

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, October 22, 1968

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

QUESTIONS

DOMICILIARY CARE

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: An article in last Saturday's *Advertiser* says:

Sweeping changes in hospital and health services in the next five to 10 years were forecast by the Minister of Health (Mr. DeGaris) yesterday . . . The Minister said that there were good reasons, apart from reducing hospital care costs, for supporting home services which could help old people live at home as long as possible.

Does the Minister intend that the cost of providing meals, linen, housekeeping, physiotherapy and other essential needs will be met in the way in which it would be met if these elderly people were in hospital, where they would receive assistance from the Government and from hospital benefit funds?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: This is a complex question and I doubt whether I can give a full answer now. The statement made was that, in view of the developments taking place in Australia and elsewhere in the world in relation to hospitals and care of the aged and of the sick, sweeping changes in this field would be made not only in South Australia but in Australia. One of the developments I foresee is the development of domiciliary care units based on available facilities. In the last Commonwealth Budget the Commonwealth Treasurer (Mr. McMahon) made a statement about the assistance the Commonwealth Government would be giving in this field. If I remember correctly, he said that the Commonwealth would look at any proposal that State Governments made in relation to this matter. As far as I can remember, the Commonwealth made no specific promises, but it was interested to see what schemes the State Governments would bring forward in relation to the establishment and development of domiciliary care units in our hospital system. Officers of the Hospitals Department are at present considering methods of developing domiciliary care in South Australia. At present, all I can say on the question is that

the situation is being examined in the light of the statement by the Commonwealth Treasurer in his Budget speech.

WHEAT

The Hon. L. R. HART: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: In a recent press statement the General Manager of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited (Mr. P. T. Sanders) said that because of the possible record harvest this season the co-operative would have some difficulty in providing sufficient storage for this season's crop, and he went on to say that it might be necessary for the farmers themselves to provide temporary storage in the sheds and barns on their own properties. It is possible that a considerable percentage of a farmer's crop will have to be stored in this manner. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether consideration has been given to devising ways and means whereby farmers may be paid the first advance on wheat that may be temporarily stored on their properties? If this consideration has not been given, will the Minister approach the appropriate authorities to see whether it is possible for an advance to be made on the wheat stored on farmers' properties?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The question raised by the honourable member is a very topical one, because it is obvious even at this stage that we are going to have more wheat than we normally have. Over the last three-year period the average yearly delivery of all grains into silos has been 49,355,000 bushels, and it is expected that this year we will have very much in excess of that amount. I am pleased with the reception of the announcement by the co-operative that some grain will have to be stored on farms. With the temporary arrangements that have been made by the co-operative, we will have sufficient capacity this season to store 69,877,000 bushels of grain which, of course, is much in excess of our State average. Of course, this matter will be one concerning the Wheat Board and the Act. I understand that the wheat that is paid for is the wheat that is in the hands of a licensed receiver, and this matter raised by the honourable member could cause some complications. I will certainly examine the matter and bring down a report for the honourable member.

ROSEWORTHY AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question concerns the Roseworthy Agricultural College, which a number of honourable members visited last Friday. Unfortunately, I was unable to do so, but I did spend a good deal of Saturday, at "the open day" at the college. No doubt honourable members will have noticed the very great improvements that have been effected in that institution in recent years. I understand that in the last few years the Principal has been somewhat embarrassed by the fact that he has had about twice as many applicants each year as he can place. Until a year or two ago he was able to select students by reason of academic achievements, but in the last two or three years I understand that he has been greatly concerned at having to reject a number of students who had the necessary requirements. I believe it is possible that the college will be extended in size and acreage and in its capacity to take students. I understand, too, that this may envisage an enrolment of 180 to 200 students, instead of the present 120 students that attend the college. Is the Minister yet in a position to make a statement regarding these possibilities?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I could talk at some length on this subject but I would rather obtain a prepared statement for the honourable member. However, we are working towards the ends that the honourable member suggests, and I will obtain for him a detailed statement of what is being done.

ABORIGINES

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Has the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, a reply to the question I asked on October 8 following the statement made by the Commonwealth Minister-in-Charge of Aboriginal Affairs regarding Aborigines having the right to make decisions and use some of their own tribal laws in so doing?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Minister of Aboriginal Affairs reports:

Representative groups of tribal Aborigines in South Australia have already been consulted on the question of allowing liquor on their reserves or missions. This has resulted in one group from Yalata requesting a licence for a wet canteen on their mission. The Aboriginal people at Amata have advised that

they do not wish to see a canteen established at Amata. Similarly no canteen is desired by the Aborigines at Ernabella Mission.

Aboriginal reserve councils are functioning on reserves in the south of this State. These councils have responsibility for giving leadership to the community in matters of public behaviour and town improvements. As the residents are non-tribal Aborigines, there is no possibility of retaining tribal laws. The councils rely on the police to enforce law and order in their communities in the normal way.

On reserves in the north and west of the State where tribal law still exists to some extent, experimentation into satisfactory methods of maintaining law and order is continuing. It is the policy of this Government to support the authority of tribal law where this does not clash with Australian law. Experiments are already being carried out in the Northern Territory and administrative methods of making tribal Aborigines responsible for policing their own decisions on their own reserves will be discussed at the Central Reserves Conference on October 28 and 29.

DOG FENCE

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (on notice): In view of the rising cost of maintaining the vermin fence and the depletion of the fund established to maintain it, will the Minister of Agriculture take up the matter with Cabinet of increasing the present Government subsidy of 20 cents a square mile to match the amount payable by landholders, namely, 35 cents a square mile?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: This is a matter which has been submitted by the Vermin Districts Association to my colleague, the Minister of Lands. The Dog Fence Board has been asked for a report which, when received shortly, will be considered by Cabinet.

REGISTRATION OF DOGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Registration of Dogs Act, 1924-1966. Read a first time.

TRUSTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 17. Page 1971.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I rise to support this amending Bill. In his second reading explanation, the Chief Secretary said:

For some time now the permanent building societies in South Australia have been making representations to the Government for deposits made with them to be accorded trustee status, thus enabling the societies to gain access to

funds not presently available to them for house mortgage lending. The Government is anxious to assist in any reasonable measure that will promote the application of additional funds for home financing.

The Opposition agrees that anything that can be done to make more money available for house building or mortgage lending is in the interests of the State, and it has our whole-hearted support. When introduced in another place, the Bill contained one or two things to which the Australian Labor Party was not able to agree. Two main amendments were moved there, both being accepted by the Government. The first was to fix March 1, 1969, as the date before which the Act could not be proclaimed. This amendment was accepted. The second amendment accepted by the Government was to the effect that it was necessary for the Auditor-General to submit to the Governor a report on the financial condition of a particular society before the Governor could make a proclamation in respect of it. Two or three consequential amendments were made for the smooth working of the Bill. I can see nothing wrong with it and have no objection to it. It is with reasonable pleasure that we support it.

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

STATE BANK ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 16. Page 1915.)

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): I support the principles of this Bill. The State Bank had a fairly chequered history in its early days which I wish to discuss for a few moments. The Bill was first introduced into the South Australian Parliament in 1895 and it gave limited powers to the State Bank, permitting it to lend a total of £5,000 as an advance for the purchase of Crown lands, and for that purpose only. Because of the restrictive nature of these lending powers it became necessary in 1925 for the then Labor Treasurer, the Hon. Mr. J. Gunn, to make sweeping changes to the Act. No sooner had the Bill been introduced in 1925 than amendments were made resulting in the role of the bank becoming even more restrictive than it had been at any time since 1895. The amendment provided that the bank could make advances only by loan, overdraft, or otherwise to the following persons and to no others: agricultural, pastoral, rural or primary producers or persons carrying on the industry of treating, processing or packing any kind of primary produce.

Of course, because of the extremely restrictive nature of the amendments passed in another place, three months later it became necessary for the Government of the day to introduce an amendment giving the bank the powers it has today; that is, to lend to primary industry and to industry, and generally to assist in the development of the State where it was considered that the bank could do those things.

When reading the debates of 1925 it was interesting to note that the members of the Australian Labor Party at that time proposed that the State Bank of South Australia should be amalgamated with the Savings Bank of South Australia, the idea being that there would then be sufficient capital structure to enable the State Bank to move forward. As the Treasurer said at the time, the proposal was a copy of similar legislation that had just been introduced into the Parliament of New South Wales where the Rural Credit Bank and the Savings Bank of New South Wales were amalgamated in order to provide the necessary capital finance for such a banking institution. That suggestion in the Parliament of this State did not see the light of day and, fortunately, it still has not.

In 1925 it was necessary to introduce the amendment because during the depression years prior to that year the bank was restricted in its lending ability, and private banks were unable to help much because of the worldwide depression (with which honourable members are familiar) that produced an export problem in Australia as well as producing fantastic monetary problems for all private trading banks. Therefore, prior to 1925 it had become necessary for the State itself to guarantee loans to producers as well as to many other organizations closely associated with primary production, such as the Renmark Irrigation Trust, which borrowed £6,000 from the trading bank. The trading bank had advanced that money without a State guarantee and when the members of the irrigation trust wanted a further £6,000, making a total of £12,000, the bank required a guarantee on the whole amount. It was apparently quite a difficulty for the State at that time.

Organizations with familiar names are the Ramco Fruitgrowers Co-operative, which borrowed £2,000 under a State guarantee, and the Waikerie Co-operative Distillery, which borrowed £3,500, again guaranteed by the Government. That was the method necessary

at that time and the reason why in 1925, because so many organizations were seeking a Government guarantee, it was decided to establish one lending authority, the State Bank of South Australia. The Treasurer at the time, who was also the Premier, in his second reading explanation of the original Bill said that half the State Bank's profit would be paid to the Treasury. That proposal is similar to what is envisaged in the Bill now before the Council, except that, instead of half the bank's profit, only 45 per cent will be paid to the Treasury.

The State Bank was formed in 1895, whilst the Bank of Adelaide was established by Government charter in 1865, 30 years earlier. It is well known that the Bank of Adelaide is a private banking company and that it is basically South Australian in its interests, even though today it trades throughout Australia and has many overseas commitments. In 1967 the Bank of Adelaide paid \$451,000 in taxation, it made a profit, after paying taxation, of \$893,000, and it declared a dividend to its shareholders of \$560,000. The total of the taxation paid and the dividend paid was \$1,011,000. In the same year the State Bank, according to the Auditor-General's Report, made a profit of \$747,000.

If a private trading bank, whose interests are basically South Australian, can make a profit and can pay by way of taxes and dividends an amount in excess of \$1,000,000, compared with the State Bank's profit of \$747,000 (of which the Treasurer has said he expects to receive \$370,000—45 per cent of the State Bank's profit), it seems to me that the State Bank will suffer as a result of a further millstone being hung around its neck. It seems that the State Bank has not been able to progress in the modern banking world of today. It is difficult for me to assess whether it has been restricted by Government thinking or by inadequate capital, but henceforth it will have an additional problem in that it will be expected to pay over \$370,000 annually to the State Government. However, at the same time, it appears to be under-capitalized and unable to branch out.

The Chief Secretary, in his second reading explanation, clearly pointed out that the State Bank's role is to assist primary and industrial concerns wherever possible. It is logical, therefore, that, if the amount of money it can lend is whittled away, even though it is a Government instrumentality to some extent, it will be restricted from now on. This will not lead to

a good banking structure. There was a fear in 1925 (indeed, there is always a fear) that altering the State Bank's structure would be the beginning of bank nationalization. In 1967 the Commonwealth Trading Bank of Australia, which is operated by charter from the Commonwealth Government, paid \$2,500,000 in taxation to the Commonwealth Treasury and it made a profit of \$2,800,000.

Some sections of the community were worried that the Commonwealth Trading Bank would monopolize the private trading banks and restrict their operations. It would appear, however, that the people have confidence in the Commonwealth Trading Bank, because they have used the bank extensively and, consequently, it has made a very handsome profit.

I cannot argue with the Government's wanting to obtain more money in one form or another, but it will mean that the State Bank's profitability, its lending ability and its ability to help those sections of industry that it was designed to help will be restricted. This is not a good step to take, unless the Government intends to look at the whole structure of the State Bank, to try to make it stronger and thereby to increase its profits and the amount paid to the Treasury.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Do you think it should be helping only certain sections of the community, not the whole community?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I understand it is helping only certain sections of the community at present. If the State Government is to use this instrumentality to bring revenue to it, then the bank's charter should be widened so that it can help all sections of the community that it wants to deal with. In this way its profitability will be improved and, consequently, the State Government will receive a greater amount from it.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: If you take away the bank's profits you will stop expansion.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I agree entirely with the honourable member when he says these things: I thought I, too, said the same thing. I said the Government should look at the bank's financial structure and its capital structure. Even if it involved the State Government's lending money to the bank for a long term, the Government should give the bank the impetus to go out and trade. I support the second reading.

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

PETROLEUM ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 15. Page 1850.)

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I support the Bill, subject to my receiving during the Committee stage one or two answers to questions. As the Hon. Mr. Bevan said, in general the amendments are of an administrative nature and do not have any far-reaching effects on the principal Act. I think the honourable member raised some pertinent points regarding clause 4, which amends section 7 of the principal Act. This clause eliminates the obligation for an applicant to apply in a prescribed form for a licence. This provision will enable the Minister to vary the type of form necessary for the application, and I wonder whether this is really needed. As far as possible, in our legislation we attempt to ensure that Acts are administered by regulation, except in an emergency. Regulations, of course, mean that any changes will come before Parliament.

The Minister may have some satisfactory explanation of this, but in principle I consider that the Hon. Mr. Bevan has raised a most pertinent point, and I wonder whether this really requires any alteration and whether this would streamline the workings of the department to any extent. Generally, I consider that when there is a prescribed form all applicants know precisely what information they have to supply. Under section 12 the Minister, in granting the licence, has power to add further conditions if he thinks they are desirable. Clause 5 strikes out section 13 (4) of the principal Act, which provides:

Every bond given under this section shall be in the form prescribed by regulations.

Again, this is giving the Minister some discretion in stating what sort of form the bond shall take. To some extent, this could be covered in section 12. However, I believe that in this matter of the bond varying conditions may have to be met and that some flexibility may be desirable. We know of instances where drillers have caused some concern to landholders by taking rather less care than they could have done in their operations on particular properties. If, by further control, the Minister can make for better relations in this respect, this must be all to the good for petroleum exploration in general.

We are at a different stage in our petroleum development than when this Act was first framed, when it was important for the Government of the day to encourage exploration

to the maximum extent in a State where there was no evidence that petroleum or natural gas existed. We know now that petroleum and natural gas exist in Australia in commercial quantities, so petroleum exploration faces a more encouraging future than it did when the original Act was framed. With those few remarks, I support the Bill.

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

VETERINARY SURGEONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 15. Page 1851.)

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): Since this Act was first introduced there have been several amendments, most of which have permitted persons to become registered veterinarians under certain qualifications laid down in the Act.

The main purpose of this Bill is that it revives the provisions under which a foreign graduate may apply for registration, and at the same time it removes the restriction on the time within which he can apply for registration. Although provisions were previously made for a foreign graduate to apply for registration, a restriction was placed on the time within which he could apply. That time, of course, has run out, and as there is a shortage of veterinarians in this country it has become necessary to revive this provision. This Bill does so, but it also removes the qualifying period.

Honourable members may not be aware that there are three types of veterinarian. The first is known as the veterinary surgeon, of which there are about 100 in South Australia. These people are the holders of certain academic qualifications as laid down in the Act. Then we have what is known as the veterinary practitioner. This is the person who five years immediately preceding this Act treated animals as the sole or substantial source of his livelihood or was a veterinary officer in a veterinary lodge. However, the veterinary practitioners are a dying race by virtue of the effluxion of time, and I believe there are only one or two of them left.

In addition to that, we have a person who is known as a permit holder. He is one who proves to the board that he is competent to treat animals for disease or injury, and has been granted a permit by the board. There are about 12 permit holders. This is the only State that provides for permit holders

to be registered. When a person is issued with a permit he is allowed to practise only within a certain area: he is given a defined district. In 1965, amendments that were introduced permitted the board to terminate a permit once a qualified veterinary surgeon set up a practice in that particular area.

Possibly most of the persons who will receive some benefits under this Bill are at present employed in the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science and in other Government departments. Of course, there will be others—similar types of foreign graduates—who will come to this State from time to time. Some of these, of course, will not qualify for registration by virtue of the training they have had in Continental countries. In many cases, some of the foreign graduates have had only a technical course, at times no longer than three years. I understand that the qualifications required to obtain registration as set out in this Act are in line with the World Health Organization's requirements, and it is necessary that we keep in line with such a body.

I believe there is little doubt that there is a shortage of veterinarians in this State, and, indeed, possibly all over Australia. I understand that last year nine were registered and that this year eight will be registered. We have 29 South Australian scholarship students on course in universities outside this State, and prior to the last two years only two or three veterinarians were registered in South Australia each year.

The area where the shortage of veterinarians is most acute and where the need is possibly the greatest is no doubt in the various Government departments, where there is tremendous scope for veterinarians. There is also a shortage in the pastoral areas. Veterinary work in the pastoral areas is possibly specialized work, in most cases dealing with the larger animals. This would be a difficult area to serve with veterinarians because of the great distances involved. Perhaps we should examine the possibility of having a flying veterinary service operating on lines similar to those on which the Flying Doctor Service operates. This may be possible in States other than South Australia; it may be more difficult to set up such a service here than it would in, say, Queensland where there is a big cattle population.

It is pleasing to see that veterinary practices are to be set up in certain country areas. Indeed, I understand that one is being set up at Whyalla by an oversea graduate who is

fully qualified and who is being sponsored by the Whyalla Junior Chamber of Commerce. No doubt, by virtue of being in that locality, he will be able to serve some of the pastoral areas. I believe that a veterinary surgeon is to set up practice at Berri, where there is a known need. I believe also that a practice is to be set up at Port Lincoln. The man setting up there is doing so on his own initiative, and there is possibly a vast opening for a veterinarian in that locality. The present trend in the country and, indeed, in the city is to set up a two-man or three-man practice. I do not necessarily mean men, because at present several women veterinarians are practising in this State. Where the treatment of dogs and cats is a major part of the practice, it is no doubt necessary that a two-man or three-man practice be established, because if a veterinarian had a surgery full of people waiting to have their dogs and cats treated it would be somewhat difficult if he were called away urgently to treat another animal.

It can be justified that there is a need to set up a chair of veterinary science at a South Australian university. This is a costly process. Indeed, I understand it is the most costly of all faculties within a university. Also, a higher ratio of staff to students is required than is the case in any other faculty. However, at the moment applicants who wish to follow a veterinary course in a university can obtain their degrees only at Brisbane, Sydney, or Melbourne, and those three universities have no vacancies at present. A veterinary chair has been set up at the University of New Zealand.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: And one is to be set up in Western Australia, is it not?

The Hon. L. R. HART: I will deal with that in a moment. That is not quite right. In addition to our own needs, we have other commitments, such as the training of veterinarians for countries within the Colombo Plan, to fulfil. The Northern Territory looks to us for a supply of veterinary surgeons, and South Australia requires about 20 or 30 veterinarians annually. The Sydney, Melbourne, and Brisbane universities turn out only 50 graduates a year each, and these graduates are, of course, required in those States.

The most recent chair to be set up was that in Victoria. It is now in its second year, and much of the finance to set it up was supplied by private industry. Moves have been made

in Western Australia to establish a chair of veterinary science there. Indeed, the Western Australian Government has promised financial support for that project. I understand also that Western Australia has asked the Australian Universities Commission to provide finance for that project. I understand, too, that a case was put by the previous Government in this State for a chair in veterinary science to be established at a South Australian university. The previous Government presented that case to the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science, who at that stage was Senator Gorton, now our Prime Minister. I understand he was so impressed with the case submitted by South Australia that it was passed on to the commission. It is, therefore, a question whether South Australia or Western Australia should get the next chair.

South Australia would have some advantage over Western Australia because it has ancillary facilities such as the Waite Agricultural Research Institute, Northfield Artificial Insemination Centre, Roseworthy College, and other institutions. These would all be of value regarding a veterinary chair at one of our universities. The role of a veterinarian in the past has been the treatment of sick and injured animals, but that role has expanded. Now veterinarians are used in an advisory capacity on animal nutrition and other such matters. Indeed, many private firms employ veterinary surgeons for this purpose. Also, laboratory work is now providing many new techniques that must be tried and proved, and much work has to be done in eliminating disease in this country. We have touched only on the fringe, and there is much scope in this field. Government departments realize that some diseases could be eliminated if we had a sufficient veterinary force.

Although this Bill may help in the provision of a few more veterinarians, it will only touch the fringe. We must look far deeper than this and examine more closely the provision of a chair of veterinary science at a South Australian university. The only reason we could not do so at the moment would be finance. When one examines the value of primary industry in this country and the value of the animals in that industry, it would be difficult to fail to realize our great need for a greater force of veterinarians. I support the second reading.

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

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third reading.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland) moved:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1): I oppose the third reading, not because I do not believe in the principles of the Bill but because I object to the attitude taken to it, as I have previously stated. I did not oppose its second reading because I did not think I should oppose the second reading of a Bill like this, but we have heard much talk about principles in this Chamber in the past. I have some principles and am living up to them today by saying that I oppose clause 3 (b) (v), which I consider does not go far enough. I see no reason why this Bill should not have gone to the extent of providing full adult franchise for the Legislative Council, as obtains in other States. So often we have been told in this Chamber that we should legislate in accordance with what happens in the other States, especially in regard to various taxation measures. In at least two other States there is full adult franchise for the Legislative Council. If our State Government had been consistent in its thinking on legislation in this State compared with that in other States, it would have introduced similar legislation here in respect of the franchise for the Legislative Council.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: This is not a new attitude on the part of the Government.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I am not suggesting it is. If the Government had adopted a different attitude last Thursday, this Bill by now would have passed through this Chamber and perhaps been in another place; we could have disposed of it then and there. However, we had a long discourse by an honourable member (who, I grant, had every right to do so) lasting 45 minutes on this Bill last Thursday afternoon, 40 minutes of which was devoted not to the Bill but to Labor Party policy. We had a long discourse on the principles of that policy as regards the abolition of the Legislative Council, but I see nothing in this Bill that deals with that. New Zealand has been cited as an example of a country that has abolished its Upper House. A committee of inquiry in that country reported that a second Chamber, if reintroduced along the lines of its recommendations, would be an alternative to the Legislative Council that had been abolished

there in 1950. Queensland is another example. It is some time now since a Labor Government was in power in Queensland, but no attempt has been made by the Liberal Party there to reintroduce an Upper House. This Bill has been introduced more or less as a sop to answer criticisms of our electoral system by the supporters of both the Labor Party and the Liberal Party.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: And criticisms by the Premier himself.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes—criticisms of the eligibility for enrolment on the Legislative Council roll. So really the purpose of this Bill is to stop future criticism about the franchise for the Legislative Council. There is no doubt about that. However, I still maintain the Bill does not go far enough. It has been said that the elected Government of the State is in another place and not here, and that this place reviews what the Government does. If that is so, to be logical, is there any reason why the electors, having elected what is admittedly the Government in another place, should not have the right to choose their representatives in this Chamber? After all, under the present Constitution this Chamber is all-powerful. It is not a "House of Review", as has been said from time to time, that reviews legislation coming from another place, agreeing with it, amending it or having the power to veto it altogether. When the Labor Government was in power, the Upper House, under the Constitution, had the power to veto practically everything coming from another place.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Not "practically everything" but everything.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: We can have a similar situation here to what existed in New Zealand, where the Government elected by the people of New Zealand found itself faced with a hostile Upper House and so was not able to govern.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: It is not doing too well now, either.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Exactly the same thing could happen here. About three and a half years ago a Labor Government was elected here by the majority of the electors. If it is said that we have majority rule now, I contradict that and say we do not have majority rule. This Government was not elected by a majority of the voters: it is in power only at the whim of one particular individual. That is the position facing us here. I see

no reason whatever why the people in this State who desire a particular Government and have the right of electing that Government in one place should have no say in who their representatives shall be in this Chamber. Because of the attitude adopted by Government members in this Council on this matter I intimated I would vote against the Bill. At least I am running true to form by opposing it and voting against the third reading.

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

FLUORIDATION

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

That this Council considers that before fluoride is added to our water supplies, Parliamentary approval should be sought for such action, which the Hon. V. G. Springett had moved to amend by striking out all words after "that" second occurring with a view to inserting in lieu thereof the following words "while the procedure adopted by the Government for introducing fluoride to the water supplies without reference to Parliament may be open to criticism, nevertheless the Government is to be commended for its wise decision to safeguard the dental health of the community by so adding fluoride".

(Continued from October 16. Page 1903.)

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): I support the motion as moved by the Hon. Mr. Geddes. It is obvious that the Government does not have a mandate from the people of this State for any of its legislation; it is simply trying to wield the big stick by forcing on people something that could have far-reaching and, possibly, ill-effects upon all citizens of this State. That could apply mainly to all citizens over seven years of age, even though the Premier did say that fluoride could have beneficial effects on persons up to the age of 45 years. I do not know why people over 45 have to be given this medicine when even the Premier says that no good purpose would be served by giving fluoride to people over that age. In this place members are looked upon as belonging to the "old men's Chamber"; should we be forced to drink something that would be of no benefit to us? The arrogant manner in which the Premier spoke of this Council having the audacity to discuss this motion leads me to believe there is something "crook".

The Premier's comments came after he had given an assurance that members could debate this question, but as soon as the subject was

brought forward by the Hon. Mr. Geddes we discover that the Premier is angry. The Hon. Mr. Springett said that those who are against this measure are a lot of "cranks". From that, it is obvious there must be many people who are "cranks".

The Hon. C. R. Story: Now that the honourable member has just received his instructions from his colleague he should be able to proceed with his remarks.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Minister obviously had his instructions, but they were not given about fluoride prior to the elections. An approach must have been made to the Government by the people who produce fluoride, and mention must have been made about the amount of assistance given to the Liberal and Country League in its election campaign. The Government was very quiet about fluoridation before the election and, in fact, it was not prepared to present legislation to this House before any announcement was made about fluoridation. The proposal to introduce fluoride into our water supplies was not even hinted at prior to the election, and yet the Government, without a mandate, is attempting to introduce it by administrative action and not by means of a Bill so that the matter could be correctly discussed. I wonder what kind of water will be supplied to members in this Chamber who object to having fluoride introduced into their drinking water and yet find it necessary to "wet their whistle" when speaking?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It would, perhaps, calm people down.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: That would be good, because I have seen the Minister "take off" time and time again when talking when he has been attacked on numerous occasions. He has often lost his calmness. Let us hope it will be the means of calming the Minister down. We had an outburst from the Minister of Agriculture recently because it was suggested that a certain Bill was doing away with British justice and putting the onus on the defendant to prove certain matters, and he then said, in effect, "I am not going to be intimidated into altering the Bill simply because one of you had the audacity to question me." It would appear that it is necessary that something other than fluoride should be put in the water in order to calm some honourable members. Perhaps if doses of *Bidomak* were added it would be better than adding fluoride.

The Hon. C. R. Story: The honourable member could always use his soul for a cork-screw curl.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: That is good, because it seems in that case some use would be made of my soul! The way the Minister is going it will not be likely that his soul will even be good for ashes in the garden.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: He walks on his soles!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Of course, Mr. President, we realize that the Ministry especially is cracking under the strain of occupying the Treasury benches without the sanction of the people of this State. Let us hope it will not be long before the present Government has a twinge of conscience and tells the people of South Australia it is prepared to go back to them, giving them the opportunity again to present the Government with 43 per cent of the vote and forcing it to give up the Treasury benches.

The Hon. Mr. Story, by way of interjection, said that if people did not want to drink the water with fluoride in it they could purchase a tank. That was not just coincidental with the lifting of price control on the price of rain water tanks: the Government knew that people under such circumstances would be forced to buy a tank. Therefore, the Government made sure that tank manufacturers would be able to increase the price of tanks without restriction.

An analysis of the situation will show how ridiculous the existing position is, supposing that a person should buy a rain water tank. Having bought one, that person would not be at home all the time and therefore able to drink rain water on every occasion. Similarly, children would spend most of their time at school and would of necessity drink the water provided at the school. They could not avoid drinking tap water and so would be forced to drink some of this poison to be provided by the Government. What would happen if I visited the home of the Minister? Would he give me a glass of poison or a glass of water from the rain water tank?

The Hon. C. R. Story: The additive I would put in the water would be most acceptable to the honourable member.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: And I would be most happy with that additive, except that the Minister would have to give me an assurance that the drink did not contain fluoride. Once fluoride is put in the water

there is no way that it can be avoided. Statements made by the Minister indicate how dictatorial a Government can become when holding office contrary to the wishes of the people.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Does the honourable member believe that fluoride is objectionable?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I think it is a poison of which people do not have sufficient knowledge. I do not see why people should be forced to take it when it is obvious it would not benefit them. In fact, it could do a lot of harm to a lot of people. Any doctor would agree that what is good for one person may not be good for another, and yet the Government intends to give everybody fluoride in our water supplies without any means of evading it.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Conflicting statements have been made by professional people about this.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It is because of those conflicting statements that we should not rush into this matter. I am not saying that because conflicting statements have been made those who object to fluoridation are all "cranks" as was said by the Hon. Mr. Springett.

The Hon. V. G. Springett: Only some.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes, those who disagree: the others are not cranks. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris said that the Government did announce this matter in Parliament and that it was not put in the newspaper first, but this statement is not entirely correct. The Premier's Ministerial statement about fluoridation appears on page 294 of *Hansard*. A similar statement made to this Council by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, as Minister of Health, appears on page 282 of *Hansard*. However, the edition of the *News* that was on the streets prior to the commencement of the Parliamentary sitting on July 30 said that Adelaide's water supply would be fluoridated. Yet the Minister of Health tells us that it was given to this Council before it was given to the newspaper!

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: About 85 per cent of the professional people would be in favour of fluoridation, wouldn't they?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I do not think any survey has been made among professional people. I wonder what professions the honourable member is referring to. The dentists admit that, no matter how good one's

teeth are, one must eventually lose them and wear dentures. The dentists are more interested in manufacturing dentures, for which they charge an exorbitant price. They also charge an exorbitant price for extractions.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Some medical people as well as dentists favour fluoridation.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes, as the Hon. Mr. Springett said, there are cranks everywhere!

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What about the lawyer in another place?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: What about him? What is the Hon. Mr. Potter doing overseas? I assume that the honourable member who interjected means that the Hon. Mr. Potter may investigate this matter. I have here a list of communities that have abandoned fluoridation after a trial period.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: You just had a sip of fluoride.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I have not had one part per million of fluoride. If we already have fluoride in our water supply, why must we have an additional amount? Let us consider the communities that have a lot of cranks running them! The people in San Diego (California) voted to abandon fluoridation after a two-year trial period, because they suffered stomach upsets. The people of Rio Vista voted to abandon fluoridation after a five-year period because they could see that no advantage was being gained from it. The people of St. Helena abandoned fluoridation after a six-year period, the people of Belmont (San Francisco) after two years, and the people of King City after seven months. The people in South Australia are already jacking up at the very thought of having it here.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Those decisions were made on expert advice.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes, on professional advice—probably these cranks, who apparently exist in all these American communities! The people had an opportunity to vote on the question, but they are not getting that opportunity here.

The Hon. V. G. Springett: How many communities have come back to fluoridation?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member had the opportunity to tell us. I am sure he could not come up with a list of communities that have gone back to fluoridation that is half as long as the list I have here. There is something suspicious about the whole thing.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Is fluoride good in Scotch whisky?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member ought to know. I am a teetotaler, as the honourable member knows, but he ought to be able to tell us. I am not prepared to taste Scotch for that reason. I cannot stand the stuff: it is even worse than fluoride. The people of Middletown, in the United States, objected to fluoride after only three weeks.

The Hon. V. G. Springett: A long trial period!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I said earlier that these trial periods had lasted from a few days to a few years. It took people in some places longer to decide than it did in other places. The people of Kansas voted to abandon fluoridation after an eight-year period. I could go on in this vein and give many other instances where people voted against introducing fluoride. Perhaps the honourable member who is overseas will come back and tell the Council what a mistake it made in his absence.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Do you think there are many people against fluoridation in South Australia?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Many South Australians are against the Government at present and I have no doubt that the same majority is against fluoridation. Why does the Government not let the people vote on the question? Why did the Government not tell the people before the election that it was considering fluoridating the water supply? Why did the Government not tell the people before the election that it did not propose to implement this measure by means of a Bill? If the Government had done these things it would not have received even 43 per cent of the vote.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: You did not do this after 1966.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: We had a mandate in 1966, so we did not have to worry about going back to the people. I suggest that the honourable member cannot recall the last occasion when a Liberal Government had a mandate from the people to govern this State. We received the same mandate from the people last March, but what do we find today?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: We have the numbers on the floor today.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes, subject to one person's help. The Government received only 43 per cent of the vote. Indeed, the people in this place received only 25 per cent of the people's vote.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It is the numbers on the floor that count.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: That is right, and that is exactly what the people of this State are complaining about. Democracy does not mean a thing; as the Hon. Mr. Hill says, it is numbers that count. I suggest that the people should have had an opportunity to vote on this matter. The Government should at least have told the people what it intended to do. I also suggest that the Government members from this Council should go and tell the Liberal Party that it has repudiated every point made in this pamphlet that was put out before the election. The Government put out four points regarding the Liberal Party's policy to maintain this Council, and by its very action it has repudiated every point brought forward by the L.C.L. office prior to the election. Why do the Liberal members not tell Wilson to correct this and tell the people the true set-up, tell the people that they are exercising their prerogative purely as dictators and putting these things on to the people who do not need them?

The only good thing that has come about as the result of the Hon. Mr. Geddes's motion is the announcement by the Premier that he will consider altering the manner in which members are elected to this Council, and by this I assume that he means that he will introduce a Bill for full adult franchise. The Hon. Mr. Rowe no doubt also interpreted it in this way, because he is rushing a Bill through this place to thwart the Premier in his attempt to bring some form of democracy into this Council. The Premier gave notice of his intention to the people up on North Terrace at their last convention. It is true that they had a bitter quarrel amongst themselves.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It is true that they nearly came to fisticuffs up on North Terrace. However, the fact remains that the Premier said he was sick and tired of South Australia being a hillbilly State and that he was going to do something about introducing democracy into this Council. In addition to the abuse levelled at this Council by the Premier because of our discussing this motion, we had the extraordinary statement by the Hon. Mr. Springett that doctors who oppose the introduction of fluoride to our water supply are cranks. Surely that is a statement in line with others made by members of the minority Government, who are power drunk.

I suggest to the Hon. Mr. Springett that if the dental and medical professions could come to some agreement on this matter it would be so much easier for the general public to form a true opinion and possibly sort the cranks from the experts. I disagree with the Hon. Mr. Whyte and the Hon. Mr. Springett when they imply that apart from this motion we have confidence in the Premier and the Government of this State. I have never had confidence in this Government. The people of South Australia have not placed their confidence in this Government, and they showed they had no confidence when they gave the Liberal Party only a 43 per cent vote at the last election.

However, I can agree with part of the Hon. Mr. Springett's amendment to the motion which says, in effect, that the action of the Government in introducing fluoride to the water supply without reference to Parliament may be open to criticism. Of course it is open to criticism.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: How about four weeks' annual leave?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It will be necessary for people to have four weeks' annual leave once they are subjected to daily doses—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I see nothing in the motion with reference to leave, and I suggest that the honourable member make his remarks relevant to the motion.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I quite agree.

The PRESIDENT: Also, interjections are out of order.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I consider that with the injection of fluoride into our water supply it will be necessary for people to have a longer holiday in which to recuperate. However, I suggest that they will have to go a long way, possibly to another State, to get away from this poison that is going to be administered to the people. That was how the question of the necessity for longer holidays arose, and apparently the Hon. Mr. DeGaris agrees with that. Unless members of this Council force the Government to drop this proposal to add fluoride to our water supply it will again highlight the misrepresentation contained in this pamphlet.

At the prospect of being only half a crank instead of a full crank, I will agree with half of the Hon. Mr. Springett's amendment, namely, that part of it regarding the criticism of the Government. However, because we do not get half a vote, although we are elected here by only one-quarter of the people of South Australia, I will have to go the whole hog and vote in favour of the motion moved by the Hon. Mr. Geddes.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.47 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, October 23, at 2.15 p.m.