adelaide for assistance in their final year of medicine. We hope the Bill will give an incentive to these young people; although the Government may help them they will be required to enter into a bond for one or two years.

Mr. Nankivell: Migrants only, not students in training.

Mr. CASEY: I understand that the Government will provide necessary financial assistance for medical students who are having financial difficulties in completing their courses.

Mr. Nankivell: It is not referred to in this amendment.

Mr. CASEY: It was referred to in the explanation by the Minister.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Yes, but it is not in the Bill.

Mr. CASEY: It does not have to be in the Bill. A similar scheme is operated by the Agriculture and Lands Departments, as it is necessary to assist these young people to obtain a degree.

Mr. Nankivell: I think this is a wise provision, but I do not think it is provided for in the Bill.

Mr. CASEY: I am interested in this legislation: I have spoken about it to members of the A.M.A. and, as it is a long-overdue measure, I compliment the Government for introducing it.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I was interested to hear the member for Frome criticize the previous Government. He claimed this is a good Bill and, in the main, my colleagues have applauded it, because anything that will assist in overcoming the shortage of doctors in this State is to be commended. I know of the situation on Eyre Peninsula and in the Murray Mallee where there is a shortage of doctors, and it is cold comfort for people to know that there is not a fully qualified medical practitioner available when his services are required. In those areas the people developing this State are entitled to proper medical care, and this Bill gives assurance that the present situation will be rectified. At Cummins and Wudinna the people are worried about the present conditions. The Bill provides some relief, and makes it possible that persons with certain qualifications, who have migrated to this State, will be able to practise. The Minister, when explaining the Bill in another place said that the committee—

The SPEAKER: I have allowed the honourable member some latitude, but I cannot allow references to debates in another place.

Mr. RODDA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, we learn something every day. The Minister said that if the assessment committee said that people needed a refresher course of one, two or three years, the Government would enable them to attend a cadetship course at the university and would pay them a reasonable living wage, as well as their expenses whilst at the university. The assessment committee will make recommendations concerning migrants who have undertaken certain training. Even a small number of people qualified in this regard may at least be responsible for some alleviation of the present problem. As it is most important that more people should be trained for the medical profession, all possible steps should be taken to ensure that sufficient practitioners graduate from our universities. Not wishing to reiterate everything that the member for Burnside said on this point, I simply endorse her remarks. Everybody concerned must fully co-operate in establishing a medical school at the Flinders University, as well as a teaching hospital. I support the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): The Bill is a good move on the Government's part to provide additional powers for the Medical Board. The supply of medical practitioners to the country areas has worsened over the last two or three years, and any steps taken to alleviate the present problem will indeed be welcomed. Bearing in mind the difficulty in bonding younger doctors to go to the country, any short supply of doctors in the future will undoubtedly occur in country areas. Qualified New Australians, with whom I have come into contact, are exceedingly fine types of people and extremely conscientious, who, given the opportunity, will do a good job in the field of medicine. I commend the Government for introducing this measure; it is indeed gratifying to see something coming forward that will definitely benefit the general community. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 16 passed.

Clause 17—"Notification of disability of a registered person and suspension from practice of such registered person."

Mrs. STEELE: Will the Premier say whether he considers the time limit of 28 days sufficient to enable a person suspended from practice to appeal to the court, following the board's decision to suspend him because of a mental or physical infirmity, or because his continuing to practise medicine was not in the best interests of the public? I repeat that a seriously ill person may not have recovered sufficiently in the specified time to be able to appeal against the board's decision.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): This important clause inserts a new section 26a in the principal Act. It provides for notification to the board by a medical superintendent or by a registered medical practitioner of any registered person who is receiving treatment in any hospital or mental institution and who is considered by the medical superintendent in charge of such hospital or mental institution (or the practitioner attending him if he is not in a hospital where there is a medical superintendent) to be incapable of exercising his profession satisfactorily. The board is empowered to suspend such registered person from practice. The latter has a right of appeal to the Supreme Court. The board, however, may itself cancel the suspension. Any person so suspended from practice under this section shall be deemed not to be registered under this Act. I would not like to go into details concerning some cases about which we have heard, but if a medical practitioner is under a cloud he has the right of appeal.

Mrs. Steele: The period of 28 days seems too short.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It seems reasonable. Apparently the other place considered 28 days a reasonable period and I would accept it as reasonable at this stage. If the Government considers the period too short, it would be guided by circumstances.

Mrs. STEELE: I raised the matter because I was considering the question of mental infirmity rather than physical infirmity; unlike mental infirmities, physical infirmities are often foreseeable. In view of this, I believe the period of 28 days is too short.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (18 to 28) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

[*Sitting suspended from* 5.57 *to* 7.30 *p.m.*]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from November 2. Page 2737.)

Clause 5—"Inspection of accounts."

Mr. COUMBE: I move:

In new section 295 (3) after "council" to insert "and to the council's auditor".

I believe the person being inspected should have the opportunity of perusing the report made on the inspection. Although I agree that the chairman or mayor of a council should have a copy of the report, the auditor should also have a copy, because he is the person responsible on behalf of the council for making the inspection and audit of the council's books, for its protection and for the protection of the ratepayers. Therefore, if a report is made on the way the books are kept, surely the auditor should receive a copy of the report. He will probably keep the books in the subsequent year, so a copy of the report would be indispensable to him. As the new subclause stands, who is to say that the auditor will ever see a copy of the report? Possibly the report would stay with the chairman or mayor of the council.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): I ask the Committee not to accept the amendment. The fears expressed by the honourable member are really groundless, because a copy of the report will go to the Auditor-General and, if anything is wrong, he will take the necessary steps. Obviously, the council's auditor would eventually hear of this and action would be taken. The auditor is employed by the council, and surely it is the responsibility of the mayor or chairman, if he thinks it necessary, to forward a copy of the report to the auditor. I have discussed this matter with the Minister of Local Government; he does not wish this amendment to be passed, because he believes it is unnecessary and undesirable.

Mr. McANANEY: I believe the council's auditor should receive a copy of the report to enable him to make out a defence, if necessary, against anything included in that report. Actually, I oppose the whole clause, as I do not think any case has been made out for an extra inspection. More manpower will have to be used and, if nothing is found, the work of these people will be completely wasted. Since last year, the regulations regarding auditors in councils have been tightened up, and certain qualifications are required. I am still not convinced that many of the irregularities mentioned in the Auditor-General's Report were found by the Auditor-General; rather, I think they were probably found by the respective council auditors. The annual balance sheet and accounts must be presented by each council. If a close review of the balance sheet of the East Torrens council had been made each year it would have been possible to see that something was wrong, when the assessment for one year and the alteration to the rate were considered.

The Government and councils should be partners, and one should not have the power to inspect the other. Of course, councils handle certain moneys granted by the Government but every month reports must be made to the department concerned of the sums expended. Few cases were found where auditors were at fault (figures on this have been supplied by the Minister of Local Government), and with a new provision for the licensing of auditors I do not see the necessity for this clause. The auditor should have the right to put his side of the case.

Mr. COUMBE: This is a question not of what is wanted by the Minister of Local Government but of what this Committee wants and what is best for councils. As the auditor is being audited, in some respects, he is entitled to receive a copy of the report. In fairness to auditors, the council and the ratepayers, the amendment should be accepted.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (14).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe (teller), Ferguson, Freebairn, Heaslip, McAnaney, and Nankivell, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday (teller), McKee, and Walsh.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clause 6—"Power of Governor to make regulations."

Mr. COUMBE: I move:

In paragraph (a4) before "councils" to strike out "the" and insert "members of".

This will provide that a clerk, who is required to prepare a budget four times a year, will supply a copy of it to all members of the council. I, members on this side, and many councils in this State oppose this clause, but if it cannot be struck out this amendment may assist the position.

Mr. Casey: I know of some councils that are not opposed to it.

Mr. COUMBE: What I have said does not mean that every council is opposed to it. I am glad to have the affirmation and confirmation of the member for Frome. Clerks employed by councils are opposed to this provision, which will require them to supply a budget to councils at least four times a year. Local Government areas range in size from the largest municipalities and cities to small district councils, some of which employ clerks on a part-time basis. The preparation of this information will prevent the officers from doing other necessary work. In the larger councils, the work will be extremely complex. Apart from the Adelaide City Council, the Enfield, Woodville, Marion and West Torrens councils will have much additional work placed on them.

Members who have served on councils know that a financial statement is prepared for each meeting and that a finance committee prepares a budget for each year. The work required by this provision will be additional and there will also be the expense associated with audits and inspections. I oppose the whole clause but, if it is to remain, the information should be sent to the members of councils. Whilst it can be argued that the word "council", as used in the definition, means the councillors, the legislation does not so provide and the converse can also be argued. I cannot see any objection to the simple alteration proposed to be made by the amendment.

Mr. SHANNON: I am opposed to central Government's trying to impose its will on local government regarding the power to make regulations. The Government is unwise to do this and could cause itself much trouble. Local Government operates under its own Act and has its own prerogatives. Councils vary in size and a few depend upon part-time officers, although I hope that all councils will soon be employing full-time staff.

Regulations made under this provision may not be appropriate to a district in which they will apply. The three councils in my district are opposed to this provision. The irregularities that occur in local government from time to time are being used as an argument in support of this provision, but I still believe that bad cases make bad laws. If regulations made under this provision are such that some clever person is able to filch the ratepayers' money, the central Government will be to blame. I think these matters are best left to the ratepayers, who are the ones who should require councillors to give an account of their stewardship every two years.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: Many ratepayers are apathetic.

Mr. SHANNON: Can anyone imagine that giving the central Government the power to make regulations will make ratepayers other than apathetic? All such action can do is bring certain irregularities to the notice of the ratepayer, and if it does even that I shall be surprised. Local government is the ideal type of government, for it gets as close as possible to the people. The less the central Government interferes in the affairs of local government the more likely we are to achieve a system that will ultimately give to the man who finds the taxation the best return for his money. I think this clause will create a false sense of security amongst certain ratepayers, who may think that because the Government has taken the matter over nothing can go wrong. Astute people can always find a way around things. Finally, the blame will be laid at the door of the central Government, and it should not put itself in that position. I think it would be better if we deleted this clause entirely.

Mr. McANANEY: I strongly oppose the clause. The member for Torrens said that members opposite had had experience in local government, but if they support this clause it will indicate that only about two of them have ever been in local government or understand how it works. I have been in local government, and I have seen just how inefficient the central Government can be regarding accounts. Figures were quoted regarding irregularities, but if we listed the many similar minor irregularities that occurred throughout Government departments the Auditor-General's report would occupy not 300 but about 600 pages. It is just too silly to treat councils like children, for if those bodies are given authority to perform duties they will carry them out.

I think the councils have done an excellent job. The Minister of Agriculture said that ratepayers were apathetic, but they are apathetic only when local government is not carrying out its functions properly. If anything is found to be wrong in a council, the ratepayers will turn up in their hundreds. It is a great mistake to think that a central body can prepare stereotype accounts and tell about 120 councils that they prepare their accounts in that way.

Mr. QUIRKE: A few council clerks have got away from the straight and narrow and betrayed their trust, but because of that we cannot say that the local government system has failed, necessitating a rigid central control. Even under the rigid central control sought by this provision, a few people will still break away from it; that is inevitable. Because of what happens to such a small degree, why is it necessary to kill local government? As no monetary reward is received, it is assumed that people connected with councils try to do a job for a ward, which, in fact, most of them do.

However, under this Bill those people are no longer the free agents they once were: they are tied by regulations that do not necessarily lend themselves to a free expansion of ideas in a council. We are placing local government in a straitjacket by making regulations that will be passed by a central body. Admittedly, the regulations will run a gamut of investigation, as will all regulations; indeed, that is already provided for. I sincerely hope that under the powers given to the Subordinate Legislation Committee it will keep a close guard on this clause if it is passed by the Committee. However, I do not intend to vote for the clause.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Members opposite have been indulging in a good many generalizations and trying to build up bogeymen and then knock them down. They have been talking about putting local government into a straitjacket when all we are asking is that councils have a standard form of accounting, so that we can ensure that the accounts are kept in a proper form. These regulations will simplify local government accounting. It was admitted that there was sufficient control over the regulations to ensure that both Chambers would have complete control of these regulations before they became enforceable. In fact, the provisions in this regard are extraordinary to ensure that that is effected. I ask the Committee not to accept the amendment, because it is unnecessary. In fact, as it stands, the council requires clerks to supply councils with a budgetary statement; in other words, it requires a report and budgetary statement to a council. If a council wishes to supply members with an individual copy, there is nothing to stop that. Here, again, if we were to lay lown that the councils should supply every member with a separate copy, we would be invading the right of local government to decide this particular little issue—the very thing other honourable members were saying was wrong.

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister just gave his case away, because he said that if a report was to be made it would be made to a council and not necessarily to members of the council.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: I said it would be made to the council.

Mr. COUMBE: Exactly. That does not mean members of the council. The Minister went on to say—

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: What is a council?

Mr. COUMBE: —that it would be a further invasion of a council's right if these details were to be sent to the members of the council. If a report is to be made, all I want to ensure is that the council or the members of the council get it: that it does not stay in the council office with either the clerk or the chairman but that the people in the ward get a copy of the budgetary statement. They are the people who will get the kicks in their own ward if too much money is spent. Whichever way the council's functions are carried out, that is what will happen.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. COUMBE: I trust the Committee realizes what it is doing if it passes this clause. There is a reference to section 691 of the principal Act, which is to be found in Division III of Part XXXIX, dealing with regulations. We are seeking here to enact a new paragraph (*a*) of section 691. I oppose this. At present the Government has power to make regulations:

(*a*) prescribing the mode in which the account books shall be kept.

That is what we are proposing to amend, but already the Governor and the Government have the power to control all account books and other books that the councils may keep, because the regulations prescribe the mode. The mode does not mean only the method by which a book is kept: it can be more widely interpreted than that. If we are to prescribe in the regulations a method of keeping the books that has been followed for 100 years or more, surely the type of book that can be controlled is within that compass. I agree there should be some uniformity in this. I am not opposed to the most modern methods being used, but it is unnecessary to consider this clause, because the power already exists.

What does the clause really state? It states the method and the systems that will be controlled. What I object to (and this is what most councils complain about) is that the wording is peremptory and mandatory. For instance, we see in (*a*) "making their use by councils and by their officers compulsory". This is really telling the council, "You must do this, or else!" Who is now going to insist that certain methods be used? It is the Local Government Department. It appears to me, without being disrespectful, that some members of the Local Government Department, who possibly have had no great experience themselves of local government, have decided that this accountancy system should be introduced. The debates in another place reveal that this was admitted by the Minister there when he said that the accountancy committee that had been set up by his department had not come to a decision on any of these matters.

These points have been raised by councils in many parts of the State. It appears that these matters now before us are not uniform and are not accepted by many councils. The aim appears to be standardization and uniformity but, of course, all councils cannot achieve this, because they are both large and small. Does it mean that under this system a council should be told that it should install a computer—because some councils will install them. It is almost as though the Local Government Department was telling the councils exactly where they got off and what they had to do.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I am surprised that the honourable member, having told us about the evils of this word "compulsory", went on to say that the Act provided that a council should do certain things, but he did not tell us the difference between "compulsory" and "shall". It is hard to please the honourable member because, if "shall" or "compulsory" was not there, he would be the first to ask, "How will you ensure that it is done?" The honourable member spoke at length on his theory that this clause was not necessary, but the committee was set up by the previous Government to examine this matter thoroughly and bring down recommendations. This clause merely provides the framework within which those recommendations can be implemented when they appear. It is a necessary and important part of this legislation.

Mr. McANANEY: Generally, uniformity is necessary among the councils, but every year a statement of accounts must be set out on a prescribed form and published in the *Government Gazette.* That provides an opportunity for comparison to be made. Some councils work on a ward system while others prefer to treat their accounts as a whole, and I know that the Local Government Department is against accounts conducted on a ward system. If the internal method suggested by this legislation is introduced it will not be possible for councils to employ the ward system, and that will go beyond the required degree of control.

The Bill attempts to mould everybody to the one shape, even though all are individuals. Uniform accounting may not necessarily suit all local government bodies. Councillors are elected on an honorary basis but when elected they will be forced to govern by these proposed regulations; even the method of finance must be the same under such control. I think it far better for councils to conduct their own finances than for the Local Government Department to prepare a set of accounts showing how finances should be arranged. I believe this should be done by example rather than by compulsion.

Mr. QUIRKE: Assuming a framework under which certain mandatory payments must be made by district councils, and assuming such councils do not comply with the requirements, what sanctions may be applied against them and where will they be applied? In other words, how can a council be penalized?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: That is a hypothetical question that will be dealt with when such a situation arises.

Mr. McANANEY: I do not think these regulations are required because sufficient control exists under the present legislation. While I agree that nobody can produce a perfect system, and that there is room for human error, I do not believe the proposed system will produce any improvement in method or control.

Mr. HEASLIP: I oppose the clause. Over a number of years local government has been carried out voluntarily and without payment. Councils have done a good job and they should not be tied down in the way proposed by this clause by making it compulsory for certain things to be done. I object to such compulsion.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (18).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday (teller), McKee, and Walsh.

Noes (14).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe (teller), Ferguson, Freebairn, Heaslip, McAnaney, and Nankivell, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MARKETING OF EGGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from November 3. Page 2775.)

Clause 4—"Election of producer members"—which Mr. Freebairn had moved to amend in paragraph (*b*) by striking out "twenty-four" and inserting "thirteen".

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): Last Thursday I asked that progress be reported to obtain information, which I now have. The member for Light said he did not know how I was able to arrive at the figure of 24 and he wondered whether it was an arbitrary figure. Also, he wanted to know how I had arrived at the figure of 18 in the suggested compromise. I have received a report from the South Australian Egg Board, at whose request the amendment was introduced, that states:

> The original 24 of the 26 levy days was designated for the reason that producers who were fully engaged or claimed a fair percentage of their income from egg production can not afford to have costly plant idle for long periods, and normal practice is for cages and sheds to be cleared of stock for the purpose of cleaning and sanitation. Stock which had been reared in rearing sheds were then transferred to laying sheds or cages. The timing is such as to ensure that there is a continuity of production and income. Very seldom would the whole of the flock be changed at one and the same time. To be out of production for six months to say the least would be most uneconomical and wasteful.

I was prepared to accept 18 because I thought it was more than a reasonable compromise. The member for Light said that under the Bill one large producer in South Australia, who lived in the Mid North and kept his birds only six months each year, would be denied a vote and denied the opportunity to stand for election as a producer-member of the board, although he stood as a candidate on the last occasion. As it was not difficult to find out to whom the honourable member was referring, I checked to see how this person would be affected by the 24 levy days, and I found that he had submitted 21 returns last year: therefore, he would be well covered by 18. This year he has already submitted 16 returns so that it is logical to assume that he will qualify at 18. The member for Light also said:

> Although I do not wish to reflect on the producer-members on the board, each of them, I believe, has 10,000 birds or more and, as there are only five South Australian producers with large flocks, the board may well become sympathetic only towards the large producer, an aspect of the restrictive franchise that I deplore.

The honourable member would have been well advised to have checked the correctness of that statement before making it. One member of the board, Mr. Macalister, has only 1,350 hens, and that is many short of the 10,000 mentioned by the member for Light. The other two, Mr. Smith and Mr. McIntosh, reached 10,000 during August of this year. Few producers have entered the industry as a capital investment. Most of the larger producers started in a small way, and by sheer hard work and thrift have increased their flocks to the present size. The question was raised as to how many would qualify for voting with the required number of hens being 250. Producers owning 250 to 500 hens number 453, and 330 have 501 and more, a total of 783 producers, which is more than the previous figures for former elections.

Mr. Rodda: How many producers are there?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The active accounts at October 20, 1966, totalled 4,231. I am not opposing the suggested 13 and ask the Committee to accept the amendment, because I do not wish to see any risk of people being disfranchised. Every opportunity should be given to the people concerned to have this right. The board has suggested legitimate reasons for the number to be 24, but in the interests of the industry generally we could accept 13, as suggested by the member for Light.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: How many producers will that eliminate from the opportunity to vote?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: To vote, 250 birds are required, and that is equivalent to the requirement under the previous Government of 3,000 dozen eggs.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: That was before the C.E.M.A. plan and the levy?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes, but voting for members of the board is the same, and that is what is involved. After all, this is for the voting for members of the board, not for C.E.M.A. particularly.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: There is a tax.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Previously there was a levy on the egg and now it is on the hen. The only people who were entitled to vote were those who paid the levy to the South Australian Egg Board. There is no difference in that regard. I am stretching myself in order to accommodate the honourable member. On Thursday I agreed to 18 as an interim compromise and tonight I have suggested that we accept the figure of 13.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I appreciate that, now that the Minister has had time to consider my amendment, he has accepted it. The adoption of 13 levy days out of a total of 26 is not unreasonable. I suggest to the Minister that, if he had discussed the Bill with me before he introduced it, we could have reached this compromise. I am actively engaged in the industry, whilst the Minister has many irons in the fire and cannot be master of every aspect of his portfolio. He cited a report by the board that, in the opinion of members of the board, the payment of 24 levies out of 26 would still enable a poultry farmer to clear his poultry sheds and recharge his laying sheds with new season's birds and be eligible to vote. However, no poultry farmer with any common sense would be likely to fill laying sheds with birds that were already in full lay. The practical poultry farmer would fill his laying sheds with the birds when they were about four and a half months old so that they would lay and reach full production without having to be forcibly moved from their laying quarters.

The comment that the Minister read had a slight ring of insincerity, especially to one engaged in the industry. When I was speaking in the Committee stage last week, I said I believed that the three grower members of the board had laying flocks of upwards of 10,000. My attention has since been drawn to the fact that one of the flocks is much smaller and comprises 3,500 birds, not 1,500 birds, as the Minister said. I have this from the owner of the flock, who telephoned me last Saturday morning. One large producer has, as the Minister has said, 10,000 birds in his own name. However, part and parcel of this particular man's unit is a large plant that his wife owns and the whole is run together as one large poultry installation, which comprises, I am informed, a total of 17,000 birds. I also wish to deal with the way the electoral system has worked in the past. This matter is germane to the clause.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: We are dealing with your amendment.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am speaking directly to the amendment to substitute 13 for 24 and I point out that the electoral system in the past has not worked with proper justice. When I was speaking to this clause last Thursday, I said that 650 producers received a franchise at the last election out of a total of about 4,000. The actual figure was only 605 producers out of a total of 4,000. In district No. 1, which takes in the county of Adelaide, only 181 ballot papers were issued. In district No. 2, which takes in all the counties south of Adelaide, 113 ballot papers were issued, and in district No. 3 192 papers were issued.

It is interesting to note that the result in district No. 3 was that 96 votes were obtained by the man who was finally elected and that the runner-up received 95 votes. The Minister said earlier that, under his legislation, he believed that the defeated candidate would have been eligible to vote.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: I said it was a compromise.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Even under the compromise, this poultry keeper himself says that this year he would be eligible but, if he continues as he has done in the past and keeps his birds for only six months or a little longer, he would not be entitled to vote or stand as a candidate. However, I do not want to press that point. I am pleased that the Minister has accepted my amendment.

Amendment carried.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I move:

In paragraph (*e*) to strike out "twenty-four" and insert "thirteen".

This is a consequential amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 5—"Term of office."

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

In paragraph (*c*) to strike out ", the thirty-first day of March, 1968, and the thirty-first day of March, 1969, respectively, the order of retirement" and insert:

; and

(*c*) of the three producers who will be elected and appointed to succeed the three producer members whose terms of office are to expire on the thirty-first day of March, 1967—

(i) one shall be appointed for a term of one year;

(ii) one shall be appointed for a term of two years; and

and

(iii) the other shall be appointed for a term of three years,

calculated as from the first day of April, 1967, the length of term of each.

The principal Act provides that the three producer members who have been elected and are members of the board shall stand for election for appointment on March 31, 1967. The Bill provides that, instead of that procedure being adopted, the term of two of the members shall be extended for one year and for two years, respectively. This would produce a staggering of the retirement of the producer members. I do not object to the principle of the producer members coming out at different times in order to establish continuity of producer representation on the board, but I believe it is asking rather a lot of the industry to extend the terms of the present producer members without any vote being taken.

During the present term of office of the members of the board the C.E.M.A. plan has been brought into operation. As we know, despite fairly widespread agitation for it, no vote was accorded to the producers on this plan, and I imagine that some people may wish to test the feeling of the producers about the membership of the board. I am sure that everyone in this Committee will acknowledge that it is their right to have a free election. However, as the Bill stands we are extending the term of one of these producer members for one more year and the term of another member for two more years without an election at all. Further, we do not know which of those members will have their terms extended, because this is to be drawn by lot in accordance with the directions of the Government.

It sems to me that it would be more reasonable if we carried on with what the Act provided and what the producers understood the Act to mean when these men were elected, and went ahead with the election that is due in March next year. After that, the staggering provision could come into operation. Under my amendment, the three producer members would be elected for one, two and three years respectively, those members to be selected by lot. That would obviate any difficulty whatever. I know there is much interest in the producer representation on the board, and if the board seeks an extension of these terms without going to an election it will only bring suspicion on it. I believe that if my amendment is accepted it will help the board in its relations with poultry farmers.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I support the amendment. I said earlier that there was great imbalance between the three present electoral districts, which each returns a producer member to the South Australian Egg Board. I believe it would be in the interests of the industry generally to go ahead with the general election in March as scheduled. I do not doubt that the Minister would then have to re-introduce the egg marketing legislation to correct the anomalies that are bound to exist in the three electoral districts. It could very well be that under the amending legislation affecting the producer's exercise of his franchise the imbalance between the three districts could be even greater.

In one way, I am surprised that the Minister has not already taken steps in this Bill to make some sort of correction of the obvious imbalance. If we allow this to extend, as it surely will under the Minister's Bill, public dissatisfaction with the board will be very great.

Mr. RODDA: I support the amendment. I was surprised to hear the Minister of Agriculture's statement about the number of producers who had a vote. Although I do not know a great deal about this industry, it seems to me as a primary producer that it is democratic to give as many people as possible the right to vote. The amendment of the member for Alexandra will result in a selection of members, and this seems to me to be much better than doing it by lot.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I ask the Committee not to accept the amendment. As the member for Alexandra said, the C.E.M.A. plan came into operation after the election of members of the board. This is very relevant, because the members of the board, including the three producer members, are expected to attend the C.E.M.A. meetings, and for a completely new board to go over to compete with the other States, particularly in respect of the allocation of money, would be a hardship on three newly elected members. A good deal of experience is needed in the board to make sure that the interests of the State are protected. I believe the very purpose of the Bill is to see that the terms of office are staggered so as to retain some knowledge of the producer members on the board.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The Minister said it would be undesirable for three new members to be elected to the board because there would then be no continuity of experience. While that may be so, if the poultry farmers of South Australia elected three new members in place of the existing three it would indicate that they had no confidence in the three existing members and therefore those members should have no right to speak for the South Australian industry in the councils of the C.E.M.A. organization.

Another point the Minister has apparently not thought of is that the election is now only four months away, and with the experience the Minister and most of us have had with elections we will realize some the candidates may have already done part of their electioneering. In that event, if the legislation now before us, including this amendment, is passed, the groundwork those candidates may have done (and done quite legitimately) will not have been done in vain. We should be doing candidates an injustice if we denied them a vote to which they were entitled. I support the amendment.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I, too, support the amendment. The Minister's argument is one which, on reflection, he himself would realizé was not particularly good, and which should be rejected by the Committee. The member for Alexandra correctly said that the C.E.M.A. plan was introduced without the authorities first seeking the specific approval of individual people in the form of a vote on the plan. Although, on the face of it, the plan has been successful, I think the Minister realizes that it will inevitably lead to problems; it will undoubtedly promote production; production will require additional levies (and I use the word ''levies'' for the Minister's benefit); levies will increase the demands on the consumer; and the consumer will gradually resent paying the high price of eggs in Australia, compared with oversea prices.

The plan has a dim future. Quite apart from the fact that the plan will eliminate the small producer and will enable the large producer to develop enormous holdings, why should we deny the industry the right to elect its own people to the board? Why should we (who do not have to pay the levy) say that, as regards one member, the election should not take place for one year and that, as regards another member, the election should not take place for two years? I think the Minister will agree that from the industry's point of view that is completely undemocratic. I ask the Minister to consider the amendment; it is fair; and it accedes to his request that representation on the board should not end abruptly in the future. Under the legislation as it exists, we shall be arbitrarily increasing the period for which members are appointed, without giving the industry any say at all about whether or not it desires the particular members on the board to remain in office.

Mr. HEASLIP: I support the amendment. Although I do not profess to know much about egg marketing, I know from my experience of boards and directorships that we cannot terminate offices indiscriminately; we must have continuity, which is exactly what the member for Alexandra is trying to achieve. Each time that the term of each of the three producer members expires, another member may be appointed, thereby affording continuity. Producers try to market a commodity at a price to suit the consumer.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Rocky River is dealing with an amendment concerning the election of producer members; there is nothing in clause 5 dealing with consumers.

Mr. HEASLIP: If the board is to be at all successful, a continuity should exist. That affects the consumer as well as the producer. Am I correct in saying that?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The member for Rocky River shall speak only to the amendment.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am sorry if I have offended, but it will affect the consumer as well as the producer. All that the member for Alexandra is trying to achieve is a continuity of producer members on the board. The consumers will get cheaper eggs.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I have allowed the honourable member too much latitude already. He will speak to the amendment.

Mr. HEASLIP: If this amendment is carried, not only the producers but also the consumers will get continuity.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister opposes the amendment because, if all three producer members were defeated, they would not be able to go to the next C.E.M.A. conference taking with them a knowledge of the business of the board. On the Egg Board there are six, not three, members, three of whom are producer members; and those are the members we are speaking about. Whether it is possible or likely that those three producer members would all be defeated I do not know. If they were, it would strongly justify the holding of an election. The Minister's opposition to this amendment will make it appear to the producer that the board is trying to escape some of its responsibilities. The Act provides for a general election of producer members, and we should stick to that. This legislation is on sufferance from the producers, and they have not had a vote on this matter.

Whether the C.E.M.A. plan would suffer if all three producer members were defeated is hypothetical. The C.E.M.A. comprises virtually the authorities from every State. There will not be a loss of continuity even within our own board: there will still be the same chairmain and the other two members of the board. If the Minister used his argument in respect of other matters, how would a State general election ever be run? We could not send the new Premier to the Loan Council meeting only a month or so after a change of Government.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member cannot link up a general election and the Premier with this clause.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It is a close analogy to the Minister's argument. I ask the Minister to reconsider this amendment, because its non-acceptance would reflect upon the board.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I regret I cannot accede to the honourable member's request. When the original Bill was introduced would have been a good time to stagger the elections. In the present circumstances, it is important that we have a staggering of the elections for the three members. True, there are other members on the board. One represents the agents and has been a useful member of C.E.M.A.: he is Mr. Mair, who has been active and has a good knowledge of these things. Another member who knew much about these things was the late Chairman (Mr. Anderson). We have not yet appointed anyone to take his place. I have been seeking someone to take this on as a part-time job, but it demands a lot of time. Although Mr. Anderson did not receive much money as Chairman, he worked for many hours on its behalf, so it is necessary to get a man who is interested and at the same time is able to devote much time to the board. Mr. McAllister, who has been the Acting Chairman, has certainly done this, to the detriment of his own business. However, this amendment reduces the experience going forward to the next C.E.M.A. conference. I ask the Committee not to agree to this amendment.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The amendment provides for a staggering in the election of future members of the board, so there is no fundamental difference of opinion between the Minister and the member for Alexandra. The difference is in whether an election will be held. If people are indispensable and therefore do not have to be elected, why have an election at any time? The amendment would ensure that three producer-members would not, in future, retire at the same time. I believe it is infinitely more democratic to have such an election than to increase the term of office of some members by two years without the producer having any say.

Surely, if the producers have so little confidence in their members that they do not re-elect them, that is a good argument for changing them! After all, the right of any person to serve on the board exists only because that person has the confidence of the producers. If that right is taken away because a person might not be elected, that is a denial of the rights of producers to express their views. I do not believe the Minister wishes to deny producers the right to elect representatives on the board, but that is what this clause will do as far as two members are concerned. To introduce a system of staggering without an election is wrong. There should not be any levies unless the producers paying them are represented. I ask the Minister to reconsider the amendment, which I consider reasonable. It does not prevent staggering: it enables it to take place.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

DENTISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 27. Page 2632.)

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I support the Bill. As a country member who realizes the difficulty of getting dental services for young people in the country, I think this is a progressive step towards providing such a service. For a considerable time there was no resident dentist in the whole of my district, and even now the only dentist there is at Bordertown. There is no dentist within 60 miles of Pinnaroo or Lameroo, while such places as Meningie and Keith are 30 miles from a dentist. For those people who live 60 miles from a dentist and who have children whose teeth need proper dental care, the only service available has been that provided by the school dental service. Even that has not been adequate, because the amount of work necessary has been beyond the capacity of the limited number of dentists in that service. The proposals in the Bill will go a long way towards overcoming this problem.

I am pleased to see that, in the Bill, the Government has accepted the recommendations of the Australian Dental Association which, at its conference last year, resolved that school dental nurses be included as auxiliary personnel in the dental health team. It further resolved that further school dental personnel be restricted to females and to a Government service: that provision has been included in the Bill. I agree with the member for Burnside that where the Bill refers to dental nurses it should be amended to read "she" for "he", even though the Acts Interpretation Act interprets ''he'' as ''she''. The association resolved also that diagnosis and treatment planning should be the duty of qualified dental practitioners; that there should be adequate direction and supervision of these school dental nurses by qualified dental practitioners; and that treatment under such a service should be available to all children of primary-school age. In this respect our scheme is better than that in New Zealand, where there is not the requirement for the nurses to be under immediate supervision. That is important, and it is proper that it should be an essential part of the Bill (as it is) that the nurses who carry out the work should be under the supervision of qualified dentists.

The scheme proposed is similar to that which has functioned in New Zealand for 15 to 20 years, and it is similar in principle to the scheme established in Tasmania this year. I understand that considerable assistance has been given to the Tasmanian Government by the New Zealand Government, which has made available an experienced consultant to advise the Tasmanian Government on the establishment of such a school. I expect that the services of such a person would be made available to South Australia; therefore, I think it would be proper if we availed ourselves of the services of such a consultant to ensure that, when our school is established, this is done in the best interests of the people training at the school and with the assistance of those who have had years of experience in the establishment and operation of such a scheme. This is expected to be a two-year course; I believe one year will be taken up in strictly theory work and that, in the second year, provision will be made, subject to the Minister's approval, for the students to do practical work under supervision. At the end of two years, a certificate will be issued to those who reach the stage of competency required by this new school.

Unless the Minister can inform me otherwise, I believe a new principal to the school has still to be appointed. The school will train about 16 students at first, and the cost for the first three years is expected to be about $178,000. I believe that is a small cost for the type of service that is to be provided by the scheme. The policy of permitting dental nurses to operate under the supervision of a qualified dental officer will provide a first-class service vitally required in country as well as in some city areas. I commend the Government for introducing the Bill. I hope it will be able to get the trainee nurses and that the school will be established at the earliest opportunity so that the scheme can be put into effect. I support the second reading.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the second reading, but I very much regret that the Government has found it necessary to take this action and no other. Frankly, the Bill is designed simply to remedy the symptom without touching the cause of the shortage of dentists in our community. We are short of dentists (and the Minister of Lands can grin at me if he likes) because of the appallingly low standard of dental health in South Australia. This is and has been a cause for great regret. In 1964, the Select Committee on Fluoridation of Water Supplies recommended that the water supply of this State should have fluoride added to it. In the course of its report, it pointed to the low standard of dental health in South Australia. I shall quote briefly from the report (because it sets out the problem as well as I have seen it set out). It states:

> The standard of dental health in this State, as elsewhere in Australia, is very low. Professor Martin described it as "a tremendous dental health problem". Doctor Fanning said that, in a sample group of 2,500 first-year high schoolchildren in the metropolitan area of Adelaide, only one boy and one girl had teeth free from decay. She described the standard of their teeth as "staggeringly low". A person with decayed teeth is not a completely sound and healthy person, for dental well-being may and usually does have an effect on general well-being. There is more work for the dental profession in South Australia than there are dentists to do it. The disease of dental caries is so widespread that the only rational way to attack the problem is by prevention.

That report was brought in at the end of October, 1964. My great regret is that the Playford Government did nothing about it at all, but at least it had only five months in office after that report was presented. The present Government has now been in office, I regret to say, for about 18 months and has done absolutely nothing about the matter, despite the fact that the Attorney-General was one of those who concurred in every paragraph of the report. Every time the matter has been raised in the House by way of question the Government has prevaricated.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have allowed the honourable member to make his point, but he cannot discuss fluoridation under the terms of the Bill, which is restricted in its clauses, as I think the honourable member will appreciate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I certainly do appreciate it, but surely the object of the Bill is to improve the dental health of the people of this State.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is not in order in canvassing in this debate matters not contained in the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Surely the question of the dental health of the people of the State is entirely relevant to the Bill, because clauses of it, as I understand them, are to provide people to try to improve the dental health of the State.

The SPEAKER: That is all: the Bill is limited to that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What I am doing is regretting very much that the Bill is limited to that.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has made that point, and I am asking him not to canvass it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I certainly will not canvass it. It is a matter of great regret that after 18 months the Government has consistently refused not only (as I would like it to do) to introduce fluoridation but apparently to even consider the matter. Every time it is raised in this House it is side-stepped by one Minister or another. Only a few weeks ago the Premier prevaricated when answering a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition. We know that prevention is better than cure, but this Bill will simply cure the symptoms and do nothing to raise the standard of dental health in this State. That problem should be tackled by this Government rather than by introducing a Bill that is only an apology for tackling the problem. I hope (and you, Sir, have been generous enough to say that I have made this point) that I have made the point effectively enough to get the Government to do something about it and not shirk its responsibility, and not be afraid to make a decision one way or another for fear of courting unpopularity.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must speak to the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course, and I shall do so. I am speaking to it by expressing the hope that this Bill will go through and will do something, but it will do nothing to remove the underlying cause.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: I will make the decision: it will never be done with my approval.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: At last we have it from the Minister, but it does not surprise me because of the way he voted in the Select Committee. Having got that admission from the Minister, I wonder what the Attorney-General thinks about it.

Mr. Langley: You should ask another question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Nothing has changed since the Select Committee's report was brought down, and all the experience in the last two years underlines the wisdom of the committee's report. With these few remarks I support the second reading, but express the fervent hope that it will not be left to the next Government to make a decision on fluoridation, but that this Government will discharge its responsibilities to the people of this State.

Mr. BROOMHILL (West Torrens): I, too, support the Bill and commend the Government for taking this first step in what will be a successful method of preventing dental disease in this State. It will assist people, mainly in country areas, who are having considerable problems because of the grave shortage of dentists. I am sure that all members opposite will support this Bill because I notice, when I look at them, that most of them would go to bed at night with their dentures laughing at them from a glass of water.

Mr. Millhouse: Why don't you call them false teeth?

Mr. BROOMHILL: I notice that the member for Mitcham objects, but it was not necessary to mention him because I am sure that all members would agree that the honourable member has not cut his wisdom teeth yet. This is a most appropriate time for the Government to introduce this measure, because an earlier speaker referred to a survey that had been conducted recently on about 2,500 schoolchildren of whom only one child was free from dental disease.

Mr. Millhouse: Be careful, or the Minister in front will bite you.

Mr. BROOMHILL: A later report made by Dr. Kenneth Adamson, who was in charge of this survey, indicated that, although only one of the children in the survey had no sign of tooth decay, almost 25 per cent of them had had one or more permanent teeth extracted. This indicates the situation in which we find ourselves in South Australia. With the continued increase in the birth rate and the current shortage of dentists, difficulties obviously exist both in country and metropolitan areas. Parents seeking an appointment for their children with a dentist find there is at least a three-week wait for this. I regret that only 16 girls will initially commence this course, as many more will be required eventually, but at least this effort is a credit to the Government.

Mr. Millhouse: What is your view on fluoridation?

Mr. BROOMHILL: This matter has been—

The SPEAKER: I have already reminded the House that this has nothing to do with the Bill.

Mr. BROOMHILL: I abide by your ruling, Sir, but I point out to the honourable member that I have strong views on this matter.

Mr. Millhouse: What are they?

Mr. BROOMHILL: As was pointed out by the Minister, the primary duties of the girls is to perform minor extractions, fillings, and cleaning work on schoolchildren where required; but, in addition, there are many duties that the girls can perform that will go a long way towards solving some of the problems to which the member for Mitcham has referred. The survey conducted by Dr. Adamson showed that the five-year-old child starting school averaged five decayed teeth. Dr. Adamson said that the tests had included two towns in the Murray mallee (Lameroo and Pinnaroo), and he said that at Lameroo, where the children had access to a tuckshop, each child averaged 10.5 diseased dental surfaces, but at a school without a tuckshop each child averaged only 5.9 diseased surfaces.

This clearly indicates that dietary habits of the children have a considerable effect on their dental diseases, and I hope that one of the duties of these dental nurses (in addition to other work) will be to speak with parent and teacher organizations in order to educate both the parents and those responsible for providing the food for children in canteens on the need to improve the type of food available. Although it is true that under the present Government South Australia has been leading the field throughout the world in many reforms, it cannot be claimed that we are taking the first step of this kind by introducing this Bill, but we can claim to be one of the first in the world (other than New Zealand, and recently Tasmania under a Labor Government) to introduce such a measure. I regret that one of the reasons why other countries and States have not followed the pattern of what has been established in New Zealand for some time is that the Australian Dental Association, throughout its various branches, has been most unhappy about the introduction of this type of labour into its field. The fact that the A.D.A. in South Australia recognizes that the Government intends to supervise the work of the girls within the school medical service is perhaps a compliment to the Government, as the association realizes that this Government will ensure that its professional standards are not relaxed. The following is part of a report by Mr. Charles Lord, a distinguished member of the dental profession, on the types of dental assistance, which appeared in the *Australian Dental Journal*:

A third category is the so-called "Dental Hygienists" girls, trained about two years in matters which otherwise will have to be done by the practitioner; not only giving the patients the necessary instructions about oral hygiene, etc., but also cleaning teeth, removing tartar, taking X-rays, making a provisional diagnosis of the status of the teeth. For many years already this group has been successfully active in several countries outside Europe; in most of the European countries the profession had objections against this form of help. However, nowadays practically everybody agrees that, especially in dental clinics, these girls can do excellent work and again the international organization has, at its meetings, warmly supported this possibility.

The last category are the so-called "New Zealand Dental Nurses". They are the girls who, very severely trained, are—after having gained their certificate—allowed not only to do the work of the hygienist, but also dental work (fillings, extractions) in the mouths of children, under the supervision of the dentist. In New Zealand, this group has already been in existence for more than forty years, but—although we are informed that they are doing good work—the profession in nearly all the other countries is very strongly opposed to the creation of such a category, fearing that this will bring about a lot of second-class dentistry. For the moment that control is not efficient or sufficient, and with a view to the shortage of dentists, they are of the opinion that this would most probably be the result in many countries.

Not having the time to enter fully into the details of these possibilities, I just want to say that I think that this is a question which cannot be solved on an international level, as the differences in the various countries are too great. In the first place, the kind of girl that is needed for this job must have the personality and prestige to be able to have enough authority over both the children and their parents. It therefore depends on the school system of the country whether a sufficient number of girls with such qualifications is available. In a number of European countries, *e.g.*, this kind of girl will want to enter the university and become a doctor or a dentist herself and then there is no intermediate form. Furthermore, the situation in each country differs with regard to population, number of dentists, distances, dental mindedness, existence of clinics, and so on. As it is impossible to equalize with one stroke of the pen all these circumstances, it seems to me that it will be good sense to leave this matter to each country to decide by itself.

That report indicates that the general attitude of the dental profession is a reluctance to have these girls doing a restricted type of work, even within the limits of work for schoolchildren. However, I am certain that this Government has in mind the needs of the profession in this State and that it will not act to the detriment of the high standards demanded by our dental profession. I consider that the assurances that have been sought be members opposite in relation to the personnel involved and in relation to only girls being engaged on this work will be forthcoming from the Minister, because it is clearly intended that girls shall be employed on this work, as they are employed on it in other States and in New Zealand.

During the past five years the dental profession has been concerned about the shortage of dentists and the inability to treat patients. In order to offset the difficulties and to enable dentists to attend patients in the chair for as much time as possible, the profession has provided training courses for dental nurses to enable them to do additional routine work in the office. These girls have attended evening courses in their own time and, on passing the examination at the end of two years, have received proficiency certificates. I have seen the examination papers and particulars of the course, and the girls have obtained good pass percentages in a difficult course.

The member for Burnside said that one of the basic reasons why the A.D.A. was lending its support in this matter was that the girls would be made available to attend to all schoolchildren. This is, of course, the intention of the Government, but it should be obvious that 16 girls (which will be the number in the initial stage) will not be sufficient to look after the needs of all our schoolchildren.

Mrs. Steele: I referred to primary schoolchildren.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Even so, 16 girls would not be able to perform all the work required. The needs of schoolchildren in the country areas are greater at present because of the shortage of dentists in those areas and, because of that, I consider that the Minister will arrange for the girls to attend to these children initially. I hope that the scheme will be large and successful.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I support the measure, although it reminds me of the work that the St. John Ambulance Brigade does in attending to accidents and picking up the human remains that are strewn around the road. Although the ambulance officers do a splendid job in repairs and attempted repairs, they cannot prevent the cause of the accidents. The dental nurses who will be appointed under this Bill may be more successful and I hope that the advice that they give to the children will be taken home to the parents.

One reason why it has been necessary to provide these nurses for the schools has been given by the member for West Torrens, in relation to Lameroo and Pinnaroo. I could have told that story, too, because I knew about it. One place had a tuckshop and the other did not, and twice as many children at the place with the tuckshop had dental caries as were affected at the place that did not have a tuckshop.

Day after day we see on television the spectacular pouring of some denatured cereal into a plate and the pouring of milk on top of the cereal, accompanied by a statement to the effect of ''There you are, there are all the calories in the world in that. That is sufficient for your child.'' The schoolchildren are sent off to school, slop fed. They do not need teeth to eat it and, if they do not need teeth, they do not want them. The children take 10c or 20c to school and we see then at tuckshops with a pasty in one hand and a soft drink in the other.

We have to think again about the whole matter. Fluoride is not the only matter involved. For the information of the member for Mitcham, I point out that I am opposed to the introduction of fluoridation until such time as we have educated our children how to keep the teeth in their heads. We have cases of children of five years of age with five or six affected milk teeth, and we would be ashamed to have a hand-fed calf with that many affected teeth. We see the morning breakfast advertised on television, with Pop coming down in a hurry, eating a great pack of cereals with 4in. of milk, and then dashing away. He probably gets ulcers within two or three years, anyway, and it is his own fault for being so stupid as to do that.

We are being equally silly here with what we are attempting to do. We are going to put in nurses to brush kiddies' teeth, take the tartar off, and then send them home to eat the same food. What we need is an intensive education campaign. Parents used to give a wooden peg to a baby cutting its teeth.

Mr. Millhouse: They still do.

Mr. QUIRKE: The Aborigines had beautiful natural teeth mainly because they bit on a hard bone. We can give children a more solid type of food than this easy-going slop with which we attempt to drown them and spoil their constitutions.

Mr. Heaslip: It is said that that is moving with the times.

Mr. QUIRKE: If that is moving with the times, then I am out of action. I did not eat that type of food. The honourable member for Torrens said that most members on this side had their dentures grinning at them at night-time, but for the honourable member's information I can say that mine will not grin at him. I welcome this Bill for the good that it will do, but I hope that these girls who will be doing this job will first be taught to teach the kiddies to go home to Mum and Dad and tell them that this slop they get in the morning is no good for their teeth and that they should have something they can chew on even if it is a green apple. I support the measure.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—''Prohibition of practising dentistry without registration or licence.''

Mrs. STEELE: I move:

In paragraph (*d*) to strike out ''he'' and insert ''she''.

I realize that the Acts Interpretation Act specifically states that ''he'' will be construed to mean ''she''. However, the whole purpose of this amendment to the Dentists Act is that the school to train dental nurses will be established with the idea of employing female nurses only. It may be argued that the rest of this legislation refers throughout its context to the word ''he'', but this is a provision that relates only to the female person.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I remind the honourable member that section 26 of the Acts Interpretation Act provides that in every Act every word of the masculine gender shall be construed as including the feminine gender. Therefore, I consider that her amendment is unnecessary. I assure the honourable member that the Bill is designed with the idea that females will become the experienced people to do the necessary work.

Mrs. STEELE: All that the Premier has said so far lends point to my argument. To me it is completely unrealistic and rather ridiculous that we should have the word ''he'' in the Bill when we have the Premier's assurance that the whole point of the legislation is to see that women only shall be employed in this service. I just do not see that this is sensible, for if we retained the word ''he'' it could be interpreted that either a male or a female could do the work.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am afraid the Premier has entirely missed the point of the honourable member's amendment, which is to ensure that only women are trained in this work, and not merely to emphasize that women may be trained. The Premier should know by now that a court considers only the wording of an Act of Parliament; it does not go behind it to whatever was said in debate in this place or any other place. The plain fact is that the Bill is couched only in the masculine gender. We do not deny the existence of the contents of section 26 of the Acts Interpretation Act, but the member for Burnside in her feminine zeal wishes to ensure that the Bill is confined exclusively to the feminine gender. If that is what we want, why should not we say so?

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Why exclude males?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Because, as I understand it, the agreement with the Australian Dental Association, amongst other things, is that only women shall be trained for this job. Everybody up to date has been proceeding on the assumption that only women are to be trained.

Mr. Coumbe: That is what the Premier said.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. There is every reason why ''she'' should be inserted in the Bill. Of course, we are able to do that by specifying that only women will be trained in this way and, if necessary, *pro tanto*, to repeal the Acts Interpretation Act, although I do not think for a moment that that will be necessary. I ask the Premier to reconsider the stand he has taken in opposition to the amendment moved by my honourable and fair friend from Burnside.

Mr. HEASLIP: Although I thought that this measure related specifically to females, neither the Bill nor the second reading explanation says so. The honourable member's amendment is pertinent and clearly seeks to achieve the purposes for which the Bill is designed.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I support the amendment. The Minister in another place has clearly stated that the Bill seeks to implement a scheme similar to those existing in New Zealand and Tasmania. However, it is apparently now intended to deviate from those schemes. I am sure that it was the accepted intention in the Bill that it should relate to female nurses. The A.D.A. specifically agreed to a service of this type along certain lines.

Mrs. Steele: Provided it was limited to females.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes, provided they were under the supervision of a trained dental surgeon and provided they were in Government employ. Most of these things have been agreed to, except that we equivocate about whether "he" means "she" or "she" means "he". When I read the second reading explanation of this Bill and other speeches, I was satisfied that the Government intended it to apply to females. I have said that I support the second reading but I have reservations now about whether it refers to male or female.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am surprised that the Premier, who is in charge of the Bill, does not get up to say where his Government stands, in view of the arguments that have been put and the clear way in which it has been pointed out to him that the terms of this Bill are completely equivocal, covering males and females. This Committee is entitled at least to know the Government's real intention here. Is it intended to have only women or is it that men, too, are to be trained? It is the Premier's duty to tell us what he proposes to do. If he is not prepared to do that, then another Minister will have to tell us. Surely we are entitled to know whether the Government persists in its opposition to this reasonable amendment. Therefore, with very great respect, I ask the Premier again whether he will get up and tell us what the Government's intention is.

Mr. HEASLIP: We are entitled to know what we are voting on. At this stage we do not. As far as I can see, we are voting for male or female: there is no explanation in the Premier's second reading speech. We are all agreed that they should be female nurses but the Bill does not specify that. We are entitled to know whether the Government intends that it shall be female or male, because we on this side support "female".

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have already explained that this is covered by the Acts Interpretation Act. I tried to assure the Committee that the Government's intention was to engage female staff. I can go further and say that it is the intention of the Government to proceed with the recruiting of 16 trainees, for a start, and they will all be females. I hope that this will commence next year. Beyond that I shall not go. I have gone a little further than I intended to in saying that 16 will commence training next year. We may need to go even beyond that. However, if we do not succeed, do we have to come back and make another amendment here? Why is there any discrimination here? Members opposite are not prepared to accept even what is in the Acts Interpretation Act. If the first scheme is successful, as I hope it will be, the authorities on fluoridation would not enter this debate again.

Mrs. STEELE: I am glad the Premier has given that explanation. I am inclined to reflect that it is still a man's world because, although the rest of the Dentists Act is governed by the Acts Interpretation Act, at least at this late hour I feel that if I have done nothing more I have helped the Government to say unequivocally that this is a scheme definitely restricted to females. However, as this is the only part of this legislation referring to females, it still seems absurd that we live in the past and use "he" when obviously "she" is the correct pronoun to be used in this clause. The fact that this scheme would be restricted to females was one of the prime conditions on which the Australian Dental Association was happy to go along with it, because it meant the employment of females in this dental service. As the member for Albert has said, it precluded dental operatives from participating in this scheme in future.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I supported the second reading of this Bill but I was under a misapprehension because I believed, as every other member on this side believed (and I believe the Bill passed through the other place with honourable members under a misapprehension) until this amendment came before the Chair, that the scheme was to be restricted to women. Now we find that such is not the intention of the Government and yet it still refuses an amendment which would so restrict it even though everybody was encouraged to believe that it would be restricted to women. However, the Premier now states that it will not be so restricted and the Attorney-General says such things as, "Why this discrimination?" Apparently the Government has all along proposed that men should be trained if it should be considered necessary. As I understand it, the agreement between the Government and the A.D.A. was that only women should be trained for this purpose, but now it appears that the Government has no intention of adhering to this agreement, and it will not accept an amendment to make the agreement effective.

I believe this to be most reprehensible and I am surprised that the Government should admit that this is its intention at this late stage. It has carried the Bill as far as this by misleading members as to its intention. The Government may defeat this amendment, but I propose to vote against the third reading of the Bill because I voted for the second reading while under a misapprehension which was encouraged, to say the least, by the Premier and the general attitude of the Government.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): As a member of Cabinet I am sick and tired of listening to the nonsensical insinuations made by the member for Mitcham. Members of Cabinet have never discussed the question of men being trained for this purpose. I am also sick and tired of the member for Mitcham seeing a dastardly plot in every line of every Bill and trying to make out something in a Bill that is not there.

Mr. Millhouse: It is there.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: It is not. The member for Mitcham spends his time in this House insinuating that the Government has some sinister plot behind every piece of legislation brought forward, and that is a lot of bunkum!

Mr. HEASLIP: I did not appreciate the remarks of the Minister of Education regarding the member for Mitcham. It is not only the member for Mitcham who is objecting to this clause, it is the Opposition.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: The honourable member has not suggested that this is a sinister plot as the member for Mitcham is always doing.

Mr. HEASLIP: I did not say that at all, but I believe that members on this side are entitled to a proper explanation of this Bill. In his second reading explanation the Premier said:

> In view of the shortage of dentists in the State and the relatively simple nature of the work performed in the School Health Service, it is proposed to train dental nurses for the purpose of carrying out this necessary work.

Frankly, we believed that this referred to females. All that is now being asked in the amendment proposed by the member for Burnside is that "he" in this clause should be altered in order that it be made clear. I thought it was clear before but now the Premier, who has given a second reading explanation, will not give a clear definition of the meaning. If it was made clear that it meant "female", we would support the Bill.

Mr. Hughes: Children will benefit from the Bill.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Interjections are out of order.

Mr. HEASLIP: Particularly from the member for Wallaroo.

Mr. McKEE: On a point of order, I am of the opinion that the member for Rocky River is provoking the member for Wallaroo.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: A point of order is not involved but I call the attention of the member for Rocky River to the fact that he must not invite interjections from members when addressing the Chair.

Mr. HEASLIP: I have not invited any interjections; they have come from members opposite.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Interjections are out of order irrespective of from whom they come. The member for Rocky River has the call, and he is not to refer to the member for Wallaroo.

Mr. HEASLIP: I hope there will be no interjections now from the member for Wallaroo. I have the floor and I am speaking to no-one in particular.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The member for Rocky River will be out of order unless he addresses his remarks to the Chair and refers to the amendment.

Mr. HEASLIP: Thank you, Mr. Acting Chairman. I hope you will protect me and that I will be able to talk to you without any interruptions. It looks as though I have the floor now, because the member for Wallaroo has disappeared. We are entitled to a clear interpretation on this matter. Opposition members and Government backbenchers believed that we were supporting having female dental nurses to help out in the present shortage of dentists. The amendment seeks to ensure that these dental nurses will be female.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: In my second reading explanation, I stated that the object of this short Bill was to enable the training and use of dental nurses. I have yet to discover in any part of South Australia where there are male dental nurses.

Mr. Millhouse: Quite right! Why don't you write it into the Bill?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Government appreciates the need for a better dental service for children in country areas, and is seeking to provide it. The member for Rocky River said we were not genuine in our attempt to provide a much-needed service in country areas.

Mr. McKee: And in the honourable member's area.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Not only in his area but throughout country areas. Opposition members have not talked about the merits of the Bill; they have used stonewalling tactics in an effort to prevent the services needed in country areas.

Mr. Hughes: And that stonewalling has prevented schoolchilden from getting attention.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: What the member for Mitcham said was a slur on the Government. His attitude is to look into every nook and cranny of Government legislation. He goes out of his way to hurl personal abuse across the floor of the Chamber. He need not shake his head or attempt to deny that, because he has gone so far on some of these matters that he will never be forgiven. He has adopted dirty, sniping tactics this evening, although I have given him an opportunity to get away with them. He has gone out of his way to deny children the services provided in the Bill the Government has introduced. The Opposition's tactics have been pure stonewalling to prevent the passage of the Bill. The Government is trying to do the best it can for the children of the State. As I have said before, it is prepared to train 16 female nurses for this purpose. Do members opposite think we are training them just for the fun of it, and that they will be used in the metropolitan area? We intend to train them so they can be of real service to the people, in particular to those in country areas. From the stonewalling that has taken place, I am inclined to believe that the member for Rocky River has no desire to help the Government in this matter.

Mr. McANANEY: The Opposition supported the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. Curren: Support it now.

Mr. McANANEY: The member for Burnside was under the impression (created by what was said in another place and by the publicity given to the Bill) that only female nurses were to be trained. However, at no time this evening has the Premier said that is to be the position. At no time has the Opposition attempted to hinder any move towards improving the care of children's teeth. If the Bill is intended to apply only to female nurses, the amendment should be accepted. If, at a later date, it is necessary to train male nurses, then the Act can be easily amended.

Mr. Hudson: Why restrict it now?

Mr. McANANEY: We are asking the Premier to say what he wants, but he has not said anything. We believed it was for female nurses.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I would not have risen again if it were not for the intemperate remarks made a few moments ago by the Premier, who reproached me about stonewalling. Surely it is the responsibility of every member of this House to contribute to a debate and to get to the bottom of every point. I am surprised that the Premier should speak as intolerantly and as vindictively as he did, and that he should import a personal element into this matter is beyond my comprehension. I cannot reproach the honourable gentleman too strongly for his intemperate language. I know the Attorney-General does not agree with the Premier and regrets that it was said.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: On the contary.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We did not want to delay the Bill, which was proceeding quickly until the pig-headedness of the honourable gentleman opposite became apparent. Throughout the debate in another place and here the Government has encouraged Opposition members to believe that only women will be trained for this purpose. When the member for Burnside, by a diligent examination of the Bill, discovered that this was not the way in which it was phrased, she introduced a proper amendment to ensure that the intention that we have all believed was behind this measure would be carried into effect.

Mr. Hurst: What a legal training you have had!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member has contributed to this debate by interjection only, and I am sure his last interjection has no substance. If he thinks he has a point, let him get up and expound it. All the member for Burnside wants to do is make sure that only women can be trained. Why should this be resisted so strenuously by the Government and by the Premier? If this is the intention of the Government, it should be written into the Bill, and that is all we are asking should be done. Much sound and fury, and now personality, have been injected into the debate. We are trying to do our job, a job that any conscientious Opposition should do, and why it should be resented I do not know. I do not know why the Government cannot accept such a reasonable amendment. I hope that even at this late stage the Premier's supporters will make representations to him to see reason, and perhaps the best thing, in view of what has been said, would be for the Committee to report progress so that this matter could be considered. If there is a better way of doing it than the member for Burnside has put it, I am sure she will not mind, so long as her objective of making certain that only women are trained is retained. I make these points in all sincerity, and I express great regret that the Premier should so far have forgotten himself as to have said what he did.

Mr. HUGHES: I object to this amendment.

Mr. Millhouse: What are your reasons?

Mr. HUGHES: Apparently Opposition members were not prepared to accept the explanation given earlier, but this is not the first time that a Government has objected to an amendment. I cannot understand why this stonewalling is continuing. The House intended to rise at 10 p.m. and now, after 11 p.m., we are still here because of the stonewalling by members opposite on an amendment on which the Premier has given an explanation that apparently Opposition members did not understand. Tonight's stonewalling is typical of other stonewallings that have been displayed on numerous occasions about legislation that would benefit the general public of this State, and members of the public should learn of the stonewalling that has been put up tonight, particularly by the members for Mitcham and Rocky River.

Mr. Millhouse: Oh, come now!

Mr. HUGHES: This stonewalling is denying attention to thousands of children in this State. This is not the first time that Opposition members have held up legislation that would benefit the people of this State.

Mr. Nankivell: We have not stopped it.

Mr. HUGHES: No, the honourable member would not be a party to that!

Mr. Heaslip: We want to know what it means.

Mr. Nankivell: We supported it.

Mr. HUGHES: The Opposition is holding up legislation that could have been passed and would have benefited thousands of children. The public of this State should be made aware of this, and I hope that members of the press present in the galleries tonight will take note of what is happening.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out, for the benefit of the member for Wallaroo, that we are discussing an amendment to a certain clause. Will he confine his remarks to that amendment?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, Mr. Acting Chairman. I have already said that I object strongly to the attitude that members are adopting to the amendment. It is no good the member for Mitcham shaking his head. He is frightened of the challenge I have made to the press tonight to make the public fully aware of the stonewalling in connection with the amendment.

Mr. Coumbe: You are wasting time now.

Mr. Millhouse: You have wasted 10 minutes already.

Mr. Coumbe: What a wonderful contribution! Sit down.

Mr. HUGHES: Now that the cry from the other side has died down, I wonder whether members opposite have any objection to a male—

Mr. Millhouse: Yes.

Mr. HUGHES: I hope the press makes that available to the public tomorrow.

Mr. Millhouse: It is a breach of faith with the Australian Dental Association. That has been said several times already.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not ashamed to repeat that I hope the press reporters have listened carefully to the ridiculous stonewalling by members opposite in connection to the amendment and that they will tell the public that the Opposition is withholding legislation that could be of much benefit to thousands of children in South Australia. The onus is on members opposite, not on the Government.

Mr. HALL: I have been absent from 7.30 p.m. and it is now nearly 11.30 p.m. When the House adjourned for dinner at a few minutes to 6, we were not discussing dentists.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: For the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition, whilst he may not have been here during the debate, we are now in the Committee stages and we are dealing with an amendment moved by the member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) to strike out "he" and insert "she".

Mr. HALL: Yes, I was about to address my remarks to what the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) said a few minutes ago. The debate on this clause should not have gone on for nearly four hours. I do not think we should take seriously the hysterical outbursts by the member for Wallaroo.

Mr. Hughes: I hope the public is made aware of it.

Mr. HALL: It was a ridiculous statement. The member himself spoke for 10 minutes of that period of less than four hours. It was a childish and ridiculous statement to make in this House.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works): It is not often that I take part in debates, but I point out that there is no need for the heat that has been engendered in the debate on this clause. I ask members to take a responsible attitude and to appreciate that the word "he" is common usage in Bills of this nature. I give the assurance that the Government has no thought of using other than female nurses in regard to the proposals in the Bill. However, the Acts Interpretation Act has always used the word "he", and what is wrong with the use of that word? I repeat that it is not the intention of the Government to use other than female nurses, but who knows what will happen in 10 years' or 15 years' time? It may then be found to be necessary to use male nurses but we will not be able to do it without amending the Act if we write in a prohibition clause now.

Mr. Millhouse: What's wrong with that?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: What is right with it?

Mr. Millhouse: You may not always be where you are now.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: No, but while I am in this House I shall adopt a responsible attitude. The use of the word "he" is common in Bills and it means she when necessary. We do not want to insert a prohibition.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: There is more involved than the inclusion of the words he or she. We have previously passed legislation setting up a profession with a high standard and involving a five-year university course. The profession has almost the same status as the medical profession. This Bill is quite unlike what has been suggested by some members who have spoken in the rather heated debate tonight. The former Minister of Health negotiated legislation with the Australian Dental Association and the debate reached the second reading stage in another place before a Bill was available. There was no objection to the measure.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The member for Gumeracha cannot refer to the debate that took place on this Bill in another place.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am merely stating that this particular amendment was founded on the assumption that we would have the goodwill of the Australian Dental Association. If the scheme is to be successful, it must have the confidence and support of that organization. I see no reason why the amendment should not be accepted by the Government if it will make the Bill acceptable to the profession.

The Attorney-General may be able to clarify some doubts I have about the Acts Interpretation Act, which provides:

In every Act—

(*a*) every word of the masculine gender shall be construed as including the feminine gender:

However, it does not say that the reverse applies. The Attorney-General can correct me if I am wrong, but I believe that the reverse would not apply. I accept the statement of the Minister of Works that the Government does not intend to train other than women for this work at the present time. However, there will be some suspicion on the part of the Dental Association if, after this debate, the Government adheres to its decision not to accept this amendment. This Parliament cannot know what will be the use made of this Bill in 20 years' time by other people who will be in Parliament then. If the Government intends to have only women doing this work, I suggest that it should accept the amendment, because that would undoubtedly allay any fear the Dental Association might have.

Mr. Hudson: Has it expressed a fear?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I cannot give the member for Glenelg a direct assurance on that, because I did not conduct any negotiation with the association. However, I have been told that the association accepted this proposal regarding women and agreed to support it. If, as has been suggested, it may be necessary to review this matter in the future, I suggest that it would be a good thing to do this by way of amendment to the Act when the occasion arises, for in that respect we would not only retain the confidence of the association and give effect to the Government's intention but also we would have a unanimous vote on the Bill.

The Committee divided on Mrs. Steele's amendment:

Ayes (16).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse, and Nankivell, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele (teller), and Mr. Teusner.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McKee, and Walsh (teller).

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 and 5) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 11.41 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, November 9, at 2 p.m.