HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, December 1, 1970

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

QUESTIONS

MORATORIUM ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr. HALL: Will the Premier say whether the Government will take action to discontinue the Royal Commission considering the recent moratorium disturbance in Adelaide? I base this question on the possibility of an appeal concerning one of the matters before the court that could lead to an action in January and possibly prevent the Commission from sitting before that date, and the obvious lack of public support for a commission that will cost a large sum of public money apart from the fees paid to counsel by those appearing before the Commission.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government will not discontinue the Commission, for it believes that considerable public benefit can be derived from it. Proposals have been made in other States concerning laws dealing with demonstrations which elsewhere in the world have not produced the results forecast. Also, proposals have been advanced by many people in South Australia to formulate laws to control demonstrations and to ensure the right of peaceful and orderly demonstration and the protection of the public from violence and disorder. It is not new in the world that inquiries should be held into matters of this kind: the President of the United States instituted such an inquiry into disorders in Chicago, and the President of the Philippines instituted such an inquiry into disorders in Manila. The Commission here having already embarked on its work, I do not expect that it will be unduly delayed in dealing with the matters within its terms of reference by the fact that one of the persons involved may be taking an appeal. I expect the evidence before the Commission to proceed shortly, and I believe that marked public advantages are to be gained from such an inquiry.

FIRE PREVENTION

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Local Government consider placing on the Building Act Advisory Committee a representative of the metropolitan fire brigade. An article on page 2 of the *Advertiser* of November 24 draws attention to the problems arising from panic caused amongst people by smoke and fire in high-rise buildings. I have information that indicates that the situation is more alarming than the *Advertiser* article suggests. I can give the following two examples: the staircase of a King William Street building, which was built in the last two years, acts as an air-conditioning duct; and the *Advertiser* building itself has no fire escape, a fault which may not have been far from the mind of the writer of the article to which I have referred.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: On behalf of the members of the *Advertiser* staff, I am disturbed lest a fire break out. I will certainly discuss the matter with the Building Act Advisory Committee. However, in fairness I should point out that, as far as I know, the provisions expected to be included in the regulations under the new Building Bill, if and when it is passed by Parliament, include adequate precautions to deal with the problem associated with fire. The major difficulty referred to by the honourable member relates to the existing Act and tends to highlight the reason why the new Bill was introduced and why there should be new regulations. The existing Act has insufficient provisions in this connection, but I expect that this position will be considerably altered by the new Bill. I know that the committee has conferred with people eminently qualified in fire protection matters. Nevertheless, I will ascertain the view of the Chairman and inform the honourable member.

ROAD SAFETY

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked him on November 12 about road safety?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am delighted to give the honourable member the reply; I have had it for him for two weeks, but in that time he has not asked for it. As promised, I have directed the honourable member's suggestion to the Road Safety Council. I have also given the matter much thought. I believe the suggestion made by the honourable member has merit, provided it is handled with care and sympathetic and human understanding. In no circumstances would I be a party to the showing of horror road accident publicity material, and I would certainly oppose children being exposed to this kind of publicity. Nevertheless, as I believe that ways and means of implementing a suggestion along the lines of that made by the honourable member should be undertaken, I have asked the Road Safety

Council to investigate the matter and provide me with a report in due course.

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport refer to the Road Safety Council for its consideration the carrying of dogs and other pets loose in passenger vehicles? From my observations and those of people who have contacted me, I understand that occasionally dogs have been responsible for accidents. I point out, too, that it is an offence to drive a vehicle with any part of one's body protruding from it. Despite this, one often sees parts of the body of a dog hanging out of a motor car window as the vehicle is being driven. This practice is, at least, most distracting, and often an animal loose in a vehicle can suffer injury as a result of an accident.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not sure that the Road Safety Council's charter would be wide enough to enable it to consider this matter. However, I will discuss the matter with it and, if necessary, in other quarters as well.

COOLER VANS

Mr. WELLS: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport ensure that sufficient railway cooler vans are available at all times, at Port Lincoln in particular, to be used in moving frozen meat from freezer works to shipside? Recently a shipment of frozen lamb was taken from the freezer works at Port Lincoln to the shipside for export. It was stated that insufficient cooler vans were available, the intention at that stage being to give to private road transport the opportunity to carry the frozen lamb. Much discussion took place, and an industrial upheaval was threatened. Eventually two railway furniture removal vans were used to transport the meat, supplementing the cooler vans available. I have been informed that many of these cooler vans are available and standing idle at Peterborough.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to inquire and give the honourable member a reply.

RAIL EXCURSIONS

Mr. CLARK: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked him recently regarding special excursion train trips?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As I mentioned on November 18, one of the main difficulties in organizing excursion trips similar to the Victor Harbour excursion that took place on September 2, 1970, is in arranging for suitable rolling stock to be made available. However, the Railways Commissioner expects that two excursions will be held during the month of January, 1971, and publicity will be arranged as soon as the firm dates are known.

TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport consider having traffic signals provided for traffic turning to the right on the Keswick bridge intersection, and will he have wiring for right-turn traffic lights provided when all future traffic light installations are being planned? Most of the accidents at the Keswick bridge intersection have been caused by cars turning into traffic whilst the caution light is showing, and the provision of a right-turn signal would be in the interests of safety. I consider that the necessary wiring was not installed at the intersection, otherwise action would have been taken by now, and I hope that the necessary wiring will be provided in future when traffic lights are installed.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know the accident rate at this intersection, although I know the intersection quite well: I travel over it every day, and I know that it is extremely difficult to negotiate. I shall have the matter investigated to find out whether the honourable member's suggestion can be acceded to.

Mr. SLATER: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on November 5 regarding the installation of traffic lights at the intersection of Sudholz Road and Main North-East Road, Windsor Gardens?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Some operational difficulties have occurred at the Sudholz Road and Main North-East Road intersection, as described by the honourable member. The problem appears to have lessened from the time when the lights were first switched on, as the regular travellers approaching from the west transfer to the through lane, well in advance of the intersection. The position is being kept under continuing surveillance and, if excessive delay continues, consideration will be given to installing a right-turn signal.

MODBURY FREEWAY

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question about a building being erected on land intended to be used for the Modbury Freeway?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: An area of 1 acre 1 rood and 34 perches of part section 1564, hundred of Yatala, is leased to Modern Tract Development Proprietary Limited, which is a subsidiary of Realty Development Corporation. The lease can be terminated by either party's giving three months' notice in writing and, at the termination of the lease, the buildings presently on the land will be removed.

TELEVISION COMPANY

Mr. SLATER: Will the Attorney-General ask his department to investigate the activities of an organization known as Metropolitan T.V. and Appliance Service? A constituent of mine answered an advertisement in the classified advertisements section of the press regarding distribution by junior boys of handbills advertising this firm. My constituent's son delivered the handbills. However, the remuneration offered in the advertisement was not received. My constituent tried to inquire into the matter further by ringing a telephone number that was on a card bearing the name of the company, but this telephone number turned out to be only that of an answering service. My constituent has been unable to find out the firm's address. I have other information that I can give the Attorney-General if he is willing to investigate this matter.

The Hon. L. J. KING: If the honourable member gives me what additional information he has, I will have the matter investigated.

HENDON RAILWAY LINE

Mr. HARRISON: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether it is contemplated that the rail passenger service on the Hendon line is to be suspended? If it is, will the Minister consider, as an alternative form of public transport, the continuation of the Queenstown bus service, run by the Municipal Tramways Trust, through to Port Adelaide at least. Should this not be practicable, could transfer tickets be issued to passengers travelling through to Semaphore, Largs, Port Adelaide, Rosewater and Adelaide?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The answer to the honourable member's first question is "Yes". This action is necessary, because of the lack of support the Hendon railway line has received and because of the necessity to provide an access corridor to the developing West Lakes area. The only way to provide this corridor is through the railway land from Albert Park, not just to Hendon but *via* the land held by the Railways Department through to the West Lakes subdivision. Regarding the second part of the question, about the bus service, I understand (although I have no specific details) that the trust has thoroughly examined the matter and, indeed, did so before a decision was taken regarding the future of the Hendon line. The trust has stated that it will be able to give the people of this area an adequate bus service and that it will at the same time provide an even better service than the two or three trains that at present run to Hendon daily.

POLICE RADIO

Mr. SIMMONS: Will the Attorney-General, representing the Chief Secretary, say whether it is an offence to eavesdrop on conversations conducted over the police radio and, if it is, are exemptions granted to organizations such as the newspapers?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the question to my colleague and obtain a reply for the honourable member.

RIVERLAND

Mr. CURREN: In the interests of tourist facility promotion, will the Attorney-General discuss with the Chief Secretary and other Ministers the desirability of changing the name of any Government or semi-government authority operating in the Murray River districts of South Australia from "Upper Murray" to "Riverland"? It is the desire of the tourist association in the area to promote the district by the name of "Riverland", and to this end it has asked many associations operating there to change their names from "Upper Murray" to "Riverland". In this respect the association has sought the concurrence of the Police Department, the name of whose Upper Murray headquarters it has requested be changed to "Riverland", but that request has been refused. The Local Government Association has agreed to the change and the Riverland Local Government Association is now the name of the local body.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the question to my colleague.

CLEAN AIR COMMITTEE

Mr. RYAN: Can the Minister for Conservation say whether the Clean Air Committee is still functioning and when a report from the committee will be brought down so that regulations can be framed under the Clean Air Act, which was passed some time ago?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The committee is still functioning. I am not sure when a report is likely to be made available but I will inquire and let the honourable member know.

MORATORIUM ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr. HALL: Before I ask my question I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that I have been waiting a long time to ask this supplementary question.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have explained the system of calling questions and I invite the Leader of the Opposition to come here and I will show him how questions are recorded. I have made clear that every member gets one round and that, when the first round is completed, I go back for the second round. I have not departed from that practice and that is what I have been doing in fairness to everyone. The Leader is getting his turn now.

Mr. HALL: Thank you for the explanation, although I am sure it disappoints the Premier as well as me because the Premier has expressed his desire to have supplementary questions asked in this House, and that is what I was trying to do on behalf of the Opposition. I see no reason why I should be denied the opportunity of asking a supplementary question.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition is out of order. A circular has been sent to members about Question Time. The Leader must ask his question and not debate matters that have been dealt with somewhere else.

Mr. HALL: Thank you for referring to the circular although I believed that was dealing with matters of the future.

The SPEAKER: Order! What is the question?

Mr. HALL: How long does the Premier believe the Royal Commission will sit and what does he believe will be the cost to the Government of its sitting?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am no more successful as a fortune teller than was Sir Thomas Playford when he was in office and instituted similar Royal Commissions.

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will you, Mr. Speaker, be prepared to see that the old practice whereby questions were taken alternately from both sides of the House is re-instituted and thus enable the Leader of the Opposition, if no other member of this Party wishes to ask a question, to ask a second question in succession to his first one: in other words, that the Leader's two questions be separated only by one question from the Government side?

The SPEAKER: The matter can be considered, but I point out to the honourable member that a member of the Opposition indicated a desire to ask a question but, after being spoken to by the Whip, left the Chamber before I had the opportunity to call on that member. This was at 2.12 p.m.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: May I ask you a further question, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: No, there must be only one question at a time.

Mr. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr. EVANS: Is there anything wrong if I, as Whip, speak to any member on this side? What reflection do you make in suggesting that a member left the Chamber after I spoke to that member.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order; I was replying to the member for Alexandra and stating the facts, which could be seen.

Mr. HALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, what has it to do with you if our Whip was speaking to one of our members?

The SPEAKER: I am stating facts as they occur. I said that a member of the Opposition had raised a hand to ask a question, and after being spoken to by the Whip, that member left the Chamber at 2.12 p.m. The next question would have been from a member on the Opposition side, following the member for Unley.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the reason for my question is that I am well aware of the practice in the past whereby most Speakers have seen that questions have been asked by both sides alternately. Recently, the practice on the Opposition benches has been to enable the Leader of the Opposition, if possible, to ask a further question closely following his first question. As it happened, the Whip did speak to one of our members and, although I am not sure of the details, I think you were probably correct in your guess that he suggested that the honourable member should not ask a question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to withdraw that statement, because I did not make a guess; nor did I assume. I stated facts, and I refuse to be reflected on by the member for Alexandra. I have stated facts about what happened in this House, and I will not be reflected on. I ask the honourable member to withdraw.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The question—

The SPEAKER: Are you prepared to withdraw that reflection?

Mr. Hall: There's nothing to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: It is that I assumed something.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can you please tell me what statement I am asked to withdraw?

The SPEAKER: You said in your explanation that I assumed that the Opposition Whip told the member concerned to withdraw. I said nothing of the sort, I have asked for that remark to be withdrawn, and it is not a personal explanation. I am asking the member for Alexandra to withdraw immediately.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I may—

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the member for Alexandra prepared to withdraw?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can you give me the exact words that I am being asked to withdraw?

The SPEAKER: This is the third occasion that I have stated that the member for Alexandra said that I assumed that the Whip had told the member for Davenport to withdraw. Never at any time did I say that, and I have asked for a withdrawal, seeing that the member for Alexandra was giving a personal explanation.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I think that I—

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member prepared to withdraw?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I should like to finish my sentence.

The SPEAKER: Order! Are you prepared to withdraw?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I should like to finish my sentence.

The SPEAKER: I am again asking the member for Alexandra to withdraw that reflection on the Chair.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think, from my recollection of what I said—

The SPEAKER: Are you prepared to withdraw?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have not finished the sentence.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Speaker is on his feet. I am asking the honourable member to withdraw that statement, and this is the fourth or fifth time that I have asked for a withdrawal.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am only asking—

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member prepared to withdraw? This is the last time I ask the member for Alexandra whether he is prepared to withdraw.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Mr. Speaker, if you will give me the exact words—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I name the honourable member for Alexandra. The honourable Premier!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the member for Alexandra be suspended for the remainder of this day's sitting.

Mr. HALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. As all of us here no doubt will have to vote whether the honourable member should or should not be suspended, I, as one of those members, should like to know of what he is guilty.

Members interjecting:

Mr. HALL: To help me make up my mind, I should like to know of what the member for Alexandra is guilty and what are the words he said that are required to be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: Standing Orders provide that "whenever such member shall have been named by the Speaker or by the Chairman of Committees such member shall have the right to be heard in explanation or apology". If the honourable member now desires, he may explain his position.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I should like to explain that the words that I think you have asked me to withdraw are not, I believe, words that I used. I do not believe that I used the words that you have said I used, and that is why I have asked you to tell me the exact words that I am asked to withdraw. You have not, to my knowledge, repeated those words and, furthermore, Mr. Speaker, although I may be subject to as much bias as is any other member. I cannot believe by any stretch of my own imagination that those words could have been offensive in any way to the Speaker of this House.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Well, he took them that way.

Mr. Coumbe: That's his fault.

Mr. Clark: It's also his right.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Premier!

Mr. HALL: On a point of order. Does the Premier close the debate by speaking at this stage?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No, I have to move the substantive motion at this time.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Premier!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The member for Alexandra having made an explanation, pursuant to Standing Order 170 I move:

That the member for Alexandra be suspended from the service of the House for the remainder of this day's sitting.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?

Mr. RYAN: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Hall: This is a terrible day for this Parliament.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader is out of order. There can be no debate: the question has to be put.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Pursuant to Standing Order 170.

The SPEAKER: Standing Order 170 specifically provides:

Whenever any such member shall have been named by the Speaker or by the Chairman of Committees, such member shall have the right to be heard in explanation or apology, and shall, unless such explanation or apology be accepted by the House, then withdraw from the Chamber; whereupon, if the offence has been committed by such member in the House, Mr. Speaker shall, on a motion being made, no amendment, adjournment or debate being allowed, forthwith put the question.

Mr. COUMBE: On a point of order. Does this mean—

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr. COUMBE: Does this mean that neither I nor any other member can move dissent from your ruling, the motion having now been moved by the Premier?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You could have moved that the explanation be accepted, but you didn't.

The SPEAKER: The only course open to members was to move that the explanation be accepted in accordance with Standing Orders, but no Opposition member so moved. I have no alternative but to proceed to put the motion.

Mr. COUMBE: I recall that the Leader asked the Premier whether the Premier's motion, which he was about to move, would close the debate.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I said, "No, I have to move the substantive motion."

Mr. COUMBE: Would I be in order in moving that Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the explanation, as given by the member for Alexandra, to be debated?

The SPEAKER: No, I am afraid that that would be stretching a point too far.

Mr. COUMBE: I think I am eligible to move the suspension, Sir.

The SPEAKER: The Standing Order to which I have referred is specific in stating what motions can be entertained, and I outlined this to the House just prior to the honourable member for Torrens rising. The question before the Chair—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Sir. Under Standing Order 170, I think the honourable member for Alexandra must leave the Chamber prior to your putting the motion.

The member for Alexandra having left the Chamber:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order. The Premier was on his feet and the Leader asked whether, if the Premier moved the motion, it closed the debate. The Premier said, "No, I have to move a motion." In the circumstances, the Premier has deliberately misled the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. I will have to put the motion as moved by the honourable Premier, "That the member for Alexandra be suspended from the service of the House for the remainder of this day's sitting."

While the division bells were ringing:

Mr. Hall: This is the most partial Speaker we've ever had.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable Leader has just made a remark which was heard by members on this side of the Chamber and which reflected on the Chair in this House, when he said that you, Sir, were the most partial Speaker we have ever had, and I ask that that remark be withdrawn.

Mr. HALL: The honourable Premier knows that interjections are out of order and he should not countenance them. I withdraw nothing.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On a point of order, Sir. A remark made during the sittings of the House which is audible in the Chamber and which reflects on the Chair is something which is in fact cognizable.

Mr. Coumbe: If heard by the Speaker.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was certainly heard by members on this side of the House, and I took objection to it.

The SPEAKER: The motion before the Chair must be disposed of at this time; we can clear up the other matter later.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Noes (16)—Messrs. Becker, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall (teller), Mathwin, Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

The SPEAKER: There are 23 Ayes and 16 Noes, a majority of seven for the Ayes. The question therefore passes in the affirmative. Therefore, the honourable member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) is suspended from the service of the House for the remainder of this day's sitting.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Sir, I draw your attention to the fact that, while the division was being taken on the last motion, the Leader of the Opposition, very audibly to members in this House, reflected on the Chair by saying, "You are the most partial Speaker we have ever known." I ask that those words be withdrawn. This is a reflection on the Chair that is not proper.

The SPEAKER: Is the honourable Leader prepared to withdraw those words?

Mr. HALL: I am not so sure that I said those words.

Mr. Ryan: Ha, ha!

Mr. HALL: If I could be heard over the raucous, rude laughter of members opposite, I would talk about the subject. I cannot be sure that I said exactly those words, but the Premier is right in saying that I said those words in intent. I will not claim to have said them exactly but I did say something very similar: that you were the most partial Speaker that we have ever had. I said it by interjection, and I cannot withdraw that.

The SPEAKER: If the honourable Leader of the Opposition is reflecting on the office of Speaker, the Premier has requested, and I shall have to request, that he withdraw his words. Is the honourable Leader willing to withdraw?

Mr. HALL: Following your ruling this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I believe you are partial. Your ruling has demonstrated this. It would be quite wrong for me to pursue a course of saying that I did not believe it, in the face of your action this afternoon.

The SPEAKER: I will have to name the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Hall). The Leader may be heard in explanation or apology. Does the honourable Leader desire to be heard?

Mr. HALL: No, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable Leader withdraw from the Chamber—

Mr. HALL: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: —pursuant to Standing Order 170?

The Leader of the Opposition having left the Chamber.

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

That the Leader of the Opposition be suspended from the service of the House for the remainder of this day's sitting.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Noes (15)—Messrs. Becker, Carnie, Coumbe (teller), Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

The SPEAKER: There are 23 Ayes and 15 Noes, a majority of eight for the Ayes. The question therefore passes in the affirmative. Therefore, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Hall) is suspened from the service of the House for the remainder of this day's sitting.

HOUSING APPLICATIONS

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Premier give me the details of the housing figures that I requested last week?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Housing Trust has always said that it is impossible to say accurately how many people are waiting for trust houses and the length of the waiting time. Waiting time varies from a relatively few weeks in some country towns to three years in some parts of the metropolitan area. To give another illustration, even within the flat-construction programme it is impossible to give a general answer, because the waiting time for a ground floor flat is quite different from the waiting time for a third floor flat even in the same group. I will refer now to the number of applications. As I have mentioned recently, the number of applications coming into the trust for rental accommodation is the highest in the history of the trust and last financial year alone more than 10,000 applications were received for rental accommodation. The trust has never claimed that it knows how many of its applications are current, because without a very large administration writing to people very frequently, it is hard to know whether applicants to the trust

have solved their problem elsewhere. What is true, however, is that the trust has very substantial numbers of applications for all types of accommodation, including rental-purchase houses, and that the demand is State-wide, not confined to the metropolitan area. The trust is building to the limit of the low-interest money available to it under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. As I have mentioned in the House, unless this sum is increased or the interest rate reduced substantially so that we will have more capital money available, instead of moneys going to interest, it is impossible for the trust to satisfy the demand for low-rental accommodation. Since the trust has no temporary houses, no applications are kept for this category of housing. That is the reply that I have received from the General Manager of the trust. I point out to the honourable member, however, that attempts are made, through the officers of my department, to assist people in relation to emergency situations, just as occurs in relation to applications to the trust, where we are able to help with emergencies. As the honourable member knows, at times houses other than those held by the trust are available to the Government, and we have made a survey of these to try to cope with any emergency situation that arises.

OPEN-SPACE TEACHING

Mrs. STEELE: Can the Minister of Education say when the projected additions to the Linden Park Demonstration School will be commenced?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Additions at the Linden Park Demonstration School involve the construction of a six-teacher open-space unit. However, it is clear that the department will not be able this financial year, or possibly even next financial year, to let a contract for that work or for any other six-teacher open-space units on the list, unless additional assistance for the school-building programme can be obtained from the Commonwealth Government. Contracts for 15 four-teacher open-space units at various primary schools throughout the State are in the course of being let. This has been made possible by the provision of an additional $500,000 from Loan funds for the school-building programme. The sum of $500,000 will be spent before the end of June, and additional expenditure will be incurred next financial year. The current building programme already involves a heavy commitment next financial year and, until the Government receives a reply to the submissions made to the Commonwealth Government, as a consequence of the national survey, for additional assistance for the school-building programme, construction of the 15 or 16 six-teacher open-space units that are planned will be delayed.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Do I understand from the Minister that the construction of additional open-space units at secondary schools is now in abeyance because of lack of funds? If it is not, will the Minister say what is the possibility of building what I think are called "Daws Road" units (that is, open-space units and library complexes) at the Loxton High School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to obtain a report for the honourable member about the position at Loxton High School, although several other secondary schools are higher than Loxton on the priority list for replacement buildings. I think the honourable member may have misunderstood my reply to the member for Davenport, which referred to the commencement of work on the programme of four-teacher and six-teacher open-space units in primary schools. That programme, which was announced some months ago, involved a total expenditure of about $3,000,000 and its rapid completion depended on the provision of Commonwealth assistance. I said then that, if Commonwealth funds were not available, the programme would take much longer to complete. The State Government has indicated its good faith in the matter by making additional money available this financial year so that half of the programme dealing with four-teacher open-space units can be commenced. That additional $500,000 represents extra expenditure that is likely to occur this year, and any contracts that are let will carry a financial commitment over into the next financial year.

Mr. Nankivell: Do these complexes involve substantial Commonwealth expenditure?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Daws Road units, so far as they involve the construction of a library, would involve the provision of some Commonwealth funds. The honourable member may well know that this State's library programme for this financial year involved an expenditure exceeding the sum provided by the Commonwealth Government for library purposes. Therefore, we are already eating into State funds in the provision of library facilities. Whether or not a Daws Road unit constructed at a secondary school contains a library complex will depend on the existing library facilities within the school as well as the size of the school concerned. Those

factors will govern how the library complex will be included. This means that the whole scheme cannot be standardized to anything like the same extent as the department is able to standardize the primary schools.

T.A.B. STAFF

Mr. WELLS: Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary to say whether it is the policy of the Totalizator Agency Board to replace male shop supervisors with female supervisors, and, if this policy has been implemented, whether it was implemented to avoid the payment of equal pay to the women supervisors who will remain? If this policy is in operation, will the Minister have it countermanded immediately?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will refer the matter to my colleague and obtain a report for the honourable member.

INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to the question I asked last Thursday about accommodation for the Industrial Commission?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Since the honourable member asked this question last Thursday, I have had an opportunity to inspect the present accommodation, which is cramped and inadequate. It was initially expected that the Industrial Commission would by now have occupied the new accommodation in I.M.F.C. House. However, although the Government has leased two floors of that building, one of the conditions of the lease (which applies to all tenants of the building) is that the internal partitioning must be done by the contractor nominated by the landlord. Although I am glad to say that work in erecting the partitions is now proceeding, it appears that the necessary work, including the fitting-out of the courtrooms, will not be completed until the end of January. Both the Attorney-General and I are anxious that the Industrial Court and Commission move as soon as possible so that the present accommodation can be made available for other courts, and all possible steps are being taken to expedite the work.

Mr. BECKER: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to my recent question about the appointment of an additional State Industrial Commissioner?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Fluctuations have always occurred in the number of matters before the Industrial Commission, and it is inevitable that this should be so. However, our State Industrial Commission has established an enviable reputation for the expedition with which it deals with matters before it and I am anxious that that reputation be maintained. An amendment to the Industrial Code would be necessary before more than two Commissioners could be appointed. A few weeks ago the Minister for Conservation announced the Government's intention comprehensively to review the Industrial Code next year, and in that review I will discuss with the President of the Industrial Commission whether there is any need for an amendment to enable more than two Commissioners to be appointed.

SMART ROAD

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the questions I asked on October 27 and November 5 regarding the reconstruction and widening of Smart Road, Modbury, and the provision of footpaths along that road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Because of the peculiar nature of development along Smart Road with the Myer shopping centre and the Modbury Hospital concentrated on its western end, the road is divided into two categories for the purpose of determining whether financial assistance is to be allocated by the Highways Department for upgrading and improvement. The section between the Main North-East Road and Seymour Road is now of arterial significance and, accordingly, has been widened to a point near the hospital boundary. However, the section between Seymour Road and Dillon Road primarily serves local residents and, as such, no substantial departmental assistance can be justified in the light of other needs throughout the State. It has always been accepted that the construction of footpaths is the responsibility of local government, and no evidence has been presented to the Highways Department to justify a change in policy in relation to this road.

O'HALLORAN HILL SCHOOL

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about a school in the O'Halloran Hill and Braeview area?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A site for the erection of a new school at Braeview is at present being acquired. Close liaison has been maintained with the Headmaster of the Reynella Primary School. The situation is being watched carefully. It is expected that a new school planned for erection at Braeview will be recommended for inclusion in the design programme soon.

MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

Mr. EVANS: I address my question to you, Mr. Speaker. Earlier, you said that every Opposition member would get an opportunity to ask one question before any Government member had the opportunity to ask two. However, I believe the members for Mawson and Tea Tree Gully have each already asked two questions, whereas some members have not had an opportunity to ask any. Will you therefore say whether you have changed your previous ruling?

The SPEAKER: No. The situation is that the first round of questions has been completed and I have already commenced the second call on one side.

TYPHOID CASE

Dr. TONKIN: Although most of the children attending the Rose Park Primary School could easily have died by this time, I believe the Attorney-General has now received from the Minister of Health a reply to my question about a typhoid case at that school.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Minister of Health reports that the child concerned was admitted to the Adelaide Children's Hospital on November 5, 1970, with a high temperature. The provisional diagnosis was bronchopneumonia. Blood examination revealed the presence of *salmonella typhi,* the organism that causes typhoid fever. The child was treated at the Adelaide Children's Hospital. A search for the source of infection is being carried out by the East Torrens County Board of Health. Investigations have produced negative results. Other more distant and indirect contacts are now being investigated. One, an ex-passenger of the ship *Angelina Lauro,* who stayed with the family a number of months ago, was traced and investigated with negative results. Medical practitioners in the area and teachers at the Rose Park school have been alerted to watch for possible further cases of typhoid fever. No evidence has so far been found to suggest that the source of infection may be at the Rose Park school or that the patient may have been a source of infection to any other children at the school. In the opinion of the Director-General of Public Health, children attending the Rose Park school are in no more danger of contracting this disease than are other members of the community.

IRON ORE

Mr. GUNN: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the Mount Christie iron ore deposits?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The iron ore deposit at Mount Christie was investigated and drilled by the Mines Department and reserves of about 20,000,000 tons established, with possible reserves up to 100,000,000 tons. Contrary to the newspaper report, it was not discovered by the company that now has exploration rights over the area. The relatively low grade (30 per cent to 40 per cent Fe) and remoteness constitute economic disabilities, but the company proposes to study the feasibility of development.

LOCAL PUBLISHERS

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Education investigate the lack of Government support for local printers and publishers? In the *Advertiser* of November 26 it was reported that Sir Donald Bradman, in addressing an annual meeting of printers and publishers, had discussed a new social studies scheme for primary schoolchildren instituted this year by the Education Department of South Australia. The article states:

Rigby was requested to produce suitable books "which were to be printed in South Australia and we did this". Eventually two other publishers were accepted as co-producers of the same series under the same terms. "Samples of these books have now arrived from one of them and they have been printed in Hong Kong."

It is not unreasonable to expect that the home producer should receive a margin of protection because he provides employment and pays rates and taxes.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The home producer or supplier receives, in relation to Government contracts, a margin of protection against interstate competition, and a further margin is applied against foreign competition. We are informed that at this stage, if the contract is determined by the Government, it will not be possible for any local supplier to satisfy the order. This would result in a late supply of books to the children concerned at the beginning of next year. I think the answer to the honourable member's question is that the supplier concerned, if he has misled the Government about his source of supply or the place where the books are to be printed, and if as a consequence of that the contract was awarded incorrectly in the first place, would have these matters taken into account in relation to future contracts. The margin that the State Government allows is limited, and the Government cannot be expected to do the job of the Tariff Board. The margin of advantage that is obtained as a result of the use of cheap labour in Hong

Kong is so great that action by the Tariff Board on an Australia-wide basis would be required to give any effective protection to the local printer and publisher. This matter has been taken up with the Commonwealth Government by the industry, and I ask the honourable member to support the attempts of the industry to ensure that proper tariff protection is applied to this area so that unfair competition from the sources mentioned by Sir Donald Bradman no longer occurs.

SCHOOL CLOSURES

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Education say whether it is intended that more small schools will be closed soon? If more of these schools are to be closed, what liaison can be expected between the various sections of his department relative to such closures? I recently informed the Minister that there was evidence of considerable expenditure this year at some of the schools that are to be closed, and the Minister rightly pointed out that some of these contracts had been entered into by the previous Government and that the work had been undertaken before the decision to close had been made. I have been informed that, subsequent to the closure of the Stanley Flat school being announced, a contract for installing fluorescent lights was completed.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have given instructions to ensure that this situation does not occur. I will make inquiries concerning Stanley Flat and bring down a reply for the honourable member.

SCHOOL BUS SERVICE

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Education say whether his department intends to discontinue the motor bus service that brings Tailem Bend children to the Murray Bridge High School and re-introduce the train service? During the past few weeks there have been persistent rumours that there is to be a change to a railway service. As a new bridge is to be built at Swanport, which will make the road journey from Tailem Bend to Murray Bridge shorter, the rumoured change does not seem to be a reasonable proposition.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not know where the honourable member heard this rumour. I certainly know of no decision in this matter. I have been told that the existing bus service is expensive, involving each day three teachers who live in Murray Bridge driving buses to Tailem Bend to pick up the children and then driving them back to Murray Bridge, and in the evening returning to Tailem Bend with the children and then driving the empty buses back to Murray Bridge.

Mr. Wardle: There is one bus in the morning and there are three in the afternoon.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: According to my information, more than one bus is involved. The cost of the service is being considered because we are concerned to see that excessive costs are not incurred: I am sure that the honourable member will agree with me that that would be undesirable. When I can make an announcement on this matter, I will do so.

PORT PIRIE CHANNEL

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Education, in the absence of the Minister of Marine, a reply to the question I asked on November 24 about the Port Pirie channel?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No formal requests have been received to deepen the channel at Port Pirie.

DETERGENTS

Mr. COUMBE: In the absence of the Minister of Works, I ask the Minister of Education whether he has a reply to the question I asked on November 17 about the problem of detergents in sewers.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The foaming problem is no longer serious, nor is the reduction in plant capacity experienced when sewage treatment plants first receive synthetic detergents. Phosphate levels will remain high even with biodegradable detergents, and will continue to be cause for concern where discharge is to inland water resources. Control will be achieved only by restricting contributing populations.

COURT HEARINGS

Mr. BURDON: Can the Attorney-General say what progress has been made in reducing the delay in bringing on cases for hearing in the various court jurisdictions?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Substantial reductions have been made in the delay in bringing on cases for trial in all jurisdictions in the past few months. The position in the Adelaide Magistrates Court now is that, if a case is not contested and the defendant is in custody, the case is dealt with almost immediately. If the defendant is on bail, the case is dealt with within a few days of the defendant's first being brought before the court. If the case is contested and the defendant is in custody, the case can be brought on in about a week. Generally speaking, it would be impossible for

a defendant or the police to be able to proceed more expeditiously. If a defendant is on bail the waiting time is about six weeks. Due to the spate of moratorium cases, it is temporarily slightly longer—perhaps about two months. A defendant needs time to prepare a contested case, and it must be said that it would be rare for a defendant to want his case to come on more quickly. There does not appear to be any problem of delay in the Adelaide Magistrates Court.

The only delay in having cases listed in the suburban and country courts relates to the frequency of the magistrates' visits. There is no undue delay. Delays have occurred in contested cases that occupy more than one day. As the magistrate's time is fully booked, he may have to adjourn a contested case which occupies more than the day allotted to it, to a further day some time in the future. If the case occupies several days, this may result in a considerable interval of time between the commencement of the case and its conclusion. This is obviously undesirable, and I have conferred with the Chief Stipendiary Magistrate to devise some method of solving this problem. It is proposed to institute a new system next year to solve this problem. Magistrates will be requested to notify the Senior Supervising Magistrate when there are any cases in their lists likely to occupy more than one day which they are unable to hear promptly and on consecutive days until completion. Upon receiving such notification, the Senior Supervising Magistrate will assign another magistrate to hear the case, so that it may proceed without interruption to its conclusion. When this system is instituted in the new year, it should overcome all avoidable delays in country and suburban courts.

The new full jurisdiction conferred on the Adelaide Local Court extends to a limit of $8,000 in ordinary cases and $10,000 in running down cases. This list is just commencing and there is no backlog of cases. In regard to workmen's compensation, on September 1, 1970, the six judges of the local court began hearings of workmen's compensation cases. Considerable inroads have been made on the list, and there are now only 60 cases in the list. As it is generally considered that about two or three months ought to elapse between the listing of a case and the commencement of the trial to enable it to be properly prepared, it may be said that the delay in hearing workmen's compensation cases has been virtually eliminated.

In the Adelaide Local Court, limited jurisdiction in civil cases is up to $2,500. This is normally a magistrate's list, but the new judges of the local court have made a determined effort to reduce this list. When they commenced their hearings on September 1, 1970, the number of cases in this list was about 3,500. The number of cases in the list as at November 20, 1970, was 1,984. Cases have been listed at the rate of 80 or 90 a week and in the new year this will be increased to 100 a week from March 1, 1971. Cases are entered for trial at the rate of 30 a week, so that a progressive reduction in the list can be expected. It may be hoped that by the middle of next year the list will be up to date.

In Supreme Court matrimonial cases the improvement has been quite significant. On August 31, 1970, the number of cases in the defended list was 152, representing a delay of 15 months after setting down. The number of cases as at November 20, 1970, was 96, representing a delay of about 11 months. In Supreme Court civil cases, the reduction has been slight. On August 31, 1970, the number of cases in the list was 450, representing a delay of 15 months. On November 20, 1970, the number of cases was 420, representing a delay of 14 months. It is in this list that the full impact of the new jurisdiction of the local court will be felt next year. As the year progresses, the extended jurisdiction of the local court will progressively relieve the pressure on the Supreme Court civil list. The Master of the Supreme Court estimates that by the second half of next year all undue delay in both the civil list and the matrimonial list will have been eliminated so that a period of only three to four months will elapse between setting down the action and the trial of the action.

There is no significant delay in the trial of criminal actions in either the Supreme Court or the District Criminal Court. I am in constant touch with the appropriate officers of each of the courts with regard to the state of the lists. I regard it as of prime importance that delays in the administration of justice should be eliminated. Availability of finance imposes limitations, but within those limitations every effort is being made to bring the lists under control. I believe that we can look forward to a situation by the middle of next year in which there will be no appreciable delay in getting a case to trial in any of our courts.

PAINTINGS

Mr. SIMMONS: I direct my question to you, Mr. Speaker. Will you consider holding discussions with the relevant Minister on the practicability of inviting local government authorities, particularly in rural areas, to submit paintings depicting scenes characteristic of their districts for display in this House? I have been informed that a similar scheme operates in Western Australia and that local government authorities there have readily co-operated in contributing to the decoration of the State Parliament. In doing so they have, of course, seized the opportunity to bring their districts to the attention of members of and visitors to the House. It is likely that appropriate assistance would have to be given here by the State to make such a scheme a success.

The SPEAKER: I will duly consider the honourable member's request.

KAPUNDA ROAD

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on November 19 about the intersection of the Gawler-Kapunda and Daveyston-Freeling roads?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Standard warning signs only have been erected at this intersection and the police have stated that no serious difficulties appear to be experienced by motorists. No doubt conditions will further improve as local motorists become aware of the new road, but the intersection will be kept under observation to determine whether further protection is necessary.

ROAD NAMES

Mr. BECKER: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on November 24 about renaming certain roads as West Beach Road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I regret that it has not been possible up to the present to reply to the West Beach Ratepayers Association on its suggestions that Burbridge, Rowland and Cowandilla Roads be renamed as West Beach Road. Regarding the present West Beach Road, the association has not made any suggestion to me that it be renamed Hamra Road. This is not a matter which can readily be resolved. Under the provisions of the Local Government Act, the naming of roads is vested in the council in whose area the roads are situated. In this case, the roads mentioned are within the areas of two councils: West Torrens and Henley and Grange. Both councils negotiated in connection with the changing of the name of the roads, but could not reach agreement. One of the councils has made an approach that I should, pursuant to powers given to the Minister of Local Government by the Local Goverment Act, settle the difference of opinion between the two councils. I am not certain at this stage whether the case is one on which I can adjudicate. This is being investigated and my officers are also holding discussions with both councils. I expect to be able to come to some finality on this matter soon.

FILM INDUSTRY

Mr. EVANS: Will the Premier give further information about the proposed film industry in South Australia which was referred to in the Labor Party policy speech and which has been the subject of answers by the Premier to questions asked about it in the House? I have received the following letter from a South Australian who is interested in the questions and answers that have been given in this Parliament in this connection:

It is difficult to make much sense out of the replies to your questions. As usual the Government seems to be completely out of touch with the practical issues involved. People that I talked to in Sydney who are in the industry had little faith in the people conducting the so-called feasibility study. A number of points come to my mind. First, back in September the Premier said that the study was being undertaken within the next month. It is well past that now, and when you asked your questions he should have been in a position to give you a proper reply. He at least has changed his mind about building studios. If you remember, the headlines in newspaper articles of September 10 and 11 were as follows: "Talks on Big Film Industry for South Australia", and "$10,000,000 Film Industry Sought." I believe when these so-called negotiations with N.L.T. were to be taking place, its film division was in the process of being disbanded because of heavy financial losses associated with previous productions.

The idea about processing facilities seems fantastic. There are three laboratories doing 35 millimetre colour in Sydney (Supreme Sound Studios, Atlab & Colour Film Laboratories) as well as providing full black and white and 16 millimetre services. Their quality is very good, and nearly every film shot in Australia is processed there. Sometimes films are sent overseas to have the final prints made from the already prepared negative because of cheaper rates for bulk printing by dye processes such as Technicolor. But virtually all local products which require a smaller number of prints are done in Australia. For example, I believe the prints of *Age of Consent* with beautiful colour results were done at Color Film Laboratories. As well as these laboratories, there are ones in Melbourne,

such as Victorian Film Laboratories, and in South Australia for instance Film Processors offers quite a good service on 16 millimetre. To run a film laboratory requires exceptional technical skill and a large turnover of work to be able to run economically.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: From whom is that letter?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Does the honourable member intend to table it?

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member table the letter?

Mr. EVANS: Yes. It continues:

Results have to be of world standard and any technical lack of expertise would lead to an incredible amount of waste. Sydney is probably the only place that is big enough to provide sufficient work for these large laboratories. Melbourne does not seem to be big enough so far to have a 35 millimetre colour laboratory, so it is laughable to think that Adelaide could provide sufficient turnover to run one.

This person goes on to explain that in the Eastern States about 75 per cent of those engaged in the film industry are out of work.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know the authority the honourable member quotes. I can only point out to him that the film feasibility study is being undertaken by P.E. Consulting Group Australia Proprietary Limited—a firm which has already been doing work for the National Film Advisory Board. We were advised to engage this firm by Mr. P. Adams, a member of that board, whom we consulted for some time before the details of the terms of reference of the feasibility study were concluded. This study is being undertaken by a steering committee of which Mr. Adams is a member. He is a most experienced man in the industry and is very well regarded in the industry generally. So well regarded is he that he has had the confidence of the Prime Minister in the work which Mr. Adams has done on behalf of the Commonwealth overseas in regard to the development of film in Australia. The feasibility study is proceeding. When the feasibility study was undertaken and the contract let for it, I checked out the terms on which we were proceeding with the Chairman of the Canadian Film Development Corporation, who is widely acknowledged as one of the most successful people in this industry anywhere in the world. He entirely endorsed the basis on which we were proceeding in South Australia, saying it was a sensible, sound, businesslike, entirely proper and competent study.

The headline that the honourable member quoted did not come from me. I may point out that, as a result of the Government's announcing that it was interested in the development of a well-based film industry, several people have sought conversations with the Government about the development of film complexes here. In each case the Government has said that it does not intend to proceed with any arrangement until it has received the feasibility study and examined the report in detail; then we will announce precisely how we will proceed from there on. It is true that many unsuccessful attempts at establishing a feature film industry have been made in the Eastern States. I know many of the people involved. We are undertaking this kind of feasibility study because we are satisfied that the film industry in New South Wales has proceeded in an unsuccessful way and we should not try to repeat those methods here. We could, in certain circumstances, develop here something that is unique in Australia. I suggest to the honourable member that what the Government has been doing has been done on the basis of sound advice, and the criticism that the honourable member's informant offers arises from a complete lack of understanding of the nature of the feasibility study we are undertaking.

HOUSING LOANS

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Treasurer consider increasing the maximum amount available from the State Bank of South Australia and the Savings Bank of South Australia for housing loans in country areas, which have higher building costs than has Adelaide? It is recognized that the more distant country areas have much higher building costs than city areas have: for example, it is recognized that building costs in Port Lincoln are between 25 per cent and 30 per cent higher than those in Adelaide. Despite this, the maximum loan available through these two banks is the same, namely, $8,000, and this means that in Port Lincoln the effective maximum loan available is between $6,000 and $6,400, in terms of what that money will build. I am sure that similar situations pertain in other country areas, to a greater or lesser degree.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will examine the matter. Once one increases the loan limit, a difficulty arises, because only limited funds are available to both banks for lending of this kind and, the more the limit is increased, the fewer the total number of loans that may be made. We were able to increase the amount

of money allocated to the institutions to try to assist this position, as I explained in detail earlier in the year. I will consider the problem of Port Lincoln. Certainly, building costs on Eyre Peninsula have given the Government much concern. The Housing Trust, to build in Port Lincoln, faces costs that are not involved in most other parts of the State.

Mr. Carnie: The loan is less effective because of the higher building costs.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I appreciate that this is so, but the problem is not easy to solve. However, I realize the difficulty facing the honourable member's constituents and I will have the matter examined by the Under Treasurer and the banks to see what can be done.

MENINGIE DRAINAGE

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Education ask the Minister of Works, who is absent today, whether the Government intends to approve the proposal made to the Meningie council by Electrolux Limited for the installation of a common effluent drainage system in Meningie? If the Government does not intend to do this, does the provision of assistance for further drainage in that town depend on the report of the Drainage Co-ordination Committee and, if it does, will the Minister ask his colleague for a report on when this committee is expected to report and when its recommendations will be referred to and considered by Cabinet? Meningie township has been in a difficult position for many years. The water table in the town is extremely high and water is about 3ft. below the surface. Because of this, any scheme evolved that has followed the conventional pattern has involved substantial additional costs in shoring up and pumping out of trenches. This work has made the scheme most expensive, as the Minister of Works would know. Further, regarding the health hazard, even though the town is now linked to the Tailem Bend to Keith water scheme, the bacterial content of the water is extremely high. We have a health hazard and the problem of continuing with the effluent disposal.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation. The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall see that the Minister of Works obtains the necessary information and gives it to the honourable member at the earliest opportunity.

WATER SKI-ING

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked the Minister of Marine regarding the problems associated with water ski-ing on the Port River?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No reports have been received by the Marine and Harbors Department of water skiers operating up-stream of the speed limit notices near Snowden Beach, nor have complaints been made by pilots for some considerable time regarding water skiers. The department has had no complaints from any aquatic sport club this season regarding the behaviour of speed boats or water skiers. There are no regulations prohibiting speed boats and water skiers from operating in those sections of the Port Adelaide River not subject to speed restrictions. The department intends to have a new patrol vessel in service on the Port Adelaide River next year.

HOSPITAL TREATMENT

Mr. BURDON: On behalf of the member for Florey, I ask the Attorney-General whether he has a reply to the honourable member's question about delay in obtaining hospital treatment.

The Hon. L. J. KING: My colleague states:

There is nothing to prevent medical practitioners from contacting the hospital in order to ascertain the state of the waiting list. Indeed, many do so. In this particular case the surgeon involved is a member of the honorary staff of the hospital and would be in a position to know the situation. What has been reported by the patient is substantially correct; for the condition for which he was suffering the wait could have been as long as 18 months. Although the private wards are heavily booked and they, too, have waiting lists of varying degree, they are not nearly as heavily pressed as the public wards, because they do not have the demand made on them of emergency trauma which is made upon the public wards. It is expected that the situation will be eased over the next 18 months to two years, when the new ward block in course of erection at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is completed.

STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question about student health services?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As the honourable member said when asking his question, an inquiry into the matter of the provision of student health services at the teachers colleges is at present proceeding. There has been discussion among departmental officers, the Schools Medical Services Branch of the Public Health Department and the University

of Adelaide concerning this matter. No decision has yet been made.

Dr. TONKIN: When will a decision be made regarding the provision of student health services at teachers colleges, and will the Minister undertake to inform the House immediately such a decision is made?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will inform the House as soon as a decision is taken, although I cannot give any definite indication as to when it will be made. I think the honourable member appreciates that the provision of a satisfactory health service at all teachers colleges involves considerable expenditure, and that the financial problem is the most difficult aspect. Unfortunately, doctors these days are not willing to provide their services on an honorary basis for such a service. The department is therefore expected to pay full rates and, of course, it does not receive any Commonwealth assistance under the health scheme in respect of fees payable to doctors. I should therefore appreciate any assistance the honourable member may be able to give the department through his good offices with the Australian Medical Association to see whether the latter will not take part in a scheme to provide a satisfactory health service to students of teachers colleges at a cost not excessive to the Education Department.

GLADSTONE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: In view of the reply that he has given this afternoon regarding the construction of new high schools, the provision of school libraries, and so on, will the Minister of Education indicate the present position regarding the proposed new Gladstone High School, and will the plans for this school be submitted to the Public Works Committee before Christmas this year? The school committee is most concerned about the delay in the referral to the committee of the plans for this school. It realizes that this must happen before the school can be built. The school committee was told by the previous Government that the plans would go to the Public Works Committee in April or May of this year. However, the year has now almost passed and the plans have still not been referred to the committee.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The present position is the same as that which applied when the honourable member introduced a deputation to me two weeks ago. I said then that I would inform him as soon as possible when this project would be referred to the Public Works Committee, and I still intend to do so. I will try to ascertain whether this will happen before Christmas. I believe that the Gladstone High School project was first promised back in 1938. Therefore, 32 years has passed without any project being planned.

Mr. Clark: I do not think it has ever been before the Public Works Committee.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No, it has not yet been referred to the committee. However, this should happen soon. The people of Gladstone have shown remarkable patience over the last 32 years; I merely hope that the honourable member is able to be patient a little longer, as the Government is doing all it can to ensure that this programme proceeds.

PINE SEEDLINGS

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Education, in the absence of the Minister of Works, a reply to the question I asked recently regarding pine plantings in the South-East?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The following conditions form the basis on which pine seedlings are made available by the Woods and Forests Department to farmers for planting on their properties: Trees will be available only to *bona fide* farmers who reside on their own property and who do not intend to make forestry the major use of their land. The area to be planted must be suitable for the satisfactory growth of radiata pine. The area to be planted must be located within a 20-mile radius of either, first, an existing Government plantation, or, secondly, an established utilization plant. The area to be planted will not be less than one acre nor more than 20 acres in any one year.

Trees will not be available unless, first, the area to be planted is prepared to the satisfaction of the inspecting officer, and, secondly, adequate maintenance can be regularly and properly carried out. The free issue of trees will be confined to the initial planting. Trees required for refilling will be charged at catalogue rates. The marketing of all areas established with free trees will be subject to advice and approval of the department. Issue of trees will be from a departmental nursery and subject to availability. A charge will be made for lifting and any packing, and so on.

DIESEL POLLUTION

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport investigate the possibility of fitting better exhaust systems to diesel freight locomotives and diesel railcars, commonly known as "red hens"? I understand that the exhausts on these machines come

straight out from the engines or motors without any form of baffle being installed, or without any thought being given to the pollution problem in these days when people are very pollution-conscious.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will discuss this matter with the Railways Commissioner as well as with the Minister for Conservation, who is most concerned with the environment problem in South Australia. However, recognized experts say that, although the exhaust fumes from diesels look bad, they are completely harmless. I do not know whether members want to believe or disbelieve that statement; I merely pass it on for information.

KIDNEY TRANSPLANTS

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question concerning changes in the law on the transplant of kidneys and other organs?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Further to the comments I made when the honourable member asked the question on November 18, 1970, my colleague the Attorney-General has informed me that the Law Reform Committee has agreed in principle to recommend the enactment of legislation with regard to anatomical gifts. It is understood that the system of donor identification will be considered by the committee.

TROTTING CONTROL BOARD

Mr. BECKER: Can the Attorney-General say whether the Government intends to set up a trotting control board as recommended by the trotting inquiry that was held under the previous Labor Government Administration? I understand there are anomalies in the rules of trotting at present, particularly those dealing with trainers who are subject to disqualification and suspension. I understand that recently four out of five appeals from decisions of the stewards were successful in whole or in part. This places trainers, owners and drivers at considerable cost in respect of appeals. Recently a leading trainer was disqualified for 12 months; he appealed; the appeal was dismissed, and his sentence was reduced to one month. As nominations are accepted for trotting races in the metropolitan area 10 to 14 days in advance, this means that a trainer disqualified for a period of one month must wait a further 10 to 14 days before he can race his horses. This is causing embarrassment to owners not involved in the trainer's disqualification as their horses cannot be nominated for coming races. An owner could temporarily transfer his horses to another trainer, but certain ethics are observed and the rules dealing with these matters appear out of date.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will discuss the matter with the Chief Secretary and let the honourable member have a reply.

HOUSING TRUST RENTALS

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier, as Minister in charge of housing, say on what basis rental charges are increased for added facilities associated with Housing Trust homes? In the Gawler area sewerage has recently been connected and it seems that rentals have been increased by a flat $1 a unit to cover this extra service. Considering the size of the houses and the number of people involved, the imposition of a flat rate of $1 is difficult to understand.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a detailed report and bring it down for the honourable member.

TEACHER ACCOMMODATION

Mr. NANKIVELL: Does the Minister of Education know whether it was intended to build an accommodation unit at Geranium for single women teachers? Was this project deferred because a house was available for the teachers to occupy? Has this house now been sold and, being required by the owner, will it be no longer available to the department? If this is so, will the Minister consider restoring the school to the priority list for such a unit as speedily as possible?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be happy to have a thorough investigation made and bring down a reply for the honourable member.

REFERENDUM VOTING

Mr. Coumbe, for the Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (on notice):

1. How many persons eligible to vote at the referendum of September 19, 1970, failed to do so?

2. Have notices been sent out seeking explanation of the reasons for failure to vote?

3. If so, how many such notices have been sent?

4. What cost was incurred in sending these notices?

5. Is any further action proposed? If so, what?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. 50,181 persons on the roll as at September 19, 1970, failed to vote.

2. Notices have been sent to electors in those cases where the Returning Officer for the State is not satisfied that they have a valid and sufficient reason.

3. 23,230 notices have been sent.

4. The cost of postage of non-voters' notices was $929.20. Cost of processing materials, etc., is not yet available.

5. Further action proposed is outlined in section 13 of the Referendum Act. No further action will be taken against those electors who give a reason held to be valid and sufficient by the Returning Officer for the State.

ABORIGINAL TRAINING

Mr. Coumbe, for Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What plans does the Government have for the training of Aboriginal teaching aides for employment in Aboriginal schools?

2. When will the plans be put into effect?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. There have been two schemes for the training of Aborigines as teaching aides under consideration. The first is a scheme for training Aboriginal teacher aides in Aboriginal schools. Following a visit of Dr. Coombs and Mr. Dexter of the Commonwealth Office of Aboriginal Affairs in 1968, they discussed with the department, informally, the training of adult Aborigines at Amata. This was because of their observations of the work being done by the Aboriginal teacher aides at Amata. It was felt that Aborigines would benefit if they could undergo a course of teacher-aide training at the Amata school, though it was realized that not all of those trained would become teacher aides. The aim was to raise the educational level of those undergoing the course and, at the same time, make the Aborigines in general more sympathetic to the work of teachers in the area.

The scheme commenced this year and involved initially the training of up to 10 Aboriginal teacher assistants at Amata (the terms "teaching aide" and "assistants" have both been used in regard to these positions). This scheme was to carry through for a period of three years at an estimated cost of $30,000. The trainees at Amata have received a general education at primary level and experience in assisting with the teaching of small groups and the use of equipment. They have also assisted the teachers with the sections of the curriculum involving Aboriginal culture. Verbal approval has been given by the Commonwealth, which is supplying the funds for similar courses to be implemented at other special Aboriginal schools.

The second scheme which is under consideration is for a course of general education to be given for Aboriginals in Adelaide. Whilst the specific aim will not be to train Aboriginal aides, the course will, nonetheless, be vocationally oriented, and it is expected that some of the Aborigines who complete the course will be able to compete at large within the community for appointment as teacher aides in metropolitan or country schools, and will be appointed as any other teacher aide (white or Aboriginal). It is hoped that some of the Aborigines involved will take on general teacher training. This scheme is still in the discussion and planning stage. It is not known definitely what financial support will be available, but it is hoped that it can commence in 1971.

HEALTH SERVICES COMMITTEE

Mr. Coumbe, for Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Why has the Government found it necessary to appoint a committee on health services?

2. What are its full terms of reference?

3. When may members of this House expect to be acquainted with its report?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Health services in South Australia are administered through a number of Government departments and many subsidized organizations providing hospital, public health, paramedical, home care, ambulance and other services. Large expenditure is involved in these fields, and it is essential to develop a plan to co-ordinate the activities of these departments and organizations to obtain the maximum benefits to the community from the funds available, and also to establish clear guide lines as to the manner in which these services should be developed or expanded in the future. This is the purpose of the committee.

2. The committee is required to examine and report on health and hospital services within the State and to make recommendations on the administrative structures required to ensure an optimum standard of health services in the future. The committee will have regard to the requirements for the total health concept and will, in particular, make recommendations regarding:

(*a*) Prevention, diagnosis, treatment and rehabilitation, including:

(i) Public health services involving the preservation of health, including epidemiology, the control of communicable and other diseases, environmental and occupational factors, maternal and infant welfare services, school health services, public diagnostic procedures and health education programmes;

(ii) Hospital services, mental health services, services for alcoholism and drug addiction, nursing homes, services for the chronic sick, handicapped, and aged, domiciliary supportive services and community health centres.

(*b*) The training and activity of nurses with particular emphasis on possible changes in the nursing role in the future.

(*c*) The co-ordination and organization of health and hospital services at both the central and regional levels.

(*d*) The examination of future demands for hospital services, including Government, subsidized, community and private as well as nursing homes.

(*e*) The future organization and role of the medical, dental, nursing, paramedical and social work services.

(*f*) Transport of patients to services and services to patients.

(*g*) The participation and involvement of voluntary agencies in health and hospital services.

3. In two years.

WATERWORKS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SEWERAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

COMMONWEALTH POWERS (TRADE PRACTICES) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. In the tit'e—After "Commonwealth" insert "for a limited time".

No. 2. In the title—Leave out "subject to a power of the Governor to terminate the reference at any time".

No. 3. Page 1, line 6 (clause 1)—Before "This" insert "Subject to section 4 of this Act,".

No. 4. Page 2, lines 4 and 5 (clause 2)—Leave out "this Act is repealed or the day fixed,", and insert "the reference made by this Act is terminated".

No. 5. Page 2, line 5 (clause 2)—Leave out "4" and insert "5".

No. 6. Page 2, lines 5 and 6 (clause 2)—Leave out ", as the day on which the reference made by this section shall terminate, but no longer".

No. 7. Page 2, lines 18 to 22 (clause 4)—Leave out clause 4 and insert new clause as follows:

"4. *No proclamation to be made before similar legislation passed in other States.*—No proclamation shall be made fixing a day for the coming into operation of this Act until legislation to the effect of sections 2 and 3 of this Act has been passed by the Parliaments of each of the other States of the Commonwealth and the Governor is satisfied that that legislation will be in force on the day fixed for the coming into operation of this Act."

No. 8 Page 2—After new clause 4 insert new clause 5 as follows:

"5. *Termination of reference.*—The reference made by this Act shall terminate on the thirty-first day of December, 1972, or on a prior date on which this Act is repealed."

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be disagreed to.

These amendments can be put into two groups. The first seeks to insert a provision that the legislation shall not be proclaimed until similar legislation has been passed in all other States, and the second limits to December 31, 1972, the time of the reference of power to the Commonwealth. The first matter was considered previously, and I see no point in redebating it. I said then, and it is still my view and the Government's view, that there is no sound reason why the implementation of this measure in South Australia should be deferred until similar provisions are enacted in the other States; indeed, there is every reason why South Australia should proceed to refer this power to the Commonweatlh so that the Commonwealth trade practices legislation can be applied for the benefit of people in South Australia. Concerning the second matter, it would be highly inconvenient to have this reference of power for a limited period. The Commonwealth must establish its machinery to administer this legislation in South Australia, and it is highly desirable that it should know that the legislation can remain in force for an indefinite period. I suggest that it would create considerable uncertainty in the community, particularly in the commercial community, and also in the Commonwealth administration if it were uncertain whether the legislation would continue in force regarding intrastate transactions in South Australia beyond the specified date. For those reasons, I ask members to reject the amendments.

Mr. COUMBE: When the Bill was previously being considered in this place, an objection was raised similar to the objection embodied in the amendments made in another place. First, it was argued that no proclamation should be made before similar legislation was passed in the other States, in order to give uniformity. It was said that South Australia could suffer as a result of the legislation. Although I do not wish to go over the points that have already been made, I submit that the objections to the relevant clauses in the Bill were made sincerely and genuinely. Regarding termination of the reference, I can only assume that the other place has set down December 31, 1972, as the termination date in order to see that this type of legislation does not go on *ad infinitum*.

The Hon. L. J. King: Perhaps it could have something to do with the next Commonwealth election.

Mr. COUMBE: I do not know about that, but there is not much doubt on this side about who will win the next State election. The termination date of December 31, 1972, means that it is a lever on behalf of South Australia, if this legislation is agreed to, for the Commonwealth to operate. The Bill provides that the Governor of South Australia may terminate the reference at any time; we are here considering a termination of the reference so that the Commonwealth will be forced to introduce this type of legislation concerning South Australia or, if this legislation operates, so that this will be the latest time to which it will operate. I formally express my opposition to the motion.

Mr. RODDA: Argument was previously advanced by members on this side along the lines of the Legislative Council's first series of amendments. These amendments provide for uniformity. Members on this side have said that, if South Australia is one of the few States to have this legislation operating, that fact could react against us commercially.

Mr. COUMBE: Acceptance of the Legislative Council's amendments will not mean hardship for South Australia; this will enable the legislation to operate uniformly in Australia. Recently the Government introduced legislation to extend the powers of the Prices Commissioner. That legislation has taken care of many of the more personal hardship cases that occur from day to day. However, the present Bill deals mainly with large concerns.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I disagree with the member for Torrens in this. The Prices Act Amendment Bill was basically designed to give teeth to the enforcement of subsequent legal rights; of itself it did not create any legal rights. The Bill we are now considering gives to the Commonwealth power to apply the restrictive trade practices laws to transactions occurring within the boundaries of South Australia. No valid reason can be offered why this legislation should not be passed in South Australia irrespective of what the other States do. Indeed, I think it is not too much to say that those who have inserted these amendments do not like the legislation we propose. They did not have the courage to reject the Bill but inserted amendments that would ensure that the Bill would never operate, knowing that the Governments of other States were unwilling to introduce similar legislation.

Mr. EVANS: I believe that the Attorney-General is wrong in assuming that members of another place have moved these amendments because they dislike the Bill. Those members have accepted the Bill, subject to the other States accepting similar legislation. The Attorney-General has said that the other States dislike the legislation and will not bring it into operation, but there is no proof of that. The members of Governments change from time to time and different Parties are elected as Governments, so a change could occur in this regard. Members of the other place have clearly stated why they have moved the amendments, their reasons being similar to those given by members on this side with regard to the need for uniformity. The Attorney-General knows that legislation dealing with trade and commerce in Australia should be as uniform as possible. Uniformity cannot be achieved in all cases, but it can be achieved in this case.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McKee, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Noes (15)—Messrs. Becker, Carnie, Coumbe (teller), Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Majority of 7 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendments render the proposed legislation ineffective.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) moved:

That disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments be insisted on.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Messrs. Evans, Keneally, King, McRae, and Millhouse.

WEST LAKES DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. RYAN (Price) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received. Ordered that report be printed.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Fourth schedule to the indenture to have effect as if expressly enacted in this Act."

Mr. COUMBE: This clause provides that six weeks is to be allowed for consideration of drawings for drainage design before the matter is submitted to arbitration by the Commissioner of Highways. The Select Committee considers that this provision adequately protects the council and the developer, and I take it that the six weeks is a period allowed for the engineers to reach agreement. Is that the purpose of the clause?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): Yes. When appearing before the Select Committee, the council sought an assurance that, under the terms of the Bill, it would be able to study any drainage designs and specifications for six weeks before tenders were called. The council asked that the period of six weeks be included in the Bill.

Clause passed.

Clause 7—"Corporation's road-making responsibility limited."

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I move:

In new section 15a (1) after "any" third occurring to insert "existing or".

The Select Committee's report makes clear the reason for the amendment. The new section provides that the council's road-making responsibility is limited and, whilst the committee considered that this provision gave some assurance for the council, a doubt remained about the exact definition of the roads that would be subject to the provisions of this new section. The amendment removes the doubt.

Mr. COUMBE: I take it that roads wider than 32ft. will come within the jurisdiction of the Highways Department?

Mr. EVANS: That is not the case. The cost of making that part of any road that is over 32ft. wide shall be borne by the council.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I move:

In new section 15a (1) to strike out "normal engineering" and insert "recognized engineering design".

This amendment tidies up the language of the Bill. In clause 6 the words "recognized engineering design" are used, and the committee considered it preferable to use similar wording in clause 7.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 8 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WHEAT DELIVERY QUOTAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The principal Act, the Wheat Delivery Quotas Act, 1969, which was enacted towards the end of last year, established a scheme for allocating wheat delivery quotas for the season that commenced on October 1, 1969. It now seems likely that the system of wheat delivery quotas will remain with us until the amount of wheat in storage is reduced to more manageable proportions. Accordingly, this Bill provides for the allocation of wheat delivery quotas for future quota seasons. It is clear that in the allocation of wheat delivery quotas for the first quota season some anomalies appeared. This does not in any way reflect on the work of the quota committees, which were called upon to discharge a most unenviable task. In this Bill, power is given to the advisory committee to resolve at least some of the anomalies that appeared. In addition, as honourable members will be aware, the Government has recently appointed a committee of inquiry to examine all aspects of the allocation of wheat delivery quotas. However, in the nature of things it is unlikely that effect could be given to any recommendations of this committee of inquiry in this quota season. Accordingly, the position will again be examined in the light of that committee's recommendations.

Clauses 1 to 3 are formal or consequential on amendments made elsewhere in the Act. Clause 4 validates certain acts of the advisory committee. Honourable members will recall that the greater portion of the work in relation to the wheat delivery quotas was done by the gentlemen whose names are set out in section 26 of the principal Act. These gentlemen, who represented the various interests involved, were appointed by the then Government before there was any enabling legislation; indeed, the principal Act was, I understand, largely the result of their recommendations and those of the industry. However, the principal Act provided for the formal appointment of an advisory committee and, although it was intended that these gentlemen would constitute the first advisory committee, the necessity for their formal appointment was overlooked until some months ago. Accordingly, this provision validates all their actions between the time when this Act came into force and the time when they were formally appointed.

Clause 5 provides for changes in the powers of the advisory committee by enabling it to allocate quotas for any quota season, since in the terms of the principal Act it could allocate quotas only for the 1969-70 season. Briefly, the system in the future will be that each production unit will have established for it a nominal quota, which will be either the 1969-70 quota or the 1969-70 quota as adjusted in the manner provided in this Bill. The wheat delivery quota for a production unit for any future quota season will be the nominal quota for that production unit, increased or decreased by the prescribed percentage determined for the season by the advisory committee. The prescribed percentage will be related to the amount by which, in any given quota season, the State quota exceeds or is less than 45,000,000 bushels, this figure being the State quota for the season that commenced on October 1, 1969. Honourable members will no doubt be aware that the State quota for this season (that is, the State's share of the amount of wheat that will attract the advance payment under the Wheat Industry Stabilization Act) is 36,000,000 bushels, being the amount fixed by the wheat industry itself through the agency of the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation.

Clause 6 inserts a new section 18a and is related to the contingency reserve, that is, that amount that is set aside from the State quota to be used to satisfy appeals for increased quotas; previously this amount was determined by the advisory committee alone. It is clear that the actual size of this pool is of enormous importance in determining whether or not the review committee can do substantial justice within the limits of the State quota. I emphasize "within the limits of the State quota", because all that both committees can do is to ensure a fair distribution of the fixed amount of the State quota. Accordingly, the importance of properly determining the size of this contingency reserve is recognized by ensuring that both the committees, together with a person appointed by the Minister, play a part in its determination. If, and only if, the persons who form the joint committee to fix this contingency reserve cannot agree, the Minister himself may fix the amount.

Clause 7 provides for applications for wheat delivery quotas. It is important to note here that the effect of this provision will be to limit applications from production units that have a nominal quota, that is, properties that delivered wheat during the 1969-70 season. In summary, it will be impossible, in the terms of the Act, to receive a quota in respect of land first brought into wheat production after the 1969-70 season, since every bushel of quota wheat allocated to that land would reduce the amount available for allocation to existing producers. Clause 8 amends section 22 of the principal Act to give effect to the proposals for the fixing of quotas for this and the next succeeding seasons. Clause 9 strikes out from the principal Act the provisions that provided for the fixing of a basic quota by reference to areas of wheat planted for harvest during the 1969-70 season as an alternative to the fixing of quotas based on production over the previous five-year period. It is considered that the application of these provisions in the fixing of quotas gave rise to the greatest number of anomalies.

Clause 10 provides for the fixing of special quotas for the 1969-70 season and is related to the power to adjust this quota before ascertaining a nominal quota for the property. Clause 11, which inserts new sections 24a, 24b, 24c, 24d, 24e and 24f, sets out in some detail the basis of the future quota scheme. Accordingly, these proposed new provisions will be dealt with *seriatim*. New section 24a provides for the establishment of a nominal quota for each production unit. This nominal quota will be the actual 1969-70 quota for that unit or the 1969-70 quota as adjusted in accordance with the succeeding provisions. New section 24b excludes from the establishment of a nominal quota a production unit

that received a 1969-70 quota on the so-called new ground allocation, that is, production units that had not produced any wheat in the previous five seasons, where no wheat at all was delivered from those production units in the 1969-70 season, unless sufficient grounds can be established for the non-delivery. This provision will ensure that such speculative applications do not prejudice existing growers.

New section 24c sets out the classes of 1969-70 quotas that may be adjusted by the advisory committee. Briefly, they are (*a*) quotas comprised of basic quotas allocated on the basis of area sown for harvest in the 1969-70 season; and (*b*) quotas consisting, in part, of special quotas; and, as a corollary, quotas that were based on only deliveries over the five-year period will not be adjusted by unilateral action of the committee. The reason for this adjustment provision is that it is in the classes (*a*) and (*b*) previously referred to that the bulk of the anomalies occurred. An appeal will, of course, be available against any adjustment, and a right for the holder of a wheat delivery quota to make representations before his quota is adjusted is also provided. New section 24d gives any wheatgrower the right to apply to the committee to have his 1969-70 quota adjusted. New section 24e gives the committee limited power to attribute to a production unit a 1969-70 quota where, although wheat had been produced from that production unit during the whole or part of the previous five-year period, for some good and sufficient reason no quota had been applied for the 1969-70 season. New section 24f provides that adjustments made pursuant to the preceding sections will not affect past deliveries of wheat.

Clause 12 again enacts a number of new sections, which are intended to spell out in some detail the procedure to be followed when a production unit or part of a production unit is transferred. Since in the terms of the principal Act persons occupying a production unit under lease were entitled to the allocation of a wheat delivery quota in respect of that production unit, the "falling-in" of that lease has, for the purposes of these provisions, been regarded as a transfer of the production unit, or part, subject to the lease. The effect of the proposed new provisions may be summarized as follows: (*a*) both parties to the transfer must give notice of the transfer to the advisory committee; (*b*) if a sale of a property is involved, and over-quota wheat has been delivered from the property, the seller must give written notice to the buyer of the amount of that over-quota wheat. If the seller does not give the notice, the buyer may within six months of the sale avoid the contract of sale. This requirement will ensure that the buyer is in the best position to determine the price he should pay for the property, since the amount of over-quota wheat that has been delivered will affect the amount of wheat that can be delivered as over-quota wheat by the buyer of the property; (*c*) where no over-quota wheat is involved, the whole or an appropriate part of the wheat delivery quota follows the transfer of the whole or part of the production unit, as the case requires; and (*d*) where over-quota wheat is involved, until the over-quota wheat is taken up as quota wheat, the amount of wheat that the transferee can deliver from the production unit will, in effect, be reduced by the whole of the over-quota wheat where the whole production unit has been transferred, or by a proportionate part of the over-quota wheat when only part of the production unit is transferred.

Clause 13 provides for a standing deputy for the Chairman of the review committee and will enable the Chairman to call on his deputy at short notice if he is for any reason unable to attend a hearing of the review committee. Clause 14 recasts the provisions of section 38 of the principal Act, which relates to the determination of appeals, to relate that determination to appeals against the establishment of nominal quotas, since, in the terms of the Act as proposed to be amended, every wheat delivery quota for a particular season will bear a precise mathematical relationship to the nominal quota on which it is based. Thus, any variation in the nominal quota will be reflected in the quota for a particular season. Clause 15 makes certain formal amendments to section 40 and also retrospectively validates certain exercise of jurisdiction by the review committee. In fact the review committee purported to deal with several appeals that were technically out of time, on the basis that, in an exercise of this nature, consideration should be given to the substantial merits of the case rather than technicalities; for the same reason the amendment proposed by clause 16 will allow the review committee in considering an appeal to go outside the four corners of the notice of appeal if it considers that substantial justice will thereby be done.

Clause 17 re-enacts section 49 of the principal Act which dealt with "short-falls". Honourable members may recall that the section provided at subsection (3) that regard shall be

had to the amount of any short-fall in allocating quotas for the next ensuing season. The amendment provides that a percentage of any short-fall in one season will be added to the wheat delivery quota for the next succeeding season. The percentage determined will, in terms of the provision, be 100 per cent unless, in the season in which the "short-falls" occurred, there was an overall condition of under-production, that is, if the total of the wheat grown in the relevant season together with the total of the wheat of a previous season that is regarded as quota wheat of the relevant season is less than the State quota for the relevant season. Only if this condition of under-production occurs (and in all the circumstances it is unlikely that it will ever occur) may the advisory committee reduce the amount of short-falls to be carried across.

Clause 18 amends section 53 of the principal Act which deals with sales of wheat otherwise than to the Australian Wheat Board and provides for this section to have effect in relation to every quota season. Clause 19 inserts a new section 56a in the principal Act which spells out a little more clearly the rights of the Australian Wheat Board in relation to wheat delivered against a wheat delivery quota that is subsequently reduced. Adjustments made to the 1969-70 quota for the purposes of establishing a nominal quota have specifically been excluded from the operation of this section. Clause 20 provides in effect that the decision of the review committee shall be final and without appeal. In addition, no appeal will lie from a decision of the Minister, since the only decision of consequence the Minister is required to make under this Act is to fix the amount of the contingency reserve for a quota season if the joint committees are unable to agree, and it would be clearly inappropriate to have such a decision reviewable elsewhere.

Finally, I should make it clear that since the State quota has been reduced by 20 per cent, that is, from 45,000,000 bushels to 36,000,000 bushels, the wheat farmers in this State must look to an "across the board" cut in their existing quotas of the order of 20 per cent. Although this Bill provides machinery for reducing the impact of anomalies as between individual farmers, even with the maximum use of that machinery it will be extremely unlikely that a farmer will receive a quota for this season equal in amount to his quota for last season. Such a farmer would, in fact, have had his quota for this season increased by more than 20 per cent over the quota that he would have received without the benefit of the adjustment provisions contained in this measure. Such an increase could only be made by reducing other quotas by substantially more than the 20 per cent contemplated.

Mr. VENNING secured the adjournment of the debate.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to render it compulsory for all existing and future specialists to register as specialists in their particular branches of medicine in the specialist register maintained by the Medical Board of this State. The need for such a provision has arisen as a direct result of the recent Commonwealth national health legislation which has set up its own Specialist Recognition Committee in each State. A warning was given by the Commonwealth Minister for Health that some medical practitioners in this State who are not registered on the State specialist register would be recognized and registered as specialists by the Commonwealth committee, for the purpose of the medical benefits scheme. Such a situation has in fact arisen since the latter committee commenced its operation in this State a few months ago.

In order to prevent the chaos which will ensue from two bodies' operating independently and at times divergently, and to preserve the autonomy of the State Medical Board in the field of specialist registration, there is no alternative but to make it compulsory for any practitioner who practises or holds himself out as a specialist in any of the specialist branches of medicine to register on the State register as a specialist in that branch of medicine. The State register was set up for the benefit and information of the public and the medical profession in this State, and therefore it should not be allowed to be by-passed and so lose its value to the community. I point out that Queensland, the only other State with a specialist register, has a similar provision to the one contained in this Bill. Both New South Wales and Victoria have indicated that draft legislation setting up similar registers with compulsory registration is being considered. This proposed amendment has the full support of the Commonwealth Director of Health, the Director-General of Medical Services and the Medical Board of this State.

I shall now deal with the clauses of the Bill. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 enacts and inserts new section 29c in the principal Act. Subsection (1) of this new section provides that it shall be an offence, on or after a day to be fixed by proclamation, for a medical practitioner to practise, hold himself out, or do anything which may imply that he is qualified as, a specialist in any specialist branch of medicine, unless his name appears on the specialist register with respect to that branch of medicine. A penalty of $200 is provided. Subsection (2) provides that subsection (1) shall not apply to a practitioner, exempted by the Medical Board under subsection (3). Subsection (3) provides that a medical practitioner who is practising as an unregistered specialist and who has not the necessary qualifications to enable him to be so registered may apply to the Medical Board within the six months after the Bill becomes law for an exemption from the provisions of this new section, and that the board may grant such an exemption on grounds which it thinks are good and reasonable and subject to any conditions it thinks proper.

These latter two subsections have been included to cover the situation which the Medical Board believes may arise with respect to one or two specialists who did not apply for specialist registration under a now repealed provision of the principal Act, and who would therefore unavoidably be guilty of an offence under this new section 29c. Such a practitioner does not have the registration qualifications required by the Act as it now stands, but is in fact a recognized specialist and undoubtedly will be registered as such by the Commonwealth Specialist Recognition Committee. It is envisaged that registration by the latter committee in a case where an applicant is not qualified to register on the State register will constitute "good grounds" for the board to grant an exemption. A limit of six months has been provided for an application for exemption, as only a practitioner practising as a specialist immediately before the Bill becomes law may apply.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I support the Bill. I am tempted at this stage to quote the old definition of a specialist as being the man who knows more and more about less and less. Indeed, that is far from being a joke nowadays, because this situation exists. The other specialist I recall is the subject of the little booklet that has enjoyed a wide sale and distribution in the past, he being a specialist in another field. As I recall, the peak of his ambition was to build a 12-holer, which I understand he eventually did.

The reason why this Bill has been introduced is obvious and apparent to all. It is designed simply to bring into line our State legislation with the action already taken by the Commonwealth Government in recognizing the diffence between a specialist and a general practitioner. This occasion should not pass without reference to the various differences between a general practitioner and a specialist. Although this is merely formal legislation, it is rather significant because it finally marks what can be called the end of the era of the old family doctor or general practitioner.

We have come a long way from the days when the country family doctor gave his services unstintingly, and was ever on call to the community he served. The country general practitioner was expected to know a little bit about everything, and that is in strict contrast to what I have said earlier about a specialist. The country general practitioner was indeed well skilled in all common fields of medicine, surgery, obstetrics and internal medicine, and even in common eye, ear, nose and throat conditions. He knew a smattering of public health as he needed to because he frequently acted as the local health officer and as medical superintendent at the local hospital. In a way, this legislation is regrettable because it means the passing of the family doctor. However, I sincerely hope and believe that this will not mean the loss of the general practitioner. Indeed, general practitioners are now themselves becoming specialized. They now have their own post-graduate college of education where the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners turns out members who are well skilled in what is now the specialized field of general practice.

People who attend specialists have every right to know that the doctors they are seeing are well qualified. They require to know that the doctor they are seeing is a specialist who has been thoroughly trained, has had the necessary experience, and has passed the necessary examinations. By means of this register, people will know that the doctor they see is so qualified. Although I will not name the whole list, I can refer to the following: Royal Australian Colleges of Surgeons, of Physicians, of Obstetrics, and of Gynaecology, and the Colleges of Ophthalmology, Radiology, and so on, These colleges insist on a rigorous course of study and a very definite period of practical hospital experience. When one considers what is necessary nowadays to become a specialist,

it almost makes one wonder why people embark on this most onerous course. As well as six years' basic medical training, there is one year of pre-registration experience in a hospital, as a general rule two years as a senior house surgeon or junior registrar in general posts, and a further minimum time of two or more years while studying in a particular field. This has the effect of lengthening the time before a man effectively takes his place as a specialist in the community by at least five or six years after he has graduated. Since he is likely to be aged 24 years when he graduates, he will therefore be 30 years old before he begins effectively practising as a specialist.

I was most interested to hear the Minister of Education refer, in reply to my question earlier this afternoon, to satisfactory arrangements being made with the Australian Medical Association to enable student health services to be adequately staffed. I presume that he meant that the satisfactory arrangements would be free or that honorary time would be given to the student health services. Although student health services are most important and I hope that we will see them established soon, I believe it is asking too much of any medical practitioner to expect him to give his time these days without adequate and just recompense. Members of the specialist community have given many years of free service in an honorary capacity to the public hospitals of the State. The worth of the service they have given must amount to millions of dollars by now. A specialist register was not necessary in the early days because if a man was accepted on the honorary staff of a public hospital it was assumed that he was indeed qualified to be there, possessing specialist qualifications. If he did not possess those qualifications, he had had so much experience in the field that he qualified as a specialist anyway.

In the past an unofficial register has been kept by virtue of a man's position on the honorary staff of a public hospital. Although the Minister of Education may possibly disagree, I think that the time is well overdue when honorary staff should be paid, and I am happy to see this come about. There was a form of pressure because, when a person did not depend only on his qualifications as a specialist, he had to obtain a position on the hospital staff before he could practise as a specialist, and this was an unfair burden that he had to bear. I think a man is entitled to work and to adequate recompense, and this applies whether he is a doctor or belongs to any other profession or calling.

The registering of specialists is necessary because medicine is sharing in the same scientific explosion as is presently occurring as part of the population explosion throughout the world. More scientific discoveries have been made in the last few years than were ever made before. These days more people are working in research and more wonderful things are happening in the spheres of science and medicine. Indeed, each specialist branch of medicine is growing in scope, degree of skill and procedures that can now be undertaken with a pretty good hope of success. I need only refer to the old general surgeon in this connection, because members will realize that the general surgeon of past times is now well and truly outmoded. He still exists but now we have neuro surgeons, orthopaedic surgeons, vascular surgeons, cardiac surgeons, renal surgeons, and pulmonary surgeons.

In fact, one can find someone who will specialize in operating on any specific part of the body. Although we may be tempted to say that this is taking things to extremes, it is necessary because the knowledge available about various parts of the body is growing every day and it becomes impossible for one man to know everything there is to know. When I first began my training, it was common practice to learn about ear, nose and throat, and eye conditions. At present, and for many years past, it has become impossible for the one surgeon to know both disciplines. Advances in ear, nose and throat work have become remarkably complex, as have those in the procedures that can be performed to help the eyes. We have in the community a new attitude, which I think is entirely justified, whereby patients now expect to be cured. I am sorry if that sounds a little Irish, but the attitude has arisen that, regardless of the condition or disease that the patient has, he expects to go to a doctor and be cured of it. I should like, indeed, to be able to say that he could but, unfortunately that is not always the case.

I think we must appreciate that the attitude that many patients took a few years ago, when they realized and admitted that doctors did not know everything and that patients accepted the fact with resignation when they had a disease that could not be treated, still applies in some cases. I must admit that we have made tremendous advances, and the work done in our own Queen Elizabeth Hospital in this State in renal transplantation is

remarkable and a credit to the surgeons there. Transplant surgery, I think, gives a fair example of the complexity of the various specialist disciplines within the faculty of medicine. As I have said, patients consulting these doctors must be able to know that the doctors are qualified in this way and are, indeed, recognized specialists.

Another practical reason is that, if patients do go to a recognized specialist and are not referred in the usual way, they do not qualify for their medical benefit refund as they should qualify, and this could be a source of great hardship to some people. There is a big tendency nowadays for young medical graduates to specialize, and in a way that is a pity. I am not saying that it is wrong, and the whole tenor of my discussion now is not that this legislation is wrong but that in some ways it is a pity that the situation has come to pass. The tendency for young graduates to specialize has arisen in many ways from the lack of university accommodation for them, the lack of medical schools and the lack, if I may be so direct and to the point as to say it, of a Flinders University hospital. I am sure all members will regret that lack. I consider that in the future we will pay for the fact that we have not this hospital well and truly advanced. It is a great shame that we have not got it.

Because of the quota system imposed for entry into the faculty of medicine and the fact that the quota is filled on academic merit, more and more young people doing medicine are not interested in being general practitioners but want to stay in the academic, hospital and research atmospheres, and to go on and accept the challenge of increasing specialization. A long time ago, when I began my medical studies, we had in the faculty of medicine a quota of 120, and this was the first time that this quota had been established. Because of the many ex-servicemen who were studying under the rehabilitation scheme, this quota was necessary, and until then it had been unheard of that there should be a quota regarding the faculty intake.

Only recently (and this is something of which South Australia cannot be proud) the quota for the faculty of medicine at the Adelaide University was still 120. This has had the effect of denying people who want to help their fellow men by practising medicine, people who have feeling for their fellow men, the opportunity to continue their medical training and to serve the community. I think all members who have been through the mill will agree with me that there is a technique in passing examinations and that the man who can pass an examination well is not necessarily the man who can do his job best. Because young men can pass examinations well, they tend to continue passing examinations. That means that they will go on in academic and specialized fields, passing more examinations and learning more and more (and I must say this) about less and less.

As I have said, this is not a bad thing, because we need their knowledge and skill and, without their research, medicine would stay still. However, it is not always good for the community as a whole, particularly communities in the country which badly need the services of a general doctor who can deal with most emergencies. That is why we have so few country doctors and why we are still trying to devise a means of attracting young graduates to the country. One problem now is that a young man is brought up in a hospital atmosphere and is not in the position, as was once the case, of being the only house surgeon on one clinic, with a registrar (whose job it was to supervise six clinics) to oversee him. In other words, that was a position in which he was charged with a fair share of responsibility, under a reasonable amount of supervision, and where he could develop this sense of responsibility towards people.

However, now we find that a house surgeon may share a ward with another house surgeon, that he may have a registrar who looks after only that ward and who, in himself, learning his profession and specialty, will tend, perhaps unwittingly, to take most of the work for himself, which means that the young house surgeon, unfortunately, is not getting the training now in accepting responsibility that he was getting in past years, and this is reflected in two ways.

It is reflected in the calibre of a young man who joins a practice in the country now. It is common to hear the comment that the latest addition to a partnership takes a little longer than the previous addition to accept full responsibility for the treatment of his patient. He tends to seek help, perhaps, a little more often than he really needs to do so. Further, it has the much more serious effect of discouraging young men from moving into the country. They are not willing to go into the country and accept the responsibility they will find there, even though help is only a short distance away. Often fewer general practitioners are available and the family doctors that are available have found it necessary

to reorganize their practices. No longer is it possible for one man to cope with the demands of an area. He cannot do it physically: it is physically impossible for him to be on call in a large area for the 24 hours of the day.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It used to happen.

Dr. TONKIN: It did and, as I have said, I am nostalgic about this because I have a great admiration for the people who were able to do this. Indeed, in many ways, I would like to see that system operating now. However, with our increasing population, it is physically impossible for them to do it. I think, too, that perhaps many doctors now, when they see the benefits other members of the community enjoy, tend to say, "Why should I not have a little relaxation and pleasure, too?" This is understandable, but I agree entirely with the sentiments the Minister for Conservation has expressed.

It is a great shame that we do not see more of this dedication, but that same dedication which inspired so many of our general practitioners, the old family doctors, also, in many cases, resulted in their premature death, leaving, as a general rule, a large family and a young widow. This happened often, and the average age of death of the busy general practitioner was much lower than it had any right to be. Clinic practices have become the accepted thing, especially in the metropolitan area and, I think, in some central country towns. It is reassuring to know that the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners has conducted a pilot study (in fact, I think two such studies) on the use of qualified social workers in the community in connection with medical practices.

An increasing emphasis is being placed on community medicine with qualified social workers working in association with doctors and providing the supportive therapy that the general practitioner no longer has time to give. It is difficult indeed for the general practitioner, seeing a patient whom he realizes is complaining of symptoms that are due to a psychosomatic cause (in other words, nervous tension and worry expressing themselves as headaches and aches and pains) to sit down and talk to that patient for half an hour or for as long as the patient needs. I have had patients who have come to me and, after we have established that there is nothing organically wrong, they talk, and because they talk out their problems they finish the consultation by saying, "Thank you very much. I feel much better." Yet they have not had a thing prescribed for them. What they have needed is someone to listen to their talk and to give them advice.

The use of words is just as important to a medical practitioner in healing the sick as is the use of drugs or other forms of medicine. Far more faith healing is going on at the hands of the good family doctor, who has much sympathy for these patients, than the community realizes. This need to give supportive therapy is difficult to satisfy when, in fact, the general practitioner sees the patient come in and knows that he has a waiting room full of people who glare at him every time he opens his door, and each wants to ask, "Why aren't you seeing me? What's holding you up?" Once again we have problems because we have too few doctors.

Mr. Evans: Especially in the country.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes. I hope that this experiment being undertaken at the college will prove successful, as I am sure it will be, because I believe that a qualified social worker working in every medical practice can take over this supportive therapy under the doctor's direction. Apparently, there is a great new emphasis on community medicine, and it is refreshing to hear that Professor Fraenkel planned that the new Flinders Medical School (when it finally gets off the ground) will train doctors of a new calibre, doctors who will be trained medically but who will have the overall ability to recognize disease or the signs indicating disease and, if necessary, to refer the patient on for investigation, but will also provide doctors who are trained in the community aspects of medicine and who can provide the supportive therapy or direct the patient to sources where he can be helped, guided, counselled, and generally relieved of his worries.

Investigation has become an extremely expensive part of medicine and, therefore, specialists now specialize in these aspects of investigation. Not only do we have pathologists: we also have pathologists who specialize in various aspects of pathology. We are finding more and more about the causes of disease, and this is one of the prerequisites of treatment. The old days, when we treated diseases without really understanding their causes, are going fast. Unfortunately we do not know the cause of some diseases, but I hope that we are on the threshold and we find them so that we can try to treat every disease. Because of the challenges of these

things, many young graduates will specialize in pathology and in the investigation of diseases. I hesitate to say this, because I know their services are useful and, in fact, indispensable, but some of these young graduates have no contact with a patient whatever, being trained in medicine to spend their days looking down a microscope or conducting other examinations.

It is the academic, the high I.Q., the well-qualified man, who will tend to specialize in this field. The cost of investigation, of training people, and of techniques generally is high. I am not sure what is the cost of a cardiac transplant, but many thousands of dollars has been spent in preparing for one case. The training of these people takes longer and, therefore, costs more money. Specialization is necessary and will become more so as our knowledge increases, but it will be a sad day if it results in the dying out completely of the family doctor, and there are still quite a few around in our community who are willing to spend time and talk to the patients. I am proud to know them. I am sure that, if the new proposal for community-medicine training put up by Professor Fraenkel is implemented we will be safe. However, I hope that it will be implemented soon and that we do not pass the point of no return, when many family doctors and general practitioners will retire because of their age or give up because of other reasons, before we can get our new generation of community-medicine trained graduates into the community.

I believe that we are facing a critical time and that that point of no return for the development of the Flinders University hospital is closer than many of us think. I pay a tribute to the old family country doctor, the pioneer who was well aware of psychosomatic illness and its manifestations and implications. He may not have been as specifically trained in psychology or psychiatry as the younger graduates are, but he had a wide understanding of human nature and earned the respect of his patients and of the community because of it. Not only was he counsellor, physician, friend, champion of the needs of the community, local officer of health, medical superintendent of the local hospital—

Mr. Evans: Financier!

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, often financier, although many of these doctors did not get paid when they should have been, but they did not fuss about it. He still found time to give a good medical service to his patients. This still applies: local doctors, particularly in the country, are still expected to champion the causes and espouse the needs of their community. An illustration of this is that of the present doctor at Tailem Bend. He is upset about the effect of the new nursing training programme on the Tailem Bend Hospital and, consequently, on the people served by that hospital. Because under the new regulations the Tailem Bend Hospital has not been classified as a nurse training centre, the nurses will have to go elsewhere, probably to Murray Bridge, to be trained. The Tailem Bend Hospital will face serious difficulties in finding trained staff to enable its nursing aides to carry on. Because of the efforts of the local medical health officer and the local general practitioner, something is being done. I pay a tribute to Doctor Gooden, because of whose work this problem (one that probably had not crossed anyone's mind before this legislation was introduced) is being brought to the attention of the Nurses Board and the Government.

I have nostalgic memories of the time I spent with my father-in-law at Tanunda after I graduated. For any young practitioner starting out from his general student days to learn general practice, I can think of no better teacher than one's father-in-law. The time I spent with him was so valuable that it has made me realize what a great shame it is that the old practice in times gone by of a doctor spending a certain time in general practice and then moving on to a specialization no longer applies. However, largely as a result of the efforts of the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners, young fifth-year students are now sent out into recognized general practices in the community to learn exactly what it is like to deal with people. There is a world of difference between what one does in a hospital and what one has to do when one is out in the community in general practice.

Because of the fine work that has been done in the past, and because of the load that has been carried by our dedicated general practitioners, I support this Bill with, perhaps, nostalgia and regret. I recognize, however, that this legislation is necessary, as I believe it also reflects the tremendous advances that have been made in all fields of medicine. Thus, with nostalgic regret and yet with much pride, I support the Bill.

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): I, too, support the Bill, the introduction of which was necessary, as the Attorney-General said in his

second reading explanation, because of recent Commonwealth national health legislation, the effect of which has been to increase substantially the amounts payable by the Commonwealth Government for specialist and general practitioner services, mainly the former, to members of medical benefits funds. As it has been necessary to lay down clearly who are specialists, the Commonwealth Government has constituted its own specialist recognition committee in each State. Because of this, I cannot really see the necessity for this Bill. South Australia has had its own specialist list for many years. Perhaps it is necessary because the Commonwealth Government had to set up its specialist recognition committee to enact its national health legislation. At that time all States except South Australia did not have such a list. However, since then Queensland has introduced a list, and New South Wales and Victoria have been considering legislation for the same purpose.

South Australia was the first State to set up a specialist register. It did so many years ago, simply for the guidance of the medical profession and the public. The list was voluntary: a specialist, if he so wished, applied to be registered on it. Not only specialists with recognized qualifications but also doctors who had practised in specific specializations, even though they had not qualified in a specialization, were allowed to apply for registration. In most cases, subject to their experience in the particular field, they were registered. I am pleased to see a clause in the Bill that allows people in this situation to apply for registration on the new list, provided it is done within six months. This is a good provision, because the people concerned are recognized as specialists, even though they may not have undertaken post-graduate study and obtained higher degrees that are usually recognized in connection with a certain specialization. The people concerned have been practising in a certain field and, as a result of their experience, are well fitted to practise the specialization they have chosen. They may apply to the Medical Board to be added to the list, and I am sure that we can have the utmost faith in the board to make the right decision in these cases.

While those people who have been practising a certain specialization for some years need protection, so, too, do the properly qualified people, if I may use that expression. I do not mean that the other people are not properly qualified or well fitted to do their job, for they are. However, those people who may have undertaken many years of extra study overseas and obtained higher degrees must be protected. We cannot have the situation where any doctor who, for example, becomes tired of being a general practitioner can say that he wishes to be a specialist in a certain field and on applying be added to the list. Under the Bill, applications must be made within six months, and these applications will be fully considered by the Medical Board.

The Bill makes it compulsory for any practitioner, who practises or who attempts to practise or who in any way holds himself out as a specialist, to register on the State register as a specialist in a certain branch of medicine. As I have said, similar legislation has been passed in Queensland, and New South Wales and Victoria are considering such legislation, as will, I believe, the other States eventually. Although, as I said earlier, I cannot see the need for the provision in this State or any other State, when the Commonwealth has set up a specialist recognition committee and, consequently, a specialist register, I do not oppose the Bill. The main provisions are that a State specialist register is to be established, the Commonwealth Government having its own register; registration for specialization will be compulsory if the person concerned wishes to be recognized as a specialist under the Commonwealth National Health Act; and facilities are provided for registration of people who are not specialists by qualification but who are, in fact, specialists by experience.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

Mr. CARNIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The member for Bragg spoke from his wide experience in this matter, and it is certainly the widest experience of any member here, the honourable member having had experience both as a general practitioner at one stage in his career and currently as a specialist. He has said that he is sad to see the end of the era of the old family doctor, but I hope the Bill does not have that effect. I know that this is an age of specialization and that this activity is constantly growing, but for over 20 years I have worked closely with doctors, 95 per cent of this work having involved general practitioners in the country. However much specialization we have, we can never dispense with the services of the family doctor. The days of the old family doctor in his horse and trap and with his top hat have gone, but the principle is still the same, the present practitioner perhaps working at a slightly faster pace.

The important thing, to which the member for Bragg referred, is that general practitioners, particularly country practitioners, are closer to their patients than any specialist can ever be, and this is vital to their work. As the member for Bragg said, many illnesses are not physical illnesses: they are caused by family stress and worry, financial worry, and so on, and in many cases the family practitioner knows this to be so. However, this would not apply in the case of strangers: it applies in those cases where the general practitioner knows all members of the family, and where he has probably brought the children of those families into the world. The local practitioner knows the financial and emotional background of the family, and this is important in treating people. Often, people require not medicine but a shoulder to cry on, and this is what the general practitioner must provide and continue to provide. It is impossible here to avoid using a cliche: to my mind a general practitioner is still the backbone of the medical profession. This is undoubtedly the age of specialization, which is intensifying, but at the base of the pyramid is the family doctor, and I hope I never see the stage where his importance is overshadowed by the necessity to narrow the field of specialization.

As I have said, the family practitioner often knows the emotional and financial background of his patients, as well as every other relevant aspect, but in many cases, in order to do his job, a specialist should not know these things and should not allow himself to become emotionally involved. To him, the human body must be treated as a machine and, if he allows emotions to enter into it, his work may be affected. Although this may not apply so much to a psychiatrist, it certainly applies to a surgeon and, I suggest, to those engaged in most forms of specialization: the organ being treated must be considered as such and not as part of a person.

The Royal Australian College of General Practitioners, realizing the need for greater recognition of the general practitioner and the need to prevent his being swallowed up in this modern age of specialization, recently introduced an examination for membership of that college, and, from discussing the matter with several friends of mine who have undertaken this examination, I know that it is exceedingly difficult, the rate of failure being high. However, the examination is designed to train people to become better general practitioners in this important field of medicine.

In effect, they become specialist general practitioners and, although this may sound a peculiar contradiction in terms, it is not: a general practitioner must have a broad knowledge in his field of specialization, but one of the most important parts of his job is to diagnose accurately: he must be able to diagnose whether a condition can be treated by him or whether it warrants further investigation by a specialist. The general practitioner represents the first stop for the sick. This is recognized in the Commonwealth national health legislation by the fact that benefits will not be paid if a patient goes direct to a specialist; he must first be recommended by a general practitioner. In this respect, the general practitioner is recognized throughout the community.

The member for Bragg referred to the quota system in universities. One thing that has worried me for a long time (although frankly I cannot see any solution to this problem) is that in choosing the quota of students who are to enter the medical school the university naturally relies on academic qualifications. I suppose this is normal, but from my experience of university graduates it is not always the best qualified person academically who makes the best doctor, engineer and so on. Too often those chosen on their academic ability are academics who do not go out into the ordinary field or, in the case of medical practitioners, become general practitioners. Such students wish to remain in the hospitals to do research work, to remain at the university to lecture, or to go on to specialize. I do not think this is a good system. However, having considered the problem for several years, I can see no solution to it unless the university is to do a full psychological inquiry into every student who applies for admission, and that is impracticable because of the numbers and time involved. To me it is not a good thing that the top academics are the only ones chosen to enter a university profession. With the member for Bragg, I resent the necessity for the introduction of the Bill, but I support it.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I am confused by some aspects of the Bill. New Part IIIa was inserted in the principal Act in 1966. I was interested to see the comments of the then Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh) in explaining the Bill on October 4, 1966, as reported at page 2005 of *Hansard* as follows:

Clause 19 inserts a new Part IIIa in the principal Act, which deals with the registration of specialists in South Australia. This amendment again fills a gap in an existing Act.

It is considered desirable that this State should make provision for the registration of specialists. It may be of interest to honourable members if I mention that the establishment of a Specialists Register has been considered desirable by various hospitals and medical associations for some time, more particularly in connection with medical benefits obtainable under the National Health Act. Queensland has had such a register operating satisfactorily for some years, and Western Australia has a limited Specialists Register for workmen's compensation purposes only. The other States have had the matter under consideration for some time but have not as yet made provision in their legislation for it.

The inclusion of this Part was related to the National Health Act. The Attorney-General said in his second reading explanation that the inclusion of the provisions in the present Bill also followed certain provisions of the National Health Act. Regarding a specialist, since 1966 the provision has been as set out in section 29a (2) (a) as follows:

That he has gained special skill in a particular specialty proclaimed under subsection (1) of this section by practising exclusively in that specialist branch of medicine or by practising partly in that specialist branch of medicine and partly in such other branch of medicine, whether in a hospital or otherwise, as the board may approve.

I refer particularly to the fact that he may specialize partly in a branch of medicine. However, the provision in the Commonwealth Act applies to a person who is registered as a medical specialist or as a specialist under the Act for full-time activity in a particular specialist field. If it were necessary to bring the South Australian register into line in this regard, I should think provisions other than those in the Bill would be necessary. We are likely to finish up with an even more confused picture than we are said to have at present. The South Australian register will allow a doctor to indicate to people generally that he is a specialist, whether he be surgeon, cardiologist, or whatever he may be. By virtue of his South Australian registration, he will be able to say that he is a specialist in that field. However, for the purposes of the Commonwealth medical benefits legislation it is unlikely that, in many cases, he will be a specialist recognized by the Commonwealth Act. Therefore, he will not be a person whom the general population can attend for medical direction. This will be confusing to the medical fraternity and even more confusing to people generally. If, as I understand it, Commonwealth legislation overrides State legislation, I cannot understand why this Bill is necessary. I shall be interested to hear the Attorney-General say whether this Bill is necessary, as provision is already made in the Commonwealth Act.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

Dr. EASTICK: In section 29a (1) of the State Act provision is made whereby the board is able to undertake the registration of new specialties. Recently we have seen (and we will see more of this in the years ahead) considerable fragmentation of existing specialties so that we have specialist specialists. Demands these days are so great that it is difficult for a doctor, dentist, veterinarian or member of any profession to give his attention to the ever-increasing areas of influence The problem associated with the country general practitioner has been mentioned, and I should like to deal with this aspect. I shall refer to the position in some large country towns. I know of one on Eyre Peninsula, and one in the middle of the Lower South-East. In the former town a person acts as a specialist surgeon, but, because the work is insufficient for him to obtain his total livelihood from that speciality, he also practices as a general practitioner, in the full sense of the term.

It is important that we do not, by forcing these people to follow the Commonwealth registration form or by altering our own registration, if it may stand on its own, prevent these specialists from maintaining the service they provide in these country towns by carrying out general practitioner services. A rather snide interjection about faith healing was made from the Government benches when the member for Bragg was speaking. Faith healing is a particularly important term in all professional directions, and I have no doubt that the Attorney-General knows full well—

The Hon. L. J. King: I was just speculating about its application to your profession.

Dr. EASTICK: We know the importance of the term "masterly inactivity", and this is what faith healing means. It is the ability to listen to all facets of the problem, make the right sounds in the right places while the information is being given, and then quietly comment or, in many instances, make no comment. I am sure that that applies in the Attorney-General's profession. It also applies in my profession, but perhaps in my case it is not so much the problem of the patient as the problem of the patient's owner.

The Hon. L. J. King: You don't listen to the horses, do you?

Dr. EASTICK: I took notice of what the member for Florey told me recently and I am certain that it is not a good thing to listen

to them, particularly if one is a betting man. The other pertinent comment I wish to make about country general practitioners is that the new nurses training scheme will make it increasingly difficult for many country hospitals to maintain adequate nursing services. This will give rise to the possibility of persons who have accepted the responsibiilty of conducting country general practitioner services being further hampered, and it could even lead to the position of being the last straw that breaks the camel's back and causing people to leave the profession in country areas. I do not want to mention any particular hospital, but I could name several of them in my district. More particularly, I should like to mention that one hospital has been told that nurses, in the first year of training, will be available to the hospital for only 35 weeks of the 52 weeks of their training. Their places will be taken by nurses from other hospitals, for a limited period. During the second and third years of the course, there will be an interchange of nurses between hospitals.

Whilst this system is useful in overall training, in that it gives the nursing profession the opportunity of obtaining experience in more than one hospital and of being trained by more than one medical practitioner, tutor sister, matron, or other senior nursing staff, the continuity of service in a hospital will be disturbed and this additional disturbance may be, again, the last straw that breaks the camel's back in relation to the members of the medical profession, who are undertaking the work of their profession in the community at considerable personal disadvantage. In the hope that the Attorney-General, either in closing the second reading debate or in the Committee stage, will be able to reply to my questions, I support the second reading. In the Committee stage I shall decide whether to support the third reading.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): Members who have spoken have all supported the measure. Although I think the member for Light said he would like me to clarify the matters that he has raised, as I understood him (and he will correct me if I am wrong) he raised one substantial matter, namely, whether the State legislation was needed, because, as he put it, the Commonwealth Act would prevail. The Commonwealth legislation simply provides for a Specialist Recognition Committee, which, in effect, recognizes those specialists who will be eligible for Commonwealth Government benefits applicable to specialists. In other words, the Commonwealth legislation is concerned solely with the operation of the medical benefits scheme. It makes no provision regarding who may practise as a specialist: it simply says, "You are the people whom we will recognize as being eligible for Commonwealth medical benefits applicable to specialist services."

On the other hand, State legislation is concerned to provide a register of persons who practise as specialists, and this Bill would go further and say, "You must be registered on that register if you practise as a specialist or hold yourself out as a specialist," so the ambit and scope of the State legislation is different from the ambit or scope of the Commonwealth legislation. The Commonwealth Act is concerned solely with the operation of the medical benefits scheme and simply says, "This is a list of names of persons whom we will recognize for the purposes of our scheme." The State legislation, on the other hand, if this Bill is passed, will say, "This is a register of persons entitled to practise as specialists, and they are the only persons entitled to practise as specialists."

I understood that the other matter raised by the member for Light was that, under the State Act, a person might be registered as a specialist, nothwithstanding that he was not occupied full time in specialist activities, whereas under the Commonwealth legislation he would have to be occupied full time in those services. Here again, it seems to me that we are concerned with two different things.

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

The Hon. L. J. KING: Finally, I point out that the Commonwealth Act is concerned purely with conditions under which the Commonwealth Government will approve the payment of specialist fees under the Commonwealth medical benefits scheme, and the Commonwealth legislation has confined that to specialists who are engaged full time. I see no way in which we could meet the problem that the member for Light is concerned about. We could only produce uniformity between the State and Commonwealth legislation if the State provided that only a full-time specialist could be registered as a specialist, but this is the reverse of what the honourable member desires because he considers (and I agree with him) that it is desirable that part-time specialists should be available to serve particularly the needs of some country areas. The problem is that, if we are to preserve the situation, there is no way we can bring the State law into conformity with the Commonwealth

Act, but I do not think it produces any difficulties, because the State legislation and the Commonwealth legislation are really concerned with different things.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Duty to register as a specialist."

Dr. EASTICK: I thank the Attorney-General for the information he gave me when replying, and I realize that he is aware of the difficulties that could arise in some country areas. Whilst accepting that perhaps nothing can be done to alter the situation, I ask whether the State Government could indicate to the Commonwealth Government some of the difficulties that may arise in country areas, and request it to consider the position of persons who are specialists functioning in country areas? I should not want to see the situation at, say, Port Lincoln or Naracoorte, where persons would have to come to Adelaide to receive specialist surgery because the specialist surgeon in those areas could not be registered for the purposes of Commonwealth benefits because he was not a full-time specialist in that field.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I am willing to discuss the matter with the Minister of Health in order to ascertain his views on this subject and, if he considers it would be appropriate to approach the Commonwealth Government, we will consider this action.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

EIGHT MILE CREEK SETTLEMENT (DRAINAGE MAINTENANCE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 26. Page 3128.)

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): This is a machinery Bill whereby the onus of valuation that had previously been on the Director is now placed on the Land and Valuation Court. This seems to be in line with the function of the court, and the Bill specifically refers to the drainage at Eight Mile Creek. That area is unique because it was swampland and a peaty area that has been drained and brought into production, and it now makes a worthwhile contribution to the output of this State. Also, it contributes to the State of Victoria, but as we are members of the Federation we do not complain about that. Clause 2 amends section 2 of the principal Act by inserting after the definition of "the Director" the following definition:

"The Land and Valuation Court" means the Land and Valuation Court constituted under the Supreme Court Act, 1935, as amended.

Clause 3, by amending section 5 of the principal Act, inserts in lieu of subsection (2) the following subsections:

(2) The board shall make, or obtain from the valuer, a written report setting out the considerations upon which each valuation was made and shall forward the valuations together with the reports to the Director.

(2*a*) The Director shall, as soon as practicable after receiving from the board the valuations of all holdings within the area and the reports relating thereto cause to be served by post on the landholder of the occupier of each holding a copy of the valuation in respect of that holding and the report relating thereto.

The situation at Eight Mile Creek is fairly static, but the right to appeal to the Land and Valuation Court will remove any doubts that the settlers may have on this aspect. After examining the Bill, as well as the principal Act and the amending Act of 1965, I see nothing wrong with this measure. Clause 9 provides:

Section 13 of the principal Act is amended by striking out from subsection (1) the passage "five pounds per centum per annum" and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "ten per centum per annum".

This relates to interest that will accrue on overdue rates, and brings this legislation into line with the relevant provision in the Crown Lands Act. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Grounds of appeal."

Mr. RODDA: Under this provision, an appeal may be made to the Land and Valuation Court and not to the local court as previously. Can the Minister of Education enlarge on this alteration?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): The general effect of this clause is to substitute the Land and Valuation Court for the local court. The opportunity has been taken in this Bill, now that the Land and Valuation Court has been established with a specialist ability to deal with general valuation problems, to alter the principal Act so that, if an appellant is dissatisfied with the result of his appeal to the Minister, he now has the right of a further appeal to the Land and Valuation Court rather than to the local court. It is a perfectly straightforward amendment, which I think all members will support.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (6 to 9) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MINES AND WORKS INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, line 11 (clause 3)—Leave out "and".

No. 2. Page 2 (clause 3)—After line 16 insert new paragraph as follows:

"and

(*d*) by inserting after subsection (3) the following subsection:—(4) An order or direction shall not be made or given under paragraph IVa of subsection (1) of this section in respect of mining for opal or operations incidental or ancillary thereto."

No. 3. Page 3 (clause 4)—After line 32 insert new sections as follows:

"Compensation.

10d. (1) In this section—

"established extractive industry" means an industry of quarrying for stone or other material or extracting or removing sand or clay, carried on at the commencement of the Mines and Works Inspection Act Amendment Act, 1970:

"the Court" means the Land and Valuation Court established under the Supreme Court Act, 1935-1970.

(2) If a person by whom an established extractive industry is carried on is required to comply with an order or direction under paragraph IVa of subsection (1) of section 10 of this Act or with any regulation under paragraph 25 of the second schedule to this Act, he may apply to the Court for an order directing the Minister to pay him such compensation as may be fair and reasonable in the circumstances.

(3) Any compensation awarded under this section shall be proportioned to loss sustained or reasonably likely to be sustained in consequence of the order, direction or regulation.

Acquisition of land.

10e. (1) The Minister may subject to and in accordance with the Land Acquisition Act, 1969, acquire any land to which an order or direction under paragraph IVa of subsection (1) of section 10 of this Act or a regulation under paragraph 25 of the second schedule to this Act applies.

(2) If the Minister proceeds to acquire any such land, no order for compensation shall be made under section 10d of this Act."

Consideration in Committee.

Amendments Nos. 1 *and* 2.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 1 and 2 be disagreed to.

These two amendments remove from the provisions of the Mines and Works Inspection Act any aspect of mining for opal or of operations ancillary thereto. This means that, apart entirely from any other mining or quarrying provisions in South Australia, opal miners are to be free to despoil the countryside of South Australia without any control whatever under the principal Act and that the most important areas of the State for conservation and for the preservation of our natural heritage may be subject to no control whatever to see that there is no despoliation. I cannot believe that members of this Chamber, at a time when it is important for us to conserve the natural heritage of South Australia, should agree to amendments of this kind.

The member for Eyre, in whose district most opal mining takes place, approached me with a member of the Upper House on behalf of the pastoral lease owner of the area in which opal mining was taking place, and we were shown a series of photographs, diagrams and maps as to the effect on the natural environment in that area of uncontrolled mining. Support was given by the member for Eyre and the member of the Upper House to the pastoralist concerned that this was a situation that needed to be controlled. There is nothing in the Bill other than a reasonable requirement by those who operate under the Act that the amenity of the area is to be considered in any mining operation. Are we to say that the rest of quarrying in South Australia is to be subject to control to see to it that the amenity of the area is preserved but that it does not matter what opal miners do to an area? I point out to members opposite, who might have a look at these amendments from the Legislative Council, that it is vital for us to conserve numbers of areas in the north-west of South Australia which are a great heritage and which are potentially opal-bearing. Are we to say that in those areas any other form of mining is to be subject to the requirement of an inspector so that the amenity of the area (the natural beauty, the ecology) is to be considered, whereas if a person is mining for opal there is to be no control whatever? That is what the amendments mean. Those few who are involved in opal mining and who use bulldozers (and this is not the majority at all) can go in with bulldozers and do what they like, and no inspector

under the Act can say "Nay", no matter what they do.

Mr. Jennings: There is no restriction as to land.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, they can do it anywhere. I do not believe for one moment that members can submit to this proposal of the Legislative Council. I believe the amendments emanated from the fact that the opal miners' association was approached by the Government with a copy of a draft Mining Act Amendment Bill, and not a Mines and Works Inspection Act Amendment Bill at all. In the draft Mining Act Amendment Bill were proposals for back-filling bulldozing cuts, and a certain minority of opal miners then said that this would put too great a cost on them, and they will now not go along with anything that comes before this place to suggest that they might act reasonably in the way they mine. As I believe this is an extraordinary proposal of the Council, I ask members not to agree to the amendments.

Mr. GUNN: I am sorry the Minister has adopted the attitude he has adopted towards these amendments, because they were drafted after members of another place had been to Coober Pedy and discussed these matters at some length with members of the opal-mining industry. Only today I received a letter froom the Secretary of the Coober Pedy Miners Association.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I received one of those.

Mr. GUNN: The letter states:

A resolution of the Miners Association: a Bill for an Act to amend the Mines and Works Inspection Act 1920-1966 now before Parliament. In the opinion of the association the above would have serious effects on the future of the opal mining industry. The association requests that Parliament remove the opal industry from the effects of the amending Bill. Our association believes that when the Mining Act is redrafted (as has been promised) a special part of the new Act should deal specifically with opal mining. The association feels that this is the only satisfactory way to allow the orderly development of this important industry.

I have also received a communication from the President of the Andamooka Opal Miners Association, which favours aspects of the Legislative Council's amendments, too. I hope that the Minister will reconsider the matter and that the amendments will be agreed to, because they will assist opal miners. Also, it would be interesting to know what Aborigines at Coober Pedy will do if bulldozers are forced to back-fill, because—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: There is nothing in this Bill about back-filling by bulldozers.

Mr. GUNN: I think there is.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Where?

Mr. GUNN: The Minister should look at the powers of the inspector. I hope members will accept the amendments as suggested by the opal miners.

Mr. COUMBE: I have listened to what the Minister and the member for Eyre have said. When this matter was previously debated in the Chamber, most members had in mind what could be done to overcome the scarring of the Adelaide Hills. However, the amendment deals with opal-mining operations. Those of us who know about geology know that most opal mined in South Australia is mined at Coober Pedy and Andamooka. I support what the member for Eyre, who is so interested in this section of the community, has said in this regard. I heard what the Minister said about back-filling and the effect of large bulldozers. We are considering the matter of amenity. Under clause 3 of the Bill, an inspector's powers, which previously related mostly to safety, are enlarged to include amenity. In the case of opal mining, I believe that it is impracticable for back-filling to occur.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: There is nothing in the Bill about that.

Mr. COUMBE: Then what is the Government worried about?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We want mining to proceed in a way that will not ruin the countryside.

Mr. COUMBE: How will the countryside be ruined? Soil is gouged out and a hole is left from which the opals are taken if one is lucky.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You should see what the pastoralists from the area brought down.

Mr. COUMBE: With the exception of the new Minister, I have seen as many mining operations as has any member in this place, and I know what the position is. This is a reasonable amendment and no harm will be done if it is accepted. It will not in any way affect our efforts to preserve the amenity, particularly of the Adelaide Hills. The Premier, with all his disdainful comments, knows this very well.

The Hon. D. A. DUNTSAN: The member for Torrens suggests that this Bill is concerned only with the Adelaide Hills. I do not know whether the honourable member has been into the Flinders Ranges recently.

Mr. Coumbe: I have.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If he has, he will have seen what has taken place in some of the mining operations there. Whole areas of hillside have been reduced in order to make roads into mines, unnecessarily.

Mr. Coumbe: For opals though.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No.

Mr. Coumbe: Well, that's what the amendment says.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We are concerned not only with the conservation of the Adelaide Hills but also with that of the whole area of the State.

Mr. Coumbe: This deals with opals only.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, and the pastoralists in the Coober Pedy area are bitterly complaining about the effect that opal mining is having on their pastoral areas. It is a question not of back-filling but of what is happening as a result of utterly careless mining. This applies not only to Coober Pedy and Andamooka, but also to Granite Downs, where opal is being found. The whole of South Australia has to be conserved, and I cannot understand why the rest of the South Australian mining industry is to be subject reasonably to control, yet the opal miners are to be as free as the wind and permitted to allow the results of their mining to blow all around the place. This is what the pastoralists in the Coober Pedy area are complaining so bitterly about.

Today I was going to answer a question put by an honourable member but, unfortunately, he had to leave the House before he asked me the question. The question concerned the removal of rutile from sands on Kangaroo Island and the restoration of that most important area to ensure that its ecology is maintained. That is all right for rutile miners apparently. Under the Mines and Works Inspection Act we are able to have a plan for the development of such mines, but not so for the opal miners: we are not to be able to say anything to them about a development plan for the way in which the area they are mining is to be preserved. I do not believe for one moment that there is any reason why on this score opal miners should be treated differently from any other miners in the State. Also, I do not believe that most opal miners are asking for this. The Andamooka and the Coober Pedy Progress Associations have not made any requests in this respect, and the Opal Miners Association, which has written in on such grandiose letterhead, represents not the majority of miners but only a small minority. This matter has from the outset been discussed with the opal miners, most of whom agree entirely with the provision. A small minority of miners, engaged in large-scale bulldozing operations to the utter depredation of the countryside, is trying to buck this legislation. It is extraordinary, too, that every Minister of the previous Government agreed to the Bill without this amendment before the Labor Government took office. The Minister of Mines in the previous Government (Hon. R. C. DeGaris) had approved the Bill, got it approved in Cabinet, and sent it to the Parliamentary Draftsman. I subsequently introduced the measure which he prepared and to which every Minister of that Government agreed. Now this sort of thing happens.

Mr. RODDA: Many discussions took place between the opal miners and the Premier weeks before this legislation was introduced, and I understood that the opal people from the opal fields were fairly happy with those discussions. They were happy, too, that they were not going to be subject to the whims of an inspector.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They didn't once raise that point with me. I was not told that by any deputation of opal miners that saw me.

Mr. RODDA: The point was raised with the member for the district, and it was far better for the opal miners to have discussions with the Premier than with him. The member for Eyre, as well as some members of another place, attended a meeting at which about 200 Andamooka people were present.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: They would be the fellows with the bulldozers.

Mr. RODDA: There would not be 200 people with bulldozers at Andamooka. This amendment is acceptable to the people who represent this area, and I am not impressed by the Premier's argument. Every member on this side believes that there should be some control over this matter, but I understood that the Premier was going to provide for this in the Mining Act Amendment Bill.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Noes—(15)—Messrs. Becker, Carnie, Coumbe (teller), Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Majority of 8 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Amendment No. 3.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 3 be disagreed to.

The proposal in this amendment is that, if any order is made which in some measure restricts the development of quarrying in South Australia (that is, the quarrying of stone or the extracting or removal of sand or clay), the Minister may pay compensation or acquire the land. The provisions of the Planning and Development Act already exist under that Act.

For us now to say, in relation to quarrying for stone, sand or clay, that there will be special provisions for compensation under the Mines and Works Inspection Act that are concurrent with and separate from the provisions of the Planning and Development Act would create a complete and absurd conundrum and, in addition, the provisions are completely unnecessary. I have not been able to follow the submissions upon which this amendment has been proposed, because I have received a series of utterly conflicting submissions from representatives of the quarrying industry. First, they wanted a right of appeal to the Planning Appeals Board. Then they dropped that and wanted a right of appeal to some separate tribunal that would have powers concurrent with and equal to the powers of the Planning Appeals Board. Therefore, there would be two lines of separate appeals they could take to different people on the one piece of legislation.

Then they said they wanted an entirely new Act like Victoria had provided for extractive industries. However, when it was pointed out that the Victorian Extractive Industries Act was much more restrictive than was proposed under the Mines and Works Inspection Act and that it contained no right of appeal, they dropped that submission. Now they have come up with this proposal. It is illogical, unreasonable and unworkable.

The Planning and Development Act covers the situation as far as existing users of quarries is concerned, and there are already provisions under that Act in relation to compensation. For us to write something separate into this Act would mean that the Land and Valuation Court would have to try to interpret this, while the Planning Appeals Board was trying to interpret the Planning and Development Act. The proposal is absurd. We have gone overboard to try to assist the quarrying industry in South Australia, to give it reasonable provisions similar to those in other areas of mining in this State with the same sort of administrative provisions and appeals which have already proved sufficiently workable and protective and which would be much better for the industry than would what is proposed here. Most people in the quarrying industry have agreed that our proposals will work, and now we get this absurd proposal that is unworkable.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the acquisition powers?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The acquisition powers are there in relation to the Planning and Development Act, if that is what we are to do. That Act covers this situation in relation to any substantial areas of quarrying and mining in South Australia, because there is little quarrying for stone, sand or clay outside the declared development area, and the people outside such an area are not protesting. What the Legislative Council proposes is not sensible, and it was not contained in the Bill proposed by the previous Minister of Mines.

Mr. COUMBE: The whole purport of this amendment is to ensure that adequate compensation is paid if a particular industry suffers. If the Premier assures the Committee that compensation provisions are already contained in the Planning and Development Act I will accept the motion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Provisions are already included in the Planning and Development Act in relation to this matter. We should be able to develop and agree to plans with the extractive industry regarding the future of its working and how the existing land is to be restored, and the industry accepts this, which is what it wants to do.

Mrs. STEELE: I understand that the extractive industry is concerned that it may have to make an adjustment or rehabilitate a quarry or mine after it has commenced long-range work which involved a large financial outlay and which may, under the order of an inspector, be delayed or stopped. Such things have occurred in Canada or the United States of America. Can the Premier assure me that this will not happen here?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: One problem at present is that there are not agreed long-term plans for working out and rehabilitation. The quarry industry states that it wants to develop these plans and agree with the Government on them. The major purpose of the legislation is that, if someone departs from the agreed plans, we can tell them that they must stop.

Mrs. STEELE: Will the areas that have been worked out have to be rehabilitated?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We do not intend to go into something that is long past. We are concerned with the present working of these quarries and how they will be rehabilitated. I have a complete plan in relation to the places in the Adelaide Hills where quarrying and extractive work is going on. We intend to develop in relation to each one (with the agreement of the company) a long-term plan of how it is to be worked out and how it is to be rehabilitated. The industry has said that this is what it wants. I know of no case where something of the kind suggested by the honourable member could occur.

Mr. RODDA: The Minister knows that certain forces in the community would close the quarries, and that he may be faced with a pressure group concerning this matter. I want his assurance that there will be adequate provision for compensation for an important industry in this State: until I have that assurance I shall oppose the motion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I assure the honourable member that the Government does not intend to interfere with the general existing user in this area. That position is preserved under the Planning and Development Act. We do not intend to close the quarries; we cannot do that. We want to get a long-term plan for the way in which they are to be worked and the areas rehabilitated to ensure that scarring of the hills will not widen. This can be done, and the quarrying industry agrees that it can be done and that the long-term plan for developing the areas concerned can be worked out so that the hills face is not wrecked for the community.

Within the area in which the quarries are now operating are the major resources of dolomite, and we could not in the foreseeable future develop outside the area of existing quarrying sufficient resources to provide for building and development within the costs that we could stand. I have clear reports on this subject. Although I will not allow constant widening of the scarring of the hills face zone, we cannot ignore our existing resources and send costs sky high.

I pay a great tribute to those people in the community who are concerned with conserving our natural environment, and by creating a special portfolio to deal with conservation this Government has made it evident that it feels that way. However, some people in the community would never allow the authorities to put up a building, an airport or any other facility. Here, we are producing something reasonable to ensure that there is an effective plan for developing this industry and for preserving our heritage in the hills face zone, and the provisions relating to compensation, if there is any restriction on an existing user, are contained in the Planning and Development Act.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendments destroy any possibility of reasonable conservation of the environment.

NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its suggested amendment to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

DANGEROUS DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL)

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its amendment No. 3, but had made the following alternative amendment:

No. 3. Page 6 (clause 11)—After line 24 insert new subclause as follows:

(1aa) Where a person is convicted of an offence against this Act and the offence involved the supply of, or an offer to supply, a drug to which this Act applies to a person under the age of eighteen years, he shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of not less than one year.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I move:

That the Legislative Council's alternative amendment be disagreed to.

The alternative amendment differs from the original amendment, to which this Committee disagreed, only in that the alternative amendment confines the mandatory minimum sentence to an offence of offering a drug to a person under the age of 18 years, the original amendment applying to a person of any age. However, the alternative amendment suffers from the same vice that led this Committee to disagree to the original amendment, in that it deprives the court, in a certain type of offence, of its discretion to impose the appropriate sentence and requires it to impose a minimum sentence of one year, irrespective of the circumstances of the offence. As was pointed out in the debate on the original amendment inserted by the Legislative Council, this is not only wrong in principle

generally, in that it fetters the discretion of the court, but it is particularly wrong in relation to this Act, because the person committing the offence may have a serious drug problem and be himself dependent on drugs, and the court's approach to him should not necessarily involve imposing a severe term of imprisonment.

In all areas of the law, it is desirable that the court's discretion regarding sentence should not be fettered, because circumstances differ so markedly from case to case. This is particularly true in an Act dealing with drugs and particularly in a section dealing with trafficking in drugs, where the offender may well have a special problem. For that reason, I suggest that the alternative amendment is wrong in principle, just as the original amendment was wrong. As it suffers from the same vice as the original amendment, I ask honourable members to disagree to it.

Dr. TONKIN: Once again I agree with the Attorney-General. I am not quite as concerned as he is about taking away the competence of a court to decide on a penalty. However, I am concerned about the principle that a drug dependant cannot help himself, and it is much more important to get him to treatment than it is to impose a term of imprisonment. If an amendment such as this is to be considered, perhaps one way out of the difficulty would be to make some provision relating to a person not being a drug user or drug dependant who is convicted of an offence. This might clarify the intended amendment. As I am not happy with the amendment in its present form, I most certainly oppose it.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the Assembly would be represented by Mrs. Steele and Messrs. King, Langley, Simmons, and Tonkin.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (PENSIONS)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes of the amendment to be moved to clause 14 of the Bill by the Treasurer.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 3074.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): This is the first of four Bills that all deal with the same topic, and I intend to support them. There is little I need say on the individual Bills. I am glad that the Government has seen fit to grant increases in connection with this Bill. I was anxious to see this done while I was in office. The problem with retired judges and the widows of deceased or retired judges is that their pension is determined by the date of their retirement or death. This means that the earlier a judge retires and therefore the longer his retirement, the less his pension is. I know of some cases where judges have been retired for several years and where a great hardship has occurred through no fault of the people involved but simply through a reduction in the value of money. All these pensions are to be increased by 8¼ per cent. This is welcome, but in some cases I wish it could have been even more so that those receiving pensions pursuant to this Act would have been on the same rate. However, this has not been done. As this is a step in the right direction, I support it.

I am particularly pleased with the explanation the Premier gave me, in answer to my interjection, to the effect that the Government was looking at some new basis for superannuation in South Australia, I presume in relation to the Superannuation Act, the Supreme Court Act and to any other schemes that are the responsibility of the Government. Obviously we do not know from what the Premier has said what he has in mind. We only hope that it comes to fruition, and we shall be looking to see that it does. Obviously there are anomalies that should be put right and, if a scheme can be devised to put them right, that is a jolly good thing. One anomaly is that South Australia is the only State in which Supreme Court judges contribute towards their pensions. In every other State the pension is non-contributory. I know that this matter has been raised from time to time. From my experience as Attorney-General, I know that we try to keep a balance between the salaries of judges in the various States and the Commonwealth. This is not easy to do, and an additional complicating fact is that judges in South Australia contribute out of their salaries towards their pensions whereas judges in other States do not do so. I hope that in any scheme that is worked out to cover pensioners under this Act this anomaly will be looked at and be put right, although I find it hard to see how it can be put right and at one and the same time comparability maintained with the other States. We will probably have to wait until the Premier tells us what he intends to do. In the meantime, as I believe

this is a step in the right direction, I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Supplementation of certain pensions."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

In new section 13ec (2) after "determination day" to insert "(*a*)"; and to insert the following new paragraph:

(*b*) that occurred during the period commencing on and including the first day of July, 1967, and concluding on and including the thirty-first day of October, 1969, shall be increased by three per cent.

The effect of this amendment will be to provide a supplement to the pension of a former member of the judiciary who retired in October, 1969. Although in the terms of the arrangement proposed by the series of measures for pension supplementation this pension would not be supplemented, the Government recognizes that the pension of this former member is based on the salaries that were payable to members of the judiciary before the most recent increase of judicial salaries. It seems, therefore, that there are grounds to supplement this pension to some degree, and accordingly a supplement of 3 per cent has been decided upon and has been given effect to by this amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 5 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 3075.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the Bill, for the reasons I gave on the last occasion. It makes many changes on which I understand the member for Torrens is anxious to speak.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): When the late Frank Walsh introduced a Bill during his term of office as Treasurer I tried unsuccessfully to persuade him to provide better benefits for superannuated public servants. This Bill achieves that end, and it gives me great pleasure to see this happen. The Treasurer has pointed out the actuarial difficulties in solving some superannuation problems. He has said that this legislation will probably operate on about January 1, and that further work on the matter will have to be done. In his second reading explanation, the Treasurer has said that the matter of retrospectivity has arisen; this is always an awkward question.

Having examined the Auditor-General's report to June 30 last, I know that the Government was then paying 70 per cent and the member 30 per cent towards superannuation benefits. I should like the Premier to say whether those proportions are being varied. I am also interested in the state of the fund. The accumulated fund held on behalf of members at June 30, 1969, totalled $47,352,397. One can see from pages 162 and 163 of the Auditor-General's report how the board's funds, investments, assets and liabilities are represented. As the total net assets amount to $57,839,694, it is obvious that the board is able to meet its commitments. I should like to know whether the amount contributed to the fund by the Government has grown and whether the percentage contributed by contributors has decreased.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I think this is referred to in the last sentence of my second reading explanation.

Mr. COUMBE: I thank the Treasurer for that interjection. I see from the second reading explanation that the proportion of all supplementary pensions payable by the Government has been fixed at 70 per cent. This means that the whole of the 8¼ per cent will still remain at 70 per cent.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Yes.

Mr. COUMBE: In that case I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill, as what I tried to achieve previously is being achieved now. It is interesting for one to see how the fund is working in these days when the cost of invested moneys has increased. Money is invested at present at rates of interest varying from 3⅞ per cent to 8½ per cent. This has involved many institutions in difficulties in respect of the yield obtained from their trustee securities. As the fund seems to be in a sound position, I support the Bill.

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

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 3705.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the Bill.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I, too, support the Bill. I see from the Auditor-General's report that the fund is in a healthy position,

the surplus of income for the last year being $89,904, and the balance of the fund at June 30, 1970, being $758,836. I have always considered in the past that former members eligible for the pension have not received their fair due. However, from the figures to which I have referred it can be seen that the fund can easily afford the 8¼ per cent increase recommended by the Public Actuary. It is interesting for one, when looking around the Chamber, to conjure up what will be the position in the future, as some members may not be here for terribly long. Those who do not qualify may find consolation in the fact that they will receive their contribution back with interest.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I consider that I should speak to this Bill, because in the last Parliament, when a Bill was introduced to increase the superannuation for members of Parliament, I said that I thought that former members, who had given considerable and great service to the State, were being treated unjustly. I congratulate the present Government on introducing, and giving us the opportunity to support, a Bill to give these increases to former members. Many of them, although retired, are still living, and the present superannuation scheme was not in operation when some of them became members. They have been superannuated on an extremely low pension compared with the value of the service they have given. I support the Bill wholeheartedly.

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

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL (PENSIONS)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 3076.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the Bill.

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

COMMONWEALTH PLACES (ADMINISTRATION OF LAWS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 18. Page 2807.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the Bill and need say little about it except that the surprising decision by the High Court (and I am sure the Attorney-General agrees that it was a surprise) shows just how capricious the High Court can be, if I may say so with very great respect to Their Honours. I am afraid that this capriciousness has increased in recent years. By the way, I hope I am speaking under Parliamentary privilege, because I may be before the court one day. I also speak with deference to Their Honours.

The Bill illustrates the wisdom of the stand that this side of the House took recently on the restrictive trade practices legislation. In these days we simply do not know precisely what the High Court will do and, unless there is a firm precedent, it is dangerous to act on an assumption or argument about what the court is likely to decide. In this case, because of an extraordinary decision made giving a right of sanctuary, as it were, on Commonwealth property similar to the sanctuary given in the early days in relation to churches and other holy places of that kind, we have had to take part in an extremely clumsy legislative scheme such as is embodied in this Bill.

We cannot do anything about the position: we must pass the Bill, otherwise the situation will be absurd. I think the Attorney-General has said in his explanation (if he did not, he would be of this opinion, anyway) that it is a jolly pity that the Commonwealth Government will not amend the Constitution and put the matter right that way. Of course, there is the practical difficulty about that that there would be another referendum, and I think members opposite are somewhat soured about referendums and perhaps that is a reason for waiting until other matters connected with amendment of the Constitution are ready to be dealt with, if ever that should happen, rather than conduct a referendum involving great expense and inconvenience on this matter alone. However, I consider that amendment of the Constitution is the only proper way, and certainly the most satisfactory way, to put right the situation with which we are confronted because of the High Court's decision.

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

MARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 24. Page 2963.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support the Bill. This measure deals with several matters which I know, from experience as a former Minister of Marine, the Director of Marine and Harbors was most anxious to bring up to date, but was unable to do so previously because of the time factor. This applies also to the Harbors Act Amendment Bill, the next item on the Notice Paper to be considered. These are peculiar Bills in so far as they have to be reserved for Her Majesty's assent,

because they relate to the requirements of the Merchant Shipping Act of the United Kingdom. This Bill redefines "vessel" to include a hovercraft or other air-cushion vessel that traverses any navigable waters within or adjacent to the State. Here, I remind members that the Murray River is regarded, under the Act, as part of the sea, so the provision will apply to the Murray River also.

When Minister of Marine, I had the pleasure of going down the Port River and out to sea in a hydrofoil, and it was a unique experience, however ill fated the enterprise concerned might have been. It is interesting to note that these vessels do not cause a wake to the extent that a normal vessel does, and that is why special regulations have been introduced from time to time in regard to the various harbours and ports of the State, as well as other parts of Australia. In addition, an air-cushion vessel or hovercraft is sometimes unpredictable: unless there are air jets fore and aft, this type of vessel is not easily steered and tends to sidle, with the result that certain restrictions must apply.

The Bill, which deals also with a fishing vessel, provides that before such a vessel can be built the plans therefor must be submitted to the Director of Marine and Harbors. I thoroughly concur in this provision, because unless a vessel is correctly built danger can occur, particularly when it gets out to sea. More important, too many people inadvertently build a boat to a certain design, which may be contained in a book that may come from America or other States but which does not comply with the regulations in this State. I support the provision that, before a design is approved and before construction can commence, the relevant plans must be submitted to the Director for his approval. However, I am not happy about an increase from $200 to $1,000 in the fine to be imposed in default of this provision. This affects the poor fisherman, and the provision is being inserted by a Government that is supposed to be espousing the cause of the fisherman. I suggest that the Government consider reducing this fine, and in Committee I will so move.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Fishing vessels."

Mr. COUMBE: I move:

In paragraph (*b*) to strike out "one thousand" and insert "five hundred".

I think the increase from the present fine of $200 to $1,000, particularly as it applies to fishing vessels, is out of proportion, although I agree that $200 is a little light. I suggest that $500 is a reasonable compromise. After all, fishermen today have many problems, as have members of the rural industry and other people in the community.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

HARBORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 3080.)

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I support the Bill. Our Party looked at this matter when we were in office. The provisions of this Bill are in line with those of the Marine Act Amendment Bill with which the House just dealt. The Bill includes within the definition of "vessel" hovercraft and other air-cushioned vehicles that are used in the course of navigation. I believe that the member for Torrens, when he was Minister, introduced certain regulations in connection with this measure. The Director of Marine and Harbors has experienced considerable problems in relation to the parking of vehicles on or near wharves under the control of the Minister. The Bill overcomes this problem by enabling the Governor to make regulations controlling parking around wharves.

Some difficulty has been experienced with regard to section 124 of the Act, which was affected by a High Court decision, and the Bill rightly makes clear that liability for damage done to property of the Minister is to be absolute except in the instances provided for. The Bill enables the Act to operate more efficiently, bringing it up to the standard necessary to deal with shipping matters. Clause 5 amends section 91 of the principal Act, which relates to the way the services of a pilot are to be requested. The amendment provides that the appropriate signals described under the international code are to be employed. Another amendment requires the master of a ship, when within 10 miles of a pilot-boarding station and intending to enter port, to maintain adequate communication in order to receive instructions from the port. The Bill also makes clear that references to tonnage in section 89 of the Act are references to gross tonnage and not to net tonnage.

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

KINGSWOOD RECREATION GROUND (VESTING) BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment:

Page 2 (clause 3)—After line 24 insert new subclause (3) as follows:

(3) Nothing in subsection (2) of this section shall be construed as limiting or restricting the power of the corporation, on and after the appointed day, to make arrangements, not inconsistent with the arrangements referred to in that subsection, to permit the use of the recreation ground by children attending any school, whether a public school or not, as a school playground or for the purposes of sport, recreation, physical culture or other activities.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

Clause 3 requires the Minister to protect the rights of existing users of the ground before he is prepared to fix the appointed day and vest the area in the Mitcham council. Once that protection is provided, there is nothing in the Bill to suggest that the Mitcham council is limited in any way. When existing users no longer wish to use the ground, the council would have full freedom in allotting the time made available in that way to some other organization. However, if the Legislative Council wishes to have this surplusage inserted, I see no reason to disagree.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: For once, the Minister has made a statesmanlike decision. I was afraid that the Bill, which is important to my constituents and, therefore, to me, would be held up over a trifle. However, it will not, because of the Government's agreement to the Legislative Council's amendment. I support the motion.

Motion carried.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 26. Page 3143.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I was in the middle of making an excellent speech when I was interrupted.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I am glad you said that, because no-one else would have.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Ryan): Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That interjection is not only out of order but is also uncharitable, Sir.

Mr. Clark: It was a good speech.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was, and I am glad to have the approbation of the member for Elizabeth. I reminded members previously of the way in which they suddenly changed their policy on an electoral matter some years ago. Having vigorously championed the cause of proportional representation in this House, having introduced motions on the matter and having spoken on and voted for it, members opposite suddenly decided that their policy was to be changed: they then hated proportional representation, and they have never raised it again. Indeed, they have opposed it when it has been suggested by anyone else, because they act in obedience to an outside body, which has changed their policy. I raise this point not to be unkind to my friends on the Government benches, as some of them (notably the Attorney-General, who is very young in this House) have been inclined to chide members on this side because many of us are seeing the virtues of a voluntary vote and voluntary enrolment for Parliamentary elections. I see no reason why we should not change our views with changing times in just the same way as members opposite are frightened to change their views because of what happened in another place.

Mr. Keneally: In the same way.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank heavens, not in the same way; we are free agents.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I obviously made that point effectively, judging by the difficulty you, Sir, are having in keeping order on the Government side. I intended to recite the various arguments for and against compulsory voting, but I will not do so, as they are all set out in an extract from the *Readings in Australian Government*, which I was able to obtain from the Parliamentary Library. Rather than go through all the arguments set out therein (and no new ones seem to have been raised) I suggest that honourable members read them. For your edification, Sir, 17 arguments are set out in favour of compulsory voting, the first of which (and, indeed, the only one that seems to have anything in it) is that democratic Government means majority rule and the expression of an opinion by a majority of electors. Only 10 arguments against compulsory voting are set out. Having looked through them, I think they outweigh in quality and persuasiveness the 17 arguments in favour of compulsory voting. The first is that compulsion cannot ensure a formal vote or an intelligent vote, and the second is that compulsory voting is an infringement of liberty, and so on. This publication contains a collection of all the arguments on this topic used in all the Australian Parliaments over the last half century, and I have heard nothing new in this place about this matter.

So long as the Government is in favour of compulsion, and so long as the numbers in this House remain as they are now—

Mr. Langley: They will go up.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Not on the results of the Senate election.

Mr. Langley: Ha, ha!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That was a very hollow laugh by the member for Unley. As I say, we will have compulsory voting for as long as the numbers are with the Government Party, unless that Party has one of its changes of heart as a result of what happens outside. However, I do not support (indeed, I oppose) the Bill that provides for a compulsory vote for Legislative Council elections. I think the least we can do is maintain the present arrangement, whereby we have a compulsory vote for the House of Assembly and a voluntary vote for the Upper House. That is one way in which there can be a fair and just differentiation between the franchises of the two Houses.

Mr. WELLS (Florey): Compulsory voting is absolutely essential if this State is to have a true expression of opinion of the people on matters with which the elected Government is to deal. I consider that every individual who is entitled to vote should vote and, if the individual is apathetic to the point where he will not exercise his franchise, he must be required to exercise it and so share with his fellow voters the responsibility for electing the Government.

The vote is precious. It was obtained after many years of struggle, and it cannot in any circumstances be considered merely as something to be exercised if a person's thinking or his will moves him to exercise it. The member for Mitcham said that the Government has seen fit to alter course or change its opinion on occasions. It is to the credit of the Government that it can be flexible and move along in the direction dictated by the requirements of good government in this State.

The Opposition Party in this House abruptly changed course and did an about face in respect of its opposition to full adult franchise for the Legislative Council. The Opposition Party was entirely opposed to any such procedure until, through the sagacity of its Leader and Deputy Leader in reading the mood of the people of this State about depriving from voting 15 per cent of the State's population who were eligible to vote, we saw an abrupt about face, and they now embrace the concept of full adult franchise.

The member for Flinders was extremely firm about wanting Legislative Council elections held not on a compulsory basis and on a day when no other election took place. He said that this was advantageous and the proper procedure to be adopted, but how different are the utterances of the members of the L.C.L. about the terrific thrashing that Party took at the recent Senate election! They blame that belting on the fact that the Senate election was held on a day other than a normal Commonwealth general election day. This has been stated as one of the reasons for the lamentable vote that the L.C.L. received at the recent Senate election.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you mean in South Australia?

Mr. WELLS: Yes, and I will make it Australia-wide, because it was the lowest vote received by the L.C.L. Party in a Senate election.

Mr. Millhouse: Have you had a chat with your Deputy Leader about this?

Mr. WELLS: I do not have to talk to my Deputy Leader to determine my opinion about an analysis of figures. I consider that the unmerciful thrashing that the L.C.L. received was not received because the Senate election was held on a day other than a general Commonwealth election day, although Commonwealth leaders of the L.C.L. have said it was.

Mr. Millhouse: I think you may find that your Deputy Leader has a different view.

Mr. WELLS: I am not here to state anyone else's opinion: I am here to state my opinion.

Mr. Rodda: What's your opinion about Millicent and Chaffey?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WELLS: I will ignore the interjections, but I am willing to discuss that matter with the member for Victoria in another place. The member for Flinders quoted the shopping hours referendum as an example of voting. He said that people voted to retain the *status quo* on shopping hours and that the Government should have acceded to the request of the people. I say he is entirely wrong. The vote was compulsory, a majority of the people voted "No", and this decision has been implemented. The L.C.L. does not want compulsory voting. That Party prefers to encourage apathy among the voters and it knows that, unfortunately, our voters are inclined to be apathetic about going to the polls. This is factual. L.C.L. members want to encourage a situation in which a person is not required to attend the polling booth to record a vote, because they consider that in these circumstances they would have an advantage.

Mr. Venning: You want it the other way.

Mr. WELLS: I want every person entitled to vote to cast a vote. The Opposition fears the combined voice of the people, so it desires to fragment the voting rights of the people. This is an endeavour to enforce—

Mr. Rodda: Do you believe in the secret ballot?

Mr. WELLS: Yes, I do.

Mr. Rodda: In union elections?

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. WELLS: I do believe in that. Secret ballots in unions are conducted as strictly as are any State elections or Commonwealth elections. Unfortunately, many Opposition members would not know this. The frantic effort to reduce the State to a position where we have voluntary voting is an endeavour to preserve a position of privilege in another place for certain people.

Mr. Millhouse: Come off it!

Mr. WELLS: That is correct: during a speech on this Bill, we were accused by the member for Mitcham of making uncomplimentary and embarrassing statements about people in the other place. That is not my object, and I know it is not the Government's object. We do not intend to embarrass anyone sitting in another place, but we intend to embarrass not only the people sitting there but those in this Chamber in respect of the operation of the present system. If we are to see true democracy prevail (and the word "democracy" seems to amuse members opposite), we will ensure that we have compulsory voting in all its aspects concerning the political situation in this State, where every person entitled to vote will be required to live up to his or her responsibility and cast a vote compulsorily, so that we will know that we have a true expression of opinion and of the desire of the people of this State in respect of the matter before them. I can see no objection to implementing compulsory voting for Legislative Council elections, and I support the Bill.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): The Minister, in his second reading explanation, stated that one of the aims of this Bill was a simple method of enrolling House of Assembly electors for elections for the Legislative Council. That was a nice smokescreen, because he then said that he wanted compulsory voting for both Houses. A few minutes ago we were accused by my good friend from Florey, in his usual form, of turning tail. A week or so ago I supported full franchise for both Houses and voted accordingly, as did my Deputy Leader and my Leader, on the basis that everyone entitled to vote for the House of Assembly should be entitled to vote for the Upper House but that voting for the Upper House should be voluntary. We crossed the floor to vote on that occasion.

The member for Florey was not a member in the last Parliament, so he would not know better, but he had the audacity to say that we had changed our mind. I remind him (and if he does not believe me he can ask his colleague from Mount Gambier, who is a wise and learned gentleman with a long memory, or he can refer to *Hansard*) that the same members to whom I referred crossed the floor last year on the same principle. We are not turncoats nor have we suddenly changed our principles. I oppose compulsory voting for the Upper House. The member for Florey said, amongst other things, when speaking about his union activities and secret ballots (with which I fully agree) that everyone entitled to vote must be required to exercise his vote. In other words, he should have no choice: just like the A.L.P. has no choice.

I wonder how far this Government will go in relation to compulsory voting. Compulsory voting is provided for in this Bill, and the Minister of Local Government has already indicated that he will introduce a Bill to provide for compulsory voting in council elections. That suggestion is running into much trouble throughout the State. It was interesting to hear the member for Florey upholding his union views (with which I agree), but he did not say why the Government of which he is a member and which wants to make everything compulsory has not used compulsory voting at union elections although it wishes to have it for Parliamentary elections. Why is it that in many unions there is no compulsory ballot before a strike?

Mr. Langley: That is an entirely different thing, and you know it.

Mr. COUMBE: When it suits the Government it is all right but, when it does not suit it, it is a different thing. This Bill means that everyone in future will have to do what the A.L.P. wants him to do. In other words, the A.L.P. is now presenting to the House a law of compulsion. Under this legislation, a person shall vote: if he does not he will be fined.

The Hon. L. J. King: This has been going on for a long time, you know.

Mr. Langley: What did you do when you were in Government?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. COUMBE: We did not introduce compulsory voting for the Upper House and we did not introduce an abortive referendum on shopping hours that caused much resentment—

Mr. Langley: You did nothing about that matter.

Mr. COUMBE: —among people living on the fringe areas, and caused much embarrassment to members of the Labor Party representing those areas.

The Hon. L. J. King: You were sitting on a volcano.

Mr. COUMBE: The volcano has already erupted in the A.L.P., and the lava will flow and the result seen at the next State election. The Attorney-General has said that he has introduced a Bill which, among other things, provides that electors who are entitled to enrol for the House of Assembly elections can vote for Legislative Council elections and that voting shall be compulsory. Boiled down, that is what it means. I have already said that members of my Party believe that for the Upper House there should be an adult franchise but that voting should be voluntary, and we have at least twice crossed the floor to prove this point. I believe firmly, as a democrat and as a Liberal, that there is a certain amount of freedom in this country and that it is our job as an Opposition to preserve that freedom which, day by day, is being whittled away, whether it be in this place or outside.

It is one of the jobs of Her Majesty's Opposition to see that the liberties of the minorities of this State are preserved and that whatever liberties and freedoms we have are maintained. That is why we are opposing this Bill, which seeks to introduce compulsion. It is an A.L.P. Bill fully in accord with that Party's platform, enunciated at the last State election, which provides that voting shall be compulsory. We are asked to vote on a law of compulsion, and I voice as vehemently as I can my repugnance of the measure.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): In supporting the Bill, I commend the member for Florey on the lucid and strong way in which he put the arguments in support of it. I believe it is an elementary principle that democratic Government means majority rule and that the expression of opinion of a small minority can never gain us a true democracy. The recent Midland by-election showed us how few people who were entitled to vote were prepared to do so. There were several reasons for this, one reason being the little esteem that people in the community have of Parliament as a whole: I refer here to both Houses of Parliament. That was evident to me as I mixed with people before and during that by-election. Many of them knew that they were entitled to vote and, although they lived close to the polling booth, they were not prepared to stir themselves to exercise their vote, because they held Parliament in no esteem.

There was another group which, through sheer apathy, without even holding an opinion of Parliament, good or bad, just could not be bothered with voting. There was a further group, not in the group that held Parliament in low esteem and not in the apathetic group, which took no interest in the life of the community and which was not prepared to involve itself in the issues in the poll because there have been far too many elections. As the member for Florey has said, the franchise has been hard fought for, and I can see no reason why it should not be exercised, and exercised under compulsion, if one cares to put it as bluntly as that. That is the way we are doing it. This duty to vote is analogous to many other duties that are imposed on citizens in our community, and I see little difference between this duty and duties such as jury service and giving evidence under subpoena. as well as various other legal duties imposed on people. People are compelled to do these things whether they like it or not. Many of them strongly object to jury service and giving evidence under subpoena, but they have no choice, and I consider that there is a good analogy here.

The turn-out figures for the various Legislatures in which there is voluntary voting support my argument that, in order to get a true democratic expression of opinion, there must be compulsory voting. In the Midland by-election only 20 per cent of the people in most districts who were entitled to vote bothered to vote, and that bears out the percentages relating to other countries and other States where voting is voluntary. It should be pointed out to members opposite that voluntary voting remains in only two Parliaments in this Commonwealth, that is, the Upper House of New South Wales and the Upper House of this State, the Lower Houses of all the States having compulsory voting. Queensland has had the good sense to abolish the Upper House altogether. I consider that the principle of uniformity can apply here: people are confused about their rights to vote, particularly people in the district I represent in which in the last seven months there have been several polls. We have had a local government poll,

the State election, followed by a Midland by-election, a referendum and a Senate election, some of them involving voluntary voting and some involving compulsory voting.

There seemed to be no rhyme or reason why some voting was voluntary and some compulsory, and this confused people no end and led to some degree to the rather large percentage of informal votes at the last two polls, namely, the referendum and the Senate election. People who had been told strongly that in the Upper House by-election there was no compulsory voting tended to carry that thought on to the referendum and then to the Senate election.

It seems to me that there is some relationship between compulsory voting and the quality of the Legislature we elect. For example, it seems to me to follow that, because such a minority elects the Upper House in this State, that in itself is a good explanation for the appalling quality of that place. The appalling nature of the notions it expounds, to my mind, is explained to some degree by the small minority of people who elect it.

The House that can afford to have its leader say that it represents the permanent will of the people is an extraordinary House indeed, and only a House that was seeking and demanding life tenure (and probably already has life tenure under the existing system) could afford to have a leader who could make a statement such as that.

I think that, while the current system is retained, we will have more demands from that House, which regards itself as a House of Lords and which may well turn back the hands of time and demand all the old prerogatives once enjoyed by the House of Lords. Recently, one of the members of that place said that it was the House of the family vote. Bearing in mind the few families that could have figured in the election of those persons, I submit that some families must be more equal than others. That would seem to me to follow as a matter of course. This low quality of Legislature that is produced by the system of voluntary voting is one of the strong reasons that prompts me to seek compulsory voting. I can see no reason why the people in our State, who are compelled to vote for the Lower House, should not also be compelled to vote for the Upper House.

People in this State ought to have a reasonable say under a reasonable system that they can understand. People are confused by our admittedly complex Commonwealth and State elctoral system and Constitutions. We have a most substandard Upper House being imposed on a majority by a very small minority. It is the low quality of that Legislature which prompts me to support the Bill. If we have compulsory voting we may be able to elevate the quality of that Chamber by making its members face up to the voters as a whole. It is always surprising to me that measures of this kind are regarded with such anger by members opposite and particularly by their colleagues in another place. I can only assume that the reason for this must be that these people have something to fear, and the only thing that I can assume that they have to fear is their own position in Parliament. I agree that they should hold that fear because, if there were a full franchise and a fair vote for the Upper House, Liberal members there would suffer a similar fate to that suffered by their former colleagues in this House.

Mr. Gunn: You should look after yourself.

Mr. McRAE: We do have to look after ourselves because we must face up to a majority of the voters with a fair franchise and a compulsory vote. Win or lose, we can say that the result is fair. As the honourable member's colleagues do not have to face up to that situation, they are afraid of measures such as this. They oppose them not because there is anything inherently wrong with them and not because any great logic can be put against them, but merely because the current situation enables those members to hold their position of power which is given them by a small minority and to which they desperately cling in order to ensure that the will of the Conservative minority will be imposed on the people of the State for as long as possible. Therefore, it is with great emphasis that I support the Bill and look forward to the day when, instead of having the permanent will of the Upper House imposed on us like a dictatorship, the State can be a true democracy.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I speak against this further dose of Socialism. Compulsory voting is the catch cry. I am fed up with it; the people in my district are fed up with it; and most South Australians are fed up with it. In explaining the Bill, the Attorney-General said that it provided a simple method of enrolling House of Assembly electors as Legislative Council electors under the Act and provided a simple method of compulsory voting for the Upper House. I agree that compulsory voting is the simple method. I also agree with the Attorney-General that people have a moral obligation to vote at an election. The policy of compulsion exposed by members opposite

is one to be feared. If a person does not vote he is punished by a fine of $8 or $10. One wonders why members opposite are so adamant on this line, and the answer is that they are after their ultimate goal, which is the abolition of the Upper House. Several members opposite have openly stated that it is their policy, and it is in their little black book.

Mr. Ryan: It isn't black.

Mr. MATHWIN: I meant that figuratively because I know that it has a little white in it. I have the latest 50c issue.

Mr. Wells: Who'll read it for you?

Mr. MATHWIN: It will not be you. The member for Florey referred to the terrific bashing the L.C.L. received at the last election. Perhaps he would be interested in a report on the results of the recent Senate election which showed that, apart from an outright defeat predicted for the Minister of Works, other Labor seats were hard hit. The Minister of Education's support was slashed by 10 per cent and the Attorney-General suffered an 8 per cent slash. The Minister of Labour and Industry (or the junior Minister as he is known in this Chamber) had his support cut by 10 per cent and even the Premier had an 8 per cent slash.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MATHWIN: I know this has upset members opposite. I did not really want to give them this news, as it is rather late and I had decided that I would speak quietly and slowly, not disturbing them. Members opposite believe in compulsory voting because of the apathy of their followers. Followers of the Labor Party only vote under compulsion and that is why that Party is so adamant that there must be a compulsory vote. The voluntary vote for the Midland by-election showed without any shadow of doubt that L.C.L. voters take the opportunity to vote. The member for Florey referred to democracy, but to me the Government's idea of democracy is democracy by compulsion: it would force people to the polls, making them like democracy whether they wanted to like it or not.

Mr. Crimes: They can still vote the way they want to.

Mr. MATHWIN: That reminds me that the member for Mawson, who sits next to the member for Spence, said last Thursday that it was a good idea that people should be compelled to vote because, although they could be made to go to the polls, they did not have to vote. He said that, when they got to the polls, they could write rude words on the ballot-paper.

Mr. Ryan: Only Liberals do that.

Mr. MATHWIN: That is not true: I know differently. If people were to vote as suggested by the member for Mawson they would register an idiot vote, and I do not think any Party would desire that type of vote. On the other hand, we must be prepared to acknowledge that some members of Parliament would receive votes whether they were idiot votes or not.

Mr. Hopgood: Even if you drove them to the polls they might still cast idiot votes.

Mr. MATHWIN: I would not mind if they voted against me: I would still take the chance. If this Government has the opportunity it will introduce compulsory voting at local government elections. In local government all candidates must work hard and prove themselves to be decent, hard-working individuals; otherwise, they will not be voted for. The member for Playford, having said that there must be a compulsory vote, pointed out how many States had voluntary voting. He said that two Houses in Australia had compulsory voting: the Upper Houses in South Australia and, I think, in New South Wales. It is a pity that he did not put this matter on a world-wide basis and say how many countries have voluntary and how many have compulsory voting. In this respect I shall refer to the free world, in which very few countries have compulsory voting. Indeed, there are only 10, five of which are South American countries, and all members know what has happened in many of those. Another country named in the list of 10 is Spain, which has a dictatorship, so members can forget Spain. Russia is not named, although all members know that it has compulsory voting. In that country one is allowed to vote at the age of 17 or 18 years. However, all members know that in Russia the voter has only one candidate and that, if the elector does not vote, he is in real trouble.

The Hon. L. J. King: That's a similar system to our Legislative Council.

Mr. MATHWIN: That is a ridiculous statement, coming as it does from the Attorney-General.

The Hon. L. J. King: There are 16 Liberal and Country League members to four Labor members in the Legislative Council.

Mr. MATHWIN: The honourable Minister should not try to blind me with science. I ask why this Government takes Russia as an example.

Mr. Hopgood: You're as bad as the member for Eyre.

Mr. MATHWIN: As long as I am not as bad as the member for Mawson I shall be satisfied. Why does the Government use Russia as an example? I oppose the Bill, and I will support an amendment regarding voluntary voting for 18 years old. I also oppose compulsory voting for the Legislative Council.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): This evening we have heard some remarkable speeches from members opposite regarding adult franchise for the Legislative Council. Government members have listened to the hysterical outburst from across the Chamber. Why has this outburst occurred? It has occurred because of the electoral setback that the Opposition has received in this State under a system which was initiated in this State a little over 100 years ago and which it wants to perpetuate. Members opposite are making a last-ditch stand in the hope that the day will come when they will lose their handsome majority of 12 in the Legislative Council. They want to perpetuate that majority for all time. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

CITRUS INDUSTRY ORGANIZATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Citrus Organization Committee of South Australia was formed to administer the Citrus Industry Organization Act, 1965, with the objective of improving the economic stability of the citrus industry within South Australia. Pursuant to the Act, the Minister of Agriculture appointed the first committee in March, 1966. After its appointment, the committee proceeded with the development of the Citrus Organization Committee as an industry organization, using the recommendations of the 1965 committee of inquiry report as a guide. Subcommittees were established to consider such matters as quality control, packing, processing, crop estimation and production statistics, public relations, and finance.

The committee considered a policy in relation to the marketing of fresh citrus fruit and concluded that this could be most effectively controlled by the establishment of a central marketing authoriy. There were two alternatives available to the committee, namely, marketing to be carried out by a division of the committee itself, or by delegation of certain of its powers under section 21 of the Act to a subsidiary marketing company. The latter course was adopted, South Australian Citrus Sales Proprietary Limited was formed, and the following powers and functions were delegated, enabling it to (*a*) undertake or arrange for the marketing of citrus fruit, (*b*) regulate and control the delivery and sale of citrus fruit by growers to any licensee or other person nominated by the Citrus Organization Committee, (*c*) arrange for the export of citrus fruits from the State, (*d*) by means of advertising or other appropriate means, take steps the company thought fit to encourage the consumption of citrus fruit and to create a greater demand, and (*e*) make arrangements with any marketing authorities of citrus fruit (either within or without South Australia) for the transport, storing and handling of citrus fruit and for the sale or other disposal thereof.

The company assumed its delegated powers and functions on July 4, 1966. South Australian Citrus Sales Proprietary Limited has eight shares, seven of which are held by the Citrus Organization Committee and one by Murray Citrus Growers Co-operative Association (Australia) Limited. The original board of South Australian Citrus Sales Proprietary Limited comprised three members representing Murray Citrus Growers Co-operative Association (Australia) Limited, and two members representing the Citrus Organization Committee. In June, 1967, South Australian Citrus Sales Proprietary Limited was reorganized and proceeded to undertake the marketing function in its own right. Membership of the board was changed and has since comprised all members of the Citrus Organization Committee together with one member representing Murray Citrus Growers Co-operative Association (Australia) Limited. The Executive Officer of the Citrus Organization Committee was, by virtue of his office, appointed General Manager of the company; the company's office was transferred from Adelaide to Kent Town and the marketing staff formerly employed by Murray Citrus Growers Co-operative Association (Australia) Limited was taken over.

Before the introduction of the Citrus Organization Committee, marketing of South Australian fresh citrus fruit within Australia was chaotic. The 1965 committee of inquiry pointed out that increased direct selling by growers and packers, bypassing the terminal market in South Australia, caused prices to collapse. The more lucrative interstate markets in Melbourne and Sydney became unprofitable because they were over-supplied with

lower quality fruit, particularly export overrun. However, export markets were serviced successfully under the voluntary supervision of Murray Citrus Growers Co-operative Association (Australia) Limited, which sold fruit under its "Riverland" trade mark.

Under the provisions of the Act, regulations and marketing orders, the Citrus Organization Committee adopted a policy which favoured the recognized principles of orderly marketing of citrus fruit. All growers are required to deliver fruit to licensed packers and no grower is permitted to sell fruit to any person other than the Citrus Organization Committee. South Australian Citrus Sales Proprietary Limited, as agent of the Citrus Organization Committee, endeavours to place fruit to the best advantage through terminal markets in capital cities, whilst export is carried on by itself or by accredited agents. The "Riverland" trade mark is used in its marketing operations.

The effectiveness of South Australian Citrus Sales Proprietary Limited in the marketing field is hampered by section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution, which provides that trade between the various States shall be free. The bulk of South Australian fresh citrus fruit production is sold on interstate and oversea markets; 10 per cent or less of total production is consumed within the State. The Act and regulations are effective only to control the disposal of fruit produced and sold within South Australia. There is no power either to control the importation of fruit from other States into South Australia or fruit from South Australia marketed interstate or overseas. To be effective South Australian Citrus Sales Proprietary Limited must rely heavily upon voluntary support and co-operation from growers and packers to maintain orderly marketing on Australian and export markets.

South Australian Citrus Sales Proprietary Limited maintains a market manager to co-ordinate supplies from producing areas to merchants in the Adelaide wholesale market. Supplies for country areas are arranged outside the wholesale market by Associated Citrus Distributors Proprietary Limited, a company formed for the purpose of distributing citrus in bulk form. All fruit is supplied to merchants and Associated Citrus Distributors Proprietary Limited against their orders. Merchants operate in the normal manner, making sales to retailers on a commission basis. Minimum wholesale selling prices are fixed by South Australian Citrus Sales Proprietary Limited and the wholesale sellers are required to obtain these prices. The quantity of fruit handled by each wholesale seller is governed by his ability to sell at minimum prices or better.

The introduction of legislation to control marketing in South Australia was effective in the early stages. Hawking of inferior fruit was severely curtailed and supplies were directed through controlled terminal market outlets. Average prices and volume distributed increased in this period. However, the situation has deteriorated again due to the following factors: (*a*) a heavy increase in the volume of the crop; (*b*) the influx of fruit from interstate, particularly Mildura, in an endeavour to take advantage of Adelaide market situation; (*c*) increases in the volume of fruit being sold through illegal channels outside the terminal markets; and (*d*) a claimed increase in "backyard" production in the metropolitan area.

The export of citrus fruit to interstate markets has increased somewhat over the last few years but is subject to fluctuation in demand and consequently in prices. The export of citrus fruit overseas has been expanded but is likely to be confronted with increasing difficulties due to increasing production in the recipient countries. The foregoing gives a little idea of some of the problems with which a marketing organization is confronted. Unfortunately, the Citrus Organization Committee has not proved to be an effective marketing organization. Acute differences of opinion have arisen within the committee.

It is clear that sectional and personal interests have been pursued at the expense of the best interests of the industry and of those people engaged in it. The stage has now been reached where uncertainty prevails in practically every area; growers and packers and other interests are confused, and there is a serious lack of direction and confidence in the industry. It is an unfortunate fact that internecine strife in both the Citrus Organization Committee and the board of South Australian Citrus Sales Proprietary Limited has diverted effort from the functions for which both of these organizations were set up. It is significant that during the short lifetime of the Citrus Organization Committee and South Australian Citrus Sales Proprietary Limited, no fewer than 15 persons have served on the committee and the board and only one of those persons has served continuously. As a consequence, action has not been taken to develop and institute marketing policies designed to cope with the substantially

increased production which has occurred and which was forecast in 1965.

Neither the Citrus Organization Committee nor the board of South Australian Citrus Sales Proprietary Limited seems to have realized that concepts of marketing were changing and that policies needed to be changed to meet this situation. If either the committee or the board realized these facts, it is quite clear that they did not act in the manner, or with the vigor and initiative, which might have been expected. From discussions with growers it is quite clear that there is great confusion among them regarding the organization of the Citrus Organization Committee, and its association with South Australian Citrus Sales Proprietary Limited. It seems to be generally understood that South Australian Citrus Sales Proprietary Limited is a body quite separate from the Citrus Organization Committee, rather than a subsidiary marketing company controlled by the Citrus Organization Committee. South Australian Citrus Sales Proprietary Limited has become the dominant force in the organization rather than acting in its intended role as a marketing subsidiary subject to the policies determined by the Citrus Organization Committee.

Growers generally appear to believe that the recommendations of the 1965 committee of inquiry are still valid, at least those growers who have read the report, and it is, perhaps, surprising to find that these are in the minority. In the circumstances, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the industry accepted the 1965 report and considered that this would be the answer to all its problems; not realizing that the mere passing of an Act and the setting up of a committee was only the beginning and that the utmost goodwill and effort by all sections was required for the successful operation of the scheme.

Although the Citrus Organization Committee has only been established for about 4½ years, the divisions of opinion at committee level have brought about divisions within the industry. As a consequence there are now several independent groups within the South Australian citrus industry which are independently marketing, or have indicated that they intend to independently market, citrus fruit, both within Australia and overseas. Under existing circumstances and policies there appears to be little possibility of these groups being prepared to once again form part of an overall industry organization, and this fact must be accepted.

It surely would have been reasonable for the Citrus Organization Committee and the board of South Australian Citrus Sales Proprietary Limited to have appreciated that section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution limited their legal control over the industry. It has always been quite clear that growers and packers could avoid statutory control by marketing interstate. Instead of accepting this position, the Citrus Organization Committee and, more particularly, South Australian Citrus Sales Proprietary Limited have pursued or endeavoured to pursue legal means of control, knowing full well that these could not be sustained, rather than adopting flexible marketing policies, providing a high level of performance in marketing and seeking the co-operation of all sections of the industry.

There has been a tendency in some quarters to blame the staff of the Citrus Organization Committee and South Australian Citrus Sales Proprietary Limited for the situation which has developed. However, it must be accepted that the responsibility lies with the Citrus Organization Committee and the board of South Australian Citrus Sales Proprietary Limited, as they have not provided the leadership which the industry required, nor have they developed consistent and imaginative marketing policies for the staff to pursue. Members will realize that the major part of this second reading explanation is based on the report of the Director of Lands (Mr. Dunsford), who inquired into the citrus industry.

The purpose of the present Bill is to reconstitute the Citrus Organization Committee. The Government considers that the Citrus Organization Committee in its reconstituted form will be able to co-ordinate and control effectively interstate and overseas marketing of citrus and sales of fruit to processors for the benefit of the industry in general, and of growers in particular. However, I emphasize that the successful functioning of the committee and the fulfilment of its proper role in the marketing of citrus fruits depend entirely on the support it receives from the industry. The Government urges all growers to market their product through the statutory organization, the continuation of which the large majority of growers appear to favour. Expressed in simple terms, if the industry wants orderly marketing, it must be prepared to support it and accept the obligations as well as the advantages of the system.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows: Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the Act shall come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 amends

the definition of "representative member" and strikes out various definitions relating to zoning. Under the provisions of the Bill any election for representative members will be made by the whole body of registered growers. Clause 4 is the major provision of the principal Act. It strikes out the present provisions of section 9 relating to the constitution of the committee and provides that upon the commencement of the amending Act the members of the committee then in office shall vacate their positions and the committee shall thereafter consist of five members appointed by the Governor of whom one shall be a chairman appointed by the Governor; two shall be persons initially appointed by the Governor to represent the interests of growers, and after the expiry of the term of the initial members these shall be appointed by the Governor after election by registered growers; and two shall be persons who in the opinion of the Governor have extensive knowledge of and experience in marketing.

Clause 5 repeals section 10 of the principal Act. This section related to the initial constitution of the Citrus Organization Committee. It has achieved its purpose and is now no longer necessary. Clause 6 amends section 11 of the principal Act, this section dealing with the election of representative members. The amendment provides that the representative members appointed first after the commencement of the amending Act shall hold office for a term of two years. Thereafter the representative members shall be elected by the whole body of registered growers. A provision is inserted allowing the Governor to cancel the nomination of any candidate for election as a representative member if, in the opinion of the Governor, that nominee has commercial interests that may prevent him from impartially representing the whole body of registered growers. Clause 7 makes consequential amendments to section 13 of the principal Act.

Clause 8 provides for elected representative members to hold office for terms of three years. Clause 9 amends section 15 of the principal Act. The amendment provides that the office of a representative member shall become vacant if he acquires commercial interests that may, in the opinion of the Governor, prevent him from impartially representing the whole body of registered growers. Clause 10 amends section 17 of the principal Act. In view of the reduction in the number of members of the committee, the number necessary to constitute a quorum is reduced from four to three. Clause 11 inserts new section 23a in the principal Act. This new section enables the committee to borrow moneys for the purposes of the Act upon such security as the committee thinks fit. The Treasurer is empowered to guarantee the repayment of any moneys borrowed by the committee under the new section.

Mr. NANKIVELL secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.42 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, December 2, at 2 p.m.