

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, October 12, 1965.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. L. H. Densley) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

MENTAL HEALTH CENTRES.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: When speaking on the Public Purposes Loan Bill I referred to the construction of the two mental health centres—Srathmont and Elanora—and mentioned the time in which the institutions would have to be completed to attract the Commonwealth subsidy. Since then I have been informed that there is no provision in this year's Estimates. Will the Minister of Health say when these two centres, which were recommended by the Public Works Committee at a cost of £6,000,000, will be commenced and whether the Government expects to be able to complete these buildings in the specified time so as to obtain the Commonwealth subsidy of one-third of the cost? I understand that they must be completed by June, 1967, so that the subsidy can be obtained.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I could give a reply off-hand but, as this is an important question and I should like to be factual and correct, I would prefer to give a considered reply if the Leader would ask his question again tomorrow.

RURAL YOUTH MOVEMENT.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of September 30 about salaries for Rural Youth Movement officers?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. My colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, informs me that the Senior Adviser is in a special salary bracket for diplomate officers occupying senior advisory positions in the department. Senior advisers in the graduate classes (II and III) receive a higher salary than diplomates and this is in accordance with established Public Service practice. When the salary structure of the department was reorganized last year, two or three diplomate officers who had been performing technical and advisory duties of professional status were classified with graduates in the professional groups, but it is not proposed to appoint non-graduates to these positions in the future.

The Senior Adviser (Rural Youth) is, therefore, classified on a similar salary range to that of other diplomates performing equivalent work. The salary and status of other officers in the Rural Youth Section are at present under discussion with the Public Service Commissioner. There is only one vacancy in this section and a recommendation for an appointment has already been made to the Public Service Commissioner. The Rural Youth Council has made a recommendation to the Minister of Agriculture that additional officers be appointed to assist with the organization of this valuable movement. The possibility of meeting this request is being considered against the availability of funds for the current financial year.

SCIENTOLOGY.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Much publicity has been given in the press of South Australia to the Anderson Report on Scientology in Victoria. It is understood that, shortly, legislation is being introduced in Victoria banning scientology and setting up a registration board for psychologists. Before any legislation of this nature can be fully effective, I believe it is necessary to have complementary legislation in the other States of Australia. In view of the very serious nature of the Anderson Report, can the Minister of Health say whether the Government intends introducing such legislation in South Australia?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It has been discussed by Cabinet. No decision has been reached, as yet, whether the Government intends to introduce legislation covering scientology within the State, but I know that my colleague the Attorney-General is making inquiries into the organization of scientology within this State and, when he is ready, he will submit a report to Cabinet; then Cabinet will further consider whether or not it is necessary to introduce legislation to control scientology within the State.

PORT PIRIE RACECOURSE LAND REVESTMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to invest in the Crown a piece of land comprising two acres vested in the Port Pirie Trotting and Racing Club Incorporated

under the Port Pirie Racecourse Site Act, 1946, so that the portion so vested can be dedicated under the Crown Lands Act for education purposes and used by the Port Pirie High School as an extension to the school's playing fields. Honourable members may recall that in 1960 a special Act was passed to enable an area to be made available by the Port Pirie Trotting and Racing Club for extension to the Port Pirie High School playing grounds. The club has indicated that it is willing to make available the additional area the subject of the present Bill. The Director of Education has reported that the land in question would be a welcome addition to the present playing area. This Bill accordingly provides for the vesting of the land in question in the Crown. Clause 3 contains the appropriate interpretations.

Clause 4 provides that on and after the commencement of this Bill the land will cease to be vested in the club, revert to the Crown and become Crown land. Clause 5 provides that the principal Act, namely, the Port Pirie Racecourse Site Act, 1946, shall so far as applicable continue to apply to the remaining portion of the land vested in the club by virtue of that Act. Clause 6 authorizes the Registrar-General to take appropriate steps to give effect to the Bill and the Schedules comprise a plan and description of the land concerned. When the Bill becomes law action will be taken under the Crown Lands Act to dedicate the land for educational purposes.

The Bill is, in substance, identical with the Act passed in 1960. The Education Department is anxious to obtain this land and I should appreciate the comments of honourable members on the measure.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

VETERINARY SURGEONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to amend the Veterinary Surgeons Act, 1935-1957. One of the main reasons for amending the Act is to provide for more comprehensive control over advertising and merchandising by members of the veterinary profession. This is sought by the profession itself as a measure of self-discipline. This amendment appears in clause 15, which amends section 34 of the principal Act by providing

for regulations to be made prescribing a code of professional conduct in the same terms as are embodied in legislation regulating the conduct of other professional groups, such as dentists.

Clause 5 amends section 21 of the principal Act and provides that no person shall be registered as a veterinary surgeon until he has paid the appropriate fee or, in the case of renewal, a renewal fee. This clause facilitates collection of fees. Clauses 4, 6 and 10 confer power on the Veterinary Surgeons Board to prescribe the fee to be paid in respect of registration rather than lay down a set fee as at present. By clause 8, which amends section 25 of the principal Act, the board will have power to cancel or suspend the registration of any veterinary surgeon who has become incapable of practising as such owing to mental or physical infirmity. This clause, like clauses 13 and 15, is designed to strengthen the authority of the board and improve ethical standards in the profession.

Clause 9, amending section 28(a), and clause 11, amending section 28(c), confer wider discretionary powers on the board as regards issue of permits to enable the interim registration of permit holders to treat sick and injured animals where no qualified veterinary surgeons are available. At the same time these provisions enable the board to encourage the establishment of qualified veterinary surgeons in all country areas of the State where livestock populations are capable of supporting a full-time qualified service. It is in this connection to be noted that South Australia is the only State that permits registration of unqualified persons. By clause 12 the penalties in sections 29, 30, 30a and 31 of the principal Act are increased from £50 to £100. The reason for this increase is to bring the penalties into line with changing money values. By clause 13, section 30 of the principal Act is extended so as to make it an offence for the holders of permits to cause themselves to advertise or hold themselves out as veterinary surgeons, etc. At present the section makes it an offence only if a person himself advertises and does not extend to the situation where, for example, another advertises on his behalf.

Clause 14 is intended to limit the scope of section 31a(1) to the extent that an unregistered person may not advertise himself as qualified to castrate, etc. dogs and cats though he may castrate, etc. other animals. The clause also amends section 31a(2) by providing that any person so treating any animal must not claim reimbursement of

any expenses incurred for such treatment. Experience has shown that unregistered persons have been avoiding the provisions of the section that no fee or reward must be charged by claiming reimbursement of expenses incurred in the treatment. It was the intention of the section that no remuneration whatsoever should be received for such treatment. Clause 15, in addition to making provisions for making regulations for prescribing a code of professional conduct, increases the penalty that can be prescribed for a breach of the regulations from £10 to £100. The reason for this increase is like clause 12, to bring the penalty provision into line with present-day money values. The other amendments are of a minor nature and are designed to remove anomalies and outdated features in the Act, and to improve the administration of the Act.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

HIDE, SKIN AND WOOL DEALERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to provide stricter control over the activities of certain itinerant hide, skin and wool dealers. Experience has shown that there are dishonest itinerant dealers who take advantage of the absence of the farmer or stockowner from his premises to take and carry away his hides, skins or wool for purposes of sale. They return later to the farmer or stockowner and give him a price for the hides, skins or wool which is often well below their true worth. There are occasions when such unauthorized taking and selling of these goods would come within the purview of the criminal law, as, for example, when a theft can be proven. It is felt, however, that resort to the criminal law does not always meet the circumstances of the case. It is, therefore, proposed that these amendments to the Hide, Skin and Wool Dealers Act, 1915-1959, which have been agreed to in consultation with the Police Department, are designed to give protection to owners who have hides, skins and wool to sell, as well as to honest dealers who may buy such goods for cash only to discover that they are subject to a lien and not therefore the property of the seller. In addition, this legislation would go some way to reduce the activities of dishonest itinerant dealers (and consequent losses to farmers and stock owners) and at the same time it would preserve

the position of honest itinerant dealers who have a standing arrangement with the stockowner to collect any of his hides, skins or wool.

Clause 3 provides that persons licensed under the Act who buy or receive into their possession any hides, skins or wool shall record the particulars of the transaction in a record book and cause the entry to be signed by the owner (or his agent). Subclause (1) thereof so provides. By subclauses (2) and (3), any person who fails to comply with the foregoing provisions or makes false entries in his record book or signs any defective entry commits an offence under the Act. Provision is made under section 12b for the owner of any hides, skins and wool to confer a written authority upon a licensee to buy or receive his hides, skins or wool. When such licensee has such written authority he would be obliged to record the particulars of any transaction made under this authority in the record book but would not be required to obtain the signature of the owner to such entry. This would safeguard the position of itinerant dealers with whom the stockowner, etc. has a standing arrangement to collect his hides, skins or wool.

The Hon. L. R. HART secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 6. Page 1951.)

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): I think I can say at the outset on behalf of all members of my Party that we have appreciated the speech given by the Chief Secretary in explaining the Bill. This is the first Appropriation Bill that he has handled, and we are glad that he has given us a detailed explanation of the expenditure. I thank him, too, for giving me the privilege of an adjournment over the weekend to examine the Bill. Unfortunately, of course, it was a long holiday weekend and I, like others, was not engaged in studying Bills. However, that was more a misfortune than something over which this Council had any control. The Bill has been examined in another place, whose duty it is to handle financial measures in Parliament. I know there is always a deadline for passing an Appropriation Bill, as Supplementary Estimates are passed to enable the Government to carry on until Revenue Estimates are presented. To meet this deadline, it will be necessary for the Bill to be passed this week. I assure the Chief Secretary now that my Party

will give him every assistance so that the debate can be completed by Thursday next.

The Bill provides for a total estimated expenditure of £121,518,000. The first Appropriation Bill introduced after I entered this Chamber was for an expenditure of between £12,000,000 and £13,000,000, which was only one-tenth of the total provided in this measure. The increased figure shows the growth and development of the State over the last two or three decades. We have been able to stabilize our economy through population and industrial activity to a remarkable degree, and the State has developed from being purely a primary producing State. This growth, accompanied by sound administration and confidence, has advanced our standards of living tremendously. Taxation has been kept to a minimum, which has enabled trade and commerce to develop to the maximum in competition with the more populous States.

This year's Budget is lacking in the quality of previous Budgets in that it provides for expenditures that are not reproductive in the sense that they enhance the production of the State. It could be justly called an inflationary Budget, and this was brought about by providing for election promises. These have necessitated increased taxation upon the people without in any way encouraging the productive potential of the State. In this morning's paper I noticed a report that 10 years ago the Budget increased by £8,000,000 without there being any increase in taxation. This means that we were developing at the same rate but that we were doing it without imposing any increased taxation burden on the people. Rather, we were assisting in the development of the State by encouraging industry, so we got general expansion in the State's economy.

This year's Appropriation Bill includes or envisages increased taxes and higher charges in many directions. Water charges and house rents have been increased, £405,000 extra will be obtained from land tax, £150,000 more will come this year from stamp duties on cheques (£450,000 will be raised for a full year), £321,000 extra will be obtained from increased rail freights, and even holders of pistol licences have their share to carry. Taxation is pending on road transport, and only public entertainment has been left as a source of State taxes. Despite this, the measure provides for a deficit of £1,541,000. Thanks to the accumulated net surplus in Consolidated Revenue of £611,000 left by the previous Government, the deficit will be reduced to £930,000. With a

reduction in seasonal prospects due to the continued dry weather, the Government will not find it easy to realize the expected revenue or to control expenditure. Anyone who has travelled in the country in recent weeks and has seen how our prospects have fallen considerably because of the continued dry weather, and the depletion of our reservoir storages, knows that this year heavy expenditure will be incurred in providing water for our expanding population. I think the figure in one year previously was £800,000, but we have a bigger population to serve now. I mention this only because I sincerely hope that the Government will be able to realize what it expects. It will be detrimental to the State if we start funding deficits from the Loan Account and reduce expenditure on essential public works. If we do this we shall find ourselves in a state of regression, with unemployment and increased taxation. This will bring about a stalemate and the confidence of the public will be shaken. Last year we were able to absorb through consolidated surpluses a wages award on the eve of the Budget, costing the State £2,250,000; and, even with three months' increased spending by the present Government, the expenditure was £166,000 below the estimate. That proved not only good budgeting but a careful control of expenditure from Government sources. This year the Government has an additional £4,000,000 provided by the Commonwealth, but we are to lose our reputation as a low taxation incentive State and become a high taxation State. This, in turn, will mean higher costs and reduced sales, with the danger of a slowing up in industry and increasing unemployment.

We have not had a new industry come to South Australia since the present Government took office. If we stand still, we shall inevitably slip back before long. We cannot afford rising costs without jeopardizing our export markets. I am perturbed at the effect of rising costs upon our primary producing interests. In 1931 Professor Perkins estimated the cost of wheat for interest and depreciation at about 2s. a bushel on an average sized farm. A farming plant at that time cost about £1,000: today it costs nearer £10,000 under power farming—10 times as much. Interest and depreciation must, therefore, be considerably higher today and we are dependent upon the price of wheat for sales that we are able to make abroad. So any persistent increase in the cost of primary production must only lead us into difficulties in respect of Government finance. The price of wool

— has fallen considerably, and the cost of wheat-producing, machinery, etc. is rising rapidly, which must ultimately affect our economy. We cannot afford any law of diminishing returns occurring in our primary industries from lack of capital to maintain efficient production on an economic basis. Increases in costs of super-phosphate, machinery, and crop-spraying for noxious weeds concern farmers today.

If the farmers cannot spend, it will soon be reflected in employment in industry and trade. I was pleased to note the reference to the group laundry under the Hospitals Department vote, although I am a little confused about its presentation. The Minister of Health said:

For The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the appropriation sought is £1,859,000, or £200,000 greater than actual expenditure in 1964-65. The sum of £71,000 of this increase is required for salaries and wages, including provision for additional medical and nursing staff, and £129,000 is to meet charges of the new group laundry.

I can find the £71,000 in the Estimates of Expenditure, but I cannot find anywhere the £170,000 proposed this year for the group laundry. Under "Royal Adelaide Hospital" I find a mention of the group laundry. The item in the Estimates of Expenditure is "Less charged to other accounts—£170,000". I looked to see where I could find that in other accounts, because I know that the laundry is to cater for a number of institutions—the Children's Hospital, the Royal Adelaide Hospital, The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Queen Victoria Hospital and any hospital desiring to come under the system—but I cannot see where the recoupments occur in detail. This detail affects only the Estimates. I hasten to say that I am pleased that this institution is coming into operation because it will add to the efficiency of the laundry services that have been split up amongst various institutions. I take it the money to run it will be recouped, although I cannot find it in the Estimates.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I will try to get the answer for the Leader.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: It includes a linen supply, and that was where I was looking for what it would cost to put the initial supplies into the group laundry for it to be able to supply the various institutions, which will merely send their laundry to the group laundry and obtain the necessary supplies on dry weight, etc. That is how it will operate. So I am looking forward to this institution's being more efficient than the smaller units that have operated previously.

Another line that interests me is that relating to assistance to subsidized hospitals. Usually, these items consist of maintenance and capital grants. This year I notice that we have two hospitals with lines showing special maintenance. Perhaps the Chief Secretary can tell us what "special maintenance" means. I would appreciate such information because I know of one hospital in particular that is in difficulties at the moment. It has asked me how it can get assistance. Maybe it can qualify under this line, but I do not know the circumstances in which it can qualify for this special maintenance. This problem has arisen in hospitals since the Commonwealth changeover regarding pensioners. Pensioners were to be paid for at a rate of 36s. a day, whereas previously in this State about 90 per cent of pensioners were insured at the small rate of about 1s. a week, or some small amount like that. The hospitals collected the insurance. In addition to that, there is an arrangement that I was able to negotiate with the then Commonwealth Minister for Health whereby the rate of contribution to country subsidized hospitals was accepted as insurance for the number of beds in those hospitals, and that was the policy up to the time of the changeover. The Commonwealth benefit was 12s. a day but, with the introduction of the new rate of 36s. a day, hospitals found themselves in difficulties because every pensioner was costing £4 or over a day, and more in places where they were using modern hospital accommodation, but the hospitals were getting only 36s. a day. That was the reason why at the last election the policy of the last Government was to make it up to £3 10s. a day by the addition of 34s. a day.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: This amount has been fixed, as from July 1, at £1, which brings the amount of 36s. to 56s.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The amount is not sufficient, of course, when the costs are so high, and the only difference between our policy and what the Government is doing is that we would have made it up to £3 10s. a day. That is not the position now, and some hospitals are in difficulties. I take it that the special maintenance must be something relating to particular circumstances. The Minister may have some information on this matter that will be of assistance to one hospital I have in mind on Eyre Peninsula at the moment. I am still concerned about the future development of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, which is already over-taxed. The rate of bed occupancy at that

hospital is extremely high and, although the Minister will know the exact figure, I understand that it is over 90 per cent.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I think I heard 96 per cent.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: It is so high that I have been afraid to mention it. It is, in fact, dangerously high.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is the overall figure, I understand.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I understand that 80 per cent occupancy means a fairly heavy demand on beds, and I again urge the Government to hasten a reconciliation on the matter of structural additions to the hospital by bringing into consultation the original architects, so that this work can be expedited. I understand from the Minister that there has been some difference of opinion with the Public Buildings Department. I know that provision was made to enable an extra two floors to be added and I should like to see those who designed the original structure consulted on the matter of accommodation for the extra beds necessary. I say this because, if extra buildings are erected and the place becomes sprawled out over the existing pleasant courtyard, the whole architectural design of a nice hospital will be destroyed.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is one point we agree on.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I think the Minister and I can agree on a number of things. It may be difficult sometimes for the Minister to understand when I am constructive and when I am critical; I like to justify criticism by being constructive at the same time. I have noted a press statement by responsible people indicating an early demand for the commencement of adequate teaching hospital facilities adjacent to the new university at Bedford Park. That is appreciated, because I have always had in mind that when the medical school is established there the next thing required will be a teaching hospital alongside.

All these things will strain the Government's finances but I think that priorities will have to be established. This hospital at Bedford Park will become urgent when additional accommodation has been provided at Queen Elizabeth Hospital and Royal Adelaide Hospital, because it is necessary to provide facilities for training medical men and nurses. Planning should be commenced now. A date when the university will have its medical school in operation has been given and we cannot build institutions costing millions of pounds

without spending considerable time in preliminary planning, the preparation of plans and estimates, and obtaining quantitative surveys. We have all seen how long it is taking to build the new Reserve Bank and other big buildings. Many people claim that outside bodies can move much faster than Government circles, but we find that they take about two years to get their buildings finished.

The next part of the Estimates that concerns me is the reference to school health. I noticed recently the proposal for the adoption of the New Zealand dental nurse service and I assure the Minister that, whatever consideration has been given to the matter so far, this move has had my support for a long time. While I was in New Zealand in 1950 attending the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference, I spent some time examining the school dental health service in operation there and was impressed by what was happening, with the training given and the work the dental nurses were doing with the children. They were giving the children confidence and were training them in general health and prophylactic. It was pleasing to see, at the dental training school, the number of children waiting for attention and how happy they were in the dental chair, under the care of these nurses. I thought that that was educating them to look after their teeth and also would encourage them to continue to do so in adult life. What was more, the scheme was not only successful but also economic and I hope that that position still continues.

When I was examining the possibility of the introduction of such a scheme into South Australia I was immediately opposed by the Dental Association itself, even though the scheme had been reported upon and commended by English authorities. Because of this frustration, I was compelled to consider an alternative, which was the granting of Government bursaries to dental students who would have to give a period of service to the State in return for assistance to enable them to graduate. That scheme has been successful but, unfortunately, the fact that it is an itinerant service means that the period between visits is longer than is desirable. However, I understand that now, after 15 years, the Dental Association has withdrawn its hostility and is today advocating a scheme similar to the one I had in mind. I hope that, in the changed circumstances, the Government will seize the opportunity to take appropriate action.

Two other departments to which I wish to refer are the Police Department and the Mines

Department. I consider that the provision in relation to each has been dangerously curtailed. For the training of probationary constables the provision is £32,000 less than last year and only £7,000 more than the actual expenditure for the same period. The standard of our police force is extremely high. We have just seen one of our senior officers appointed to the position of Commissioner for the Commonwealth Police and he was chosen from a long list of applicants. I think that speaks for itself, and I congratulate Inspector Wilson upon his appointment. I am sure he will do credit to the position. We cannot maintain an efficient force in South Australia or obtain the necessary increase in establishment without a proper recruitment programme to attract the best possible material. This is a "must", and the limiting of funds in this sphere is regrettable.

In the Mines Department there is an actual reduction of about £50,000 for the geological and geophysical branch. This section of the Mines Department has played an important part in the industrial development of the State through the exploitation of our mineral resources. Leigh Creek, Radium Hill, underground water supplies, ceramics and many other examples I could give are the direct result of the work of this department. Much unexplored territory remains in this State, and every effort should be made to maintain this work at an increasing tempo rather than decreasing it. It can have an important bearing on the future prosperity of this State and on employment. I am concerned that the prestige of a department that ranked highest in the Commonwealth may be prejudiced to the extent that we shall cease to attract the best talent available. We have a big enough problem in our salary range that has lost us many of our best officers, without taking risks in not keeping a full programme of work before us. I have found from experience that professional people wish to be busy, particularly those engaged on such interesting work as geology. They strive to do something useful all the time. We have had excellent officers in the past who have perhaps remained in positions here at a lower salary than they could have commanded elsewhere because of the opportunities for interesting work that South Australia provided, and I should not like to think that we might lose highly qualified people from such positions.

We did at one time have two seismic teams that carried out valuable work in oil search,

a branch that requires skilled technicians and permanent work in order to retain and train staff. Last year we lost some of our top men to private enterprise, with the result that the work programme had to be reduced to one team. I think that the search for oil is particularly urgent as the discovery of gas or oil is the only practical answer to a pipeline. I see that there is a reference to a certain sum on the Estimates to obtain reports on a pipeline, but I say that a guaranteed supply is what is needed, and that urgently, if we are not to be too late in the field to attract petro-chemical industries here. If the gas is there, I do not think that there is any great problem. I think that there are sufficient reports on file, some being obtained by the previous Government and some from the companies themselves. Those firms know that there is no insuperable difficulty regarding a pipeline. It is only a matter of building a line at a certain cost and obtaining sufficient gas to sell at a profit. If we cannot have a pipeline we cannot guarantee a supply of gas and if we cannot guarantee gas we cannot have a pipeline. We must be able to provide sufficient gas and be in a position to sell it in competition with existing supplies of power. I know that the Minister is paying some attention to my remarks, and I am sure that he is aware of the position. I hope that he will strive to get for the department that has been held in such high regard throughout Australia—

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: What if we can purchase gas at an economical price elsewhere?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: That may satisfy the Minister but it does not satisfy me. We want that gas to be taken from South Australian sources and not from some other place.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: What if we have not got it here?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: We shall not have it if the Minister is not prepared to help people find it. We should not have what we have if we had not gone out to get it. To sit down and put your head in the sand and say, "We have not got it", without having proof of such a statement is, I think, the wrong approach. We have to get "stuck into" these things! The honourable member represents Labor, and surely he should be as interested as I am in maintaining the highest possible manufacturing potential in this State and being as independent in every way of other States as we can be, and as

I think we should be. A large area of country remains to be explored, and that is what we should be doing. I am aware that gas exists elsewhere, but perhaps I am not looking at it in the same light as the Minister is at the moment, that is, that we can go further afield and get it without chasing it in South Australia, but that would entail additional cost in constructing the pipeline. We were in exactly the same position with coal until a few years ago when we were dependent upon outside sources of supply and it was not until we developed the Leigh Creek field that we were able to get stability in coal supplies. It meant that we could then provide industry with power and get away from the position where people were unable to have continuous work owing to the lack of power. If we can get an adequate gas supply we can produce at competitive prices and market our products in other States. This is important, and I ask the Minister to consider my remarks not as carping criticism but as something that I feel keenly about as far as South Australia is concerned.

I could address myself to many other matters, such as water contamination, because of the importance of water to this State. However, I have already taken more of the Council's time than I had anticipated so I shall conclude by assuring the Government that my remarks are meant to be constructive, and I hope they will receive consideration. I support the second reading of the Bill.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE secured the adjournment of the debate.

REFERENDUM (STATE LOTTERIES) BILL.

(Continued from October 7. Page 2016.)

The House of Assembly intimated that it had agreed to the time and place appointed by the Legislative Council for the holding of a conference.

The PRESIDENT: As the time for the conference with the House of Assembly is approaching, and as several members have asked me the duties, rights, powers and responsibilities of managers at a conference, I think I could do no better than read what President Sir Lancelot Stirling said in 1921 when the position was the same as it is today. He said:

The inherent principle involved in the practice of conferences is that the managers of each branch of the Legislature shall have the opportunity of inducing the other House to withdraw its opposition to any amendment of

an Act under consideration, or failing such withdrawal to arrive at a compromise, by amendment (under certain restrictions) likely to be accepted by the respective Houses when reported by its managers. This duty is clearly defined under Standing Order No. 263 (now No. 260). The implication inferred by the definition of the duty of the managers is that such managers, whether they have been supporters or otherwise of the question at issue, should, in their advocacy at the conference, represent the decision of the majority of the Council as ascertained by the votes taken thereon in the course of debate. Unless such a duty is accepted by those appointed by the Council (in order to carry out the spirit of the Orders relating to conferences) it would be desirable that the representation on all conferences should be made by ballot when those only who support the majority voice of the Council may, if so desired, be sent to the conference to support such majority decision. Provision is made in the Standing Orders to demand that any such selection shall be by ballot.

Having defined what is the duty of the managers, I proceed now to allude to the proceedings at conferences: In Halcomb's *Practice of the Council* it is laid down that its managers shall, before leaving the conference, draft their report containing recommendations which have been mutually agreed upon with the Assembly managers. A majority of the Council delegation is sufficient for its agreement to any recommendation, and inversely is sufficient to confirm a disagreement, either of which results such managers shall report to the Council. The Council acts in accordance with such report. It is believed that on occasions the decision of the conference as reported has been arrived at by a majority vote of the managers for both Houses voting as a whole, and is therefore not in accordance with the rules laid down by the Standing Orders as to conferences.

It will be seen that it is possible under the procedure at conferences, which I believe has been adopted on some occasions, for a united representation from the House of Assembly assisted by the votes of a majority of the managers from the Council to successfully accomplish the defeat of the views of the Legislative Council as expressed by a majority of its members. I have on other occasions pointed out the duties of managers at conferences, and am in the hope that these duties will be accepted on the lines laid down by our Standing Orders, or that the Council will see that its managers are selected as representing the majority decision of the Council.

I think that statement makes the position relating to the duties of managers quite clear.

At 3.18 p.m. the managers proceeded to the conference, the sitting of the Council being suspended. They returned at 5.56 p.m.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I have to report that the managers have been to the conference on the Bill, which was managed on behalf of the House of Assembly by the Hon. Frank Walsh, the Hon. D. A. Dunstan, Mr. Lawn, the Hon. G. G. Pearson and

the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, and they there received from the managers on behalf of the House of Assembly the Bill and the following resolution adopted by that House:

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

Thereupon the managers for the two Houses conferred together, and it was agreed that they should recommend to their respective Houses:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment No. 3, and that the House of Assembly amend clause 14 as follows: In subclause (11) after paragraph (c) to insert:

"For the purposes of this section it shall be a valid and sufficient reason for a failure to vote if an elector has a conscientious objection to voting at the referendum."

That new subclause (11a) as follows be inserted:

(11a) Proceedings for an offence against this section shall not be instituted unless the Governor, by proclamation in the *Gazette* before the issue of the writ, has amended the form of the prescribed question by striking out therefrom the words 'or under the authority of'. Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, the Governor is hereby authorized to make such a proclamation, and upon the making thereof the prescribed question and Forms A and B in the Schedule shall be amended accordingly."

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

It is, I think, sufficient to say that the first amendment to clause 14 means that, if an elector has a conscientious objection to voting at the referendum and satisfies the electoral officer to that effect, that will be sufficient to prevent him from being penalized. New subclause (11a) means that the Government will conduct the lottery for the benefit of the State. In other words, it will not be empowered to appoint an agent or somebody to run the lottery; it will be the responsibility of the Government to conduct the lottery, and the proceeds will be for the benefit of the State.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): As one of the managers, I support the motion. The conference was attended by the managers mentioned by the Chief Secretary and was carried out in the

most dignified manner, both sides being prepared to consider the pros and cons of the opinions of both Chambers. The only clause considered was clause 14, which deals with the question of compulsory voting, and opinions expressed in this Chamber were against the imposition of penalties for not voting on what was an abstract question. This was the basis upon which the managers discussed the disagreement. Finally a compromise was reached that certain words be struck out of the prescribed question, which makes it definite that the lottery will be conducted by the Government. This means that it will be under the control of a Minister responsible to Parliament, and that it will be a Government lottery.

The objection raised about people being compelled to vote on something on which they did not have any opinion was to a certain extent overcome by making it definite that it would be a Government lottery, but that did not completely overcome the problem of a person who did not desire to vote or had a conscientious objection to voting. The view was expressed strongly in this Council that such a person should not be penalized. That was accepted by the managers for the House of Assembly. Although the compromise may not cover all the ideas and opinions expressed here, the managers realized that they were sent to the conference to overcome the difference between the two Chambers by reaching a compromise, and they considered that it could be accepted, and I think this was the spirit displayed by the managers of the other place. The conference was carried on in the best traditions of conferences between the two Chambers, and I think the compromise, although perhaps only partly meeting the ideas of honourable members, can be accepted by them. Altogether, I think the results are satisfactory from all points of view. We were not discussing the merits or otherwise of a lottery: we met merely to consider the conditions of the poll and particularly the penal clauses under a compulsory vote.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 6.8 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, October 13, at 2.15 p.m.