LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, October 9, 1968

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

ABORIGINAL CHILDREN

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern) moved:

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report upon the welfare of the Aboriginal children of this State.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE seconded the motion.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Mr. President, I do not think I need speak at length on this motion. After wide inquiry in our own district and later in the Far North of the State, I am convinced that there is an urgent need for an inquiry into the circumstances and well-being of Aboriginal children. Every member who has Aboriginal population within his electoral district is aware of the disaster that has overtaken all but a small section of the Aborigines since they were given free access to alcohol.

Although the position has been glossed over (I go so far as to say that as far as possible it has been hidden), it has been impossible to hide everything, and many ugly incidents can be related which together add up to a tally of a scandalous state of affairs which, if known, I am sure our community would not tolerate. Be that as it may, it is impossible to put the clock back. All we can do now that this horror has been released on these people is to hope that gradually they will learn to tolerate alcohol and to use it with responsibility.

While this is going on (and it must take many years), we have Aborigines in every electoral district who cannot tolerate alcohol and yet are spending on their addiction every cent they can obtain, by any means possible. The impact of this is bad enough upon the adult Aborigines. The heaviest impact, however, is falling on the small children. Very small children have even been brought into public hospitals, in at least one area.

I am informed they have been left unfed by their parents following their addiction to alcohol; these children have been brought in to be treated for advanced malnutrition—in plain terms, starvation. They have been cured by good feeding and returned to their parents, but the same children have had to be admitted again in a few weeks in the same condition. Older children more able to fend for themselves do so or starve. There is no other course but police action away from the missions and reserves. This brings these children with a record into close contact with our own problem children, the juvenile delinquents, the most difficult unsolved problem in our community today. I need elaborate on that no further.

It will be the duty of the committee, I hope, to inspect these areas where up to the coming of drinking rights Aboriginal families were establishing themselves as respected members of the community, and to examine the fate that has now overtaken them in the great majority of cases and also the squalor in which their children are living in the wreckage of the homes provided for them. This is the real tragedy.

Many families well on to the road to full emancipation have been dragged down by alcohol; they have lost all their assets built up over the years and their acceptance by and the respect of the community in which they have lived; and the children of these families who seemed set fair to win for themselves further progress with better education are living in hopeless squalor with parents drunk at every opportunity. There can be no future for them unless help is given, and quickly.

This is not my own opinion. I quote the exact words of Mr. James McFarlane of Brinkley via Tailem Bend. This family has an unsurpassed record for the protection, help and guidance it has given the Aborigines in its area from the days of first settlement. These are his words:

> You cannot put the clock back and, hard though it may be, you must accept that the present generation is lost; but something must be done, and done quickly, to save the children.

From there, let us go north to Nepabunna Mission, where the words of the Missioner-in-charge were:

> I give you solemn warning that the position is dangerous. Lives will be lost soon and they will be those of white people who are in contact with Aboriginal people.

They reported helplessness in the present situation. The best that could be done was to influence Aboriginal families to leave the children at the mission when they went seeking alcohol elsewhere. With new school clinics and accommodation, some children were being saved from worse exposure. In fact, one or two mothers had returned to the refuge of the mission for the sake of their children.

This had already led to ugly incidents when the male parents followed. In the station country of the North-East we were given record after record of highly paid respected

Aboriginal families established over many years who had left their employment to seek alcohol along the railway line. In their previous existence the children of these families were educated with the white children and had a future before them.

In this inquiry I have gone to people who I know speak the truth, who know and have known the Aborigines for a lifetime. In every single case there has been a demand for an urgent inquiry, and it is on their behalf that I move this motion.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act, 1934-1965. Read a first time.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I thank honourable members for allowing Standing Orders to be suspended to enable me to give the second reading explanation of this Bill forthwith. I am arranging for copies of the Bill to be distributed immediately to all members. Its object is to enlarge the franchise relating to Legislative Council elections by:

(*a*) granting a right to vote at Legislative Council elections to spouses who have attained the age of 21 years of persons who are at present eligible to vote;

(*b*) removing from qualifications for voting of the owner or lessee of any land the requirement that the land must be of a minimum value; and

(*c*) enlarging the rights of servicemen and exservicemen to vote at such elections.

Paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*) of clause 2 have the effect of giving a person who has a freehold or leasehold estate in possession in land of any value a right to vote at Council elections. Paragraph (*c*) strikes out subdivisions II and III of subsection (1) of section 20 which, if allowed to remain in force, would be inconsistent with subdivision I of that subsection as amended by paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*) of the clause. In effect, subdivision I, as so amended, would be wide enough to include the categories of persons eligible to vote under subdivisions II and III as they now stand.

Paragraph (*d*) restricts the meaning of dwellinghouse in subdivision IV to one situated within the State. Paragraph (*e*) is consequential on paragraph (*f*) which gives a right to vote to the spouse of a person entitled to vote by virtue of section 20 of the principal Act. Paragraph (*g*) strikes out section 20 (6), which becomes superfluous in consequence of the repeal of subdivision III of subsection (1). Clause 3 (*a*) widens the class of person entitled to vote under subdivision I of subsection (1) of section 20a of the principal Act to all Commonwealth servicemen or exservicemen, whether they had volunteered for service or not.

Paragraph (*b*) adds subdivisions IV and V to section 20a (1). New subdivision IV extends the right to vote to a person who is or has been engaged on active service in any proclaimed place or on any proclaimed Naval, Military or Air Force operation. This will enable servicemen and exservicemen who become engaged in operations where war has not been formally declared by the Commonwealth to be brought into the category of persons eligible to vote. New subdivision V gives a right to vote to the spouse of a person entitled to vote by virtue of section 20a. Paragraph (*c*) makes a consequential amendment by striking out subsection (4). Clause 4 merely clarifies section 21 of the principal Act.

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

FLUORIDATION

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. R. A. Geddes:

(For wording of motion, see page 1361.)

(Continued from September 25. Page 1362.)

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): In rising to support this motion I want to make it clear from the outset that I do not intend or desire to oppose any legitimate public health programme. Furthermore, this motion should not be construed as such opposition. An attempt has been made to place this interpretation on the motion. The Premier was reported in the press as considering the motion a vote of no confidence in the Government, but I hasten to assure him that both the mover and the seconder of the motion have the greatest confidence in the Cabinet and in the Premier. I must point out, however, that this assurance in no way indicates that, if I disagree with the Premier, I will not say so. The Premier was reported as saying that, if some members of Parliament persisted in their plans, there was a danger of the Government's ultimately being forced to withdraw the

plan for fluoridating the water supply. This, however, is not the purpose of the motion.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Do you think it is a bit of blackmail?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Whether the Premier's statement indicates that an easy way out is being sought, I do not know. If, however, the benefits of fluoridation are as the Government first described them and if the public will be denied its benefits because of criticism of the method of deciding the manner of introduction, I want to make it quite clear that the responsibility for such a decision would rest fairly and squarely on the Government: such a decision could in no way be tied to the purpose of this motion. Every member of Parliament would have a drawer full of correspondence relating to fluoridation, some of the correspondence being in favour of fluoridation and some against it. The purpose of this motion is to allow those people who are most concerned about the ill-effects of fluoride to express their viewpoint. There seemed no alternative to the introduction of this motion because, when I approached the Premier and the Minister of Health, the only advice they could give me was that, if I did not like the method of introduction, I should move against it. Consequently, I was quite surprised when, after the Hon. Mr. Geddes had moved this motion, the Premier expressed concern.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: He has been slipping back ever since he has been in office.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: He is a good Premier.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Some people think that a person will be out of business as soon as he takes one good mouthful of fluoride. It is a pity that some of these people could not have had the opportunity, as I had, of attending the Dental Health Education Conference.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Did they convert you?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I did not need converting. The conference did not influence my opinion. I believe if people with doubts about fluoride had the same opportunity to listen to these speakers as I had it would help to alleviate some of their fears. From a study of the various propaganda pamphlets and correspondence posted to us, it is apparent that this is a controversial issue. Those people opposing fluoridation have done a good job in presenting the case against it and I do not think all of them can be rated (as some fluoride experts term them) cranks. Many who have spoken against fluoridation are men of letters and holders of degrees, amongst them some of the leading medical and dental men of the world.

People have the right to make up their own minds whether such learned men who speak for fluoridation are correct in their thinking or whether those who speak against it are correct. This is the purpose of this motion. Fuoride can be introduced and made available by many different methods. I asked at one time for figures relating to the possibility of administering fluoride through tablets, and although the calculations may not be comprehensive I am sure the Minister of Health, even though he is a busy man, would have time to consider the figures I shall now give the Council.

South Australia has a population of 1,121,000, and of that number 769,000 live in the metropolitan area, representing 68.6 per cent of the State's population. I intend to deal with that 68.6 per cent because I believe it is the only section directly affected by the suggested administrative action on fluoridation. To my knowledge, the under-twelve age group is that most likely to benefit from fluoridation. In that group 180,428 children comprise 23.4 per cent of the population in the metropolitan area, or 16.1 per cent of the State population. The Minister of Works recently gave some figures dealing with children up to the age of 14 years, who number 328,465, or 29.3 per cent of the population.

I, too, have some figures that may be of interest when dealing with that age group. Over the last five years the metropolitan area has consumed water at a rate of slightly more than 100 gallons a head of population a day. Last year was not the highest year of consumption but the second highest, despite an increase of 107,500 in the population during that time. Last year 27,375,000,000 gallons of water was consumed, and I have used that figure as my basis in arriving at the following calculations. The children under 12 in the proposed fluoridated area represent 16.1 per cent, and if we allow the extremely generous consumption rate of four pints a day (I believe that it would more likely be half of that) we find that they would consume .12 per cent of the water fluoridated. We find also that the children under 14 would consume .13 per cent of the fluoridated water.

The cost of fluoridated water in the initial year would be about $206,000, or about $1.14 for every child up to the age of 12 years. It would cost 61.9c for every child up to the age of 14 years. I have compiled also some figures regarding the cost of tablets. The present

retail price of tablets averaged over the various brands is about 40c for 100 tablets. At the rate of one a day, which again is an extravagant allowance when we consider that at least one-twelfth of the children under 12 would use only about half a tablet a day, we find that at present retail prices the cost would be $1.46 a child a year. I think it could be assumed that by buying in bulk, as the Government could, this cost would be halved, and that would bring the total cost in respect of children up to 12 years of age to $132,000 a year. A Gallup poll recently showed that less than 70 per cent of people were in favour of fluoride, and taking this figure we find that the cost is $92,400 a year for children up to the age of 12 years, or $161,000 a year for those up to the age of 14 years.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: This is your assessment, based on how many people would take it?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Yes. I submit these calculations as a basis for argument; they may be disputed, and if they are they will serve a useful purpose. I make the comparisons in order to point out that it would be possible to consider the administration of fluoride through tablets, and this would certainly put the Government in a better standing with those people who are so opposed to having fluoride forced upon them against their wishes.

I know that speakers who are to follow in this debate will have some excellent material to work with, especially if they attended the recent dental conference, and perhaps they will be able to refute the points I have made. Nevertheless, this motion is designed to overcome the fears of people that fluoridation will have adverse effects on them.

Those with diabetes and kidney troubles are particularly concerned about this matter. An elderly gentleman who approached me the other day said he believed that fluoride would affect the marrow in his bones. He asked me: what will be the use of a mouth full of good teeth if I cannot get to the table to use them? When I pointed out that both the dental and medical professions seemed to think there would be no such adverse side effects he said, "It is all right for the dentists; it is their living to help keep teeth in a person's head; once a dentist sells you a decent set of dentures you are out of his business."

In order to try to overcome some of the fears of such people, I support the motion, which I consider serves a good purpose.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1): I support the motion. I do not intend to debate the pros and cons regarding whether or not fluoride should be added to our water supply, for I do not think this is the question now before the Council.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: But this is the important aspect.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Perhaps so. However, I remind honourable members of the wording of the motion, as follows:

That this Council considers that before fluoride is added to our water supplies, Parliamentary approval should be sought for such action.

That is the question. I support the motion because I believe this is a matter that could have far-reaching consequences. Parliament should have been consulted before any action was taken by the Government. In fact, this Government has no mandate whatsoever from the electors of this State to take the course it has taken. I thought we had got over Government by proclamation during the last few years. During the term of office of previous Liberal Governments I strenuously opposed from time to time on the floor of this Council the administration of this State by proclamation. What usually happened was that the first information members got about anything was through reading it in the daily newspapers.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: We did announce this matter of fluoridation in Parliament.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: As I just said, we frequently got our first intimation about things from the press. I thought we had got over that state of affairs.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: We have.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: It appears we have not, because in this matter Parliament was not consulted at all. The Government merely circulated the information through the newspapers that it intended to introduce fluoride into our reticulated water supplies in this State.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I think this is the way that the liquor permit was given to Aborigines under the Labor Government.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I think the Minister will find that it was contained in a Bill.

The Hon. C. R. Story: It was a proclamation by your Government.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The proclamation related to the time it was to take effect.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I take exception to these things—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: We did announce this matter in Parliament: it was not put in the newspaper first.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: It was not announced in Parliament before information about it was published in the press. The Chief Secretary did make a statement in this Chamber (and I am not denying it) that the Government intended to add fluoride to our drinking water and that members of Parliament would have ample opportunity of discussing the matter, or words to that effect. Yet we find that, immediately a motion such as this is moved by an honourable member of this Council, not only he but also every other honourable member is severely criticized by others, and especially by the Premier, for having the audacity, although a member of the Premier's Party, to express an opinion on the floor of this Chamber. The following headline appeared in the *News* of Thursday, September 26, in large black letters across the top of the page: "Premier Angry on Fluoride". The article stated:

The Premier, Mr. Hall, today criticized the attitudes of some Liberal and Country League Legislative Council members over fluoride. He said, "It would be a pity if fluoridation of South Australia's water supplies is prevented by the more conservative members of the Legislative Council, in the face of clear public support for it."

The Premier continued, a little later:

I am disappointed that a number of members have become involved in the fluoride question, and yet have not seemed willing to back their opinion by moving directly in Parliament to stop fluoride outright.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: To whom was the Premier referring when he said "conservative members"—the Labor Party?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I do not think by any stretch of the imagination that he would do that. His statement referred to every member of this Council.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Would he be referring to you?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: He would be referring to me as he would be referring to the Leader, and to every member of this Council. He was trying the intimidation method.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Not the intimidation method—the dictatorship method.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I would not go into that if I were you.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I would. It is not the first threat he has made in his short term as Premier. He is not going too well with his threats, either.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The Premier went on to say:

I see no danger of fluoride being lost in the House of Assembly as at least several Opposition members have indicated, I believe, that they support it.

If he believed that, why did he not give members an opportunity of expressing their opinion by reporting to Parliament that this was the Government's intention?

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: He cracked the whip over his own members.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. He continued:

However, I do not know how hard the Legislative Council members will press what really is an expression of no confidence in the Government, as indicated by Mr. Geddes yesterday.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Do you think the whip has been cracking ever since then?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: If that is not political intimidation by a member of the Government, I do not know what is. If the Premier considers that this is a motion of no confidence (assuming it is carried here) I suggest to him in view of his own statement he has no alternative but to tender his resignation.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That is wishful thinking.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I want to know who the Premier of this State thinks he is when an expression of opinion is made here by an honourable member who is then told he should not express that opinion.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Are you defending the Council now?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: If this is not political dictatorship, I do not know what is.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: It is nice to hear the honourable member defending this institution.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: We have not heard this from him for a long time. This is music to my ears.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: You are hearing it now. The following day, September 27, there appeared in the *News* comments by Mr. J. F. Irwin, who severely criticized members of Parliament—again, for an expression of opinion. He criticized them because they did not intend attending a conference held recently by dental experts on fluoride. He said that, if members of Parliament accepted the invitations and attended the conference, they would hear something useful, be more informed than they were, and be in a better position to appreciate what was at stake. His criticism seemed

to imply that the Australian Dental Association (South Australian Branch) had an opinion about fluoride and nobody else should express any other opinion than that, for that was what he was saying. This reminds me of what is known as a "drop". If honourable members want to know the definition of a "drop", it is a drip with a swollen head. That is what these things lead me to believe when we see statements like these in the press. The Premier makes these statements in the press, criticizing an honourable member of this Council who has the audacity to express an opinion more or less contrary to an opinion expressed previously. I support this motion. It is not a question of whether or not fluoride should be added to our water supplies: it is a question, as the Hon. Mr. Geddes has said, of expressing an opinion in this Council that Parliament should have been consulted before action was taken.

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

PETROLEUM ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Minister of Mines): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to make a number of miscellaneous amendments to the Petroleum Act, 1940-1967. The Act was extensively amended in 1967 but further examination of its provisions has disclosed a few areas in which its operation might be improved. The present amendments simplify the procedures existing under the Act and insert provisions designed to improve the liaison between petroleum exploration companies and the Department of Mines. These latter amendments therefore ensure that the Minister is kept adequately informed of the activities of exploration companies, so that he can exercise informed co-operation in the search for petroleum in this State.

I turn now to the provisions of the Bill. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 removes a possible ambiguity in the definition of "petroleum". Clause 3 makes a drafting amendment to section 4 of the principal Act. Clause 4 amends section 7 of the principal Act. This amendment eliminates the obligation for an application for a licence to be in a prescribed form. The power to obtain all information that may be required by the Minister already exists in subsection (4) of that section, and it is considered that a more flexible form of application to suit varying circumstances is desirable. Clause 5 strikes out section 13 (4) of the principal Act. That subsection provides that a bond must be in a prescribed form. A certain amount of variation in the provisions of bonds is desirable; hence, this provision is struck out.

Clause 6 enacts new section 18d in the principal Act. This new section provides that a licensee engaged in petroleum exploration is to furnish the Minister with such statements and accounts relating to his expenditure in connection with petroleum exploration as the Minister may require. Clause 7 amends section 27 of the principal Act by inserting a new subsection (4). This new subsection provides that upon the grant of a petroleum production licence the area comprised in that licence shall be excised from the area comprised in the petroleum exploration licence. This merely clarifies the intention of the Act and obviates the necessity for the licensee to surrender that area under the provisions of the Act.

Clause 8 amends section 32 of the principal Act. This amendment also provides for a more flexible form of application: in this case, an application for the renewal of a petroleum production licence. Clause 9 amends section 33 of the principal Act. This amendment is to some extent consequential upon the amendment made by clause 7. Its purpose is merely to make it clear that the holder of a petroleum production licence is entitled to carry out petroleum exploration operations on the area comprised in the production licence. Clause 10 amends section 35 of the principal Act. It avoids the necessity of prescribing a form upon which the holder of a production licence is to declare the value of petroleum recovered by him. Its purpose therefore is also to increase the flexibility of the Act.

Clause 11 makes a drafting amendment to section 38 of the principal Act by striking out the passage "his mining operations", a phraseology that is now obsolete. Clause 12 repeals and re-enacts section 45 of the principal Act. There is no change in substance; the provision is merely expressed in a modified form. Clause 13 amends section 55 of the principal Act by adding to the records that are to be kept by a licensee and to be made available to him upon request. The licensee is required to keep a record of the machinery and equipment used by him in the course of operations conducted by him; a record of the geophysical and geological surveys and examinations undertaken by him in the area comprised in the licence; and a record of the quantity and quality of any petroleum encountered by him in the course of his operations.

Clause 14 repeals section 57 of the principal Act. It is thought that this provision could be inserted in the regulations in a more flexible and comprehensive form. Clause 15 amends section 62 of the principal Act. The licensee is relieved of the necessity of using a prescribed form when reporting accidents and injuries occurring in the course of his operations. Clause 16 amends section 80e of the principal Act. This amendment merely provides for a more flexible method of application for a pipeline licence. Clause 17 enables the Minister specifically to requisition information relating to the construction or operation of a pipeline. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

VETERINARY SURGEONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to enable the Veterinary Surgeons Board of South Australia to register, as veterinary surgeons in South Australia, competent veterinary surgeons who graduated outside the Commonwealth of Australia. A provision was inserted to this effect by the amending Act of 1952, but that Act provided that an application for registration by a foreign graduate had to be made within three years after the passing of that Act. This Bill revives that provision without, however, imposing any limitation as to the time of application for registration.

Clause 3 therefore amends section 17a of the principal Act, which is the provision dealing with the registration of foreign graduates inserted by the amending Act of 1952. In its amended form, it will provide that a person shall be entitled to be registered as a veterinary surgeon if he has attained the age of 21 years and is of good character and (*a*) he has passed through a course of veterinary study in a country outside the Commonwealth and has duly graduated in that course of study; (*b*) the course of study was, if he graduated before January 1, 1947, of not less than four years' duration or, if he graduated on or after that day, of not less than five years' duration; (*c*) he is, by law, qualified to practise as a veterinary surgeon in the country in which he graduated; (*d*) he has resided in Australia for not less than two years; and (*e*) he has satisfied the examiners appointed by the board of his competence in veterinary surgery and practice. The remaining provisions of the Bill merely make decimal currency amendments. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 8. Page 1683.)

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): In rising to speak to this Bill, I congratulate the Government on a very courageous Budget, which is no doubt designed to meet the increased expenditure which the previous Labor Government has incurred. Legislation introduced by the previous Government undoubtedly increased expenditure from the Revenue Account of this State. Although I do not intend to debate the merits or otherwise of the legislation introduced by the Labor Government, we must face the fact that we have this problem of progressive increased expenditure, which will no doubt increase as the years go on. Furthermore, the Labor Administration made little or no provision to cover these increased costs.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: They didn't give any thought to keeping costs down.

The Hon. L. R. HART: That is true. As the national product of the State increased, these costs would have been taken care of, but things have not worked out that way. Yesterday the Hon. Mr. Shard criticized the present Administration in relation to the categories of people who would, under the present Budget, have to pay increased taxes. He implied that the Labor Party would tax the few for the benefit of the many, but when one looks at the legislation one finds that the people who benefit are in the majority. Therefore, it is fair that the majority of the people should make some contribution towards increased benefits. It must be realized that once a benefit is given, it cannot be taken away. We cannot, therefore, reduce costs; we must live with them and find ways and means of meeting them.

The Hon. Mr. Shard also said that we should tax people according to their ability to pay. I point out that a certain category of person is not only being taxed but also incurring increased costs, yet he does not have the ability to pay: I refer to the primary producer.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Does he receive subsidies?

The Hon. L. R. HART: He may receive subsidies, but he contributes towards most of them. The primary producer is subsidized only to keep industry intact, so that employment can be assured.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Everyone else contributes.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Yes, everyone else contributes towards the revenue of the State, but all people do not benefit to the same extent. I am referring to the people who are the backbone of this country in respect of exports and building up oversea reserves.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Industry is catching up.

The Hon. L. R. HART: It is catching up to a small extent, but 85 per cent of our exports comes from rural industries. Until secondary industry can take over we must regard primary industry as the backbone of this country. I advise the honourable member not to talk too much about subsidies when speaking about secondary industry because secondary industry hides behind a fairly high tariff wall. We have heard much from Labor Party members about the little people, but I do not know who the little people are. Let us consider what happened to the little people during the Labor Government's term of office. We have often heard that much legislation was passed during that period, but much of it merely increased taxes and charges.

The Labor Party claims that it did not increase taxes on the same scale as did the Liberal and Country Party Government in the present Budget, but this claim does not bear examination. In 1965-66 the Labor Government increased land tax, stamp duty on cheques, harbour charges, water charges and hospital fees. No doubt there were some little people affected by these charges. In its next year of office the Labor Government again increased land tax, this time as a result of the quinquennial assessment.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The Labor Government reduced the rates.

The Hon. L. R. HART: But land tax charges were increased.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It was the first reduction in 25 years.

The Hon. L. R. HART: But there had not previously been such a large increase in the quinquennial assessment. The landowner is paying more in land tax today than he did previously. The Labor Government then made another increase in stamp duty: this time stamp duty on conveyances, on hire-purchase and on money-lenders' transactions was increased. The Labor Government also increased liquor taxes. Yesterday, when the Hon. Mr. Shard referred to increased liquor charges, he said it was a sorry state of affairs when a man had to deny himself some of the joys of life to pay his taxes. However, I thought the honourable member had it the wrong way round: if a man denies himself the joys of life he does not have to pay the taxes. If he does indulge, then, of course, he pays the taxes. The fact that he indulges indicates his ability to pay.

Then, the Labor Government increased rail freight charges and tram and bus fares; then it increased water rates, largely as a result of a new assessment; then it again increased hospital fees. So, there were two sets of increases in hospital fees, water rates and stamp duties. No doubt many little people in this State felt the impact of these increased charges. Then, there was a self-inflicted tax that cost the working force of this State $8 a head—the cost of lottery tickets.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Lotteries have never cost the people $8 a head.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The working force of this State invests $8 a head.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is the working man's privilege.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I realize that. The point I want to make is that the Hon. Mr. Shard was very vocal on the question of ability to pay. If the working force of this State spends $8 a head on lottery tickets on the average, some people must spend much more than this amount, because I know people who do not spend anything in this way. Therefore, I assume that people who invest about $8 a head in lotteries come within the category of those with the ability to pay. I do not oppose lotteries, provided I am not expected to contribute.

The Labor Government was faced with a further deficit, but it said, "We will not tax the people of this State further: we will transfer some of the items from Revenue Account, which is in deficit, to Loan Account." This was the Labor Government's method of avoiding an increase in taxation. Had the Labor Government been returned to power it would have been faced with the same situation as that which faces the present Government. The practice adopted by the Labor Government cannot be continued: some of the money must be paid back from Loan Account. Taxation had to be increased.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Your Government will have to do it for many years.

The Hon. L. R. HART: When one is halfway across a tightrope, one cannot walk backwards: one must go to the other side. During debates on Public Purposes Loan Bills and on Appropriation Bills I always try to make one or two suggestions to the Government, irrespective of its political colour. I referred to land tax earlier in my speech. The problem with land tax in relation to primary producing land is that of assessment; that is, to asses the value of the land correctly. Under the law, land has to be assessed on its market value but we are faced with the anomalous position of having inflated land values and consequently much of the land in the near metropolitan area is assessed at an inflated rate. The proper way to assess land is on its productive capacity, but it is physically impossible to assess land accurately on that basis. I wonder whether this State would be better off if it followed the lead given by New South Wales and Victoria in abolishing State land tax on land used exclusively for primary production? We would then solve the problem of people having to sell their land because of high assessments placed upon it; sell it for subdivision purposes ahead of the requirements of subdivision in a particular area.

Many people today hold primary producing land but are not able to use it for that purpose because the dogs in built up areas nearby attack their flocks. Such land is not producing sufficient income to cover the land tax incurred. I believe we should consider abolishing land tax on this land.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Where is the Government going to recover that money from?

The Hon. L. R. HART: I do not know.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Put it on the worker!

The Hon. L. R. HART: This problem is something we have to face up to eventually. We cannot go on assessing land at market value when that value is so inflated.

There has been an improvement in the rate of registration of motor vehicles, and I want to comment briefly on that subject. There is a motor vehicle on the market known as the Mini Moke, a light and economical vehicle. Some primary producers, in particular, purchase this brand of vehicle and use it as a runabout on their properties; they do not use it for passenger purposes but entirely as a runabout for primary production pursuits. However, as the Motor Vehicles Act now stands, the Mini Moke does not qualify for a primary producer's concessional registration. I believe that the Act should be amended to allow the Registrar of Motor Vehicles discretionary power to grant such a concession if he is satisfied that the vehicle is to be used solely for primary production purposes. I know that the Mini Moke is used for other purposes, and full registration fees are paid in those cases.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Is the Landrover in this category?

The Hon. L. R. HART: No, it is in a different category. The Mini Moke now does not qualify for a concessional registration fee if used for primary producing purposes only, and I ask the Minister to see if the Act can be amended. The Hon. A. J. Shard made some mention of the Police Department. He normally does so, and I know that he has a high regard—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I did not mention it yesterday.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The honourable member often does mention it, and I know he has a high regard for the Police Department, but it is unfortunate that the Leader in another place does not seem to have the same high regard for our Police Force. I know that the Police Department has been given a slight increase in the amount of money made available to it—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is not slight; it is, perhaps, not enough, but it has been going on for some two or three years, with an increase each year.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The increase amounts to almost 5 per cent, which is fairly substantial. The calls on the Police Department today are considerably greater than previously and so it is necessary to try and bring it up to strength. An activity within the Police Department with which I am not entirely happy (and I make this observation in no critical manner because I appreciate that the Police Force has a job to do and this happens to be one of them) is the use of radar. I know there is a problem about excessive speed, especially in built-up areas, and it is necessary to combat such drivers. Radar seems to be the main method used at present to curb some drivers.

However, the problem with radar is that many normally law-abiding citizens are being caught by this method, while many other people who are speedsters and who drive to the danger of the public are getting away scot-free. It is not so bad when a person is caught the first time or even, perhaps, the second time, but the more prosecutions lodged against a persor

the greater the penalties become until a stage is reached where a man not only has to pay a heavy fine but also is deprived of his licence.

I think some other provision should have to be coupled with exceeding the speed limit; perhaps a charge of driving to the danger of the public. Radar is often set up on the outskirts of a country town, and it is not difficult for the police to catch 30, 40, 50 or even 100 drivers in a day in the radar trap, depending on the amount of traffic going through that country town. Admittedly, such people may be exceeding the speed limit, but normally they are not driving to the danger of the public or causing any particular danger. They are merely caught in this trap before observing it. Another situation exists where radar units are set up in certain metropolitan areas.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It is hard to prove a charge of driving in a manner dangerous to the public.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Possibly it is. Radar is set up in certain metropolitan areas and one of those areas is on the Main North Road in the area known as the Enfield Hills. In that locality from perhaps 7.30 a.m. to 9.30 a.m. the radar trap does not operate, but 50, 60, or even 70 per cent of the traffic in that area exceeds the speed limit during that busy period. The same thing happens in the evening from 4 p.m. onwards and radar traps are not seen in action at those times. I venture to say that of people going home from work 70 per cent or more would be exceeding the speed limit by a substantial margin. I appreciate the physical difficulties involved in operating radar units in these circumstances.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Sufficient machines are not available to have them everywhere.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I appreciate the problems and I also appreciate that there may be a need to keep traffic moving at these periods in order to prevent congestion.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I saw radar units operating last night in the metropolitan area in the busy period between 4.45 and 5 p.m. They cannot be everywhere.

The Hon. L. R. HART: In spite of that, what I have said is true. At a certain time of the day we condone a practice for which one would be liable for prosecution at a later period in the day.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: What is the alternative to radar?

The Hon. L. R. HART: I am not too sure, but I am concerned that so many law-abiding citizens are being trapped by radar units, not only once but more often, and placed in a position where they may lose their licence and their livelihood may be endangered, even though they may not be actually driving to the danger of the public. I appreciate the difficulties involved, and I appreciate also that the police have this job to do. I believe they do it quite fairly, because a person has to be exceeding the speed limit by at least a few miles an hour.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Would you say they are driving without due care?

The Hon. L. R. HART: I suppose one could say that, because if a person was driving with sufficient care he would observe the radar trap. The Hon. Mr. Shard referred to hospitals, a matter that we know is dear to his heart. He mentioned increased hospital charges, and I think it was the Hon. Mr. Rowe who implied, by interjection, that many of the charges were brought about as a result of Industrial Court awards. I think these charges will increase still further, because I consider that we shall be faced with increased wages for nurses. At the present time the nurses are out of line with school teachers when it comes to award rates. I consider that nursing is equally as important a profession as teaching, and that the nurses possibly are not at all well treated compared with teachers.

Mr. Shard went on to say that there must be a ceiling somewhere in hospital charges and medical benefit contributions. I believe that the medical benefits scheme has been of considerable assistance to many people who have been unfortunate enough to require hospitalization, for without them many people today would be in dire circumstances.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Very few people could afford to be ill if they did not have those benefits.

The Hon. L. R. HART: That may be so. Many people cannot afford to be without them. I refer to people who are illness prone. Australia's voluntary health insurance scheme has been operating for about 15 years, and although it has had its successful periods it is still developing and it has at times caused widespread dissatisfaction amongst the contributors, the medical practitioners, the hospital administrators and also the organizations themselves.

The Commonwealth Government early this year set up a Select Committee to inquire into the whole scheme, and at the same time the Senate also set up a similar committee. I am not sure what the Hon. Mr. Shard had in mind, or whether he would prefer a national health scheme. Experience overseas suggests that such schemes are riddled with deficiencies.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The scheme here is a long way from being perfect.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I appreciate that, but from what one hears from people overseas the national health schemes there are far from perfect. In fact, the Australian voluntary health insurance scheme is the envy of many oversea countries.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I consider that the Australian scheme does not need a great deal of improvement for it to be pretty near perfect.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The great benefit of our scheme is that it combines freedom of choice of health services with Government assistance meeting the cost of the services. It will be interesting to hear the findings of the Select Committees. Many problems are involved, one being the multiplicity of organizations offering similar benefit tables.

Some of the organizations have been accused of withholding the benefits from the contributors so that they themselves can accumulate large reserves. Over the years several of the medical benefit schemes have folded up, and in consequence quite a number of people have suffered considerable losses.

I refer now to the possible need to have some form of legislation covering the sale of hearing aids. We have what is known as the Opticians Act, under which the people who make and dispense optical requirements are governed by legislation. I think the time is here (in fact, we have probably gone well past it) when South Australia should look at the question of having legislation to cover the hearing aid industry. Possibly we could set up something of the nature of a South Australian Hearing Aid Industry Council.

It is essential that we have a code of ethics in this trade governing the many aspects of it. We must have adequate standards of competence and conduct among persons engaged in the retail selling of hearing aids, and we must have adequate facilities for the training of persons who act as dispensers of those aids.

We should also have some control over the advertising of this article. In fact, some rather unscrupulous trading practices exist in this industry. This is borne out by the fact that the Commonwealth Government, which had made provision for hearing aids to be covered by Commonwealth benefits, went into the business itself and produced its own hearing aid because it was not prepared to trust the industry to supply that article under the Commonwealth scheme for pensioners.

This, of course, is a reflection on the whole industry. I hasten to make it clear that there are some quite reputable traders in that industry. However, there are some whose ethics would not bear examination, and I consider that we should set up some sort of scheme to promote and enforce a code of ethics to govern all these people in their conduct with the public and with each other. We have only to look at the varying costs of hearing aids between different retailers to realize the need for some form of control in this industry.

I have had some experience of this matter, and I know that one can buy a certain hearing aid from some firms for about $230, whereas a similar hearing aid can be purchased from another firm for as little as $130—a difference of $100 in the cost for what is virtually an identical article. One of the reasons for this, of course, is the cost of advertising that is indulged in by certain firms. We know that a hearing aid is something that is not solid in large numbers every day. If a person advertises hearing aids to any great extent, he can quite easily put anything up to $50 on to their cost, and this is what is being done by some firms who are indulging in considerable advertising.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Do you get them any cheaper on a trade-in?

The Hon. L. R. HART: That brings me to the point of whether we should have some control over the sale of secondhand hearing aids. We should certainly have some control over the people who fit them, because if a person is not particularly deaf when he goes to some of the specialists, with the type of hearing aid they would fit him with he soon would be. So I believe the time has come when we should look at this question. In fact, Great Britain has an Act covering hearing aids, known as the Hearing Aid Council Act. No doubt, we could have similar legislation in South Australia. I wish to say nothing more at present on the Budget except that, if we are to demand services in this State for the people, they must be prepared to pay for them.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They are not getting any at the moment.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You did not tell them that last March.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You are taking up the railway lines.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The Labor Party promised and gave some services, and we are committed to paying for them. No doubt, many services are acceptable to the general public.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: What about your taxation legislation?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. L. R. HART: Taxation is a sore point. The Labor Party is prepared to juggle the Budget.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We still got the support of the people.

The Hon. L. R. HART: With those few remarks, I support the second reading.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

STOCK DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 3. Page 1649.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Minister of Agriculture): I thank honourable members for the attention they have given this Bill and commend the Hon. Mr. Kneebone for his contribution to the debate. I do not wish to reply at length but I must observe that the honourable members who have spoken to the Bill have obviously read it and spent some time checking its various aspects. I have several small amendments (which I shall submit during the Committee stage) which arise from this debate. One deals with laboratories. Veterinary surgeons and the department's Chief Inspector of Stock, after a conference, have reached an agreement, which I believe will be satisfactory to the honourable members who raised this point. The Hon. Mr. Gilfillan had much to say about laboratories. I think his problems will be solved by these proposed amendments.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Are the amendments on the file?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They were handed out today.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Hon. Mr. Gilfillan also referred to dieldrin. I think I have covered that, too, in an amendment I have on the file. The Hon. Mr. Whyte raised several matters that will be better dealt with in the Committee stage rather than by a long speech from me now. The Hon. Mr. Kemp raised several points—in particular, that the definition of "horse" should include donkeys and mules.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: I said "hybrid species".

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I have had a close look at this and feel that the present definition covers the situation adequately. In the matter of reducing the carcasses by burning to ashes, the word "ashes" was used as indicating an end point at which there could be no possibility of survival of any infective agent and would include reducing the bones to a state where they remained only as inorganic material. I think we can accept that definition. The Hon. Mr. Hart spoke on clause 2, which deals with infectious or contagious diseases. I think I can satisfy him on that during the Committee stage. He also raised some points about clause 4 in respect of the treatment of a flock or a herd. He asked for the insertion of a suitable provision to cover that. Once again, I think I can satisfy him that that will be met. I intend to amend clause 18 to cater for problems involved there.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Interpretation."

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Minister of Agriculture) moved to insert the following new paragraph:

(*b*1) by inserting after the definition of "inspector" in subsection (1) the following definition:

> "laboratory" means premises habitually used for the examination of sick or diseased stock and the diagnosis of disease, but does not include any such premises under the control of, and used by, a veterinary surgeon for the treatment and cure of sick and diseased stock;

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Power of Governor to make regulations."

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I move:

In paragraph VIa to strike out "prescribing the" and insert "prohibiting the treatment of stock by any".

That was the point raised by a number of honourable members. I believe it is a much better coverage for the public, and will enable stock inspectors to deal with the situation much more easily.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. C. R. STORY moved:

In new paragraph VIa to strike out "by which stock shall or shall not be treated" and insert "that might, in the opinion of the Governor, have an injurious or adverse effect upon any stock or the quality of the carcass or animal product of any stock".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 5 to 10 passed.

Clause 11—"Inspector may destroy diseased stock."

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: This clause deals with the powers of an inspector to seize, remove and destroy stock. I brought up this matter during the second reading debate but, when replying, the Minister did not touch on the question of compensation. Section 26 of the principal Act provides that no compensation shall be paid. I believe that the destruction of stock is carried out for the benefit of stock-owners in general, to protect their herds against infection. Will the Minister therefore fully consider the question of compensation, either as a Government measure or as a statutory contributory scheme to cover losses that may occur through destruction of stock, in order to prevent the spread of the diseases that are not covered by the Cattle Compensation Act or by any Commonwealth Act?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The same question was raised by the Hon. Mr. Whyte in his speech on the Bill. Rabies and foot-and-mouth disease are pretty desperate types of disease, and if an animal is killed and it is subsequently proved that it was not suffering from either of these diseases, due provision has been made. However, if we get into the matter of compensation for foot-and-mouth disease the present Budget would almost be used up completely—

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: This is covered by the Commonwealth Act.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: —if we put a compensation clause in the State Act. In these cases the Commonwealth would be asked to meet the cost involved. Indeed, in other disaster cases the Commonwealth would, as it has in the past, come to the aid of the State. The department is at present considering our position under the Commonwealth Foot and Mouth Disease Act, and is also examining the question of exotic disease and others in line with it. The Cattle Compensation Act of 1962 provided that any disease to which it referred could be proclaimed as a disease. Therefore, by simple proclamation we can include other diseases under the terms of that Act.

It is a little premature to say that we are going to compensate owners of cattle infected by this disease. There is sufficient power under the Commonwealth Act to enable us to fall within its provisions and to make applications for assistance. This is a State Act and it must be kept as such.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I am satisfied with the Minister's explanation. I am aware that the Commonwealth Act deals with compensation for foot-and-mouth, blue tongue and other exotic diseases. I would, perhaps, have liked to see something written into this Bill to cover this matter, though I am satisfied to accept what the Minister has told us.

Clause passed.

Clauses 12 to 17 passed.

Clause 18—"Diseased carcasses not to be sent out of State."

The Hon. C. R. STORY moved:

In new subsection 28b after "establish" to insert "a laboratory"; after "or use" to insert "or permit the use of"; and to strike out "or other premises" and insert "under his control,".

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 19 to 22 passed.

Clause 23—"Allegation in complaint deemed to be proved in absence of contrary proof."

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I am concerned about the words "or treated" in new section 45a (*c*). The wording of this clause is almost similar to that of section 35 of the principal Act, which is repealed under clause 21, but it changes the word "sheep" to "stock" and adds these words "or treated". I interpret these words as referring to any treatment specified in this legislation—not only to dipping but also to veterinary or other treatment prescribed by inspectors. It is often easy for a stockowner to prove that he has dipped his stock, because he has outside assistance, but it is almost impossible for him to prove that he has treated individual animals. In putting the onus of proof on the stockowner we are putting him in an impossible position. If the words "or treated" refer to the dipping process, which can be done by methods other than a plunge dip, I believe the provision should make this clear. The words "or treated" are too wide, and an unfair onus of proof is placed on the stockowner.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: An earlier amendment cleaned up many of the problems referred to earlier by the honourable member. An inspector must first gather evidence that he

believes justifies a prosecution. The matter is then passed to the Chief Inspector of Stock, and then to the Minister, who in turn sends it to the Crown Law Office, which studies the evidence and considers whether a prosecution is justified. A defendant still has his rights in the court. The veterinary officer has had long discussions with the Chief Inspector of Stock on this clause, and apparently they are satisfied that it is in order. I do not think the provision ought to be further watered down.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I agree with the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan that this clause certainly puts the stockowner in the position of being guilty until proved innocent, which is contrary to the principles of British justice. Surely, as the honourable member pointed out, it would often be very difficult for the stockowner to prove that he had treated a certain animal. I think the onus of proof should be on the person laying the complaint, not on the defendant. I oppose the clause.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I should have pointed out that wide powers in respect of prosecutions already exist in sections 17 and 47 of the principal Act, under which fairly substantial penalties can be imposed. The Hon. Mr. Banfield has said that he will oppose the clause, but I do not intend to go to this extent. Because section 35 of the principal Act has already been repealed by clause 21, if this clause was not passed the Act would be left without the other provisions. I move:

In new section 45a (*c*) to strike out "or treated".

The Hon. L. R. HART: I cannot agree with the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan. Under this legislation a person is required to do certain things, one of which is dipping sheep in a certain specified period. For every disease that can be proclaimed under this Act, he can be required to do certain things involving treatment. Footrot is a proclaimed disease, so sheep infected with it must be treated. Unless the words "or treated" are retained, the onus of proof in relation to the treatment of sheep for footrot would not exist. If the words "or treated" are struck out, "dipped" might as well be cut out also, because one thing is just as important as the other. I think the Act will be weakened if it is tampered with. I oppose the amendment.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: If the amendment is carried, this provision will be made almost impotent. If it is carried, why not also cut out the word "dipped", because there would still be some doubt whether sheep had been dipped? If the words "or treated" are struck out a heavy burden will be placed on people. The purpose of the Bill and the principal Act is to protect people who own stock. The department does not wish to inflict this Bill on anyone: it is introduced at the request of the industry to deal immediately with contagious diseases.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Why should the onus of proof be on the defendant?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: If the honourable member examines practically any Act he will find this provision. A person would have every chance of having his story believed, first by the Chief Inspector, then by the Minister, and then by the Crown Law Department; he would then have the opportunity to enter the witness box and say under oath that he had dipped his sheep. The onus is on the person bringing the charge to place sufficient evidence before the court that the man had not treated his sheep. That is the practice in law.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It does not say that in the Bill.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: If it had to be said on every occasion we would never be finished. It is a well-established principle of law, and there have been judgments of the court on this matter. The honourable member is a good "bush lawyer" but he is not going to intimidate me—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfied: But the Minister is intimidating the owners.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The honourable member is not going to intimidate me into wrecking this Bill, because he has taken this out of context and he is trying to make out a case that British justice will not be done in prosecutions under this legislation.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I am merely stating what is in the Bill; the Minister put it there, not me.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I would like to see the words "or treated" remain, because this is part of the Bill. It is necessary in order that the department may function in the way it should.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: The clause is substantially the same as section 35, but two words have been added. I maintain a big difference exists between having to prove that sheep have been dipped and having to prove that they have been treated, because "treatment" can cover a whole range of different procedures. For instance, it could mean

an injection or something of that kind, whereas the average owner would have little trouble in proving that he had dipped his sheep because there would usually be witnesses.

The Minister implied that the provisions of the Bill were brought forward at the request of the industry. I do not know what part of the industry requested this, but neither the Stockowners Association nor the Veterinary Association did this, although the latter, in consultation with the department, has since reached an agreement with the department on this amendment. The words "or treated", in spite of cases at law, mean that we are writing something into the Act placing upon an owner the onus of proving something that he might find impossible to prove. It is purely regarding onus of proof that I raise this objection. Other provisions provide ample means by which the department can enforce the Act.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (24 and 25) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendments. Committee's report adopted.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 8. Page 1684.)

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern): I have examined the detail of this Bill, and I commend it to members for a speedy passage. It complies with the needs of those chiefly concerned, namely, the friendly societies themselves, and removes impediments in our State legislation that have been preventing the smooth operation of Commonwealth provisions, which interlock in the field of medical benefits.

That such anomalies must at times arise is obvious, for after all our friendly societies served the South Australian community generations before the Commonwealth Government entered this field so effectively. In addition, in the field of medical science such huge strides have been made that there is now day-to-day familiarity with processes and methods beyond imagination when the original Act was introduced many years ago. Who, for instance, in 1919 could imagine that the funds of a friendly society would be called upon to contribute to the cost of an artificial heart valve? This is the purpose of clause 3. Clause 6 can only reduce the overhead costs of supervision in a field in which both the Commonwealth and the State are interested, and must ensure freedom from irregularities.

Clause 7 will be welcomed by co-operatives beyond the building societies. If extended under the Industrial and Provident Societies Act (I do not know whether this is the intention of the Government), it will loosen slightly but sufficiently the tight straitjacket of the rules under which subsidiary enterprises can be entered into by the co-operatives, which are so important to our fruit, fishing, and dairying industries. I am asking these people to examine this matter very closely to see whether there is need for further amendment to the legislation of this nature. The details of how these changes have been made have already been covered by previous speakers.

There is so little understanding of just how co-operative societies work that it is worth taking a few moments of the Council's time to detail the restriction under which they operate. A co-operative society in this State must limit its trading to its membership, and it must also return all its profits to its members from whom those profits have arisen. Actually, they are *not* profits: they are surpluses of provision which the co-operatives have made as servants of their members. There is a very strict limitation in this matter, for a co-operative can trade outside its membership only to the extent of 10 per cent, otherwise it loses its co-operative status. This very strictly limits the field of operations the co-operatives can enter, and it really strictly limits their functions. However, this is a very good thing so long as it is recognized at all stages that the co-operative truly is part of the business of the co-operative shareholder.

As an example of how much this is so, the fruit that we ship to Great Britain remains the property of the individual grower who produced it right through its packing stages and its shipping stages, and any loss, deterioration or damage that occurs to the fruit right up to the time it is sold in the markets in Britain is the responsibility of the man who grew it. I emphasize this because shortly there will be other legislation affecting the working of co-operatives, and it is a type of business that is quite strange to people who have not been engaged in it.

In the same way, on the purchasing side there is a very strict limitation on the co-operative that it can trade only with its members, and it trades with those members not as an agent or as a merchant but as a servant. It is truly a servant of its membership and is not only completely non-profit-making but also almost a non-commercial

enterprise. I do not think it is necessary to say more on this subject. I commend the Government for introducing this measure, and I commend it to members for a speedy passage.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

BUILDING SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

(Second reading debate adjourned on October 8. Page 1685.)

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

SCIENTOLOGY (PROHIBITION) BILL

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. R. C. DeGaris (Minister of Health):

That this Bill be now read a second time, which the Hon. A. J. Shard had moved to amend by striking out all words after "be" with a view to inserting in lieu thereof the words "withdrawn and that the matter of measures to protect the public from any harm which may be caused by the teaching or practice of scientology be referred to a Select Committee of the House", and which amendment the Hon. G. J. Gilfillan had moved to amend by striking out the words "withdrawn and that the matter of measures to protect the public from any harm which may be caused by the teaching or practice of scientology be".

(Continued from October 8. Page 1686.)

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Central No. 1): Consequent upon the amendment moved by the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan yesterday, I believe the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition will be withdrawn. If so, I propose to support the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan's amendment because it will have the desired effect of referring this matter to a Select Committee of this Council. I agree with what the Hon. Mr. Shard said about the Bill. Surely there is a more effective way of providing protection from exploitation, fraud or corruption, whatever the nature or origin of that exploitation, fraud, or corruption may be, than the heavy-handed action proposed in this Bill, the provisions of which are far too stringent. If legislation can be introduced against scientology, this type of action can be taken against some other way of life accepted as a religion, although I am not convinced that scientology is a religion.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Nor is anybody else.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: It is strange that this type of cult has only comparatively recently been referred to as a religion. Lately, we have all witnessed a number of aggressive cults springing up, some masquerading as religions. At a time when the world should be searching for areas of agreement rather than remaining in discord, it is bad that some of these so-called religions seem to be doing all in their power to cause divisions, even in the home. We hear many reports of efforts made to set the mother against the child, the father against the child, or the mother against the father. All these divisions have occurred as a result of the actions of some of these people who set themselves up as being religious.

It is also a criticism of these people that this is occurring at a time when the main sections of the Christian religion are reported to be making progress towards unity. The Bill indicates that this Government is guilty of muddled thinking in its approach to these matters. It has selected only one of the offenders culpable of disruptive action and is taking action against it only. I am not suggesting that any action should be taken against any of them but, for the Government to select one of these—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: For a particular reason, of course.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: You mean one group?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Government is taking this action against one group when there are possibly other ways of combating the disturbing effects and actions of some of these groups than this action against one of them.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I mentioned in the second reading explanation the reason why this particular cult was more damaging than some others.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I agree that may be so but, if the action proposed by the Leader was not an effective way of doing it, the action taken by the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan in seeking to clear up this matter is. We can then consider it further before we proceed against one particular group. If it is a logical action for the Government to take against this group, is it not also logical to assume that the Government may in the future take similar action against some other group. I support the amendment moved by the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.38 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, October 10, at 2.15 p.m.