LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, September 20, 1966.

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

QUESTIONS

DRIVING LICENCES.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: In view of the number of fatal accidents reported recently involving minors less than 18 years of age driving motor vehicles capable of speeds up to 80 miles an hour, will the Chief Secretary say whether the Government will give serious consideration to the undesirability of granting motor vehicle licences to inexperienced minors?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The question affects policy that has been in vogue in South Australia for many years. I hope that minors are not blamed for one accident in which they were involved over the weekend. However, the Motor Vehicles Act comes not under my jurisdiction but under the jurisdiction of my colleague, the Premier, and I shall refer the question to him.

VICTORIA SQUARE INCIDENT.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Chief Secretary a further reply to my question of September 15 concerning the Victoria Square incident?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The honourable member asked whether the Government would obtain and give to this Council the names of all persons who might have been involved in burning a replica of a United States of America flag. The answer is "No". It is not the duty of the Government to make allegations in this Chamber under privilege as to the action of private individuals. The Government regrets the incident, but its only public duty is to prosecute any breach of the law, and none appears to have occurred. The honourable member has also asked that the Government seek assurances from the university as to disciplinary action against any university student involved. The Government will not do this. It is not the business of the Government to intervene at the university, and the university should not have any responsibility for a matter that does not involve it. The Government will not investigate the matter further. The Premier has personally expressed to the American Consul his regret at the incident.

WATERLOO CORNER ACCIDENT.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: On August 24 I asked the Minister a question about the intersection of Main Road No. 410, which leads to Angle Vale, and the road from Salisbury to Waterloo Corner. Before the Minister has been able to give a reply, most unfortunately another dreadful tragedy has occurred at that corner. I believe the Minister has already taken action to block off one section of the road, and I agree with his having taken some action to overcome the problem for the time being, but I doubt that this is the answer. I think the department is probably looking at the matter now. Will the Minister consider providing a roundabout in this area, which I believe was suggested by His Worship the Mayor of Salisbury, so that we can at least protect these people from themselves?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. Before the recent fatal accident there was a fatal accident in which a school bus was involved. I went to the site with engineers from the Highways Department and discussed the problem with them. Various sugestions were put forward. The suggestion for a roundabout is not a new one: it was being considered at the time. However, the opinion has been expressed that this intersection does not lend itself to the construction of a roundabout that would be efficient, and I take this to mean that the intersection is not wide enough. This could be overcome, however, because it is open country and land could be acquired to extend the intersection so that a roundabout could be constructed.

The present opinion is that a roundabout would not eliminate the trouble, as immediately it was completed one of these motorists would come through the intersection just as at present, hit the concrete roundabout, turn over, and finish in the middle of the roundabout or on the road, the driver and any occupant probably being killed. In the circumstances, I asked for an investigation and report by the engineers of the department on what they considered the best thing to do to make the intersection safe. I think all honourable members are aware that precautions have been taken. "Give way" signs have been erected, and notices warning motorists that these signs are ahead have been placed on the approaches to the intersection. We put the safety bars in the centre of the road to try to eliminate some of the speeding, but all this has been of no avail.

On Sunday morning, when I took up the *Sunday Mail* and first saw the heading, "Waterloo Corner" immediately occurred to

me. Then, when I read the account of the accident that had occurred on the Saturday evening, I saw indeed that it had been at Waterloo Corner. I then, on the Sunday, telephoned the Acting Commissioner of Highways and instructed him to put a gang out there the first thing on Monday morning to close that section of the road until we could have a full investigation into all the circumstances of the intersection to see what could be done. Unfortunately, to be quite frank about it, whatever is done by myself, by the Highways Department engineers or by the experts of the Road Traffic Board, I think it will be difficult to make this intersection safe. However, that remains to be seen. The problem is not really that the intersection itself is not safe: it is perfectly safe. The speed limit in that zone is 55 m.p.h., which lends itself perhaps to what is prevailing, and it is apparent from the reports of the fatalities that have occurred at this intersection that the fault lies with the motorist, who goes through the intersection perhaps at 60 m.p.h., ignoring all warning and "give way" signs, the result being these fatal accidents. Unfortunately, this is what occurred last Saturday afternoon. The driver, besides committing suicide, committed murder, because his wife, too, was killed.

But what can be done to stop this sort of thing? I do not know. Police officers in uniform were at the scene of this accident last Sunday afternoon, with other people, and, while they were there, the uniformed police (it has been reported to me) on two separate occasions saw motorists going through that intersection without stopping or attempting to reduce speed. The police estimated their speed at 60 m.p.h. This is the sort of thing we are trying to cope with to protect the motorist from his own folly. The whole matter is being investigated at the moment by the engineers of the Highways Department in conjunction with the Road Traffic Board. It may be that in the final analysis the safest thing to do will be to close permanently this section of the road. Until these investigations are completed, as far as I personally am concerned, these barriers will remain on the road and this section of the road will be closed. When I have the final report available, I shall be only too happy to make a statement to this Council.

POLICE LEAVE.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Some time ago the Government approved five weeks' annual leave for members of the Police Force. Can the Chief Secretary say how many additional police officers were appointed to cover the requirements of additional leave, or did the existing force have to work additional hours at overtime rates?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall be pleased to procure the information. I cannot answer the honourable member's question at the moment.

COMMONWEALTH GRANTS.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Today's *Advertiser* carries a report of a broadcast made by the Attorney-General. The report states:

The Commonwealth was making attractive offers but placing the State in an impossible position, the Attorney-General (Mr. Dunstan) said in a broadcast yesterday. It had offered baits to South Australian instrumentalities such as the University of Adelaide and the National Fitness Council. While the proposals had been laudable in intent, they had been made without consulting the State on its spending priorities.

In view of this statement that was broadcast, I ask the Chief Secretary, does this mean that the South Australian Government will be unable to meet its financial obligations in respect of matching grants for the University of Adelaide and the National Fitness Council, or any other matching grant? Have South Australian Governments in previous years been unable to meet matching grants from the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: If I cared to roll up my sleeves I could make several comments on this subject. The answer to the second part of the question is "yes", because previous Governments have been unable to match such grants. With regard to the first part of the question, the matter is under consideration. I do not know the position of the University of Adelaide or the National Fitness Council. However, I do know that similar matching offers have been made in connection with the Hospitals Department which we have no hope of meeting. Such offers were made to the previous Government and it also had no hope of meeting them. It is easy for someone to dangle large amounts of money, if this or that is done. It is quite common for the Commonwealth Government to do this. It does it without consulting the States. This year it threw a further burden on us about January 1 in connection with the medical pensioners' scheme. As I have said, it is easy to do this

when holding the purse without giving any consideration to the people who are asked to match the offers. This is so, irrespective of the Government in power. If the Commonwealth Government continues in this way it will be impossible for the States to match the grants. It applies not only to this State but to all States.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a further question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: If I understood the Chief Secretary correctly, he said that the previous Government had not been able to match Commonwealth grants in the case of hospitals. Can he say what matching grants he was referring to when he said that the previous Government was unable to meet the requirements?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No provision had been made in connection with the Strathmont and Elanora psychiatric hospitals when we took office.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I do not know whether my first question was answered properly. Can the Chief Secretary say whether the previous Government was ever unable to match grants for educational purposes in this State?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I thought I made that point clear. I said that I did not know the position of the Adelaide University or the National Fitness Council, but that I did know in relation to the other matter. I do not know what the position has been previously and I do not know the present position. It is all under discussion and no agreement has been reached.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Is the Chief Secretary aware that no expenditure of public money on a project estimated to cost more than $200,000 can be made until a report has been submitted by the Public Works Committee? If he is aware of that, what right has he to make such an extravagant statement as his statement that the previous Government did not match grants?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am aware of the position referred to in the first part of the question. Secondly, I did not make an extravagant statement, because plans were prepared and a report was about to be received when we took office. However, there was no provision in the order of priorities by the previous Government in an attempt to match the hospital grants by the Commonwealth. We have touched on a very raw point.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: In reverse.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No. Honourable members cannot have it both ways.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: On a point of order, Mr. President, I ask whether the Chief Secretary is in order in debating this matter when I have not the same privilege. I asked only for a reply to my question.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: You got it, and it is a very raw point.

The PRESIDENT: The Minister has replied.

UNEMPLOYMENT.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Labour and Industry.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Under the heading "South Australian unemployment again rises", this morning's *Advertiser* contained the following:

South Australia was the only State to register an increase in August in the number of people seeking work.

Against the Australian average of 1.2 per cent of unemployment, the South Australian percentage was 1.7 per cent. On checking earlier newspapers, I found that this was the third consecutive month that South Australia had had the highest percentage of unemployment in Australia. Can the Minister, in view of these newly-published figures and the trend over the past three months, say whether the Government has any new plans by which unemployment can be reduced in this State?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: With regard to plans for relieving unemployment in this State, the Government considers this matter all the time. Of course, a progressive attitude is adopted. As to general unemployment figures in this State, I think they are better than I expected, in view of the large number of people dismissed from General Motors-Holden during the period concerned. In addition to those directly affected (and I believe about 400 people were dismissed) many others were put out of work as a result of the action in the motor industry generally. I mentioned earlier that additional dismissals could be expected in subsidiary and supplying industries as a result of the laying off of the 400 men. I believe that considerably more than 400 people were dismissed as a result of the position in the motor industry. It was surprising to find that the South Australian figure, as a result, was only 119 more than the figure for the previous month, despite the considerable number of dismissals. I think we have passed the bottom of the trough and are on the improve, particularly

in view of the fact that the number of vacancies registered in this State has increased by 75 since last month. The figure in regard to unemployment has certainly gone up, but not as far as one would have imagined it would. It was stated in the press yesterday and again this morning that the sales of motor vehicles in this State and all over Australia had increased. The position in the motor industry is improving and there are not as many people out of work as would have been expected. I take heart because things are as they are and I am confident that the employment position in South Australia is improving.

PARATOO COPPER.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Mines.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I understand that copper ore is being worked in the Paratoo district and that it is being sent to Port Kembla, or somewhere in that area, for treatment. I also understand that some time ago a company approached the Government with a view to using the old uranium treatment works at Port Pirie in order to deal with this ore and that the request was refused. If this is substantially correct, and in view of the opportunity to improve the employment position, can the Minister of Mines say on what grounds the request was refused?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I refer Sir Norman to the answer I gave in this Council last Thursday to a similar question asked by the Hon. Mr. Geddes.

IMPOUNDING ACT.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Can the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Agriculture, say whether the Government intends to introduce an amendment to the Impounding Act in the present session?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I do not at this stage know what are the intentions of the Minister of Agriculture. I shall refer the question to him and obtain a reply as soon as possible.

PLASTIC CONTAINERS.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my question of August 17 regarding a letter from the South Australian Housewives Association regarding the undesirability of using plastic containers?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: As I promised to do, I took up the question with the Premier, and the Prices Commissioner submitted a report. Members of the South Australian Food Industry Consultative Council (S.A.F.I.C.C.) have agreed not to retail goods packed in half-gallon returnable containers from October 1. Membership of the council comprises the main wholesale and retail grocery houses, as well as a large number of smaller retailers. At a joint meeting of S.A.F.I.C.C. and manufacturers on May 31, 1966, it was agreed unanimously that manufacturers would cease the production and delivery of goods in flagons as a retail pack as from September 1. However, there is little doubt that it was made clear that if any manufacturer did not agree he would not receive the support of the members of S.A.F.I.C.C., which comprises approximately 85 per cent of the retail trade. Although methods adopted by S.A.F.I.C.C. are subject to criticism, it appears that there is no infringement of any legislation now current. S.A.F.I.C.C. claims that goods in returnable flagons are difficult and expensive to handle under modern marketing methods and it is time manufacturers were encouraged to develop cheap alternative non-returnable containers. Already one manufacturer has commenced marketing vinegar in a one-gallon plastic container that will retail at from 59c to 65c, which is less than the price of two half-gallons of similar quality sold in returnable flagons. It has also been ascertained that Coles Food Markets Pty. Ltd. has not handled flagons for about two years, and it is claimed that the actual gallonage sold of the lines concerned has been more than maintained. Tom The Cheap Grocer Pty. Ltd. has announced that it will continue to market goods in returnable flagons, which will be available to the public in its stores.

BUILDING INDUSTRY.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether any figures are available of the number of building workers and associated tradesmen who in the last 18 months have left this State to obtain employment in other States?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I do not know whether those figures are available, but I will make inquiries and see if I can obtain this information for the honourable member.

RETRENCHMENTS.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (on notice):

1. How many daily or weekly paid employees of the Government have been retrenched since July 1, 1966?

2. Of these, how many are married and how many are ex-servicemen?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The replies are:

1. Five.

2. Four married and two ex-servicemen.

CAMBRAI AND SEDAN RAILWAY DISCONTINUANCE BILL.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the discontinuance of the railway between Cambrai and Sedan and for other purposes. Read a first time.

APPRENTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Labour and Industry) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Apprentices Act, 1950-1966. Read a first time.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT 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.

It deals with local government accounting and procedures. Investigations carried out by the Auditor-General and complaints received both by the Minister and the Auditor-General indicate that many councils digress from the general provisions of the Act, sometimes in a serious manner. The amendments made by this Bill are designed to tighten up the provisions respecting local government accounts and procedures to ensure as far as possible that everything is regulated in a proper manner.

I shall now refer to the provisions of the Bill in order. Clause 3 amends section 158 of the Local Government Act, which provides that a council may pay such salaries, allowances, etc., to its officers, including the auditor, as the council determines. The clause removes the reference to the auditor and inserts a new subsection providing that a council shall pay to its auditor such remuneration as the Minister, on the recommendation of the Auditor-General, may fix. In many cases fees paid to council auditors have been found to be far too low to provide for a proper audit. Some councils, indeed, adopt the practice of seeking and accepting the lowest fees obtainable (even calling tenders, which is thought to be undesirable). Investigations have shown that in many cases proper audits have not been carried out. The setting of appropriate fees would ensure proper and efficient audits. The setting of fees is not uncommon: for example, in Victoria auditors' fees are set in a somewhat similar manner.

Last year a private Bill was introduced to provide that auditors be approved by the Auditor-General. This is not considered necessary, because auditors are required to hold the Local Government Auditor's Certificate issued by the Local Government Auditors Examining Committee, of which the Auditor-General is Chairman. It is not the ability of auditors that is questioned but the quality of the audits, which in many cases has been governed by the low fees.

Clause 4 relates to payments of accounts by councils. Section 286 of the principal Act requires all amounts received on a council's account to be paid into a bank, payment therefrom of amounts exceeding $4, except wages, to be by cheque signed by the mayor, chairman or any councillor and countersigned by the clerk or some other appointed officer. It is often necessary for amounts to be paid before a council meeting can give approval for payment. For example, an employee who is dismissed or has resigned requires immediate payment of wages, and payments of accounts where discount is involved must be made immediately. It is often impossible for the clerk to obtain at short notice a councillor's signature. Accordingly, provision has been made for the use between council meetings of an advance account to be operated on by the clerk and countersigned by some other person appointed for the purpose. The advance account must be authorized by the council by resolution and payments against it are subject to confirmation at the following council meeting.

The next amendment is made by clause 5, which amends section 295 of the principal Act. That section provides for inspection by the Auditor-General from time to time. It has now been recast not only to retain the powers of the Auditor-General but also to provide that the accounts, records and procedures of any council shall be inspected from time to time by officers appointed by the Minister. This will enable the appointment of inspectors of local government as is provided in practically every other State in the Commonwealth. While inspections by the Auditor-General have been most necessary and it is essential that his powers be retained, the Auditor-General has not the staff to carry out the regular inspections that are considered desirable. Subclauses (1) to (3) (inclusive)

provide for inspection by departmental officers, subclause (4) for the retention of the Auditor-General's powers, and subclause (5) empowers the Minister to give directions to a council if reports reveal that the council has not complied with any statutory provisions.

The last amendment is made by clause 6 of the Bill which relates to regulations. A committee to investigate council accounting principles with a view to providing a standard system of accounting proposed to recommend that regulations be made to provide for standard accounting and financial procedures. The regulation-making power in section 691 of the principal Act is not sufficiently wide to enable the making of the proposed regulations. It is considered that the new procedures should be the subject of regulations. The clause will enable the making of regulations on matters of accounting the books of accounts and records to be kept, the adoption of annual budgets and quarterly budgetary statements.

As I have said, recent investigations have shown that some definitive control over accounting procedures should be established with a view to the protection not only of council accounts but of the ratepayers, and the provisions of this Bill are designed to enable the necessary steps to this end to be taken.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (T.A.B.).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 15. Page 1618.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): The first thing I say is that I am in favour of legalized off-course betting in South Australia. Secondly, I say that I am not in favour of the method adopted in this Bill to ensure that all interested parties are put on the spot to accept it. This Bill can be likened to the gill net used in fishing. The principle of that is that fish can get their heads through the mesh while their gills are closed but, the moment they see their plight, they want some extra impetus; their gills go out and they find themselves ensnared. They need to put out their gills to get some momentum.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: You are likening the punters to the poor fish?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes, and at this stage they would like the impetus to get out. Incidentally, this gill net method of fishing is illegal in the River Murray. The way this Bill is conceived is, therefore, like the gill net, or else it is a package deal: whichever way one looks at it, he is ensnared. The racing club committees have been offered the right sort of bait to make them rise to it. The racehorse owners have been tempted by choice titbits. The punter has had an oyster placed within his reach by the assurance that the tax on the punter's stake will be removed within 13 months of this legislation coming into operation.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Has the oyster got a pearl in it?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I believe in some people's eyes the oyster has a pearl in it. When the tax on the punter's stake is removed, it does not mean that the winning bets tax will be, too. There is some confusion about this point. I think that charitable institutions see something in it for themselves, and then comes the Government which, like the owner of the gill net, gets the whole catch. Being a good fisherman, this Government says, "Now, if any of you struggle or try to upset the net, we shall leave you there to perish." My point is that this Bill is fairly passable until we reach clause 9. From that clause onwards we really get the gill net clauses. This measure should be withdrawn—

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It is wishful thinking.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: —and redrafted in two separate Bills. I advocate that because, at present, the matter is completely confused by the last three or four clauses of the Bill. So far, from what I have heard, the Government has said nothing to indicate its exact feelings about this proposal. First, we should have a Bill dealing with T.A.B. so that everyone could know what it was all about; secondly, there should be a Bill dealing with the cutting up of the spoils arising from T.A.B. I expect the Chief Secretary will consider this proposal and probably give some reasons, when he is closing the debate, why this plan cannot be adopted. However, as I see it, there is no real reason why this method cannot be adopted.

By adopting it, many advantages are to be gained by all the interested parties, with the exception perhaps of the Government. The racing clubs, the owners and the punters would then be able to discuss freely with the Government matters of percentages, the winning bets tax, stamp duties and kindred problems, without the present fear of asking for amendments. They are frightened (and I believe this is a real fear) that the Government will lay aside this Bill if any attempt is made to

alter its financial structure. Is this fear really justified? Would the Goverment really drop this matter because the winning bets tax was removed by an amendment? Its supporters would have something to answer for if it dropped the Bill on those grounds. This, of course, is the real crux of the Bill, and of any arguments going on at present. I do not think many people are opposed to the principle of T.A.B. but I think there is much worry at present about the clauses to which I have referred—how this money is to be disbursed, on the one hand, and how much is to be levied, on the other.

The Government, under this Bill, is extracting ever-increasing amounts from the racing public, and it will be vastly in excess of what the Government is receiving at present. I know that all Governments find gambling and racing lucrative sources of income, but to go to the lengths proposed under this Bill, without any assurance by the Government that it will remove the winning bets tax at any particular stage, is, to say the least, grasping.

I want now to develop one or two points that have not so far been fully investigated. I have read the debates that took place in another place and carefully studied the comments from both sides. I have listened to argument from people outside this place who are interested in racing, and I cannot see why, unless the Government is frightened by outside political pressures which may be great enough for them to remove the winning bets tax, or reduce the amount it believes it will get from it, this package deal has been presented. At the present time I am not happy with it, and I will listen carefully to the Chief Secretary's reply to the debate before committing myself on the Bill.

I turn now to the provisions of the Bill. Sir Norman Jude and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris clearly set out the position as seen by them. I am interested in this measure mainly from the point of view of a country man; it has been extremely difficult for the country racegoer and punter to bet legally, except in some of the larger country towns where racing takes place. In other cases the punter has had no alternative but to apply "hole-in-the-corner" methods, and such methods are never satisfactory and should not be condoned by any Government. Therefore, I support the legalization of offcourse betting. The manner of setting up offcourse betting is not clearly defined in the Bill as affecting smaller centres. We are aware that in the larger centres agencies will be established and I consider that similar provision should be made for the smaller centres. Commission agencies have been mentioned but I am not keen on this method because I have seen it used in other forms of industry and I do not like it. I think the salary to be paid to people employed in this connection should be defined.

In some States of Australia where lotteries operate it is extremely difficult to buy a packet of cigarettes or get a haircut because many of these places operate as agencies. As such, their main concern is selling lottery tickets rather than doing the legitimate business for which they were established. Such an establishment would be open to all kinds of (I could almost say nefarious) practices which could well be done without. The moment we start to set up commission agencies people will start vying with each other to be given an agency because it would be better than working on a salary. I think we should be careful in this aspect of the matter and I would like to hear a more detailed explanation from the Chief Secretary at a later stage.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is on the question of agency?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Basically, bookmakers are commission agents.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: There are no offcourse bookmakers, either.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: We have done away with them; the legalized ones, I mean.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You had better keep out of that one!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I will not get involved in that, because I have friends in all circles of the community.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: We have bookmakers at Port Pirie.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes, I am aware of that, and I will have something to say about it later because that is an interesting point which I have not reached as yet. I turn now to the appointment of the chairman of the board; it is a most important matter.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is one thing on which we are in agreement.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes, but we are in agreement on two things; we both want offcourse betting and the matter I have just mentioned. They are the only points on which we have agreed to date, but I hope the Chief Secretary will get much closer to me after the second reading debate.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I always try to.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Returning to the appointment of the chairman of the board, I

believe that this is a plum job and one that requires a person who is responsible, beyond reproach and well skilled in business affairs. It can be seen that this is a position requiring a businessman because of the amount of turnover involved. As Sir Norman Jude said, it should not be given as a plum to somebody for services rendered.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You have my assurance that that will not be done.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I accept that, but then perhaps the Chief Secretary and I may not agree on the type of person or the person to be appointed. I have seen one or two appointments that have been made by the present Government that I thought were not appointments made on the basis of "horses for courses".

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I do not know of them; I shall talk to you later about that.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Certainly they were not the type of people I would have thought should be appointed chairman of a statutory board such as this. I exhort the Government to be extremely careful in the choice of a man for this position because I believe the whole tone of racing will be judged on the type of person given this job. With regard to the constitution of the board, I am aware that the major racing clubs will each have a representative; the country trotting association will have one representative; country racing clubs will have two representatives (one residing not less than 30 miles north of Adelaide and the other not less than 20 miles south of Adelaide) but there does not seem to be provision for representation of the poor old punter.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Do you want to make a job on it for me?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: A job could be made for Perce the Punter or Perce the Battler's friend. It seems to me that some representation should be given to the race-going public, because they are the people who keep racing going. I hope to listen to further discussion on that before the Bill reaches the Committee stages. I shall now deal with the matter raised by the Chief Secretary regarding Port Pirie, in which he was interested.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I did not raise it; I entered into the debate.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Chief Secretary mentioned it a little while ago.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No. Sir Norman Jude did; don't blame me for everything.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: You mentioned it in the second reading explanation.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Yes, but not today.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: There seems to be confusion about this; the Chief Secretary has laboured this matter all the way through by saying words to the effect, "I did not really mention Port Pirie", but in the second reading explanation he went to some pains to mention it in the following words:

> This provision has the advantage of providing the Government with control over the establishment of agencies by the board and in particular would provide a safeguard against the indiscriminate establishment of agencies. It will also enable the Government to exercise adequate control over the establishment of any agency at Port Pirie and in exercising such control the Government will have regard to the wishes of the people of that town as well as social and economic factors.

Port Pirie is specifically mentioned. I, like most other honourable members, have had much correspondence from that town and it reminds me of what took place in relation to a local government matter affecting the hundreds of Pooginook and Markaranka. At that time, we would receive petitions and counter petitions almost weekly and it was found that about 40 per cent of the people had signed both lots of petitions. The position regarding Port Pirie seems to be similar, with many petitions and counter petitions being received. I think the board will be the best arbiter and, if I were sitting in the box seat, as the Chief Secretary is, I should be glad to give this to the board to work out, because it is something on which a Minister can be terrifically pressured.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I may not be the Minister.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Chief Secretary looks very healthy.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: My health is good but I may not be the Minister controlling the legislation, if it passes.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That augurs badly for this State, because I understood that this Bill was coming into effect soon. If the Chief Secretary is trying to tell me that we are going to have an early election, I welcome the information.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No. I am trying to tell you these matters are under the control of the Treasurer.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Chief Secretary will be the adviser to the Treasury. I had a glimmer of hope when I thought he was telling me we would be likely to go to the people and I thought there would be a change of Government.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It doesn't matter when we go to the people: there won't be a change of Government.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I agree with Sir Norman Jude about the use of the word "location" and should like the Chief Secretary to explain that matter. I understand that an amendment concerning Port Pirie is pending. Many of these matters can be dealt with in Committee. I think clauses 9 and 10 should be taken out of the Bill and put back in the principal Act, where they belong, or dealt with in a separate Bill, because they cloud the issue. In South Australia at present the Government is receiving $1,100,000 from the winning bets tax. It is expected that the winning bets tax on the stake will cease 13 months after T.A.B. commences and the removal of that tax will reduce the revenue to $860,000 in the second year.

Then, the revenue will continue to build up. In the third year, it will increase to $1,040,000 and, on these estimates, it will remain constant until the fifth and sixth years. In the sixth year an additional $1,800,000 will be received in relation to the 6 per cent of Government receipts and $62,500 will be received from the 1¼ per cent in relation to on-course totalizators, which will revert to the Government after the third year. The clubs will receive the money temporarily in order to get over the stile while they are establishing T.A.B. and then they will lose a certain amount of revenue. In the sixth year, the Government will receive $2,902,500.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Who says that?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: This is all in with the lunch. They are good figures and I advise the Chief Secretary to study them. If he does, he will find that it is about three times the amount the Government is receiving at present from racing.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Is that on anticipated figures?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: This is the estimated turnover.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You need not go into it: it is estimated.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Well, how does one get an actual figure before something happens?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I do not like estimates and theories.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Chief Secretary's second reading explanation gives estimates of various matters.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: He only likes his estimates.

The C. R. STORY: These are probably more accurate than the ones the Chief Secretary has cited from time to time. He may examine these figures later in order to ascertain whether they are not close to the actual amount. They have been worked out conservatively from estimated turnover of $6,000,000 in the first year and $30,000,000 in the sixth year, and they show that three times the present revenue will be going into the Treasury after the sixth year. I have said that gambling and racing are always sources of income to the Treasury, but I think this Bill loads the sport or industry too heavily. We shall kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

The figures that I have cited today could not be less reliable than those given to me recently in answer to a question. I asked for two sets of figures, and received some other figures. I do not doubt that the figures given to me were perfectly correct, but they were not what I asked for.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I did tell you they were not available at the time.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Minister did not tell me that. The figures he gave were nothing like those I asked for. They were figures given in reply to a question asked by Mr. Casey, who I understand is in another place. What I sought was some information about a report I had read in the daily press regarding a boycott on the meeting held at Cheltenham. I wanted to know what difference this made in order to judge the influence on attendances by the body formed in this State to try to induce the Government to remove the winning bets tax, and to see how the general public reacted to the injunction to stay away. The figures I got did not mean anything, and I would like to put the record straight. On the Saturday before the boycott a meeting was held at Cheltenham. Nine races were run in Adelaide and seven in Melbourne. The total turnover for that meeting was $779,304, the average for each race being $53,382 for the Adelaide races and $42,694 for the Melbourne races. The totalizator investments for both Adelaide and Melbourne were $60,448, and five South Australian horses raced in Melbourne on that day. On September 10, the day of the boycott, seven races were run in Adelaide and eight in Melbourne. The total investment for Adelaide races was $311,274 and for Melbourne $274,102, making a total of $585,376. The average for each race was $44,467 for Adelaide and $34,262 for Melbourne. The decrease in turnover was $193,928.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Not for the same number of races.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I have given a break-up of Melbourne and Adelaide races.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: How much was held on each race on each day?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The average holding on September 3 was $53,382 on Adelaide races and $42,694 on Melbourne races, and on September 10 the average for Adelaide was $44,467 (a drop of about $9,000) and for Melbourne $34,262 (a drop of over $10,000). This shows that there was some appreciable difference between the two sets of figures when viewed in that way.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: This was not all due to the boycott, though. There was a different class of race.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That may be so.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It cannot be denied that the big punters have an effect.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That is the point I make. The reply to the question was confusing. The Bill should not be put up in a package deal form. I think people are being intimidated by what the Government intends to do if any financial provision is tampered with. As a result, not nearly so many people are coming forward to complain about what they consider to be an iniquitous tax placed on them because a portion of the winning bets tax will not be removed as from the start of T.A.B. I believe it would be very much in the interests of racing if we started off with a clear knowledge of the position into which this was going to lead us. I would then not be forced to bring up estimated figures, which the Chief Secretary rather pooh-poohed and said, "They are only an estimate." They are a very intelligent estimate. I want to hear from the Chief Secretary his intentions regarding the matters I have raised. I support the principle of off-course betting, and I therefore support the second reading of this Bill.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 13. Page 1511.)

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2): I support this Bill. I do not do so because I think it is all good: in fact, I think there are some disquieting features. I support it in general because I believe that new methods are required for dealing with the Aboriginal people and their problems, and particularly when most of the native people in South Australia are only part-Aboriginal. The Aborigines of South Australia for far too long were caught between the two schools of thought —that of the scientists and anthropologists, who for many years thought of these people as museum pieces and tried to maintain them in their primitive state, and that of the settlers on the outskirts of our developed areas, who sought to use them as cheap unskilled labour. The general public, of course, did not care. The old and, indeed, false myth that we of the British race do not interfere in other people's lives can be carried too far until it becomes not myth but tragic fact: namely, we can easily become so self-interested that we adopt a "couldn't care less" attitude towards other people's way of life. Most of us, except for that minority group of dedicated men and women who have worked in medical and mission fields for our Aboriginal people, have done very little in the way of either thinking or acting to make the lot of these people better.

I do not ascribe to the opinion already expressed in relation to clause 6 that the Aboriginal people are not ready for this responsibility. Most honourable members in this Chamber had meetings with delegations of part-Aborigines a week or two ago. The group representing Central No. 2 consisted of six women and two men led by a sincere and capable young man (John Moriarty). It included Mrs. Elphick, who has worked hard and intelligently for her people for many years. In that group there was not one who could not have assumed the responsibility if appointed a member of the Aboriginal Lands Trust. I also met once more a man who served with distinction in the Second World War; he was accepted and respected by his comrades in arms in South Australia's famous 2/10th Battalion. The ignorant attitude adopted by so many people that the Aborigines are still primitive is not unique. The same view is held of Africans, thousands of whom come from second or even third generation Christian families; they have been educated abroad and have returned to serve their people as doctors and teachers, architects and artists. Yet, mention an African, and the average European thinks of bare black skins, men waving spears, and women with elongated necks adorned with copper rings.

It surely must be beginning to penetrate into most Australian minds that there are many of Aboriginal blood in our community who have by their lives and example proved to be good citizens and capable of handling their affairs. We do not know to what heights the Aboriginal people can rise until, in all areas, they are given

educational and medical facilities equivalent to those available to the general run of Australian people. This objective, as far as I am aware, has not yet been realized anywhere in Australia, certainly not in South Australia. I personally believe that there are now sufficient educated people of some Aboriginal blood to form a nucleus to look after the welfare of the less highly developed members of their community. The disquieting feature of the proposed establishment of the Aboriginal Lands Trust lies elsewhere in the Bill. In Part III, clause 15 (1) states:

The trust may, with the approval of the Minister, appoint such officers and employees as are required to carry out the functions and duties of the trust.

In Part IV, clause 16 (6) states:

The trust may—(*a*) with the consent of the Minister, sell, lease, mortgage or otherwise deal with land vested in it pursuant to this Act - . .

Then subclause (8) states:

No lease or licence granted by the trust under subsection (6) of this section shall be assigned nor shall any lessee or licensee sublet or part with the possession of the land the subject thereof without the consent in writing of the Minister first had and obtained.

This is an aspect of the Bill that I deplore—that, whereas a pretence is being made of putting the welfare of the Aboriginal people in the hands of a special trust, the Bill is in fact giving autocratic powers to the Minister. I have an uneasy feeling that this trust is to be a trust in name only. Nobody, least of all the Aboriginal person, wants to see this Bill used as a device to put the control of Aboriginal lands and moneys into the hands of a Minister of the Crown. What can the trust actually do? Clause 18 states:

Subject to the approval of the Minister the trust may grant technical or other assistance or advance moneys to Aborigines and persons of Aboriginal blood or to recognized Aboriginal groups for such purposes and upon such conditions as the trust thinks fit.

To my mind, this shows that in all major matters the trust is hamstrung. The Minister could well withhold moneys for trivial reasons, refuse to grant technical assistance capriciously, and so on. These points have been dealt with thoroughly by other honourable members. I will content myself at this stage of the debate by saying that it is to be hoped that, if money accrues to the trust in any great quantity under this scheme, it will be used to give the Aboriginal people educational facilities comparable with those provided for the rest of the South Australian community. If there is any one thing that is needed more than another to enable the Aborigines to take equality of position in the community, it is equality of education. I support the Bill.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): This is an important Bill concerning the welfare of the Aboriginal people in this State. This has been exemplified in the speeches made by honourable members and is something in respect of which we all desire to find an improved solution (if one is to be found) to this problem of giving what we all desire—equality between Aborigines and other peoples in this State. After all, we are now composed of many races in our population and the nearer we can get to a population living with proper education and understanding of common law the better it will be for all concerned. Therefore, it is regrettable that this Bill should have been used as an attempt to find a Party political football. I take strong objection to being publicly accused by the Government of trying to defeat the measure before I have even spoken to it. This accusation can be interpreted only as inciting the emotions of our Aborigines into an hysteria of hostility against the Legislative Council without even knowing the true circumstances. In other words, a deliberate attempt was being made to promote a psychology of racial discrimination where none existed. That there was an organized response cannot be denied. Whereas it is unusual to obtain much news of South Australia in the papers of other States, the mere giving of notice about a contingent motion in this place was sufficient to bring a flood of identical telegrams and letters from other States within 24 hours, giving me instructions what to do and accusing me of attempting to delay the Bill.

I regret that without secretarial assistance I am unable to provide individual replies to such a large mail. I am unable to reply to each person individually, so I am afraid the news will have to spread as it did previously by the same sources rather than by personal replies from me. This volume of correspondence was accompanied by inspired press articles, including some incorrect reporting relating to members of this Council. Every available member on this side of the Council (of course, it was only on this side of the Council in respect of which it was made Party politics; it was significant that only members on this side of the Chamber were sought out) received a deputation or interviewed somebody in connection with this Bill. I received a deputation the following morning.

Apparently, I am not expected to be in this Chamber. If somebody comes along, we can all go out and receive deputations, yet we are supposed to be taking our responsible positions in this Chamber. However, I took the first opportunity of receiving a deputation the following morning. It was of interstate proportions: it consisted of eight delegates, representing four States of the Commonwealth, and a free and harmonious discussion took place. I was able to explain at first hand why I had given notice of a contingent motion for the Bill to be referred to a Select Committee.

The deputation comprised intelligent people of Aboriginal blood who, on being given access to the wording of our Standing Orders, were able to understand the situation. I was also able truthfully to inform them that several honourable members had spoken sympathetically and thoughtfully upon the Bill and its objects, and had made a careful analysis of the position. The impression I gained from the deputation was that they assumed the appointment of a Select Committee would shelve the Bill because it had happened in Queensland, where a committee sat for three years. It was repeated by the Hon. Mr. Banfield who said:

To suggest that this Bill should go before a Select Committee is only their way of again obstructing and delaying the handing back of certain rights to the Aborigines that should never, in the first place, have been taken away from them. The same thing happened in Queensland, where the Select Committee took three years to bring in its findings. Is that what our Opposition wants to do with this Bill? It has placed no time limit on when the Select Committee's report should come back to this place. It is obstruction.

I excuse the honourable member for that statement; I put it down to his lack of knowledge and experience. I do not think the Hon. Mr. Banfield would deliberately misrepresent the position and show such ignorance of Standing Orders. He was not correct when he said there was a Select Committee in Queensland, and he showed a lack of knowledge when he said that no time had been set down when a Select Committee should report to Parliament. I point out that we have not reached that stage. I have a contingent motion on the Notice Paper, but we have not reached the stage he mentioned. If the honourable member studied Standing Orders he would learn that when a Select Committee is appointed a date is set down when it must report.

With regard to the Queensland report, if the honourable member had taken the same trouble as I did he would have discovered that no Select Committee was appointed in that State. This is the kind of information that was bandied around in the press before I had even had the opportunity to speak and refer to my contingent motion. It was misrepresentation which I say was nothing short of deliberate. It was wrong, and the sooner I give this Council the information regarding that Queensland committee the better it will be. As a matter of fact, the Queensland Government went to considerable trouble to obtain the best possible legislation, taking into account all the decisions of international conferences and charters. It appointed a special committee, not a Select Committee, to inquire into legislation for the promotion of the well-being of Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders in Queensland. I believe only one member of Parliament was appointed to the committee. It comprised about a dozen members in all. The Chairman was Mr. R. A. Armstrong, M.L.A., member for Mulgrave, while the experts were: Mr. K. J. McCormack, Under Secretary, Department of Health and Home Affairs—from August 29, 1962, to November 6, 1962; Dr. A. Fryberg, Director-General of Health and Medical Services, and nominee; Dr. M. H. Gabriel, Health Officer, Health and Medical Branch, Department of Health; Mr. C. O'Leary, Director of Native Affairs, Brisbane—from August 29, 1962, to June 30, 1963, (retired); Mr. P. J. Killoran, Director of Native Affairs, Brisbane—from July 1, 1963; Professor Sir Fred Schonell, Vice-Chancellor, University of Queensland, and nominee; Miss Betty H. Watts, Lecturer in Education, University of Queensland—from August 29, 1962, to December 31, 1962; Professor D. W. McElwain, University of Queensland; Sir Herbert G. Watkin, Director-General of Education, and nominee; Mr. W. Wood, Director of Special Education Services, Department of Education; Miss M. Whiley, Senior Social Worker, Department of Health; Mr. R. T. Matthews, Stipendiary Magistrate, Children's Court, and formerly Assistant Under Secretary, Justice Department; Mr. James Hamilton, President, O.P.A.L. Brisbane. I do not know the meaning of O.P.A.L. but I gather Mr. Hamilton was a representative of the Queensland natives. The committee was appointed on August 29, 1962, and presented its report on November 3, 1964. I understand that the legislation was drafted and introduced in the following March. A list was given of the submissions made to the committee, as well as the documents it had studied. In the list of the submissions are the names of many of the people from whom I received correspondence.

Now that I have referred to the constitution of the committee, I have said enough to explain that it was not a Select Committee but a committee set up in a manner somewhat similar to the manner used by the present Government in its habit of appointing a Royal Commission or a committee to tackle a big problem.

The Queensland committee was established to advise on the best legislation possible. I found it interesting to follow what happened in Parliament afterwards. The Minister made considerable use of the report when taking Parliament and everbody else into his confidence. He took an hour and a half to introduce the Bill and many interesting matters were mentioned. It was an informative speech and one that I commend to members. It can be found on page 2529 of Vol. 240 of the 1964-65 Queensland Parliamentary Debates.

I would like to refer to several matters, but rather than weary members I repeat my suggestion that they read the speech for themselves. It was interesting to note something that the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Duggan, said when he spoke immediately after the Bill had been introduced. The Parliament had been well informed prior to the Bill being introduced and I hope that such a method will be adopted here. The debate continued throughout that afternoon. About a half dozen members from both sides of the House spoke to the Bill. Not only did the Government have the benefit of this report, but it also arranged a Parliamentary visit to the areas inhabited by the native population. The Minister for Education said in the debate:

I accompanied the all-Party group to Thursday Island, Bamaga and adjacent islands, and Mr. Armstrong, the chairman of the committee, and Mr. Duggan, Leader of the Opposition, were with me. Those honourable members were given the opportunity to see for themselves settlements and missions under working conditions and the people were given the opportunity to speak to honourable members in privacy and to discuss their problems. In addition to myself, the all-Party group included—Mr. R. A. Armstrong, committee chairman, honourable member for Mulgrave; Mr. J. E. Duggan, Leader of the Opposition and honourable member for Toowoomba; Mr. H. McKechnie, honourable member for Carnarvon; Mr. C. Carey, honourable member for Albert; Mr. D. Cory, honourable member for Warwick; Mr. G. T. Chinchen, honourable member for Mount Gravatt; Mr. J. Herbert, honourable member for Sherwood; Mr. J. Melloy, honourable member for Nudgee; Mr. F. Bromley, honourable member for Norman; Mr. H. Davies, honourable member for Maryborough; Mr. E. Wallis-Smith, honourable member for Tablelands; and Mr. H. Adair, honourable member for Cook.

The Minister went on to describe the visit. It appears that the committee spent some time on its investigation and that, during that time, the opportunity was given to everyone to become informed on the subject. Parliament was able to proceed with the consideration of the legislation immediately. What Mr. Duggan said was rather different from what has happened here. He said:

We have listened for an hour and a half to the Minister introducing his proposal to bring down a Bill to deal with the important obligation of improving conditions for Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders and placing them on a basis of equality with other Australians. No-one will quarrel with the time taken by the Minister, because he dealt with the subject in a very comprehensive and interesting way and, in his comments to this stage, he has been very impartial. I say on behalf of the Opposition that we accept the Minister's invitation to deal with this very challenging problem in the manner suggested by him, and will give honourable members the benefit of our views on things likely to improve the conditions of those covered by the provisions of the Bill.

I should like at this stage to acknowledge the Minister's undoubted courtesy in inviting a small party from this side of the Chamber to join a group from Parliament that visited some mission stations and parts of the Torres Strait Islands for the purpose of viewing conditions prevailing there. It is true that no restrictions were placed on our speaking to people in those areas and obtaining their views, and I should like personally to thank the Minister for that constructive gesture by the Government. When we addressed various gatherings, no attempt was made to score along Party-political lines and, although I am not seeking it, the Minister might be good enough to make an acknowledgment that that is so.

The Minister interjected and said, "That is acknowledged." That seems to be an excellent background for dealing with the problem of the dimensions that we are considering. Everybody was given the opportunity to study the matter, not through theory or pressure groups but because they were in a position to exercise their judgment from first-hand knowledge. It is different from the cavalier attitude that the Minister has taken regarding this Bill. Quite contrary to what the Minister said in his unrelenting enthusiasm and insatiable desire to smear this honourable Council when he asserted that honourable members should do their homework, this debate has proved that honourable members have done their homework and have examined the Bill with a view to securing the best possible result.

As I pointed out, Queensland sought the fullest investigation before legislation was introduced. This Bill has been presented to us under different circumstances. There is not, in

my opinion, a shadow of doubt that, if it had been introduced in this Chamber, it would have been declared a hybrid Bill. My authority for saying that is Standing Order No. 268, which states:

Bills of a hybrid nature introduced to the Council by the Government, which—

(*a*) have for their primary and chief object to promote the interests of one or more Municipal Corporations, District Councils, or public local bodies, rather than those of Municipal Corporation, District Councils, or public local bodies generally:

(*b*) authorize the granting of Crown or waste lands to an individual person, a company, a corporation, or local body:

shall be proceeded with as Public Bills, but shall each be referred to a Select Committee after the second readings.

A similar Joint Standing Order also prevails, and I say without doubt that this Bill is one that should be referred to a Select Committee. I do not think the fact that it was not introduced in this Chamber alters the nature of the Bill in any way, and I think a Select Committee is necessary if we are to ensure that whatever legislation is passed will not be open to a challenge to its validity. Such a challenge would entail more delay than would an inquiry by a Select Committee.

I have cited the Standing Order regarding Bills dealing with the property of the Crown and corporate bodies. Now let us look at this measure. It transfers land to the trust and states that the trust is a body corporate, not a department of the Government. It promotes the interests of one body of the people, not the whole of the people. It takes away the mineral rights of the Crown and gives them to the trust. It distinguishes between personal responsibilities under laws of the community. So, I consider that this Bill should be referred to a Select Committee. My contingent notice of motion, if passed by the Council, will provide the opportunity to ensure that the validity of any measure passed cannot be challenged.

It may be that the rights of natives on the Aboriginal reserves in the North-West can be affected, and the rights of others may also be involved. I have been told that some Aborigines do not want the paternal care of the Minister, which is included in this Bill. It would be the work of a Select Committee to find out by obtaining expressions of opinion. We have had two Select Committees in this session on matters far less involved than those dealt with in this Bill and that is proof that the Standing Orders are designed to ensure that the rights of everyone are considered, and Parliament is directed accordingly. That is our guard against despotism.

Criticism has been made about delaying the passing of the Bill. If the Bill is of such urgency, why did the Government adjourn the debate and drop it to a low position on the Notice Paper? It could have been referred to a Select Committee as long ago as August 25, the day on which I placed my contingent notice of motion on the Notice Paper. I did that because it seemed that the debate had finished, and I set out to take the necessary precautions, the reasons for which I have already explained. Instead, the Government has tried to engage in Party politics or, putting it in a more favourable light, perhaps it is afraid of a proper inquiry being held into this controversial problem.

The problem of assimilation *versus* integration, which is fundamental to this Bill, is something on which I need some clarification. The apartheid policies in South Africa and America do not appear to have solved the problems we desire to solve: that is, to give a happy existence regardless of race or colour under a common law. Australia is composed of many races, and it is almost cosmopolitan. Can we have different laws for every different national background in this country? As a descendant of a tribal race, I prefer to continue to live as a citizen of a country of one people. It is not to be wondered, therefore, why I seek further knowledge on the working of any other system.

I wonder, too, what will be the effect of this legislation if other States do not adopt similar legislation. I understand that we have in this State 6,000 Aborigines out of a total of 300,000 for the whole of Australia. I was told by a deputation that our existing legislation was in advance of that of any other States. This opinion was expressed despite the long inquiry held in Queensland by experts. As we have not been followed by other States in the past, can we assume that we shall be followed in the future? If we are not, does this mean that we shall have a migration to this State from other States and that a further problem will be created? These are the things I wish to have clarified before I give a final vote on the Bill. The Hon. Mr. Banfield attempted to reply to many questions last week. He appears to have assumed the role of Minister in charge of the Bill. Among other things, he said:

I took the opportunity of obtaining from the Acting Director of Aboriginal Affairs . . . his views and report.

I do not know whether this indicates a change in Government policy: whether all questions and answers must continue to come only through the Minister, even to the extent of access to the Parliamentary Draftsman. Perhaps the Minister will advise us whether there has been any alteration.

I congratulate all honourable members who have spoken on this Bill upon the research and thought they have put into their speeches. Because of the amount of information and knowledge placed before this Council during the debate, I do not wish to engage in repetition, because, as I have said, I am seeking a further investigation before the Bill is finally passed. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

That this Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I do not wish to delay the Bill. I did not reply to the second reading debate because, knowing that this motion would be moved, I did not think it was the opportune time. The Government did not consider this Bill was a matter for a Select Committee. However, I know the feeling of this Council, but I point out that the Government does not welcome this move.

Motion carried. Bill referred to a Select Committee consisting of the Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, R. C. DeGaris, Sir Lyell McEwin, Sir Arthur Rymill, and A. J. Shard; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on October 18.

ENFIELD GENERAL CEMETERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from September 15. Page 1612.)

Bill taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MINES AND WORKS INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 15. Page 1612.)

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): I have had a brief look at this amending Bill and must say that the intention of its provisions is not clear to me. I remember the circumstances in 1962 when this Act was amended and the Port Pirie wharves were all brought under its provisions. It arose from an accident on the wharves, nothing to do with industrial conditions or anything like that. It involved purely an inspection of some machinery. There had been a accident involving a crane. There was a gap between the actual machinery on the wharf itself and a ship lying off it. It was a simple matter, but it created some doubt as to which department the company should report the accident. It did not come within the law pertaining to ships (either Harbors Board or Commonwealth legislation) and it did not come under the Mines Department. So, at the request of the company, those amendments were made in 1962. As far as I can understand the Bill, it will only confuse the issue.

At Port Pirie there are six contiguous wharves—Nos. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10. There is no doubt that Nos. 8, 9 and 10 are on the company's land or mineral lease. I do not think this Bill attempts to remove the control of the Mines Department in that regard.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It is Nos. 5, 6 and 7.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Nos. 5, 6 and 7 are taken out of the control of the Mines Department. The interesting thing about this is that the cranes that operate on wharves Nos. 8, 9 and 10 travel, when they load the ships with ore and export material, on the same wharf railway lines as the cranes on wharves Nos. 5, 6 and 7, which are controlled by the Harbors Board. Who controls what, and when and where? Does a different set of circumstances apply to a crane once it leaves point A and gets to point B? Does that mean that there will be complications and overlapping? Who is in charge at the time the crane passes from one area to another? At present, it is all subject to the determination of the Mines Department's inspection branch. It is purely machinery. I am at a loss to understand this Bill. It was introduced only last Thursday. I have tried to get information about it, but I do not know where to get it from. If such information could be made available to me, I should be in a better position to express an opinion to this Council. I do not see how any honourable member can make up his mind why this measure is necessary. What does it set out to do? What is the problem it has to solve? We have not been told.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: The only problem I can see is what I have already told you— dual control by the Mines Department and the Harbors Board.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: That is not so. The Minister is suggesting by interjection that there is attached to this some prestige between two Government departments. I have never heard a worse argument in support of a Bill, because this concerns purely machinery inspection. Is machinery to be subject to two examinations and to be approved by the Mines Department on one side of the line and to be subjected to a fresh inspection on the other side of the line? Perhaps everything is in order to satisfy the provisions of the Mines and Works Inspection Act and the machinery may be safe in the eyes of the Mines Department but is it unsafe in the eyes of the Harbors Board? Is that the position? What is the problem?

If the Harbors Board is responsible everywhere else in the State, there is nowhere else with the same set of conditions existing as exist at Port Pirie. It seems to me that something simple is being made complicated by making a divided control—because it is really all one, like the cranes of Broken Hill Associated Smelters. Therefore, because of this dilemma in which I find myself about why this Bill is being introduced and what it is supposed to do, I cannot at this stage support it. I must reserve my vote until the Committee stage or until the end of the second reading debate, after I have got some information that will remove any doubt I have about what this legislation is designed to do.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 15. Page 1620.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I rise to support this Bill. Other honourable members have dealt with it at some length and the comment has been made that it is largely a Committee Bill dealing with a number of machinery matters, most of which are unrelated to each other. With those comments I agree, but I want now to touch on one or two points. In the first instance, paragraph (*a*) of clause 4, which amends section 31 of the principal Act, refers to a courtesy registration for accredited diplomatic officers. As a matter of courtesy between Governments, I find no fault with that, provided it does not extend to all sorts of local people who may be acting as officials for oversea Governments.

Paragraph (*b*) refers to the registration of any tractor, bulldozer, scarifier, grader, roller, and a number of other implements at present exempted from registration. I have no particular objection to this clause. It will make much more book work, probably, for some district council clerks, on the one hand, and for some primary producers, on the other. Not only that, it will make more book work for people in the Motor Vehicles Department, and it will create more employment. Anything that does that at present will no doubt be clutched at like a straw by the Government. However, it is unproductive and time-wasting employment, and means little in the long run. Although I do not particularly oppose the clause, I think it has a limited value, except probably to those people with shares in companies making trade plates or number plates, because I can see that with this provision and others that have been foreshadowed such people are in for a real harvest.

Clause 6 deals with registration fees not being altogether lost if for some reason the transfer cannot be carried out within the stipulated 14 days. I support the clause because I realize that, even though transfers should be carried out within a fortnight, circumstances can arise from time to time that prevent this. I believe it is a reasonable amendment. Clause 7 refers to a practice which, if this clause is passed, will become lawful. I refer to the provision that will allow vehicles to be registered in business names. I think the Minister said that this new provision would recognize an existing practice and empower the Registrar to register vehicles in business names. I have some doubt about this; I am not happy to know that this is an existing practice. A business name is frequently a side issue of a company or individual and sometimes a front for activities not quite as reputable as the company or individual otherwise engages in. Not only that, to my mind it is not a proper identity, and I endorse the views expressed by the Hon. Sir Norman Jude and the Hon. Mr. Hill in this regard. It is a doubtful proposition, especially at a time when the Government states that it is trying to tighten up on the registration of motor vehicles and ensure that motor vehicles are less likely to be stolen. Here is a loophole that should be examined, and I suggest to the Minister that he examine it. I am not inclined to support the clause as it now stands.

Clause 10 deals with the exemption of some driving instructors from the need to be licensed. Today more than ever (and this is underlined each day by various occurrences on our roads) driving instructors should be more carefully

screened. They should be drivers more competent than ever before. I ask the Minister to examine this clause again. We should be assured that these instructors, who are not to be licensed but who are working for public authorities such as the Municipal Tramways Trust, will have to undergo substantially the same test as those who have to be approved by the Registrar. Perhaps an officer from that public authority could be appointed to conduct the test. I think the words "public authority" should be spelt out in more detail because at present they allow an interpretation that is too wide. I suggest that this clause could be improved.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: That phrase has been adopted from the present Act.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Even so, I think it is possible to improve it, and I suggest that it be further examined. Driving instructors should be competent and of the highest repute, mainly because of the trouble we are having on our roads. Even with authorities such as the Municipal Tramways Trust, which name seems to be a misnomer in these days, the drivers should be particularly well-trained. In addition to that they should be well-trained in courtesy and in obeying the rules of the road. I think the Hon. Mr. Hill mentioned that M.T.T. drivers do not always pull into their proper parking places when picking up passengers. I have travelled on some of these buses, and although many drivers are extremely competent others are not so capable and do not obey the rules as they should. I do not intend to say much more about the Bill. The Hon. Mr. Potter intends moving two or three amendments to clause 11. They spell out, or indicate more clearly, the intention of the Government, and I agree with his suggested amendments.

Clause 12 provides for the Treasurer to recover from the third-party insurer the cost of burial of a person who may have been buried at public expense. That is a reasonable provision, but here again it is a matter of dollars and cents. With the present state of the Treasury, I believe it is necessary to gather all funds possible, and therefore I do not oppose the clause. This is largely a Committee Bill, as I said previously, and honourable members will no doubt comment further at that stage. I may do so myself. I support the Bill.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Southern): My comments will be brief. As has been pointed out, this is a Committee Bill. Clause 3 repeals section 13 of the principal Act and in its place gives certain exemptions to vehicles working on roadways. Those to be exempted are vehicles:

(*a*) used on a road in the work of making a fire-break or of destroying dangerous or noxious weeds or vermin; or

(*b*) driven on a road in the course of a journey to or from a place where such work is being or is to be done.

It is tied in with clause 4 and when section 13 is repealed the vehicles mentioned will be included in section 31, which lists the vehicles that can be registered without fees being paid. I point out that it is necessary for people to take many vehicles on to roads for specific purposes.

This is particularly so in relation to farm vehicles and where roads divide farming properties. The roads concerned may not be used to any great extent. A farmer who has an unregistered vehicle may desire to re-erect a fence adjoining a roadway and may have to take the vehicle on to the road in order to take posts out. The list of vehicles exempted is not sufficiently wide. Any vehicle used on a road on the boundary of a property could be included. The operations covered could be extended to include any work done on a road adjacent to a property.

Section 30 of the principal Act allows registration fees to be collected to the nearest 10c and clause 5 applies this provision to refunds. Clause 6 amends section 60. I understand that at present, if the buyer of a registered motor vehicle fails to apply for transfer of registration within 14 days, the registration is cancelled and no refund is payable. The amendment provides that, if no application is made after 14 days, the Registrar may refund to the transferee, on his application, the balance of any registration due, less $4.

I cannot see much objection to this, but I point out that the refund is to be made to the transferee upon his application and somehow I feel that this portion of the registration belongs to the transferor. I do not know how the difficulty can be overcome. For example, secondhand car dealers will be aware of this provision and people who sell cars to dealers may not be aware of it. In that way the clause may place in the hands of a transferee a right to collect the unexpired portion of registration to which he may not be entitled. The two applicable provisions in the principal Act are sections 56a and 56b. When the transferor applies for the cancellation of a registration, he can collect the unexpired portion. However, when no application is made by the transferor, the transferee can apply for it.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: That has been puzzling me, too.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I think it is a matter on which we can seek clarification from the Minister. I am not completely happy about it, although I understand what the amendment is designed to do. Regarding clause 7, the matters raised by the Hon. Mr. Hill are worthy of consideration and I ask the honourable members who are lawyers to comment on the matter of the registration in a business name. The Hon. Mr. Dawkins has also mentioned the matter, and further information is required.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Registration will be in the business name rather than in the name of the individual. That is all.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes, but the Hon. Mr. Hill has pointed out that there may be difficulties.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: If the individual does not own the vehicle, it will be owned by the company.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: This refers to names, and I hope we will get a lead from the lawyers.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I do not quite see what is worrying you.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Perhaps the honourable member had better speak to the Hon. Mr. Hill, because he raised it. I am merely saying that the matter is worthy of consideration.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: What does that indicate? That you oppose the clause because some other honourable member opposes it?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No. All I am saying is that the Hon. Mr. Hill raised a point that is worthy of consideration, and I stick by that statement. Perhaps the Minister's reply will satisfy the Hon. Mr. Hill and me. Clause 8 is clear and reasonable. It deals with the right of appeal in the case of cancellation or suspension of a licence. I think the principal Act at present provides that an appeal can be lodged where an application for the issue or renewal of a licence has been refused. This clause provides for an appeal where a licence has been cancelled or suspended.

Clause 9 confers on inspectors the same powers, as defined in section 5 of the Road Traffic Act, as are conferred on members of the Police Force regarding requests for production of licences. It was pointed out in the second reading explanation that this clause was necessary because of the extra work involved in administration of the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act and to enable inspectors to carry out their work effectively. I have no great objection to this provision.

Clause 11 amends section 102 of the principal Act and refers to the duty to insure against third party risks. I have much pleasure in giving my complete support to the amendment. I have had some experience of this matter and I know the harshness of the provision in the principal Act. If a person does not register a trailer the minimum penalty is a fine of $40 and suspension of the licence for, I think, three months. I, therefore, wholeheartedly support the first part of the clause, which amends section 102 (2). As clause 11 (*b*) has been dealt with fully by the Hon. Mr. Potter, who has an amendment on honourable members' files, I will not deal with it.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I, too, have an amendment.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I notice that. Clause 12, which enables the Treasurer in a court of competent jurisdiction to recover from the insurer the cost of a burial, is unobjectionable. Clause 13 deals with a claim against the defendant where a vehicle is uninsured. I have some difficulty with clause 14.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: You are not the only one!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Now that I have seen the small amendment to be moved by the Minister, however, it is much clearer. The foreshadowed amendment, which is to insert "or (*c*)", improves the clause considerably. I had some difficulty in relation to the amendments to be moved by the Hon. Mr. Potter, so in Committee I shall listen intently to the debate and have more to say about them. I support the second reading.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 15. Page 1626.)

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill, a long explanation of the clauses of which was given by the Minister of Health. I think the Bill has probably been misunderstood by many people, as I have already been asked questions by country people about how soon it will remedy the position in relation to general practitioners in the country. As I was away from Adelaide over the weekend, I have not had time to have more than a cursory glance through the Minister's second reading explanation, but

it seems to me to be a good measure that will assist to maintain the standards of the profession. Also, it is a worthy consolidation of all the Acts and amendments of the past, which is necessary because the legislation is contained in about six separate volumes.

This Bill will assist to maintain the status of the profession, particularly as, with people being brought here from other countries, it is necessary to sort out those who are suitable to practise the profession of medicine. I think the Bill has two main features, the first of which is that it increases the powers of the board with regard to the registration and disciplining of medical practitioners. This is done by clause 16, which amends section 26 of the principal Act. This section sets out the powers of the board with regard to discipline. The first amendment to this section is merely to clarify the position regarding qualifications, and in relation to this the Minister said:

It is considered highly unlikely for a qualification to be withdrawn or cancelled by the university, college, or other body by which it was conferred as distinct from the authority which registered the medical practitioner, and so a new paragraph (*b*) is inserted in lieu thereof which makes it clear that the authority which registered such person and has withdrawn, suspended or cancelled such registration should be the body referred to in this paragraph and not the university, etc., that conferred the qualification.

One can easily appreciate why this should be the position, and I am quite happy with the provision. Regarding clause 16 (*b*), the Minister said:

The second amendment introduced by paragraph (*b*) of this clause inserts an additional provision whereby the name of any person may be removed from the register if such person has been certified to be a mental defective or suffering from any mental or physical infirmity which renders him incapable of practising as a medical practitioner.

I am not sure that anyone would approve of that.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is not nearly as severe as it has been.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: My main interest is that people who should not be practising are not allowed to practise.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They will be suspended until they recover.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I will accept the risk associated with that: sometimes it is difficult to know and to give a certificate that there will not be a recurrence. The third amendment to section 26 is designed to confer upon the board powers to deal with any registered person who is guilty of infamous conduct. This is desirable, and I hope it will work a little more effectively than the existing provision has worked in the past. I think these provisions are desirable. In his explanation, the Minister said:

The Government, therefore, as a matter of urgency, thought that something must be done to relieve the position, and it is thought that this present proposal will do much in that direction.

Modifications have been made in previous amending Bills to enable new Australians to qualify, usually by a period at the University (at one time it was, I think, three years) and other considerations. All these things were designed to ensure that the persons concerned were qualified to practise and sufficiently understood the language, the ethics of the profession generally and associations with patients. I cannot see that this really extends the position very far from what it has been. I say this because people have got the impression that the Bill will relieve the shortage of doctors. I support the Bill *in toto*—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: There is not any immediate alteration to the rules in this Bill.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: That should be made quite clear.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: When I reply I shall go into that.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: A doctor is not a doctor until he is trained. I think the answer to the problem about doctors is contained in the report by the Committee on Facilities for Training Medical Practitioners in South Australia. That is a report that interests people more than anything else in this connection. This is a good Bill but it should not be associated with the supply of additional doctors. Additional doctors can come only from sufficient training facilities to cater for the number of students in training and by reducing the embargo on the numbers in training. I was interested to read this report because, with each reference, we return to the same answer: that additional clinical teaching facilities are required to be provided. That is the first reference.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Is that the committee's report you are reading from?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Yes. The first question that the committee had to answer was:

To make a factual survey showing the number of medical practitioners at work in South Australia, where they have come from and their numerical relation to the State's population. The statistics for the present situation should be projected over future years until, say, 1985.

After giving its four conclusions on this first term of reference, it makes the following recommendation:

In addition to the predicted 95 graduates per year from the University of Adelaide, a minimum of 45 additional South Australian graduates should qualify annually from December, 1975.

The second term of reference was:

To examine what measures are practicable to increase the facilities for training medical practitioners in South Australia should the Government deem the number of practitioners available either now or at some future date to be insufficient.

The committee's recommendation, following its conclusion on that term of reference, was:

A second medical school should be established with a minimum of delay at Flinders university. It should be the intention that the first increment of medical students will qualify in December, 1975.

That period of training means that we want a hospital there fairly soon. The third term of reference was:

How far it is possible to use more extensively the existing teaching facilities by re-organization of methods, some supplementary provisions at teaching hospitals, and the institution of a special fourth term or comparable arrangement.

On that, there are a number of conclusions referring to the possibility of using more extensively the existing and proposed facilities at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and taking into consideration the use of the Repatriation General Hospital. The committee's recommendation was:

Additional clinical teaching facilities require to be provided at a new major hospital in association with the Flinders university.

The fourth term of reference was:

Whether, if a new teaching hospital were contemplated, it could be expected there would be a full and necessary requirement by patients for additional beds both for general and maternity cases and without serious diversion from existing public and private hospital facilities.

The recommendations there, following several conclusions again referring to the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, were:

A new major hospital should be established in association with the Flinders university. Its completion date should be related to—

(*a*) the urgent need for the provision of additional beds to meet the needs of the population;

(*b*) the need for additional South Australians to qualify as doctors in 1975.

Planning should therefore commence early in 1966.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We are in front of that.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Then:

Steps should be taken immediately to provide the Queen Elizabeth Hospital with the proposed extensions.

I do not know whether the Minister is in front of that.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: 1970, was it?

The Hon. F. J. Potter: Sir Lyell is now talking about proposed extensions to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Yes, and that is something that was under consideration some time ago, because of the reduction in the number of medical schools at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, which were to be replaced by an additional two at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. So we have a limitation on the number of medical students at present. While we have that, it is useless to talk about providing more doctors for anywhere, let alone country areas in particular. We shall not get doctors in country areas until there are sufficient doctors available to go out there, and they will not go out there while they can remain happily in the metropolitan area or in the suburbs. Personally, I am not at all interested in some of the suggestions I have heard that we can send anybody out to the country.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is not our intention.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: It has been suggested that they can go out into the country with fewer qualifications. On the contrary, what is required in the country are people competent to carry on their own profession with their own resources rather than depending on a neighbour in the next street. Doctors for country areas will come only out of hastening and extending the teaching facilities required. In spite of what the Minister said today about other hospitals, the fact remains that hospitals were planned, and the particular ones to which he referred today would have been in operation as soon as the report was available, which would have enabled the Government to provide funds on the Estimates. I was quite happy about the future in that direction. If the Minister says that we could not have done it, all I know is that there was no indication of it in my time, and there was every promise that I could proceed as soon as that report was available. Now I hope that, with all the desires expressed by the Minister, with this report now nearly one year old, he will stop talking about these things

and get to work and do something that will have some effect on the supply of medical practitioners both for the country and for the metropolitan area.

I think this Bill protects the profession; it contains many safeguards. However, I do not think it will make any difference to the country. Doctors will still have to obtain the required qualifications and, if they do not have them, they will have to wait till they get them. That does not advance the supply of doctors one iota. I do not want the public to misunderstand and be misled by this Bill, thinking that it will do what is needed, because it will only create confusion and raise false hopes in people, who believe it will be the means of recruiting more doctors. Unless we get doctors with the proper qualifications, we shall not be any nearer to solving the problem. I support the Bill.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.5 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, September 21, at 2.15 p.m.