

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, September 21, 1966.

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

QUESTIONS

RENTAL HOUSES.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Has the Minister of Local Government obtained a reply to my question of August 30 with reference to Crown lands in country districts being available for housing purposes?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The Minister of Irrigation reports that there are allotments open for application under irrigation town perpetual lease in the towns of Waikerie, Moorook South, Glossop, Berri, Monash, Cooltong, Loxton East and Loxton North at present. Gazettal of these allotments open for application dates back for up to 15 months. Further allotments at Waikerie, Kingston and Berri, and one at Barmera, were priced recently, whilst the Land Board will be pricing additional allotments at Barmera this week. It is expected that such allotments will be open for application in the near future. More land for township purposes is in the course of purchase at Berri. Subdivisional survey will proceed as soon as practicable after acquisition, and reticulation of this area for town water supply purposes will be undertaken when funds are available. A request for further extensions to the town of Moorook South is under consideration but if proceeded with it will involve acquisition from a number of landholders, which may take some time to effect. In the meantime, the current demand for land in that town seems to be adequately covered by allotments already available for application and the recent allocation of sufficient blocks to the South Australian Housing Trust to meet its requirements there. Allocations to the trust have also been made recently at Barmera and Berri to the extent of 14 and 28 allotments respectively, whilst it is understood that in both these towns the trust has a few allotments previously allocated but still available to prospective clients for residential purposes.

LEVEL CROSSINGS.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Has the Minister of Roads a reply to my question of September 15 concerning level crossings?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. During 1964-65 work was carried out on six level crossings at a cost of \$16,520. Similar work was carried

out on nine level crossings during 1965-66 at a cost of \$66,788. Provision has been made on this year's works programme for 12 level crossings to be improved at an estimated cost of \$75,000.

CAMBRAI AND SEDAN RAILWAY DISCONTINUANCE BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Transport): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to enable the Railways Commissioner to take up the line of railway between Cambrai and Sedan. The Bill is in the usual form, clause 4 empowering the Commissioner to remove the line and dispose of the materials thereof, and clause 5 providing for the effect of removal. This particular portion of railway was closed by order of the Transport Control Board with the approval of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works as from December 1, 1964. The board was satisfied that there would be other transport facilities for serving the area previously served by this portion of railway, which was authorized in 1914 by Statute.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I support the measure, the subject matter of which, as the Minister has said, has been reported upon by the Public Works Standing Committee. I should like to make one or two points in this matter, because I visited this area, which is in my electoral district, only recently in company with the Hon. Mr. Dawkins. The people in the area are of the opinion that the section of railway between Cambrai and Sedan will be utilized by the Engineering and Water Supply Department for the carriage of water to a new camp being established in that area in connection with the Swan Reach main. I notice that the wording of the Minister's explanation is "to remove the line and dispose of the materials". I do not see any mention of this matter in the Bill but it is of considerable interest in the locality that this line may be retained for some time—in fact, during the whole period of the construction of the main, which will be completed in, I think, 1970. We should have additional information on this.

The line has not been used for some time. When the Public Works Committee inquired into the Monarto South line, in respect of which there was a recommendation that it be closed, it found that the Monarto South portion should remain open as far as Cambrai,

and that from Cambrai to Sedan the line should be closed. That was because there was a wheat silo at Cambrai. The line, in company with many others, has not paid for some considerable time, but the advent of the wheat silo has made it a little more paying at the Cambrai to Monarto South end. I have no objection to disposing of this portion because the committee fully inquired into the matter.

I think that six witnesses were examined at Sedan, some of them wanting to keep the line open; but one said that the line had done only 14s. 7d. worth of business in the previous 12 months, yet it was proposed to keep open a line that was not economic. The people of the area have accepted that it is desirable that the line be closed between those two places. It was more important when the committee inquired into it in 1964, because at that time we had transport control regulations, which meant that there would be control of the route while the railway remained open. Since the advent of the present Government, and with the concurrence of Parliament, the restrictions imposed by the Transport Control Board over the area have been removed and road transport operators have taken over. That was always desired by the people in the area. It was extremely difficult to shift stock to the Adelaide abattoirs by rail because long distances, including travel through the Adelaide hills, were involved and it was easier to use road transport because of shorter distances. I would like the Minister in his reply, or in the Committee stage, to supply information regarding the use of the line between Cambrai and Sedan for the purpose of carting water to keep the new camp in operation for some time.

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

APPRENTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to amend the Apprentices Act, 1950-1966. The Bill proposes two rather minor amendments to the Act. The first amendment relates to the number of hours that an apprentice should attend a technical school after the first two years of his apprenticeship. The amendment to section 18 (4) of the principal Act, which was agreed to at a managers' conference on the Apprentices Act Amendment Act, 1966, held on March 3, 1966, provided that after the completion of the second year of

apprenticeship he (the apprentice) shall attend during working hours a technical school or class of instruction for four hours each week in every week that the school or class is open for instruction. Though it was clearly the intention of the managers that the amendment should apply to an apprentice only in the third year of his apprenticeship, this was inadvertently not stated in the amendment as agreed upon. As at present drafted the amendment could be construed as meaning that this requirement is to apply in any year after the second year of apprenticeship—i.e. to the third, fourth or fifth year. This was never the intention. It is necessary, therefore, to put the matter beyond doubt by including in this amendment the words "during the third year of an apprenticeship". Clause 3 so provides.

The second amendment proposed relates to section 27 (4) of the principal Act and is also an amendment that in its nature is consequential to a provision that was inserted in the Apprentices Act Amendment Act, 1966. In section 27 (3) of the principal Act provision was made that no indenture can be cancelled without the approval of the Apprenticeship Commission. The penalty for any contravention of this subsection which appears in subsection (4) of this section, however, only applies to an employer. It does not apply to an apprentice, or the parent. It is the Government's view that the Chairman of the Apprenticeship Commission should be able to prosecute an apprentice who wilfully terminates his indenture after approval for such termination has been refused by the commission; and also the parent in any case when he or she was wilfully obstructing the implementation of any decision of the commission. This can be accomplished by replacing the word "employer" with the word "person" in subsection (4) of this section; this will be uniform with the other offences provisions in Part IV of the Act. I commend this Bill for the consideration of honourable members.

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

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST BILL.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary) moved:

That a message be sent to the House of Assembly requesting that the Attorney-General (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) and the Hon. G. G. Pearson, members of the House of Assembly, be permitted to attend and give evidence before the Select Committee of the Legislative Council on the Aboriginal Lands Trust Bill.

Motion carried.

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 20. Page 1661.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): In general terms, I support the introduction of a totalizator agency board system of betting in South Australia. This is a Government measure and there has been much investigation and public comment about the plans and the general principle involved. It is, of course, part of the Labor Party's social legislation programme. From my observations (and I am also influenced somewhat by the vote at the lotteries referendum, another social issue) I am convinced that the people of this State want T.A.B. and so I support the general principle that it be introduced.

In doing that, I cannot help mentioning that, after looking at this matter from the State's viewpoint, I do not think any real benefit will result to the economy and general production of the State from T.A.B. I am informed that one group, the race horse breeders, will be assisted considerably by T.A.B. as time passes, and I think race horse breeding is a growing industry in the State and one that will in time become quite famous. However, I think there are other important points that offset the benefits that may result to that sector of the economy.

For example, the moderate wage-earner who now bets on the course has only a certain amount of money with which to meet his needs and I think that off-course betting will increase the amount of betting on races far more than most people expect. The person on a fixed wage who spends his money today on goods and services within the State and who will increase expenditure on gambling will, in my opinion, have to cut down on some other expenditure. An appliance that otherwise might have been purchased for the home may not be bought, and it would be interesting to follow back along the line to find where the particular appliance had been made, what people were employed in its production, and so on. The demand for such goods will decrease as gambling increases.

I do not think that T.A.B. will help our standard of living, although it will change it, and it seems that the public want that change. I think the matter should be dealt with with the greatest of care, because people will be affected if the incidence of gambling increases. I note with much satisfaction the safeguards the Government has written into the Bill

to try to maintain high standards in the actual machinery of T.A.B. operation. This is pleasing to see, because I often talk with people who mention to me the blot on the history of this State that the old betting shops made. Memories are still strong in the minds of some about what those betting shops did.

It appears that the Government, through its own desire and following the Victorian pattern (which it has used as a guide), has introduced many provisions in this Bill in an endeavour to maintain very high standards in this matter. For example, minors under 21 will not be permitted to be in an office, branch or agency, and signs indicating this must be shown in these places. Under new section 31ka, no seating accommodation or waiting rooms are to be provided in these offices for public purposes.

This new section also prohibits broadcasting and telecasting, and other forms of news or entertainment such as radio and television, at the branches and offices. This new section also provides that only the bare essential facts relative to betting are to be posted within the shops. The fact that a winning bet cannot be paid out on the same day as the dividend is declared is another safeguard to ensure that T.A.B. will start in this State on a very high level.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I am glad to hear you say that.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: He is a city member!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am concerned about how this measure will affect the people of this State. Some sections within the racing fraternity can well look after themselves, but there is at least one section of people whose ability to look after themselves I doubt. I think this section needs some help.

Among the groups that can look after themselves is that consisting of the clubs, which will in effect be managing the operation of T.A.B., as they will appoint eight of the nine members of the board. Although they claim that their resources are not very strong, I think the metropolitan clubs (I have not had much experience with country clubs, which I believe are much smaller) are able to look after themselves.

The bookmakers can do the same, as it is probably fair to say that they are people of considerable means, that they are businessmen, and that this is their business activity, so I do not think they need any great consideration from me. I put into this category, too, the

big punter. He may well have a love of the sport, but generally speaking he is in this matter as a pretty big business, as he stands to gain big money if his chosen horses win.

Similarly, the owners, who I think are people of reasonably big means (it is fairly expensive to own and race a horse, so I am told by friends who own horses), do not need my consideration. Breeders, too, are people of considerable means. Indeed, the breeding industry seems to be going into the phase of syndication. I think all these categories are of people of fairly good means who can take good care of themselves.

The group that needs some help is that consisting of small bettors—the people of limited means who choose this as a sport or find it a habit they cannot avoid. They attend races regularly, mainly attending on the flat, and many of them cannot really afford to bet as they do. Nevertheless, they do it, and I am not criticizing them or trying to be moral. Looking at it from the point of view of their families, however, I do not think they can really afford to bet as they do. If it is possible in this Bill to help that section of the community, I want to make every endeavour to do that.

These are my general comments about the introduction of T.A.B. Yesterday I listened to the Hon. Mr. Story mentioning a package deal. It appears to me, too, that the Bill is a package measure, which seems to deal with the introduction of T.A.B. on the one hand and the winning bets tax on the other. I believe there was a very strong public opinion in favour of the introduction of T.A.B. There has also been a very strong public demand for the abolition of the winning bets tax, and I have given this much consideration.

I question the need for the winning bets tax to be retained after a certain period. There is no doubt that the Government needs revenue at present: this was featured on the front page of today's *News*. I consider, however, that after a certain period the tax on winnings as well as on the stake should be lifted. I understand that this is the practice in other States and that we shall be the only State in which the winning bets tax will exist. No doubt the Chief Secretary will correct me if I am wrong.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You think we should be on a parity with other States?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You were on a parity for 15 years. When you were in office you took it and did not blink an eyelid. What are you talking about? Be a little reasonable!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I know that.

The Hon. C. R. Story: This is the year!

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We haven't got T.A.B. yet.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: There is a public demand for the removal of the winning bets tax. I think it should be abolished when the tax on the stake is removed. That should be written into the Bill. If it is followed, that will be a date to be found in the Bill.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: You were not here previously.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am not using that as an excuse. I understand that that date is the relevant date in the Bill, and it would be any time up to 13 months after the appointed day.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No—"not later than 13 months".

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I stand corrected. I do not know when the Government expects that day to be but, nevertheless, it is written in there that not later than 13 months after the appointed day, which is the commencement of T.A.B., will be the relevant date. This has now become a taxation measure, anyway. Originally, the whole concept was to give a service to the public, to give them an opportunity to bet legally off the course; but now it has become a tax Bill.

Revenue is, of course, most important to the Government but I feel that the estimates of the degree of the increase in gambling will be exceeded. If it was written into the Bill that the winning bets tax was to be abolished, the amount of turnover could well be far greater than that estimated at present. If that was so and the winning bets tax was removed, it might well be that there would not be any reduction in the Government's revenue and, from the Government's point of view, that would be a satisfactory state of affairs. If it was also written in that the turnover tax payable by the bookmakers would be increased as well, that too would be a safety measure along this same track, that the Government might be quite satisfied by that relevant date in regard to its income.

So the Government at that time (a considerable time in the future, because it will take some time for T.A.B. to be introduced, and then there is a period of up to 13 months after that) may not be so embarrassed by this financial aspect if this tax on winnings is lifted altogether. If there was a small reduction in income to the Government, there would be

every possibility that, in the years after that, that small reduction could easily be made up.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: How?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Because I take it that it is expected that the turnover on T.A.B. will gradually increase.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You said that, and then you said that there could be a reduction, and then that it could be made up. Assuming there was a reduction, how could it be made up?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In the first instance, I assume that T.A.B. will not take on as quickly as I expect it to. If it does not, it will take time, but ultimately I think the amount the Government would be short of compared with its present estimates could be made up in the years after that one bad year, after the worst had happened.

The Hon. C. R. Story: It will be.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is one possibility.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Oh, frogs!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The other one (I am not wanting to force the point) is that, if the Government is short of money, it is in its own hands to introduce legislation to reintroduce the winning bets tax. My Party introduced it at one stage and, although I doubt very much whether it would be necessary, it would of course be possible to do that.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I have a proposition in reverse to yours, which should satisfy you.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I revert to my first main point—consideration of the little man who attends races, who wants to place a small bet. If any section of the racing community deserves a fair go, it is the little man. There are many of these people in my electoral district and I am concerned about them. I do not think that forever and forever these people will be getting a fair deal if this winning bets tax remains, whereas, if they know that at a certain time that tax will be lifted, at least I shall satisfy myself that I am giving that section of the community a fair deal.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I think the people that go to the races that you are looking after pay practically nothing by way of winning bets tax.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: They may not pay much, but certainly some bettors in the low income bracket do. Whilst in amount they do not pay a great deal, it means a lot to them because it is a certain percentage of their total income. I look forward to further discussions on this Bill in the Committee stage.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR BYMILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 20. Page 1657.)

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE (Southern): It was not my intention to speak on this Bill today. I mentioned this to the Minister, who then offered to have it adjourned until tomorrow, but, on examining the Bill, I find it deals almost entirely with one matter—the desirability of the more careful auditing of local government accounts. I have been somewhat acquainted with the problems associated with local government accounts, and particularly with those small areas with limited revenue. Notwithstanding the limited revenue, in some cases the amount of money a council handles in grants from the Highways Department and so forth is considerable. Regrettably, the Auditor-General has on several occasions had to draw attention to the, in some cases grossly and in other cases minor, improper practices that have been carried out by certain councils, and particularly those in the more remote areas of the State—for instance, Eyre Peninsula, where there is a problem.

The men who undertake the onerous task of local government do so free of charge. There are certain, shall I say, occupational hazards (just as we call harvesting a hazard, seeding may be, too) and at certain times of the year these men find themselves unable to attend council meetings regularly. Consequently, many matters are left in the hands of the clerk, who may have to resort to what we may regard as necessary practices but what the Auditor-General certainly regards as improper practices. For instance, he may call unexpectedly and find the clerk in possession of a cheque book signed from beginning to end, with the names of the payees and the amounts not filled in.

That is done with perfectly honest intent by the chairman or some other senior member of the council because he cannot attend the council office regularly and the clerk needs to draw out money for wage payments or to pay contractors who have completed their jobs. This problem has led to incorrect practices. It is also regrettable that the Auditor-General found it necessary to draw attention to the fact that some councils (as the Minister said

in the press this morning) pay an auditor only \$20 for an annual audit of council affairs. It is obvious that they get what they pay for. If district council accounts, related to hundreds of square miles, can be audited in half a day for a fee of \$20 it is obvious that the work cannot be done with the thoroughness expected when ratepayers' money is concerned.

I have only one query regarding the Bill. It would appear to be the intent to set up a considerably larger Local Government Department. This department carried on for many years with a very small number of officers; in fact, I recall the days when it had only one officer but, naturally, he made use of the clerks and assistants in the Highways Department. Virtually it was conducted by the one man. As far as I know, the position is the same today. If the Minister has in the back of his mind the appointment of another eight or ten sub-auditors in his department to go around the country it is incumbent upon him at this moment, when remembering the dire straits that the Government is in financially, to see that the number appointed is kept to a minimum. As far as I can see, it would involve only an inspection of council books from time to time. Although the Local Government Department has an auditor, he gets around to probably only one-tenth of the councils in each year. He certainly cannot expect to do more unless the staff is increased. I imagine that, with the assistance of two or three qualified men, the work could be covered.

The Bill contains only a few clauses and, as I said, the intention is to protect the ratepayers' money with regard to auditing authorities. I suggest that not only auditing of council accounts must be considered. There is a need to see that the highest standard of integrity is maintained in regard to contracts let by councils, particularly the participation by a councillor in the affairs of the council. I know there is a modest provision in the Local Government Act, but it has been abused on several occasions to my knowledge, and certainly to the knowledge of the present Minister. More or less the intention of the Bill is to tighten up and bring council accounts into a more deliberate design, thereby permitting auditing to be carried on far more easily than it is at present. Many councils adopt entirely different methods of procedure. In the circumstances, I have no hesitation in supporting the Bill.

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

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 20. Page 1672.)

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I support the second reading of the Bill but I must say that when I looked at the newspaper last Friday morning I was rather surprised (and somewhat amused) to read the banner headline on page 1, "Bill to recruit foreign doctors". Further on in the report reference was made to the Chief Secretary's statement that the Bill would help to overcome a serious shortage of practitioners. I listened for a portion of the time when the Chief Secretary was speaking, but I could not recall his saying anything about that. However, on re-reading the speech I found tucked away in the middle of it the following:

Honourable members are well aware of the serious shortage of medical practitioners in the State, particularly in rural areas. 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.

I emphasize the word "thought". I don't know whether or not I am on the same wave length as the Government in this thinking, but (as the Leader of the Opposition said when he spoke yesterday on this matter) I cannot see how this will really overcome the very drastic shortage of medical practitioners, and general practitioners in particular, that now exists in South Australia. It seems to me that few people are likely to be added to the register as a result of the Bill.

The A. J. Shard: That is merely your opinion.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: It might be, but if one looks at the Bill it seems that the safeguards are far-reaching (and I am not for a moment attempting to argue that they should not be).

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You are on the right wave length there!

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: But they are so far-reaching that they almost approach the stringent requirements that now exist regarding foreign people who have to do some years of the course. When the Bill is examined and tied in with what the Minister said about overcoming the shortage, particularly in rural areas, it can be seen that there is talk about people being registered when they have an international reputation or qualifications making them especially suitable for South Australia. I think the people who will be

added to the medical register will not be many. I find it difficult to understand how it could be said in the press that the Bill will help to overcome the serious shortage. I, like the Leader of the Opposition, say that in only one or two other ways can the Government tackle this serious problem.

I also refer to the excellent report presented to this Council last year by a committee in relation to facilities for training medical practitioners in South Australia. I shall not quote the report *in extenso*, but it seems to me that too much emphasis may have been placed on one small section of the report, namely, the need to plan for and build a second teaching hospital in this State. This is only one facet of the problem of overcoming the shortage of medical practitioners. The report makes it abundantly clear that, if we are to catch up with the shortage, particularly the shortage of general practitioners, we need to increase the number of graduates from our universities. At present people can graduate in medicine and surgery from only one of our universities. We need to increase the number of graduates by 50 per cent by—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: By 1975.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Yes. In other words, in nine years we have to increase the number of graduates to that extent if we are to make any impression on the problem. The specific points made in the report are that two important things are necessary. The first is that a new major hospital must be established in association with the Flinders university, and that its completion date should be related to the urgency of having additional beds to meet the needs of the population, and to the need for additional South Australians to qualify as doctors by 1975. The Leader made the point yesterday that the report said planning should have commenced early in 1966. The Minister said we were ahead of that.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We started in 1965.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I congratulate the Government if it has started on this particular aspect, but that will not get us anywhere unless something is done about the second recommendation of the committee, which is that it is necessary to establish a second medical school at Flinders university with the minimum of delay and that it should be the intention that the first increment of medical students shall qualify in December, 1975. I assume that the report intends that they should qualify from Flinders university.

It is no good talking about establishing a new teaching hospital if Flinders university

has not been able to establish a medical school at the same time or if the facilities at the University of Adelaide are not changed drastically. The whole tenor of this report seems to be that it is a waste of time considering any drastic change regarding the facilities at the University of Adelaide and that attention should be switched to establishing the second medical school. The first step is bound up with whether the universities in this State, particularly Flinders university, will have available the necessary money with which to establish a medical school.

This is the disquieting aspect of the situation on which I should like information from the Minister. True, something may have been started about the provision of the hospital, but what has been done about the provision of money for the second medical school? We heard recently with much alarm (and I do not think we have heard the end of it yet) that the universities in South Australia will be possibly very short of money in the coming triennium.

It seems to me that there has been procrastination on the part of the Government regarding what finance will be made available to the universities. The Minister has made many press announcements that he cannot say what the position will be because the Government does not know what money will be made available from the Commonwealth Government in the next triennium and that, therefore, the State Government does not know whether it will be prepared to match Commonwealth grants according to the formula, nor does it know how far it will be able to go.

This is an extraordinary state of affairs, because I believe that the Government does know how far it can go in this field and that it is not far enough. I understand that an announcement is being made this afternoon in the Commonwealth Parliament by Senator Gorton. Perhaps it is being made at this moment. If there is to be any drastic reduction in the funds available to the universities in the next triennium, the Government must realize that the greatest proportion of the expenses of the universities covers the wages and salaries paid to the staff. Figures in relation to universities prepared from year to year show that 75 per cent of the expenditure in a university is incurred in the payment of wages and salaries for the professorial staff, lecturers, and all the other people employed in and around the university.

The small percentage left for buildings and other requirements will be insufficient to enable the medical school to be established at Flinders

university. Unless staff numbers are reduced, which is unlikely, or salaries and wages are reduced, which is even more unlikely, the universities in this State will not be able to add one brick to their buildings or to buy any additional equipment if their grant is substantially reduced or pegged to the level that has been suggested.

I should like to see some action by the Government in this matter. We need medical practitioners. Many people in this State who are at present qualified to commence the medical course are not able to do so because of the arbitrary limit of 120 people that can be taken into the first and second years of the course at the University of Adelaide. This means that only about 95 of them can get into that course as soon as they matriculate. This is not good enough and will not help in solving the problem.

I should like to hear from the Minister on this matter and not about what he is doing in regard to the hospital. Much as we need the hospital, its establishment will be useless until we have a second medical school.

I do not really want to say any more about the Bill. I have looked at it carefully and it seems to me to be quite unexceptionable in every respect. It appears to make proper safeguards for the existing medical profession in this State, and even strengthens the position of the profession, making it better and more firmly entrenched. I do not object to this, as I think any body of professional people is entitled to seek protection, within limits, for its members.

This is an unexciting Bill. I am sure it will be good from an administrative point of view, as it will certainly tighten up the existing position. I have pleasure in supporting every bit of it, but I draw the attention of the Government and this Council to the serious position that will arise unless something is done to have more graduates come out of our universities and hospitals to meet the shortage of practitioners.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Minister of Health): I thank honourable members for their support of this measure. There will not be an immediate increase in the number of doctors, but this legislation is 15 years late in relation to foreign doctors who, no matter how brilliant they are, have not been able to be registered. That has been the position for many years. A body in the metropolitan area has been trying to correct this ever since 1951. In that area there are 18 people who claim to be doctors

but who are not practising because they cannot be registered without doing three years, and possibly a further year, at the university.

The kernel of this Bill is the appointment of an assessment committee to check these people. Since I have been Minister of Health four medical practitioners have gone from South Australia to other States because they would not accept the procedure laid down here. These people are now in practice in those other States. However, the 18 people (I do not claim they are all practitioners) have been told that they must do three years' study at the university, but they cannot afford this.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: Of course, this assessment committee may tell them exactly the same thing.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It may. However, this Government has gone further. It has said that, if the committee says that people need a refresher course of one, two or three years, it will enable them to attend a cadetship course at the university and will pay them a reasonable living wage, as well as their expenses while at the university. I have personally sponsored this. I say without fear of contradiction that if this had been in operation for the last 15 years we would have at least 20 or 30 more practitioners operating in this State.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Are you going to tell them to serve in certain areas afterwards?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Under the cadetship, yes, and they have accepted it. We have one already. If these people are sponsored by the Government and accept a cadetship, they must go wherever they are directed for two years after attending the university for one year or two years, and if they attend for three years they must go where directed for three years.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: When they finish the course?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. An inquiry was made on Friday morning by a man who asked what he had to do to get going under this Bill. We think these people will go where they are sent. They may need 12 months at the Royal Adelaide Hospital or a teaching institution as resident medical officers: the assessment committee may say they need 12 months to brush up. The assessment committee is the kernel, in conjunction with the cadetship, but it is easy and convenient to miss that. We are not going out to recruit them. As I have said here before, it is not my wish to send to the country as general practitioners people who are not able to do the job. We will encourage people

to go out, and we will assist them to become educated, which is something they did not have previously. That is the kernel of the matter. In five or six years the Government may have up to 10 of these people, and perhaps more, to fill gaps in rural areas.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: You are assuming a change of heart by the people who approve of them?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. The assessment committee is the kernel.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: You are assuming that you can tie them to the terms of the cadetship?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That is if they accept it. The assessment committee may lay down that they must do two years' study, but if they go off under their own steam, we have no control over them. Even if another 50 doctors are turned out each year, there is nothing in the world that can make them go to the country. In my experience, most of them will never go to the country.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: The law of supply and demand starts to operate after a certain time.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have my doubts. I know of new areas where, although 30 are needed, there are only 10, so they are doing all right. There are disabilities in the country. I know that from speaking to practitioners in country towns. I cannot quarrel with what they say. They do not mind when they are single or when their children are young. Many are then happy to go to the country. When on a trip with Sir Lyell McEwin, I spoke to a doctor who liked the country life. He said, however, that as he needed to give his children a good education, and as it was not available in the town where he was living, he would have to come to the metropolitan area. How can I or anyone else direct a doctor to go to a place where his children will perhaps not get a good education?

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: It is a poor lookout for people in the country, isn't it?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, I know all the difficulties. There is no easy answer to this. I am speaking from the doctors' point of view. I appreciate it from the community's point of view. Much of this problem could be overcome with our modern transport services, thinking and outlook. We now have quick access to various places in a short time.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Doesn't that also apply to the city? You are suggesting that people come in 300 miles. They can travel six miles to the city?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes; it is not an easy problem. The honourable member knows the difficulties and so do I. This Bill is a genuine attempt at least to get some more doctors, to assist some people to go through their training with a view to getting them to go to country areas. It is an attempt; it may be successful. I hope to goodness that the one person we have now at the university qualifies. If he does not, it will be a wet blanket on the whole scheme. I think the report was very good. It is true that we started this last year. We ran into difficulties with the proposed hospital at Flinders university, as regards suitable ground for buildings, but I think that that difficulty has been overcome. Planning will continue for the hospital in conjunction with the Flinders university.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Will the Government buy the land?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: If Flinders university agrees. It will be a *quid pro quo*; nobody is worried about a few dollars, one way or the other. It could be called a package deal. It is unfortunate that the school will not be at the hospital under the new scheme, but it will be in close proximity. It has a high priority. The school is there. There is no doubt that the hospital will be completed on schedule.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: You have the money for the school at the university?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I cannot give an assurance on that; it is not my department. But, knowing the Loan programme for the hospitals, I have no doubt that the hospital will be ready on schedule.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: What about the Queen Elizabeth? We are dragging our feet there.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not think so.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: We are losing two schools.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The question of extending that hospital is before the Public Works Committee now. We cannot go too fast.

The Hon. C. R. Story: You have its report?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes; we have it now. There will be no delay in the building of the hospital. It is No. 1 priority.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: That takes the place of what you lose at the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The Queen Elizabeth is the No. 1 priority; that will be the next one, and others will follow. I have no doubt about that priority. I hope I have made

that clear. This Bill has been a difficult job for a layman to handle: I compliment Mr. Daniel on his drafting, with which I am very pleased. Three small amendments have been circulated to members. These do not concern drafting errors but it has been suggested in some quarters that the Bill could be made more explicit. There are amendments to clause 19, the reasons being as follows:

The proposed amendments are purely drafting amendments designed to clarify the intention behind subsection (3) of the new section 29a. As at present drafted, the subsection does not make it clear that (a) for a person to be deemed to be a specialist he must initially make application to the board; (b) that if such person has already paid the annual practice fee as a medical practitioner he will not have to pay a further annual practice fee on registration as a person who is deemed to be a specialist; and (c) once such person is deemed to be a specialist he will be treated as if he was a person entitled to be registered under subsection (2) of this section. The amendments if accepted would have the effect of removing any doubts that might arise in these respects and clearly define the position of persons who were deemed to be specialists under this subsection (3).

Again, I thank honourable members for their attention to this Bill and I place on record my appreciation of the drafting of Mr. Daniel.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 18 passed.

Clause 19—"Enactment of Part IIIa of principal Act."

The Hon. A. J. SHARD moved:

In new section 29a (3) after "upon" to insert "application to the board and upon"; after "fee" to insert "(if such annual practice fee has not already been paid)"; after "registration" last occurring to insert "as if such person was a person entitled to be registered under subsection (2) of this section".

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (20 to 28) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 20. Page 1669.)

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I rise to speak briefly to this Bill, which has been covered in some detail by previous speakers. Generally speaking, it will make the administration of the Act better from the point

of view of both the department and the general public. It is essentially a Committee Bill and I have no doubt that more will be said at that stage. I would like to touch briefly on one or two points raised by previous speakers; in particular, clause 3, upon which some comments were made by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris. This clause repeals section 13 of the Act and it is re-enacted in a form that will enable certain vehicles to be used on a road without being registered. They are vehicles:

- (a) used on a road in the work of making a firebreak 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.

I think most people who are obliged by law to destroy weeds on roads, or who have to provide firebreaks in certain circumstances, will appreciate this move to widen the category of unregistered vehicles as it will result in greater convenience to owners of property. Section 12 of the Act mentions exemptions that apply to farm vehicles and tractors and, on examining this in conjunction with clause 3 of the Bill, I consider that the Act would still not go far enough in order to cover present day operations.

Under section 12 a tractor may be driven on the road for certain purposes, and that applies also to farm implements. However, in these days of mechanization nearly all farm work is done by machine or implement and it is often necessary for these implements or vehicles to move on to a roadway. The Act no doubt envisages tractors and implements being used for cultivation, reaping and other purposes and being moved from one paddock to another for such purposes and, in addition, a tractor may have to be driven to the nearest garage for repairs.

I believe that even further concessions could be given as regards vehicles on those roads immediately abutting a property. I am not suggesting that owners should be given an open go on all roads for any purpose, but I think they should be allowed to take their vehicles on roads immediately adjoining a property without the necessity of registering them. The vehicles should be allowed to travel on such roads while used in the ordinary working of the property.

The matter of weed spraying has fortunately been recognized in this Bill, but other matters, such as fencing a property, should be considered because a property owner is obliged to keep his fences in good repair. A recent court judgment confirms my comment, because if stock stray on to a road the owner

may be in some difficulty if his fences have not been kept in reasonable repair.

The Hon. C. R. Story: The Impounding Act makes provision for that.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: The repairing and renewing of fences is a normal part of farm work. For instance, posthole diggers mounted on tractors are involved. Often unregistered vehicles, perhaps old vehicles used exclusively on the property for farm work, have to be taken from one paddock to another and, because of circumstances, it may be necessary to move them along a road abutting the property. Consideration should be given to extending this exemption to any unregistered implement or vehicle that is used on roads abutting farms.

I am pleased the Bill, in clause 11, gives further recognition to the responsibilities and penalties incurred when an unregistered and uninsured trailer is on the road. Many farm implements are defined in the principal Act as trailers. One such implement is the farm welder, many of which are portable welders driven by motors and mounted on two wheels. These implements may be required on a part of the farm to which they cannot be

moved without their being taken on to a road. Recently, the wife of the owner of a welder that was attached to a vehicle took it on to the road and the owner had to meet a substantial fine and lost his licence for three months.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: His wife isn't likely to offend again, is she?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: For the husband's sake, I hope not. These problems can best be appreciated by people who work country properties. Many of the roads abutting properties are back roads. It is not a case of motor vehicles obtaining undue use of the road. The owners pay substantial taxes by way of land tax, local government rates, and so on. If these problems were overcome, financial strain would not be placed on the Motor Vehicles Department or the local government authority concerned. However, the work of farming properties would be assisted. I support the Bill.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.53 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, September 22, at 2.15 p.m.