

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, November 21, 1968

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

### ADELAIDE TO GAWLER RAILWAY (ALTERATION OF DRY CREEK TERMINUS) BILL

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

## QUESTIONS

### LICENSING

The Hon. L. R. HART: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Local Government, representing the Attorney-General.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I have before me a letter from the Waikerie Golf Club, Inc. It is a copy of the correspondence it has sent to the Clerk of the Licensing Court of South Australia. It states:

Dear Sir, Although our club permit has expired, we will shortly be applying for its renewal as from March, 1969. I wish to draw your attention to the following facts, which relate to our desire in future to have Cooper's Gold Crown beer available for our members.

1. Our permit stipulates that we purchase our supplies from the Waikerie Hotel.
2. The S.A. Brewing Co. have, under the terms of the lease, prohibited the hotel from stocking Cooper's Gold Crown beer.
3. We would therefore be unable to provide this beer for our members.

I have ascertained that there will be a considerable demand from our members for this brand, and it is our contention that we should cater for their individual tastes as far as is practical. While agreeing with the limitation placed on our trading by the Act, we consider that this action by the S.A. Brewing Co. places a further and unwarranted restriction on our operations which was not envisaged when the Act was passed.

I would emphasise that we enjoy very cordial relations with the Waikerie Hotel, and wish to continue to trade with them, but consider that the restrictive actions of a third party should not be permitted to influence our ability to cater for the reasonable requirements of our members. We would be pleased if you would consider these points and clarify the position for us prior to our application for a renewal of the permit.

Yours faithfully,  
(Sgd.) J. B. Heinemann, President

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I hope the honourable member for Midland is not trying to cause a split in Central No. 2!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I take it the question is that the honourable member wants me to look into the matter with my honourable friend, the Attorney-General.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Yes.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It seemed to me from the letter that the golfers might have to "re-cooperate" with West End. However, it seems that the letter deals with the question of certain agreements that sometimes exist between hotel licensees and brewing companies. I will refer the matter to the Attorney-General and obtain a report. If the honourable member wants to take any action in regard to any amendments that he feels may be necessary as a result of this matter, I point out that the Attorney-General hopes to bring down a further Bill to amend the Licensing Act.

### DOCTORS

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Can the Minister of Health tell the Council the present doctor-population ratio in South Australia, and can he say whether this ratio has improved in the last 12 months?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I cannot answer the honourable member's question off-hand, but I will obtain the information he requires.

### FREIGHT RATES

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about freight rates?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In addition to a road passenger service between Adelaide and Port Lincoln, Birdseye's Motor Service also operates overnight fast freight and general freight services to Eyre Peninsula. The charge for a parcel from Adelaide on the fast freight service is 2c a pound plus 25c surcharge, while the rate on the general service is 1c a pound plus 25c surcharge.

Although the passenger service is operated under licence from the Transport Control Board, no such authority is required by Birdseye's Motor Service to conduct the freight services, but inquiries have revealed that the charge for a 100 lb. cream can from Arno Bay to Port Lincoln on the latter service is 40c, and this charge includes the empty return can.

### EFFICIENCY EXAMINATION

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I ask leave to make a very brief statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Yesterday I asked a question regarding the possibility of efficiency investigations in Government departments as possible buffers to increased taxation. In other words, we should look at the expenditure side and see whether it can be reduced. I know that departmental investigations are normally carried out within the various departments. I would like to make it clear that my question was directed entirely towards the employment of outside experts who are specially trained and equipped for this type of task and who can have an entirely fresh approach and a new look at the problems involved. I would say, too, that my question was not critical of Government departments: it was asked for the purpose of seeing whether something cannot be done in this line because, just as these investigations are carried out in private businesses and can often be very valuable, I feel certain that the same can apply to Government departments. I understand that the Chief Secretary has a further reply to my question, and I ask him if he would be good enough to make it available to the Council.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yesterday the honourable member referred to the need for the use of management consultants periodically to review the efficiency of departments of the South Australian Public Service. I have received the following report from the Chairman of the Public Service Board Department:

The Public Service Board, pursuant to Section 19 (1) of the Public Service Act 1967, has the power and the function of devising means for effecting economies and promoting efficiency in the management and working of departments. The board has on its staff investigating officers to assist it in the discharge of this function and, in addition, the board has provided within the establishment of some of the larger departments for the appointment of officers to undertake an efficiency advisory service for the permanent head.

The board has a close working liaison with management consulting organizations with branches established in South Australia and periodically assignments are arranged with these consultants to examine specific areas of work within departments. This is a continuing process. With the co-operation of one of the large consulting organizations and a client in the private sector, an Investigating Officer of the board is currently working in the consultants' team to gain experience for his work in the Public Service.

It can be seen, therefore, that there is a close liaison with consulting organizations, and their advice is sought in relation to the efficiency of the South Australian Public Service Departments. However, I believe the honourable

member's point is well taken. I assure him that the Government is more than conscious of the need to see that there is maximum efficiency in the South Australian Public Service.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I appreciate having that answer. Will the Chief Secretary consider making available to Parliament in due course a report on the matter that is currently being investigated?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I will take this matter to Cabinet to see whether this can be made available to Parliament.

#### GOVERNMENT OFFICE BUILDING

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: It was reported in the weekend newspaper that the Premier's daughter had received what I would describe as a static electrical shock while moving furniture into her father's office in the new Government office building in Victoria Square. This makes me suspect that the carpet in this office is made of synthetic material. Will the Chief Secretary therefore inform me what type of carpet is in the Premier's office in the new building?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I cannot answer the question because I do not know. However, having had a similar experience myself, I know that one can get a shock from the doors in the new building. I shall obtain for the honourable member the reply he requires, including information about the material used in the manufacture of the carpet.

#### WATER STORAGES

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I believe that over a number of years now some preliminary inquiries have been made with regard to further water storages in the Adelaide metropolitan area and in areas immediately north thereof. I understand that in previous years these inquiries were made in respect of the Little Para, the North Para and the Light rivers. In view of the ever-increasing need for water and for the storage thereof, in addition to the requirement to pump water from

the Murray River, will the Minister ascertain from his colleague whether any further progress has been made with these investigations?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I shall be pleased to do so.

#### WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILIZATION BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

#### TRUSTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The House of Assembly intimated that it had agreed to the Legislative Council's amendments.

#### LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

#### STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

#### BULK HANDLING OF GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

#### LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second reading.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government): I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.* Its purpose is to make amendments to the Licensing Act, 1967, upon two subjects. The Bill by no means represents all the amendments that the Government has in mind to make to the Licensing Act, and it is intended that a further Bill will be introduced some time later this session, designed to correct further anomalies in the Act, and to render its operation more effective.

The immediate urgency for the present Bill arises in consequence of a decision by the Licensing Court refusing licences to Penfolds Wines Pty. Ltd., a company that is not incorporated in this State. The court has held that Penfolds are not entitled under the Act to hold any licences in addition to those into which their licences under the old Act were converted in pursuance of the Licensing Act, 1967.

The effect of this decision is to seriously impede the ability of Penfolds to carry on business in this State. Consequently the Bill

makes an amendment to section 82 of the principal Act designed to remedy this situation. The Bill, as foreshadowed in the Budget, also increases licence fees from 5 per cent to 6 per cent of the previous year's turnover, and an increase that is to take effect from the 1st January, 1969. The provisions of the Bill are as follows:

Clause 1 is merely formal. Clause 2 amends section 37 of the principal Act. Paragraph (a) strikes out a proviso from paragraph (a) of section 37 which has now served its purpose, and provides that if a licence is granted or renewed on or after January 1, 1969, the licence fee shall be increased from 5 per cent to 6 per cent of the previous year's gross turnover. This paragraph of section 37 deals with licences other than those for which specific provision is made in the section. Paragraph (b) makes a corresponding proportionate increase in the fee for a wholesale storekeeper's licence. Paragraph (c) makes a corresponding increase in the fee for a wine licence.

Paragraph (d) strikes out paragraph (d) of section 37. This paragraph deals with packet licences and the effect of this amendment will be to bring packet licences under section 37 (a). There are very few packet licences at present in force, but it does seem that there is no real justification for making a separate and different provision for packet licence fees. Paragraph (e) makes a corresponding increase in the fee for a brewer's Australian ale licence, and paragraph (f) similarly makes a corresponding increase in the fee for a distiller's storekeeper's licence.

Clause 3 amends section 82 of the principal Act. Firstly, a new subsection (1a) is inserted after subsection (1) of that section, providing that a company incorporated in the United Kingdom or in any State or Territory of the Commonwealth of Australia and registered in this State that held a licence of any kind under the old Licensing Act, or was carrying on business without a licence pursuant to that Act shall be entitled to obtain and hold a licence of any kind except a full publican's licence, a limited publican's licence, a retail storekeeper's licence, a wine licence, or a brewer's Australian ale licence. Subsections (5) and (6) of section 82 are struck out.

These subsections were transposed uncritically from the old Licensing Act without consideration of the fact that they are really inappropriate in their new context. The matters

with which they were intended to deal are now to be incorporated in new subsection (1a) to which I have referred previously.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD secured the adjournment of the debate.

## FRUIT AND PLANT PROTECTION BILL

### Second reading.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.* It is a Bill to repeal the Vine, Fruit and Vegetable Protection Act, 1885-1959, and to substitute for it a new Act to be entitled the Fruit and Plant Protection Act, 1968. This legislation deals with matters of vital importance to the protection of trees and vegetation and their fruit and products from destruction or injury by pests or disease. The present Vine, Fruit and Vegetable Protection Act was enacted substantially in its present form in 1885. It has become increasingly outdated and ineffective in its application to modern methods of production and transportation. Many attempts have been made by regulation to improve the efficacy of the provisions necessary to ensure adequate restrictions upon the introduction and dissemination of pests and diseases, but it has become increasingly clear that a major revision of the Act is necessary.

The Bill cannot itself provide specifically for future contingencies for it is, of course, impossible to anticipate and provide remedies in advance for outbreaks of pests and disease. The purpose of the Bill is, therefore to ensure that adequate power to deal with such outbreaks will exist when they occur. It thus attempts to achieve a maximum of flexibility, ensuring that power will exist where necessary but that orchardists, viculturists and others affected by its provisions will not be subjected to unnecessary and gratuitous prohibitions and restraints.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows: Clause 1 is merely formal. Clause 2 provides for the repeal of the Vine, Fruit and Vegetable Protection Act, 1885-1959. It continues in office the inspectors appointed under the repealed Act and provides that the regulations and proclamations under that Act shall continue in force so far as they are applicable to the new Act. Clause 3 is the definition section. Perhaps the most significant definitions are those of "disease", "pest" and "plant". "Disease" is defined as including any infection or affection of a fruit or plant that

the Governor declares to be a disease for the purposes of the Act, and any abnormality in, disorder of, or injury to a fruit or plant caused by a pest. "Pest" is defined as any organism or micro-organism that the Governor declares to be a pest for the purposes of the Act. "Plant" includes the species of vegetation specified in the definition, whether alive or dead, and materials from which they may be propagated. The definition includes sawn or dressed timber, which has been causing some concern because of the possibility of disease being transmitted thereby.

Clause 4 empowers the Governor to prohibit, either absolutely or conditionally, the introduction or importation into the State of any pest, any fruit or plant affected by disease, any fruit or plant of a species that is likely to introduce a pest or disease into the State, any host fruit or host plant of any species that has been grown in an area where host fruit or host plants of that species are subject to pests or disease, and any packaging or goods in or with which diseased fruit or plants have been packed. Clause 5 enables the Governor to specify certain ports and places as the only ports or places through which host fruit or host plants may be introduced into the State. Clause 6 enables the Governor to establish quarantine stations where diseased fruit and plants may be examined, disinfected or destroyed.

Clause 7 empowers the Governor to declare portions of the State to be quarantine areas. He may prohibit the removal of fruit or plants from the quarantine area; he may require the owners of land within the quarantine area to take prescribed measures for the control or eradication of a pest or disease; he may specify measures, in addition to those prescribed, to be taken by owners of land, discriminating, if necessary, between various portions of the quarantine area; and he may prohibit the planting and propagation of plants within the quarantine area during a period specified in the proclamation. Clause 8 enables the Governor to declare certain pests and diseases to be notifiable pests and diseases. If a person discovers any fruit or plant affected by a notifiable pest or disease, he is required to notify the Chief Inspector forthwith. Subclause (3) places upon the owner of an orchard the onus of proving that he did not know of the pest or disease.

Clause 9 enables the Governor to proclaim such preventive measures as he deems necessary to be taken by the owners of orchards against pests and diseases. Clause 10 provides for the appointment and remuneration of inspectors.

Clause 11 establishes the powers of inspectors. Under subclause (1) an inspector may enter upon any land, premises, vehicle, train, aircraft, vessel, carriage or conveyance on or in which there is, or he suspects there is, any fruit or plant affected by a pest or disease; subclause (2) empowers the inspector to disinfect or treat the fruit or plant and any packaging in which it has been packed. Subclause (3) empowers him to remove and destroy any fruit or plant that he finds affected by any prescribed pest or disease and any packaging in which it has been packed. Clause 12 enables an inspector to direct the owner of a property to take prescribed measures for the control or eradication of a pest or disease and to prevent the removal of fruit or plants from that property.

Clause 13 empowers the Minister, if he is of opinion that the owner of property is not taking proper measures to control or eradicate a pest or disease, to authorize an inspector to take such measures. Clause 14 provides that an inspector is not to be liable for any action taken *bona fide* and without negligence in the exercise of his powers under the Act. Clause 15 makes it an offence to obstruct or impede an inspector. Clause 16 provides for the summary disposal of offences. Clause 17 provides for the service of notices to be given under the Act. Clause 18 deals with the appropriation of moneys for the purposes of the Act. Clause 19 empowers the Governor to make regulations for the purposes of the Act. This measure is long overdue. The industry has been working under very frail rules for a long while.

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

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL  
(No. 2)

In Committee.

(Continued from November 19. Page 2524.)

Clause 9—"Amendment of Second Schedule to principal Act"—which the Hon. S. C. Bevan had moved to amend by inserting in paragraph (b) the following new exemption:

8. Certificate of insurance where the application in relation to which the certificate is lodged is made by a person who satisfies the Registrar of Motor Vehicles—

(a) that he is the owner of the motor vehicle;

(b) that he is in receipt of a pension, on account of age or physical disability or infirmity or on account of being wholly dependent on a deceased serviceman or on a person incapacitated as a result of service in the armed forces of the Commonwealth,

paid or payable under any Act or law of the Commonwealth;

and

(c) that he is, by virtue of being in receipt of such a pension, entitled to travel in any public transport in South Australia at concession fares under any Act, regulation or by-law for the time being in force.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Chief Secretary):  
I move:

In paragraph (b) of the proposed new exemption to strike out "on account of age or physical disability or infirmity or on account of being wholly dependent on a deceased serviceman or on a person incapacitated as a result of service in the armed forces of the Commonwealth."

I oppose the Hon. S. C. Bevan's amendment as moved because the pensioners who would mainly benefit from it are those who are in the better-off category. Whilst some pensioners must live very frugally, many are actually better off than are many wage-earners who have large families to support. An elderly person can get a pension or a part-pension and concession travel. He may own his own house and his own car, and he may have some savings, while at the same time earning up to \$40 a week in addition to a part-pension (I am thinking of the situation where both husband and wife are receiving a part-pension). If the State Government gives more concessions in this direction, all it is doing is relieving the Commonwealth Government of its obligations towards pensioners. The more we do this the more we will be pressed to extend. However, if the Council is disposed to accept the Hon. Mr. Bevan's amendment, then I believe my amendment should be considered, as it will remove some anomalies that would occur if the amendment was carried as it stood.

The Committee divided on the Hon. R. C. DeGaris's amendment:

Ayes (10)—The Hons. R. C. DeGaris (teller), R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan, C. M. Hill, Sir Norman Jude, F. J. Potter, C. D. Rowe, Sir Arthur Rymill, C. R. Story, and A. M. Whyte.

Noes (9)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, S. C. Bevan (teller), Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, L. R. Hart, H. K. Kemp, A. F. Kneebone, A. J. Shard, and V. G. Springett.

Majority of one for the Ayes.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris's amendment thus carried.

The CHAIRMAN: The Hon. S. C. Bevan's amendment as amended will be a suggested amendment. I put the question "That the suggested amendment as amended be agreed to."

The Hon. S. C. Bevan's suggested amendment, as amended, carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with a suggested amendment. Committee's report adopted.

#### PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 19. Page 2526.)

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I support the Bill, which is a short measure to keep the Prices Act in operation for another year. Although I am somewhat dubious about the value of price control in a free-enterprise community, I question whether in this day and age we do actually live in a free-enterprise community. As time passes we find that more and more people and enterprises are grouping together. This lessens the true value of free and open competition. The Bill also contains some valuable provisions that apply to unfair trade practices and misleading advertising. This legislation is worth retaining for those two aspects alone. Of course, it also allows the Prices Department to keep a watchful eye over many items not under price control at present.

I mentioned earlier that we appeared to be establishing a community in which there was less rather than more competition in many fields. Last year the Licensing Bill, which prevented competition in certain fields, was before us. That is a different concept altogether from price fixation, which attempts to fix maximum prices for certain commodities. We have an important grapegrowing industry, which will be affected by the provisions of this Act in that the fixation of minimum prices takes its authority from this Act. The community is, therefore, becoming more complex and complicated each year as more legislation is put on the Statute Book which interferes to some extent with the natural order of supply and demand. However, I believe that true competition still exists in the retail trade through the many channels that deal with the public.

On this occasion I have the unusual honour of following the Hon. Mr. Banfield in speaking to a Bill. He mentioned rather critically the effect of removing price control from certain items, and he mentioned precisely the price of

a certain brand of shoe: I believe that he referred to only one brand. I know he asked a question in this Council some days ago in which he listed several brands of shoe and gave their increased prices. However, to obtain a true picture of the position, we should have before us the price of a whole range of footwear, because it is the practice in retail trade to impose a loading on certain grades of goods so that concessions can be given on others. I refer particularly to the cheaper lines of footwear and to children's shoes. If that is not done the complete picture is not given.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Have you an example where any price has come down since the lifting of price control?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: No—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Well, I had one.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: —because I have not investigated this aspect. However, all members know that prices do fluctuate. One need only examine the daily paper to see that stores put out special lines. There is, therefore, a daily two-way fluctuation of prices, and it would be difficult to establish this point without a full investigation. There is another aspect of the honourable member's speech to which I should like to refer. We hear debate from both sides in this Council, each giving different political views, and it is natural when members speak that they try to establish the points in their political thinking. That is a correct and normal process of Parliamentary debate. In his speech the honourable member said:

I am pointing out what happens when goods are decontrolled, and they are being decontrolled because this Government gave an undertaking to certain people that it would give them the green light to go ahead and fleece the public in whatever way they could.

I am sorry that that was said in this Council, because I believe that statement goes much further than normal political comment and, I believe, it would be close to being a libellous statement if it were made outside the confines of this Chamber. I know each member of the Government personally and I have a high regard for the integrity of each. I believe it is completely unfair that this sort of accusation should be made against men of such integrity, who are doing their best in the interests of this State, whatever their political views may be. I have mentioned this because I believe it should be said that the integrity of members of the Government is undoubted.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: When we were in Government we were told we were crook.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: But that is different.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: To the best of my knowledge I have never heard in this Council any personal reflection on members of the Labor Government.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Didn't you call us crook? Have a look at *Hansard* and find it.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Other members will have their opportunity to speak.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You can give it but you can't take it. You said we were quite incapable and anything but good. If you heard the Hon. Mr. Rowe yesterday, you would realize that.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: This was not a personal reflection.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It was.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: This makes a direct reflection on the members of the Government.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: If you can't take it, don't throw it because you will get it back.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I believe that statement was not in keeping with the standard of debate usually found in this Chamber.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You want to see what some of your members said because they have said a lot in the last 24 hours. If you want a brawl on that, we will give it to you.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I repeat that this form of accusation is not in keeping with the standard of debate of either Party in this Chamber. I support the Bill.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I support the Bill. Indeed, I have supported it on each occasion on which it has come before this Council, although on no occasion have I supported it enthusiastically. As time goes on I support it with less enthusiasm. I believe that when goods are in plentiful supply and when there is competition within a trade, the need for price control no longer exists. Price control is being used as a substitute for control over restrictive trade practices. Furthermore, I believe that, in itself, price control creates a shortage in certain lines because of the low margin of profit allowed. I gave an instance of this two years ago in relation to the manufacture of bricks, when plain bricks were under price control and texture bricks were not. On that occasion there was a shortage of plain bricks because the manufacturers concentrated on producing texture bricks.

Some concern has been expressed over meat prices, and questions have been asked in another place regarding them. It has been suggested that the public thinks the price of meat would be lower if it were under price control. A question was asked recently in another place in relation to the price of ham. A misleading report appeared in the press yesterday that ham would cost less. That report stated:

Leg ham would be 3c a pound cheaper this Christmas, the Treasurer (Mr. Pearson) said in the Assembly yesterday. He told Mr. Venning (L.C.P.) that the price was fixed by the Prices Commissioner each year in September, and this year had been set at 77c a pound.

The true position is that the wholesale price of ham is 77c. The press report indicated that that was the retail price, but in fact it is only the wholesale price and, indeed, the Prices Commissioner does not fix the price of ham. The price of ham this year will be 3c a pound cheaper than it was last year.

The prices are set by the South Australian Bacon Curers and Smallgoods Manufacturers Association. The price is set usually in October and applies for 12 months. I believe that the Prices Commissioner does make a review of the prices set by the association. However, the facts are that the prices are set by the association, and they must not be considered as against the current price of pig meat because to obtain sufficient carcasses to treat for the manufacture of ham and bacon it is necessary that the smallgoods manufacturers start their purchases back in about May, and they purchase right through until the Christmas period. It is the average price over that period that must be considered in relation to ham prices.

Another matter that is causing concern in the butchery trade concerns what is known as "quantitative discounts". These discounts have been given by certain smallgoods manufacturers to social clubs in the purchase of their smallgoods. Some of those clubs are very large indeed, for they are clubs such as General Motors-Holden's and the Weapons Research Establishment, consisting of anything up to 3,000 or 4,000 members. These clubs have been able to buy at a quantitative discount and in fact at prices lower than the butcher and other people who trade in smallgoods can get, so they are thus able to sell their smallgoods at a price that is lower than retailers' prices.

Although this is an advantage to the members of these clubs, this places the retailing trade at a distinct disadvantage, and I think

that the retail trade must also be considered. I do not know whether this is a matter for the Prices Commissioner or whether it is a form of trading practice which, although strictly legal, should perhaps be frowned upon.

We also are seeing set up a new type of retailing outlet for fresh meat. There is one on the Main South Road at O'Halloran Hill, which is open for seven days a week. There is a move to set up further trading depots, and these will be established just outside the area covered by the Early Closing Act.

The producer might feel quite happy to see the setting up of further avenues through which his products may be sold. Where there is pressure for a shorter working week and a smaller number of working hours, the same people who apply that pressure are the ones who make the demands for weekend services. I do not believe that in this day and age we should be extending our facilities for the purchase of products over the weekend, for after all there would be no more meat consumed if it was sold on seven days a week than there would be if it was sold on only five days of the week.

The problem is, of course, that if it is possible for fresh meat to be traded for seven days a week then there are plenty of good reasons why other products should also be sold. Therefore, one could well ask: where would the rat race finish? It would finish up that we would have all forms of business opening for seven days a week provided they were outside the Early Closing Act area. Such establishments as those that are on the fringe of the metropolitan area are causing some hardship to the normal trading retailers. Some of the retailers I know that are being affected by this form of trading are in the position where they will have to reduce staff, and this is something no-one wants to see.

The butcher provides a personalized service, and I consider that the general public still requires this specialized service. We get this situation where a commodity is being sold by certain means during some period and there is a certain amount of glamour and attractiveness attached to it, and this attracts people to the premises. However, if a butcher tried to adopt a similar type of trading in his present premises, he would probably be up against the Department of Health.

I sincerely hope that meat is not brought under price control. Meat is not a stabilized commodity; there are different types and quali-

ties of meat and ranges of quality within different types. We have been through a period when meat was under price control, and I am sure that, under price control, high-quality meat cannot and does not receive its just reward.

Another matter on which I have spoken in this place concerns the price of pies and pasties. Price control exists over pies and pasties in two different forms. First, there is price control by blanket cover which covers the whole State. However, manufacturers at Port Pirie, Port Augusta, Whyalla and Port Lincoln may, by application, obtain a 1c increase above the blanket cover. This price control made by application is known as "written orders". When the price of pies and pasties is increased by blanket cover, the announcement is made in the press and from trading on the morning the announcement is made prices may be increased.

If a manufacturer is working not under blanket cover but under the written orders procedure, he is not allowed to increase his price until he has received his written orders, which may be late in that afternoon or even the next day, so he is at a disadvantage in this respect.

I believe it is only reasonable that the Prices Branch should post out the written orders the day before a price change is announced in order to allow everybody to be on the same footing. Although a manufacturer may live in Port Pirie or in the other areas where written orders apply, unless he applies he cannot obtain an increase but has to work under the blanket cover. Some manufacturers, by the nature of their business, are unable to supply the necessary details for the increase that applies under the "written orders" system. Certain problems exist in relation to price control on pies and pasties.

Another problem has arisen this year regarding the price of baling twine. As I understand it, the price of such twine is laid down by the Australian Rope and Twine Baling Association; the manufacturers supply to the wholesalers and certain privileged wholesalers are able to obtain their requirements at a discount price. Those wholesalers then sell to the retail trade, and they are required to sell at a price fixed by the association. However, this year some privileged buyers who sell to the retail trade are also selling to the consumer at a price below that at which the retail trade can purchase from them. This has caused some concern among traders in country areas where some of the larger privileged buyers in the



State are selling throughout the country at a price below which the retail trade can purchase.

I have referred to that case, but perhaps it is not so much a matter requiring price control as one for discipline within the association. Perhaps it is something that should be dealt with under a different Act. I also believe that rent control prevents proper maintenance of certain properties in the metropolitan area. Many properties are subject to rent control; it does not pay the owners to maintain them or make structural alterations to them because they cannot recover costs by increasing rentals. These are one or two matters that have come to mind. I do not like price control, and I believe we should endeavour to release as many articles as possible from it. I congratulate the Government on releasing a number of articles recently. However, fields exist in which price control should be maintained, and until such time as we are able to abolish it altogether I think we shall have to accept it, although we do not like it. For those reasons, I support the Bill.

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

#### CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 19. Page 2527.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I rise to discuss this short Bill and will speak briefly on the proposed slight but important amendments. I stress the importance of the Cattle Compensation Fund and the Swine Compensation Fund, to which I believe there may be some variation in due course. Both are exceedingly important in South Australia, particularly having regard to the imminent dangers arising from stock diseases being brought in from overseas, with their associated problems. The fact that these funds are in good condition is something that should be pleasing to all honourable members. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

There is a growing practice of selling whole carcasses to butchers and as the Act is at present framed this sale of whole carcasses attracts duty.

And that, of course, is the reason for the proposed small amendment. The Minister further said:

The proposed amendments exempt sales in these circumstances of whole carcasses from duty.

The amendment is directed to this end, and it corrects an anomaly that has existed with the growing practice of selling whole carcasses. I agree with comments made by the Hon. Mr. Bevan, who spoke on the Bill recently, when he said that this anomaly should be corrected, and I therefore support the Bill. It proposes to insert a new subsection (4) in section 13, which relates to duty on sales of cattle, and it also makes a consequential amendment to the preceding sections affected by this provision. Proposed new subsection (4) reads:

Notwithstanding anything in this Act—(a) no cattle stamp duty shall be payable under this Act in respect of the sale of any carcass of cattle derived from cattle which were, within the period of 14 days immediately preceding their slaughter, the subject of a sale in respect of which cattle stamp duty was paid or is payable under this Act:

This and the consequential amendments (the bits and pieces before, as well as the following subsection) correct an anomaly that has existed and, as I believe all members realize the value of the Cattle Compensation Fund and the need for the correction of anomalies, this is a logical step. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): I, too, rise to support this Bill. As the Hon. Mr. Dawkins has said when he read proposed new subsection (4), the amendment is self-explanatory and its intention is clear. It removes the anomaly of a carcass possibly attracting double duty. I do not think the Bill needs any further explanation or debate, and, because it corrects the anomaly referred to, I support it.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I support the Bill. It has been introduced mainly because of a system of trading in whole carcasses by a firm that has been set up in recent times and known as Nelsons and Producers Meat Markets (S.A.) Ltd. This is a market that auctions meat on the hook instead of on the hoof, and there has been a considerable amount of trade through this outlet. The idea of establishing this firm was to give producers a further avenue through which they could sell their stock. Unfortunately, producers have not supported the company as they should; consequently, the company over the last 12 months has shown a loss. This, I believe, is serious because producers in South Australia have a responsibility to sell stock through this outlet to ensure there

is more competitive trading within the industry. The Directors' report goes on to say:

During the year the requirements of the butchers buying in the market have increased but the supplies from producers have fallen drastically. Throughout the year it was necessary to augment supplies by buying substantial quantities of stock at the live markets.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: And it is not economical to do that.

The Hon. L. R. HART: That is so. The report continues:

In consequence stock on hand appears on the balance sheet for the first time. It has not been possible to maintain the same margin of profit on this stock. Anticipating a shortage of quality lamb during the late autumn, a supply was bought and placed in cold storage. The demand did not eventuate and the carcasses were sold at a loss.

The Directors' report continues:

We again acknowledge and express appreciation of the co-operation of the Minister of Agriculture, the Government Produce Department and the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board.

So here is an organization that gets the full co-operation of the Minister, the Government Produce Department and the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, but not the support it should from the producers. The purpose of this Bill is merely to rectify an anomaly that has crept in through this system of trading. The Bill should have our blessing. Therefore, I support the second reading.

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

#### TEXTILE PRODUCTS DESCRIPTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 19. Page 2527.)

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): The purpose of this Bill is to allow for a greater proportion of fibres other than pure wool to be blended with wool and at the same time to allow the article still to be branded "pure wool". The fibres that may be blended must be of specific animal origin. Previously, an article, to be branded "wool" or "pure wool", had to contain 95 per cent of woollen fibres. Under this Bill, it may now contain as little as 80 per cent. The wool industry has long recognized that a marriage between wool fibres and fibres other than wool has some distinct advantages.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Did you say that the Wool Board supported the wedding of synthetic fibres and wool?

The Hon. L. R. HART: I did not say "synthetic fibres"; I said "other than wool" fibres. The Act does not refer to "synthetic fibres"; it says "specialty animal fibre". It is necessary from time to time to introduce amending legislation because of the changing pattern of living in this country. For instance, in recent years there has been a great change in wearing apparel. Today, we see an increased use of an apparel known as "wash and wear". This type of apparel has considerable ease of washing and is of great assistance to people who do a lot of travelling, because they can wash such an article overnight and have it dry for the following day.

So that some of these apparels can be adapted to "wash and wear", it has been necessary to blend with pure wool some other fibres. I think this has been recognized by the Wool Board itself: in fact, this Bill was instigated by the Australian Wool Board and was endorsed by the Australian Wool Industry Council, the governing body of the wool industry. The industry, of course, has for some time been concerned that the terms "pure wool" and "all wool" have been applied to garments that are not legally permitted to use those terms. In recent times, we have seen the introduction of what is known as the "Wool mark symbol", which may be applied to woollen garments that measure up to specific standards. This symbol, I believe, has been well accepted and, indeed, has been successful throughout the world. It has done much to publicize and make more acceptable the wearing of woollen articles. Improved methods of treatment of woollen articles today make it possible for them to be given a permanent crease; there are others that do not crease, and there is also the extremely light-weight article which helps to popularize the wearing of woollen garments. We know this Bill is acceptable to the wool trade, so I support the second reading.

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

#### ELECTORAL DISTRICTS (REDIVISION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 19. Page 2528.)

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland): I rise to speak to this Bill but at this point of time I cannot indicate to the Council whether or not I shall support it and vote for it, because in many respects it does not satisfy my ideas

on what is required for South Australia's electoral set-up. It proposes to divide the State into 47 House of Assembly seats, 29 of which will be in the enlarged metropolitan area, which will in fact give that area 60 per cent of the voting power in the House of Assembly; and there will be 18 country seats, which means that the country voting power will be reduced to 40 per cent. I am very disturbed about that situation.

There have been numerous electoral proposals over the years, and both Parties have altered their ideas concerning what is required. I do not quite know what is the latest idea of the Australian Labor Party, although I believe that, in general principle, it supports this Bill. However, not so long ago it was talking about 56 seats, which meant 34 metropolitan seats and 22 country seats. I believe that, if it had not been for the existence of this Council, that would have been the situation today, and we would have found ourselves with 56 seats in a one-House Parliament, with 34 metropolitan seats, and with the country reduced to 22 seats. I am sure most fair-minded people would have regarded such a situation as quite reactionary.

I have my doubts about supporting this Bill; first, because it does not provide adequate representation for country areas. I should like to refer to the proposal put to this Parliament in February, 1964, which proposal was for 20 members representing primary-producing districts and 20 members representing other types of district, with a proviso for two additional members for the latter types. It seems to me that, from the viewpoints of Parliament, of the people's interests, of adequate representation for all sections of the community and of the State's future development, that proposal provided a very satisfactory balance between the differing interests of people in the community. There was an equality of votes between the country and the metropolitan area, and I am still at a loss to know why that was not acceptable to Parliament. I am sorry that the Bill now before the Council is not more along those lines. Under this Bill, with 60 per cent of the voting power in the metropolitan area, the country people must look forward to a decrease in representation and a decrease in their effective voice in the government of this State. So, first, I am not happy about this Bill because it does not provide adequate country representation.

Secondly, it means that country areas will be permanently subjugated to the will of the

metropolitan area. If events move as sometimes I am afraid they are moving, to the point where the leavening influence that this Council exercises today as a House of Review is reduced or removed altogether, then I believe an electoral system so biased towards the city will be very bad indeed.

The third reason why I am not happy about this Bill is that there have been many country areas that for many years have had one representative, and these areas will find themselves mixed up with other areas where there is no community of interest, no common economic interest and no social association. I shall give one instance of this that I know very well. For many years Yorke Peninsula has been a closely-knit political unit: it knows its representative, and he ably covers the area, but under this proposal it will be joined to neighbouring areas. For many years the areas north of Yorke Peninsula were included with it, but that did not work very satisfactorily then, and I do not think that the representation of those areas will be adequate if the representative is required to cover a larger scope. This point applies more particularly to those areas of the State where distance, means of communication and interests are on a much wider scale.

My next reason for not fancying the proposal to give 60 per cent of the voting power to the metropolitan area is that no-one can say that the metropolitan area has been depressed in relation to the rest of the State. Indeed, over the last 25 years the metropolitan area has boomed. It has developed at a very fast rate: new houses have been built at an unprecedented rate; the suburbs of Adelaide have extended both north and south; Elizabeth, which is the most outstanding example of its kind anywhere in Australia, has grown to fruition and is a lively and effective unit; the expansion south of Adelaide in the Tonsley Park area is the envy of many other parts of Australia; great advances have been made in the city of Adelaide itself with regard to buildings, commerce and parks; and now we are told that some further hundreds of millions of dollars, almost, are to be spent in the development of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan to provide further city amenities.

The allegation is sometimes made that, because the country at present has a preponderance of representation in the other House, the metropolitan area has suffered. This allegation, however, cannot be substantiated by any facts that I am able to bring

to my mind. If we consider South Australia as a whole under the present electoral system, the truth is that the metropolitan area has developed and enjoyed a degree of prosperity that far exceeds that of the country. So, in view of the present position, I cannot see any argument for creating a situation where the metropolitan area has 60 per cent of the representation and the country 40 per cent. On the other hand, the story in respect of the country is, unfortunately, not so good. The country areas are having a very difficult time.

It is true to say that both the Labor and the Liberal Governments have tried their best to develop the country—it is necessary for each Party to do this in the interests of its own political survival—but, notwithstanding their efforts, the country is still in a depressed condition in relation to the metropolitan area. This depressed condition is a result not only of the drought (although that has accentuated the situation) but also of the inbuilt difficulties involved in trying to develop the country, which has severe economic disabilities.

The country has a lack of amenities and a lack of opportunities for young people. In many country towns young people, particularly the girls, find difficulty in getting suitable employment and in developing their talents and abilities. Secondly, there is a large wastage of effective talent in the country because the opportunities do not exist for the people to engage in the kind of occupation to which they are most suited.

In the country the question of freight and passenger transport is still very serious and needs earnest attention and much detailed consideration. Furthermore, the imposts that Governments have found it necessary to introduce in connection with land tax, water rates and succession duties are really heavy burdens to be carried by the country. These burdens are becoming increasingly heavy and in my view they have got to a point where they cannot be carried. To institute an electoral system that will give 60 per cent of the voting power to the metropolitan area, which does not really understand these problems, the hardships they create or the adverse effects that they can have on the community at large, is in my opinion not in the best interests of this State.

In almost every country district many matters require urgent attention, and in many instances they are relatively small matters that require only a small expenditure of money. Nevertheless, members are told in reply to questions that these works cannot be carried

out. I recently asked a question regarding the provision of a new schoolhouse at Kulpara, which would have cost between \$10,000 and \$15,000, but I was told that the money was not available for that work. As a result, the people in Kulpara, small though they may be in numbers, are denied the facilities of even a schoolhouse for their teacher.

Numerous questions have been asked in this Council about the necessity for a new police station at Snowtown because an itinerant work force is going to that town in the near future. We have heard, too, of the difficulties that the people of the Barossa Valley are experiencing in securing for themselves an adequate railway service or, alternatively, a bus service to Adelaide. All members know of the necessity to proceed with work on Chowilla dam which, as far as I can see, has now come to a complete standstill.

I have heard reference in this Council to the necessity for a new area school at Yorketown. Throughout my district I continually receive representations that further lengths of bitumen road should be put down in various areas to give people a reasonable transport system. There is also an urgent necessity in all country areas for more money to be spent on the search for minerals, which must be done if we are to discover the latent talents and possibilities of this State.

When one examines the disabilities that exist in country areas and compares them with the progress that is going on in the city, I do not think the man who lives in the Barossa Valley, who is required to travel to Adelaide in a rail-car that may be 30 or 40 years old, will feel that he has gained much even if he gets here and pulls up in a marble-lined and air-conditioned railway station under King William Street.

We in the State must rely on our primary producing potential to obtain a balanced economy. If we cannot export, we cannot import, and if we cannot import we cannot maintain the modern developments in our economic society that we desire to maintain. For these reasons I am not happy about a Bill that will give the preponderance of voting power to the metropolitan area, not because I have anything against the metropolitan area but simply because when I look at the facts I find that the metropolitan area is progressing and developing quickly, while country areas need urgent attention.

I know it may be said that the Liberal and Country League Government was in power for a long time and, perhaps, that not much was

done to help country areas. However, I repeat what I said earlier in this speech: I believe the Party in office, whatever political complexion it may have, should do all it can for the country areas. The problems and difficulties are so great that they are not easily overcome, and the position will worsen if country people do not have an effective voice in the Parliament of this State.

True, in many respects the country voice gets a better hearing in the Legislative Council than it does in the House of Assembly. That is one of the reasons why I am so much in favour of the retention of this Council. A very determined attempt is being made to reduce the effectiveness of this Council and indeed an attempt has been made quite openly to bring about its abolition. I hope I will never live to see that day, because it would be a bad day for South Australia. However, if it does eventuate and the unfortunate does transpire and we are left with one House of Parliament, with 60 per cent of the representatives living within cooee of the town hall clock, and 40 per cent of them required to represent country areas, one can see that it will no longer be necessary for Parliament to consider the interests of country people. They will be completely impotent from a political point of view, and what they think or say will not matter in the Parliamentary councils of this State.

For these reasons I am not prepared to support the Bill. I am sorry that we have not proceeded with the proposal brought forward in 1964, which would have given equal representation between the country and the city areas. That seemed to me to be eminently desirable, and in my opinion these things are far more important, when examining whether we have effective Parliamentary representation, than talking about one vote one value or other matters associated with it. I have never been impressed by that argument. I do not think it is a valid one from the point of view of considering the Parliamentary institution. It is not universally applied and it certainly does not apply as far as this State's representation in the Senate is concerned, because we want to ensure equal representation between the various States of Australia. Just as we find it necessary to have equal representation between the various States, it is logical to argue that, in view of all the facts, we want equal representation between country and city areas in the South Australian Parliament.

I agree with the proposal in the Bill that the area known as the metropolitan area should be expanded. True, there has been a terrific growth of the metropolitan area, and it is only logical that this should be brought within the new area outlined in this Bill. I am worried about the electoral situation. I accept that something must be done to alter and improve it, but some of the moves being made are not those which I can support, and that applies both in relation to boundaries and in relation to some of the proposals contained in the Constitution Bill that is now before the Council. Without saying any more, I can say only that I speak to the Bill.

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

#### PUBLIC EXAMINATIONS BOARD BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 19. Page 2529.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I support the Bill. It seeks to reconstitute the Public Examinations Board which was first established in this State about 30 years ago. We have heard two very good speeches on the Bill by the Hon. Mrs. Cooper and, later, by the Hon. Mr. Springett. I do not intend to repeat what those honourable members have said, but I fully endorse their comments.

The Public Examinations Board is very necessary and is a most important institution in the educational set-up in this State, and I believe that it has progressed towards some uniformity of standards throughout Australia. Although I am the last person to seek uniformity just for the sake of uniformity, I do believe we must have considerable uniformity in examination standards in this country. While we are progressing to this stage we still have considerable variations from State to State, perhaps not so much in standards now as in descriptions of the various examinations used in the various States which would cause some confusion to those who did not know exactly what they meant. For example, Western Australia has the Leaving standard and the Sub-Leaving standard. If my information is correct, or if I am not out of date on this, I believe the Leaving over there corresponds somewhat to our Matriculation and their Sub-Leaving corresponds to our Leaving.

Here, of course, we have the Matriculation and the Leaving examination, and other States have the Senior and the Junior. These terms are confusing to people who do not know their exact meaning. The lack of uniformity should be corrected, and it is something to which I

believe the Public Examinations Board might well direct its attention. Of course, it also extends to the universities, which have been very largely instrumental in administering the Public Examinations Board in the past.

I have mentioned some anomalies in this place before, as a layman, and of course there is the old saying that the onlooker sees most of the game; as a layman one sees things which seem to be quite inconsistent. I have quoted in this place before the instance of a very prominent member of the veterinary fraternity who, if he had had to stick by the Adelaide requirements, would not have matriculated, but because he was able to go to Sydney University with a first-class honours diploma from Roseworthy College he was able to gain matriculation, complete his course and become an exceedingly successful member of his profession in this State.

I can also remember another gentleman who, because he could not do Intermediate German, or whatever the subject was, had a full stop after his name for many years whilst he was a lecturer at our university and he had otherwise, of course, completed his Mus. Bac. degree for some years before he was able to use it. This indicates to the onlooker a lack of manoeuvrability and a lack of alternatives.

This is somewhat ludicrous when a man has passed in every other respect the requirements of his profession. I believe it is unfortunate that these inconsistencies should continue to exist in the universities, and I believe in the same way that the various public examinations in this country should be brought into line so that we know that, when we are speaking of a Leaving examination, it means a similar standard throughout Australia and is not equivalent to Sub-Leaving in one State and Leaving in another, and so forth.

In directing my attention to the Bill, I wish only to discuss clause 3 (4) which, as I see it, is similar to the provision put before this Council almost exactly 12 months ago. It provides:

Subject to this Act, the board shall consist of thirty-two members appointed by the Minister of whom—

- (a) ten shall be members of the teaching or administrative staff of the Education Department, nominated by the Director-General of Education;
- (b) six shall be persons engaged as teachers in, or in the administration of, South Australian schools other than those maintained and administered by the Minister—

Then it goes on to enumerate how those six are to be chosen. It goes on:

- (c) two shall be members of the academic or administrative staff of the South Australian Institute of Technology.

Then there are two other paragraphs which refer to seven being members of the academic or administrative staff of the University of Adelaide and of the Flinders University of South Australia respectively.

Once again I am speaking as a layman, but I believe, as the Hon. Mr. Springett said yesterday, that the private schools have made a tremendous contribution to education in this State, and I am not in favour, as I said in this debate last year, of 10 members being selected by the Education Department and only six coming from the private schools. I think the fact that there are seven members from the University of Adelaide, with 8,000 or 9,000 students, and still seven members from the Flinders University, with only about 1,000 students, creates a precedent which should suggest that there ought to be an equal number of representatives from both State and private education in this State. Therefore, I will support an amendment in the Committee stage with reference to bringing these numbers into line and suggesting that eight members shall come from the Education Department and eight members shall come from the private schools.

I also wish to indicate that I am in favour of some representation, on the departmental side, from the South Australian Institute of Teachers. I believe that clause 3 (4) (a) could well be altered from "ten shall be members of the teaching or administrative staff of the Education Department, all nominated by the Director-General" (the word "all" is not written in the Bill, but they are so nominated by the Director-General of Education) to something like, "eight shall be members of the teaching or administrative staff of the Education Department, some of whom (I am not being firm on any particular number at this stage) shall be nominated by the Director-General of Education and some shall be nominated by the South Australian Institute of Teachers."

If this happens, it will enable the teachers to have some say. I do not say that they should have a great deal of say, but by the same token I do not believe that the Director-General should necessarily have all the say in the nomination of members from the Education Department. Also, as I said in this debate last year when these amendments were

in this Chamber before, I support this contention because, even if the provision is brought in for eight members from each side of secondary education in this State, this will only mean that 25 per cent of the members of the Public Examinations Board (eight out of 32) will come from the private sector of education. I do not intend to speak at length on the other clauses, and in general terms I support the Bill.

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

#### ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 19. Page 2519.)

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): My colleagues and I support this Bill, which is intended to revise and bring consistency of principle to the administration of the principal Act and at the same time to facilitate its consolidation by the Commissioner of Statute Revision. This Bill is certainly much different from what it was when it was introduced in another place on August 13, because many amendments were moved by the Leader of the Opposition in another place and accepted by the Minister in charge of the Bill. I am particularly interested to see that clauses 7, 8 and 10 are intended to make it clear that administration of the Act will be in the hands of the Minister rather than with the Aboriginal Affairs Board; that is a step in the right direction. The Bill is also designed to make necessary alterations to the principal Act as a result of legislation passed after the last amendments were made to the principal Act. The Government has accepted several amendments moved by the Leader in another place, and because of that acceptance my colleagues and I support the Bill.

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

#### AGED AND INFIRM PERSONS' PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 19. Page 2519.)

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Central No. 1): My colleagues and I support the second reading. The Bill's main purpose is to amend certain sections of the principal Act that have become obsolete and inappropriately worded because of amending legislation over recent

years to associated Acts. The Bill also proposes an amendment of some substance: clause 2 provides:

- (3) The court shall have, and may exercise jurisdiction under Part II of this Act—
- (a) if the person in respect of whom the protection order is sought, or has been made, is, or was at the time of the commencement of proceedings under that Part, domiciled or resident within the State; or
  - (b) if the property in respect of which the protection order is sought, or has been made, is situate within the State.

This appears to mean that, where a person whose property is in need of protection is resident in the State at the time an application is made, a court shall have jurisdiction to make an order under the Act. That was not made clear in the Minister's second reading explanation, although I can see that its purpose is to enable a court to deal with a matter if an application has been made while a person is still resident in the State, and it can still apply if that person moves to another State.

The principal Act has been of considerable help in past years in protecting the property of aged and infirm persons when unfeeling, unscrupulous people have had designs on that property. Most honourable members have had evidence placed before them concerning people who, through advancing years or some affliction, have become incapable of dealing with their affairs in a level-headed and reasonable manner. This has caused great concern to their relatives and friends. The principal Act provides that in such cases, upon application by the person whose property is sought to be protected, by the husband or wife of such person, by any near relation by blood or marriage of such person, by the Public Trustee, or by any other person who adduces proof of circumstances which in the opinion of the court make it proper that such other person should make the application, the court may appoint a manager to take possession of and to control and manage all or such part or parts of the estate of the protected person as the court may direct. More often than not the Public Trustee is appointed as manager, although the Act provides that the court may appoint some other person or body corporate if it so desires. The court is then faced with great difficulty in deciding whether it should or should not make an order.

The amendment made to the principal Act last year was of some assistance to the court in that it provided that the court could ask the Director of Social Welfare for a report on any matter, and this made its task slightly easier. The proposed amendments made by clauses 3 and 4 arise from a more humane attitude to the problems of mental health and alcohol or drug addiction, resulting in many amendments being made in recent years to legislation dealing with those problems. Such a changed attitude is illustrated to some extent by an alteration in titles allied to this type of legislation. This change of titles has led to the necessity for amendments to be made to the references in various sections of the principal Act.

I cite two examples: the Mental Defectives Act now becomes the Mental Health Act, and the Inebriates Act becomes the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Act. This indicates to some extent a more humane approach to the problems mentioned in the Acts. I do not propose to say more about the Bill, because I think all honourable members agree with its purpose. I support the second reading.

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

#### OATHS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

(Second reading debate adjourned on November 19. Page 2519.)

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

#### INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Central No. 1) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Code, 1967. Read a first time.

#### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Modbury North-West Primary School,  
Para Vista (View Road) Primary School.

#### BULK HANDLING OF GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 4.40 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, November 26, at 2.15 p.m.