LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, September 22, 1971

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

QUESTIONS

RURAL RECONSTRUCTION

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I noticed in the press last week that the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry had announced further assistance by way of education of people in the rural industry who were unable to continue on the land. Can the Minister of Lands give the Council any information on this matter?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The honourable member was good enough to ask me yesterday whether I could obtain this information for him, and I have been able to do so. On August 8 the Minister for Primary Industry (Hon. Ian Sinclair) forwarded me a draft copy of the details of the proposed retraining scheme, and in the accompanying letter he asked whether I could suggest any improvement to that scheme. I wrote to Mr. Sinclair on August 20 saying that generally the proposals were acceptable but that I thought some modifications of clauses 4 and 5 regarding eligibility were necessary. I said:

> As the proposal stands, members of families and employees who may be displaced are covered only where an eligible farmer is concerned.

I said I was aware that there were and are likely to be cases where sons and employees of farmers are displaced for the simple reason that the farm is economically unable to maintain the number of people on it, and that I firmly believed that where such people were dismissed to enable the farm to carry on without assistance under the scheme those people should be covered also. I pointed out, too, that I thought the operators and employees of small farm service businesses in country towns whose livelihood may be terminated by the current rural situation should also be covered. Unfortunately the proposals did not include the last point, although they included the previous one. I express my concern regarding those people who are not actually engaged in primary industry, but in the servicing of primary industries, and as a result of the rural crisis have had to leave their jobs or lose their jobs or their businesses, and who are not covered in this retraining scheme. The Commonwealth authorities apparently did not agree with me and that point was not included. I have the details of the proposals here, and I think it would be a good idea to read them.

The purpose is to assist eligible farmers to transfer to alternative suitable employment away from their farms. The scheme will become operative from October 1, 1971.

"Alternative suitable employment" means employment in an occupation for which the affected person has stated a preference, other than a farming occupation, which he regards as suitable, and which he and the Commonwealth Employment Service agree is available within reasonable distance of his chosen place of residence.

A farmer is eligible to apply for training if his farm has either been acquired under the Government's farm build-up programmes or is not economically viable to the extent that an application for debt reconstruction assistance to the State authorities administering the rural reconstruction programme has been or is likely to be refused, and who decides to work away from his farm. Such a farmer will have owned his farm or leased it from the Crown or have worked it as a share fanner. Alternatively, the farm may be held by a trust of which the farmer is a beneficiary or by a partnership of which the farmer is one, or by a company of which he is a shareholder. In all cases the farmer must have been in personal working occupation of his farm.

Members of the family of an eligible farmer can apply for training if they have been working full-time on farming other than in a domestic capacity for at least the six months prior to their application for training and, as a consequence, have been primarily dependent for their livelihood on the income earned by the farm.

Farm workers are eligible for training if they have been employed by eligible farmers for an uninterrupted period of at least one year immediately prior to their dismissal.

The objective of the training is to help eligible persons to obtain alternative suitable employment away from their farms. Some may be able to take up employment in their chosen fields without the need for further training, and they will be assisted by the Commonwealth Employment Service. The considerations taken into account when selecting applications for approval are:

(*a*) Is the proposed training course of a type which will, on completion, lead to alternative suitable employment away from farming?

(*b*) Can the proposed training course be completed within the time allowed?

(*c*) Is the applicant ready to commence the first available course or programme of

training in his preferred occupation, and to commence employment immediately after training?

(*d*) Does the applicant have the aptitude and ability to complete the training proposed?

(*e*) Is the applicant registered for alternative suitable employment with the Commonwealth Employment Service?

Training may take the form of an existing formal course at an approved technical school or vocational training institution, either full-time, part-time or by correspondence, or on-the-job training with an approved employer, or a combination of on-the-job training and a formal course where such is available.

Training programmes approved should be capable of completion within 12 months for full-time courses or on-the-job training, or within 24 months for part-time or correspondence courses.

Training in individual cases for a longer period, up to a maximum of a further 12 months, either full-time or part-time or by correspondence, is subject to approval by the Minister for Labour and National Service or his delegate advised by the advisory committee keeping the scope and provisions of the scheme under review.

Where entry to a training programme depends on additional educational qualifications, tuition necessary to acquire the additional education may be considered up to a maximum of 12 months prior to commencement of the approved training programme.

The costs of fees for existing courses in State Government training institutions will be met by the trainee's State Government. The costs of fees for courses in other institutions will be borne by the Commonwealth Government. Regardless of the training institution, all other costs, including training allowances, will be the responsibility of the Commonwealth.

While undertaking an approved full-time training course at an approved training institution and not available for placement in employment:

(i) For adults, a weekly training allowance of $46.20; for trainees who are minors, an allowance calculated on the following scale:

Age of Minor	Percentage of adult Training Allowance
17 years and under . .	50
18 years.....	66⅔
19 years	75
20 years.....	90

All training allowances are subject to an income test.

If a trainee receives, in the period during which the allowance is payable, income from employment other than vacation employment, or from investments other than savings bank deposits, the amount of the training allowance payable each week will be reduced by the weekly equivalent of that income. The income of the spouse is taken into account.

(ii) Payment of all necessary tuition fees and examination and certificate fees;

(iii) Reimbursement of local fares incurred travelling to and from the place of training;

(iv) An allowance for essential books and equipment to a maximum of $80 in total;

(v) In addition to (i) a contribution of $10 a week towards expenses for married persons when full-time training is undertaken in a school located in a town other than that in which the trainee normally resides.

While undertaking an approved part-time training (including correspondence) course at an approved training institution and also in employment:

(i) The payment of all necessary tuition fees and examination and certificate fees;

(ii) Reimbursement of local fares incurred travelling to and from the place of training;

(iii) An allowance for essential books and equipment up to a maximum of $80 in total.

Employers who are providing on-the-job training at the request of the Department of Labour and National Service, and in accordance with a previously approved time schedule, will be reimbursed a proportion of the appropriate weekly award wage as follows—

First three months of training—30 per cent of award rate of pay.

Second three months of training—25 per cent of award rate of pay.

Third three months of training—20 per cent of award rate of pay.

Fourth three months of training—10 per cent of award rate of pay.

Trainees in on-the-job training with an approved employer must be paid not less than the award rate, for age and job classification, by that employer.

Applications by post should be addressed to the Regional Director or officer-in-charge of the department in any capital city or may be lodged with any district employment office of the Commonwealth Employment Service.

Application by farmers or members of their families should be made within 12 months of the date on which the State rural reconstruction authority's assessment of non-viability was made, or within 12 months of the date on which a property was acquired for farm build-up purposes. Farm workers should apply within 12 months of the date of termination of their employment by eligible farmers.

Application forms are available from the State rural reconstruction authorities' offices, shire offices, officers of farmers' organizations, relevant trade unions, and from any district office of the Commonwealth Employment Service.

Training benefits will be payable from the date of application for training or from the date of commencement of training, whichever is the later.

An advisory committee to keep the scope and provisions of the scheme under review includes representatives of the State reconstruction authorities and the Department of Primary Industry.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Minister of Lands any further information regarding the number of applications for rural assistance that have been approved and the sums of money that have been allocated?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The latest information I have was prepared on August 20, but I will obtain later information for the honourable member.

ROADS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to directing a question to the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: As a result of a question I asked earlier this session and also a question I asked on October 13, 1970, I have been informed that the Highways Department's road programme for 1969-70 included a sum of $12,583,981, which was spent on declared urban arterial roads that were part of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report, and that this figure included Commonwealth funds totalling $7,780,000. I have also been informed that the total sum spent for the same purpose in 1970-71 was $11,962,395 and that the estimate for the year 1971-72 is $12,500,000 to be spent on declared urban arterial roads that are part of the M.A.T.S. Report and in that sum the Commonwealth allocation of $11,500,000 was included. The figure which I have not so far been able to obtain and which I seek from the Minister is the amount of Commonwealth funds allocated, received and spent by the State for the year 1970-71, which sum is part of the $11,962,395. Can the Minister obtain that figure for me?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will convey the honourable member's question to my colleague and endeavour to get a reply to it.

APPLE AND PEAR INDUSTRY

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I seek permission to make a short statement before directing a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: My question relates to the future of the apple and pear exports to the United Kingdom. Clearly, the apple and pear industry of Australia has been told by the people to whom we have paid a terrific amount of money in the past, the shipowners of the United Kingdom, that they no longer want our business. That is the only interpretation that can be placed on the impost they have put upon us this year of increasing our freight costs from $2.40-odd to $3—a 25 per cent increase, which will completely run the whole trade into the ground. That is a serious matter for the State.

It is a much more serious matter for the apple and pear industry in other States, which has been built, in good faith, on the certainty that we had reliable markets in the United Kingdom. It is not the market in the United Kingdom that is denying us this access: it is the shipowner, and only the shipowner, who is giving away completely the Australian trade in these fresh fruits.

I do not doubt there is something to be said on the other side (I do not wish to debate this; I am merely trying to put facts before the Council) to the effect that it is costly to run refrigerated transport from the Northern Hemisphere to the Southern Hemisphere and sustain our Australian trade; but this is the important thing: we have built up this trade in good faith, and we have sustained these markets efficiently and sincerely.

The trouble is not that the market for our fruit no longer exists but that the shipowners, who have been taking so much of Australia's money in sealed exports (and they are that), have decided that they cannot sustain it any longer. This will put many people, not so much in this State, but in other States, in a

completely hopeless position, and these people will have to reorientate the whole of their existence. As these matters have been discussed by the State and Commonwealth Governments in recent weeks, will the Minister of Agriculture give honourable members some idea of where these industries are heading?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Let me say at the outset that I agree with everything the honourable member has said. Indeed, if the present state of affairs continues, Tasmanian apple growers could be forced off the land completely. Also, Victorian growers could be adversely affected, which could rebound in some way against South Australian growers. The present situation is that the Commonwealth Government has offered to the industry a guarantee of 80c a bushel on the export trade, to the extent of 4,400,000 bushels. However, the industry is requesting a guarantee of 80c a bushel on 10,000,000 bushels.

In this respect, the Commonwealth Government and, no doubt, the Treasury are under a certain amount of pressure not only from the apple and pear industry but also from other primary industries. As I see it, in the long term a guarantee of this nature, which will cost the Commonwealth Government about $10,000,000 over five years, would be returned handsomely because Australia has markets in South-East Asia waiting to be opened up. I have been informed by the industry that, unfortunately, the present demand in South-East Asia is for the Delicious type apple, the full demand for which we cannot at present meet. However, in the long term Australia could grow more Delicious apples. Indeed, I understand that the plantings of the Delicious varieties in this State are fairly extensive. I understand, too, that a market is opening up in California for our Granny Smith apples. Although I am unable at present to say of what magnitude these markets are, I have been told they are specific markets.

In the interests of the industry, the Commonwealth Government would be well advised to examine the future thereof, particularly in the markets pending in South-East Asia. I draw the honourable member's attention to the Indonesian archipelago, where there are over 90,000,000 people, and also to Japan. Unfortunately, Japan is reluctant to import our apples because we have codlin moth in this State. However, it is possible that Western Australia could send the whole of its crop to Japan, as it does not have codlin moth there. These are things that have to be looked at in perspective. I assure the honourable member that I will again be taking up this matter, which had the endorsement of every other State, with the Commonwealth Government. I took it up previously following the honourable member's question in this Chamber. I think that in the interests of the industry the Commonwealth would be well advised to re-examine the matter with a view to guaranteeing the growers the amount they are asking for.

SHARE VALUATIONS

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary, representing the Treasurer.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: On November 26, 1969, I asked the then Chief Secretary a question about succession duty valuations. I pointed out then that, by the time a deceased person's estate became negotiable, because of fluctuations of the share market the shares that had been assessed for duty at the date of death may have dropped from a very high amount to practically nothing. The then Chief Secretary promised to get me a reply, but unfortunately the electors intervened some sitting days later and I think the reply was not forthcoming because there was another Chief Secretary by then. I refer the present Chief Secretary to my earlier detailed question, which appears on page 3271 of *Hansard* of 1969. I am not asking for an immediate reply, because obviously it is a question of Government policy. However, if he would be good enough to have a look at that detailed question and try to obtain for me the answer that I have not had, I should be very grateful. I may say that since that time land has come into the same category, because the Select Committee found very unfortunate cases of people who had their land assessed at the high value for succession duty purposes and, by the time they were able to do anything about selling all or part of the land to pay the duty, values had dropped right away to the extent in some cases that the land was worth only about as much as the duty, if as much. I mention that because I think the question is even more relevant today than it was in November, 1969. I should be grateful if the Chief Secretary would have a look at this question and bring me a reply when he can do so.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall be happy to have the question examined and bring back a reply as soon as it is available.

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question refers to the recent report of the committee on agricultural education which was appointed some three years ago, I think, to consider the question of improvement in agricultural education in this State. As I recall, the report that has been brought down recommends some rather sweeping changes, including the establishment of four residential agricultural colleges in addition to and rather different from the existing college at Roseworthy. I believe that the committee had to decide to do one of two things: either to report on what it thought was feasible in the relatively immediate future or to report on what it thought was the ideal situation. I understand that it decided to come down in the latter way. Therefore, I do not think anyone would expect that the Government would be able to promise early implementation of this scheme. My question to the honourable gentleman is this: is the Government considering the scheme, and is it taking into account the possibility that this scheme may be implemented in stages, with the first stage perhaps in the not too far distant future?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I assure the honourable member that the Government is looking at this matter very closely. Of course, just when it can implement these things will depend on its financial resources. I point out that agriculture today is going through marked changes, as we are well aware, and things are happening so quickly that, probably unhappily, what was in vogue three years ago may not be in vogue today. Nevertheless, there are problems confronting agriculture in its general sense. I assure the honourable member that the Government is very concerned about the whole situation. It has its finger on the pulse, and when this matter or any matters of this nature are pending I will certainly inform the honourable member.

HILLS TRAFFIC

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Has the Minister of Lands received from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on August 24 regarding Hills traffic?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: My colleague has supplied the following report:

The Road Traffic Act requires that a vehicle, when being driven, shall have its headlights burning between sunset and sunrise and at any period of low visibility such as in fog, rain or dust storm. During July, 1971, the Traffic Division of the South Australian Police Department conducted a public education campaign to make drivers aware of the need to use headlights and not parking lights at such times. This campaign included articles in the daily newspapers to draw the attention of the public to the lighting requirements of the Act. It is considered impracticable to enforce a special speed limit during foggy conditions because the degree of visibility would vary, since the density of fog is not constant. It is also considered that the requirements of sections 45 and 46 of the Road Traffic Act, which require that a driver shall not drive at a speed that is dangerous to the public or without reasonable consideration for other persons using the road, are adequate to regulate the speed of vehicles under adverse conditions.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Extremely serious accidents have occurred in Great Britain as a result of speeding in foggy conditions. We have had very narrow escapes from the same sort of thing on the roads in the Adelaide Hills. Would the Minister look seriously at this matter instead of dismissing it as an idle matter that has been raised?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I do not accept from any honourable member the statement that this has been dismissed as an idle matter. The Minister of Roads and Transport considered the matter, and the answer I gave was adequate. There are provisions within the present legislation to take care of these matters. If people drive under adverse conditions at speeds at which they should not drive, they are liable to prosecution. I think that answers the honourable member's question. I resent the honourable member's statement.

CITRUS

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: When I was in Osaka last year I had talks with the then Assistant Commissioner regarding the entry of Australian citrus into the Japanese market. Of course, the Australian Federation of Citrus Growers has been trying for the last 10 years to get some of our citrus into Japan. However, I noted that when the Premier returned recently from a visit to that country he seemed very optimistic that something would happen soon and that the ban on the importation of at least South Australian citrus, which is free of fruit fly, would be lifted. Can the Minister say whether that optimism has been manifest in any way up to the present time?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I assure the honourable member that the optimism has not been manifest in the strict sense of the word as he used it. However, I can say that we are very optimistic about the entry of South Australian citrus into Japan in the future. As the honourable member knows, the Japanese Government is very reluctant to import citrus or other fruit from another country that has certain diseases. When that country deals with Australia it deals with Australia as a whole, and of course we have both Queensland and Mediterranean fruit fly in this country. The same situation applies with apples. In South Australia we have codlin moth but, as I have already mentioned in reply to a question, Western Australia apparently has no such problem. Much has been accomplished in the past few weeks. Recently a Japanese Parliamentary delegation visited South Australia. I think it was the first one ever, and I spoke with its members (through an interpreter, I might add, because I do not speak Japanese). Nevertheless, I believe they were very happy with what they saw in South Australia, particularly with some of our top quality citrus fruits. I am unable to give the honourable member any further information at this stage.

GRASSHOPPERS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: In yesterday's *News* it was stated that the Victorian Government was planning to hire a helicopter to patrol areas in south-west of New South Wales (and, I presume, in the north-west of Victoria) where hatchings of plague grasshoppers were occurring, the idea being that the hatching beds could be found quickly and sprayed if it was considered desirable to do so. Bearing in mind that the northern areas of South Australia where plague grasshoppers are most likely to hatch this year are very sparsely populated, and also bearing in mind the difficulties of property owners in effectively spraying the hatchings at the correct time and also that the season has been excellent, particularly in the inside country, will the Minister seriously consider using every possible mechanical means of patrolling, locating and, if necessary, spraying hatchings of grasshoppers in this State, even to the extent of using a helicopter?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: No, I cannot give an undertaking of this magnitude.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: I asked whether you would seriously consider the matter.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will definitely seriously consider it in relation to certain areas. When we speak of the areas in the North of South Australia we are talking of more than 200,000 square miles. When we consider how many helicopters would be needed and how many men required to police such an area, it is obvious that it just could not be done. I had talks last weekend with members of the district councils affected, including the Hawker, Carrieton, Orroroo, Peterborough and Wilmington councils, and they are getting the co-operation of landowners in reporting outbreaks that have occurred. Last year I made available to landowners through the district councils a subsidy of 50 per cent of the cost of insecticides used. Unfortunately, however, the matter becomes rather complicated, because we have the ordinary grasshopper, which is a localized one, and then the locust, which migrates, and one insecticide does not kill both types. It is necessary first to establish which type is present and then to apply the corresponding insecticide. The insecticide used for the localized grasshopper is malathion, which must be used in the concentrated form and can be used effectively only through a boom spray. We have made such a spray available to district councils and it can be hired out by the day for spraying. I stressed to the landholders and the district council members who came to see me that any spraying that could be undertaken must have the effect of lessening the numbers of grasshoppers in the same way as the co-operation of landholders helps in the eradication of vermin such as rabbits. If the co-operation is not forthcoming from the whole of the area, it is useless in the end. In a season such as this, where tremendous growth is occurring in the Far North, there is a distinct possibility that a plague such as has occurred in Victoria and New South Wales will occur here. The Government is well aware of the seriousness of the situation, and I assure the honourable member that it is being watched closely.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I, too, read the press statement which reported the action of the Victorian Government in relation to the 20,000 square miles in the Riverina subject to hatchings

of locusts. From that press statement I understand that the Victorian Government is making available money for spraying in New South Wales. The report was that if hatchings occurred in these areas the movement of locusts would be to the south-west. Does co-operation exist between the Agriculture Department in South Australia and the departments in New South Wales and Victoria in relation to this 20,000 square miles in New South Wales, where it is expected there will be large hatchings of locusts, which may move in a south-westerly direction and which could infest parts of South Australia?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I cannot say specifically "Yes" or "No" in answer to that question, because I heard this press report only yesterday. I will certainly contact the departments in New South Wales and Victoria to see how the situation is viewed there and, if our co-operation is required, honourable members can rest assured that it will be given.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: It seems that we are circumnavigating the very real prospect that locusts or local grasshoppers could create havoc in South Australia. I appreciate the replies the Minister has given about the co-operation of his department should such an outbreak occur. However, I point out that it is not necessary to seek the co-operation of the landholder: what the landholder is asking is that the department be ready to act where Government assistance is necessary. It will not be necessary for departmental officers to survey the area to locate locust hatchings, because such hatchings will be reported immediately. If no hatchings are reported, there will be no cause for the department to act. Can the Minister say whether the department is ready to act in the case of a locust outbreak?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The answer is "No", because we do not even know exactly how serious any outbreak will be. We do not have the necessary officers, nor have we ever had them, to participate in large-scale measures such as the honourable member is suggesting. A subsidy has already been given to the landholders, in the form of a subsidy of 50 per cent on the cost of purchasing insecticides. My property has been eaten out by locusts five times in the last 20 years, so I know from my own experience what problems confront landholders in these areas. I assure the honourable member that we will do everything within our capabilities, but we cannot simply hand the whole problem to the Agriculture Department and ask it to supply all the men, machinery and insecticides and to find the locusts. Nevertheless, we will do everything possible with the manpower available.

EGGS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Over a period South Australian egg producers have experienced difficulty in disposing of their surplus eggs. Even with the advent of the C.E.M.A. plan, which to some extent has evened out the situation, the South Australian egg industry appears to be at a disadvantage because it lacks a suitable pasteurizing plant similar to those operating in Victoria and New South Wales. It is of paramount importance to export as many eggs as we possibly can, but such eggs must be pasteurized and treated in a highly technical manner, because the Japanese market (the main market) is the most discriminating in the world. Can the Minister say whether the egg industry has recently made a request to the Government in connection with financing or setting up a pasteurizing factory in conjunction with either the Egg Board or an organization connected with the egg industry?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Some time ago the Egg Board recommended to me the advisability of setting up such a plant under that board, and I have closely studied the proposition. At that time the controlled production of eggs was shortly to be discussed at a meeting of the Agricultural Council. It is essential to the welfare of the industry generally that we consider the question of controlled egg production in this country before committing ourselves to setting up an egg pulping plant of the kind described by the honourable member. I am sure the Hon. Mr. Hill would agree with that. I have asked wholesalers whether they are interested in setting up a pulping plant to meet the requirements of the Japanese market, but they have said that they are not willing to do that because it would not be profitable at this stage. I will be grateful if the honourable member can help me to convince the Victorian Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Chandler, that controlled egg production is desirable. If Victoria does not agree to the proposal that all the other States have

agreed to, the whole industry will be thrown into chaos. At present oversea companies are coming into this State and operating through subsidiary companies; they can purchase poultry farms here or in any other State and double production within 12 months. However, if farms were licensed, with controlled production, the oversea companies could not do that.

ORROROO-WILMINGTON ROAD

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Roads and Transport for details of the average daily traffic on the Orroroo-Wilmington road, and the percentage growth rate of that traffic?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I shall be happy to convey the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply as soon as it is available.

SALISBURY FREEWAY

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Roads and Transport what is the present stage of planning for the Salisbury Freeway between the Port Wakefield Road and Torrens Road?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I shall be happy to convey the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply as soon as it is available.

BUILDING REGULATIONS

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. R. C. DeGaris:

(For wording of motion, see page 860.)

(Continued from September 1. Page 1263.)

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON (Southern): For many reasons I support the disallowance of the regulations under the Builders Licensing Act. The Government should withdraw those regulations and hold further discussions with the building industry to determine what that industry requires. The regulations go far too deeply into a builder's personal life; they require a builder to list his total business assets, his total personal liabilities, and his total liabilities. The resultant figure for net worth obviously plays a part in the board's consideration of whether the applicant should receive a builder's licence or retain one. I wonder how many builders at present operating in this State would ever have got a start if they had had to comply with those requirements over the whole of their business careers. How many would have been able to comply with this requirement? Obviously, a person could at any stage be within the requirement of liquidity and within the next few weeks he could be right outside the requirement, because there would be no further check on him for 12 months. So, in my opinion, it is not a very valid requirement. It affords some protection to the home-owner but not very much: he still has to go to court in such a matter when a contract is not complied with.

The Chairman of the board has very wide powers. I have some evidence already of the operations of the board and the licensing, and the regulations will go much further than I should have expected, because a short letter I have already received indicates that in one case the aesthetic quality of a house came into the determination whether or not the board should interfere. If that is to be part of the requirement of the board, obviously an army of inspectors will be needed, and the publicity already given to the potential rise in the cost of houses through the actions of the board indicates that the rise will certainly come into force, because clearly the public will pay for those inspectors. I am not normally against builders licensing but these regulations go too far. I should like to see them withdrawn. If they are not, I shall be supporting their disallowance. This should happen within a reasonable time in order that further discussion can take place.

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

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (SEAT BELTS)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 15. Page 1445.)

The Hon. E. K. RUSSACK (Midland): First, I refer to the second reading speech of the Hon. Mr. Hill, who said:

> However, the weight of informed opinion and other evidence to which I have referred must be given full consideration by those whose clear duty it is to approach this question without fixed views, and to weigh up the points for and against the Bill.

I think I have done that: I have approached this matter without any fixed views, giving all consideration possible to every facet of this matter. I am convinced, as most people are, that seat belts are an asset and do assist in, and are a big contributing factor to, the lessening of the road carnage.

I would go so far as to say that, in most accidents where seat belts are worn, they do assist in the prevention of injury and death. However, there are those people who, from experience, are convinced that they would have been in danger had they been wearing seat

belts. Though in the minority, those people are sincere. I quote again from the second reading speech of the Hon. Mr. Hill, who said:

The question is not one for Party politics: it is one which demands a statesmanlike approach. I admit and acknowledge that the compulsory wearing of seat belts is objected to most strongly by some sincere people.

I take it that the two people I am about to mention fall into that category. I refer to two short letters that appeared recently in one of our daily newspapers. The first stated:

There is talk about making the wearing of seat belts compulsory in this State. This is one of the most dangerous regulations ever contemplated. I was once in a car that caught fire, and within 10 seconds the petrol tank blew up. Had I been fastened in with seat belts I would not be here now. They may prevent one from going through the windscreen. On the other hand, they may cause internal injuries, or be the cause of being burned to death.

The second stated:

Once again the call is going out asking the Government to force me to wear a seat belt. It may be the exception that proves the rule, but I was once involved in an accident in which my life was saved solely because of being thrown from my car, and I deny anyone the right to insist that I do something which I feel could endanger my own life.

In saying that I am convinced that most people who wear seat belts are helped, I do consider the sincere conviction of people who have been concerned in incidents of the type I have just mentioned. I refer again to *Hansard,* where the Hon. Mr. Hill said:

I admit and acknowledge that the compulsory wearing of seat belts is objected to most strongly by some sincere people.

The honourable member referred to the police surgeon in Victoria, Dr. John Birrell, who, according to an article in the *Advertiser* on July 30, 1971, made claims in support of the wearing of seat belts; no doubt his facts and figures were correct. The same article contained a statement made by an Adelaide forensic pathologist, Dr. Colin Manock, who said:

"Seat belt legislation is an 'ostrich attitude'. It appears to accept an ever-increasing accident rate as the normal. Basic factors of the causes of accidents need more urgent consideration." On Victoria's claim of a reduction of 12 per cent in both the number of road deaths and injuries during the compulsory seat belt period Dr. Manock says: "In South Australia, where there has been no seat belt legislation, the reduction for the same period was 27 per cent and, excluding the Wasleys bus crash, the fall is still greater than in Victoria—17.3 per cent. It is reasonable to suspect that the wearing of seat belts has played a part in bringing about the injury reduction that has been observed, but until a closer analysis can be conducted it must remain only an inference."

Dr. Manock is one of those people who, I believe, is convinced of a certain attitude to seat belts because of his own experience. He later states:

"A large proportion of cars on Australian roads are not equipped with foolproof seat belts and few people realize their adjustment is critical for their efficacy. People who escape serious injury by not wearing seat belts need to be as fully questioned about their accident experiences as those who do. It's a task that seems to have been neglected."

Dr. Manock, as a scientist, deals in facts and observations. He has survived two crashes. In Britain in 1963 he was able to "jump over into the back seat when all else failed" and prevent himself from being impaled on the steering column.

The second crash was two years ago, when he was a passenger in the back seat of a car which rolled over when a tyre blew out, and he forced himself to the floor to miss being crushed by the roof, which caved in.

I understand that much intensive research into safety measures in motor vehicles is proceeding in America and other countries, but that the introduction of these safety measures might be delayed because of the costs involved. However, a device exists that could make it possible for seat belts to be dispensed with. Certain plastic bags can be placed under the dashboard of a car which, on impact, become inflated and act as a cushion for passengers and driver. Some people consider that, because new inventions will become available, it is perhaps hasty now to force people to wear seat belts as we know them today.

Some people conscientiously oppose the wearing of seat belts. In 1967 it was compulsory in this State for a seat belt to be placed in the driver's position in a motor vehicle. Also, all passenger cars and derivates manufactured on and after January 1, 1970, had to have seat belts fitted in their front seats. All passenger cars and derivates manufactured on and after January 1 this year must have rear seat belts installed therein. This is a safety measure with which I wholeheartedly agree, as I use seat belts and believe that they are of assistance. However, I have certain reservations regarding their compulsory use, one reason being that the owners of different models of cars are obliged to fit belts to different seats. Therefore, it would be difficult to police the compulsory wearing of seat belts, and I see this as one disadvantage of the Bill.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What percentage of people wear seat belts in Victoria, where it is compulsory?

The Hon. E. K. RUSSACK: As it is compulsory to wear seat belts in that State, I do not know. However, I understand that in South Australia 9 per cent of the people wear belts. I make the point that, if this Bill becomes law, not everyone will be forced to wear seat belts: only those who drive vehicles in which seat belts have been fitted in pursuance of the provisions to which I have referred will be forced to do so. Other difficulties occur in country areas. Recently, I was approached by a gentleman who has been involved extensively in local government and who has held federal office at this level. He has also held office in an organization concerned in the interests of safety. I have told the Council of this gentleman's qualifications merely to illustrate that his views should carry some weight. This man, who is a primary producer and who in the course of his business finds it necessary to drive cattle, does not want to break the law. However, in the area adjacent to his property there are three-chain roads lined on either side by scrub, and he has told me that it would be impossible for him, when driving cattle, to comply with the law requiring him to wear seat belts, as he would be unable effectively and efficiently to perform his task of driving cattle. I understand that at times an animal will break away and, to prevent a serious situation occurring, it is necessary for the person tending the cattle to get out of his vehicle as quickly as possible, which he would be unable to do if he were forced to wear a seat belt.

There are many other instances such as this which need to be considered and clarified. I refer to the psychological effect that this provision could have on some people. It has been suggested that regulations could be promulgated in order to overcome many of these problems. I have no doubt that regulations could be framed to overcome the anomalies, to some of which I have referred. However, seat belts are useful only when a vehicle has been involved in an accident. I suggest strongly that every effort should be made to make people aware of the necessity in the first instance of preventing accidents. This can be done by education.

I was pleased today to receive a publication entitled *Road Alert* the official journal of the South Australian Road Safety Council. I commend the Government for the efforts it is making to educate people in road safety. I refer the Council to an article entitled "Work under way on South Australian road safety centre" in this publication, part of which is as follows:

> Work has begun on the Road Safety Council's biggest venture yet—the Road Safety Instruction Centre at Marion. The Minister of Roads and Transport (Mr. Virgo) has forecast that the centre will be in operation in January.
>
> "We are giving the centre top priority to enable the Road Safety Council to begin practical driver training even before the centre is completed," he said. Mr. Virgo said the road system, fitted with all types of traffic control equipment, should be finished by the new year.

Every effort should be made to prevent accidents so that it would not be necessary for the provision requiring the compulsory wearing of seat belts to come into effect. I was concerned when I read in the newspaper yesterday that the police were appealing for assistance to identify the drivers involved in six hit-run accidents. I suggest that the high accident rate in South Australia is caused by the lack of responsibility on the part of drivers, and that any education designed to assist drivers is to be commended.

I notice that there are certain amendments on honourable members' files. I look forward to subsequent debate on this Bill, and I reserve the right not to say at this stage how I will vote on the second reading.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I do not wish to detain the Council for very long on this measure. As the Hon. Mr. Russack has just mentioned, this amending Bill refers particularly to seat belts and the compulsory wearing of same. I would say right at the outset that the value of seat belts is unquestioned in many instances. I have seat belts in the vehicles that I drive and I use them on practically every occasion; I may not use them if I am driving for just a very short distance in a private lane or something of that nature, but to all intents and purposes I use them most of the time.

As I have said, the value of these belts has been demonstrated on many occasions when people have been saved because they have been wearing them at the time of an accident. However, although I readily concede this point, it is also a fact that in some cases people have been trapped in cars by seat belts and have been killed as a result.

I believe in the general use of seat belts. I believe that I have the right to decide to put on a belt and thereby, probably four times out of five, increase the safety angle as far as my personal safety is concerned. But, Sir, I do not believe in compulsion, for the very reason that it would be possible for people to be trapped and killed in a car by reason of the

fact that, by law, they were forced to wear seat belts. Such tragedies, of course, have happened.

The law as it stands today encourages the use of seat belts. There are some exemptions that are indicated in this legislation, and there are also some anomalies. Some of the exemptions would appear to be quite reasonable. One or two exemptions are indicated in clause 3, and it is also indicated that there will be a number of regulations providing that the legislation is not to apply to certain people.

I have no particular quarrel with that provision, and I have no quarrel with the reasonable exemptions because there are people who from time to time need to be exempted. However, I believe that there are many other exemptions provided by the anomalies which at present exist and which, according to this legislation, will continue to exist.

As I remember it, I think the first seat belt legislation came down in 1967, and I think that was eventually amended to provide that anchorages only would be installed in the front seats of motor cars. At a later stage it became compulsory to fit seat belts in the front seats of motor cars. As recently as a few months ago, as the Hon. Mr. Russack has indicated, it became compulsory to fit seat belts in both front and rear seats of the various cars made during this year and in the future.

In my view, anomalies occur by reason of the fact that with all cars manufactured before 1967 there is no requirement at all to fit any seat belts. I have a 1966 model car in which I have two seat belts in the front, but I am under no obligation whatsoever to have seat belts in that car. There are plenty of earlier model cars manufactured in 1963, 1964, 1965 and even earlier—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Some manufactured in 1960.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I do not know whether the Chief Secretary has one manufactured as early as that.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Mine is a 1961 car.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Well, that is going back 10 years. There are many cars of that vintage still in very good order, and there is no requirement whatsoever to put a seat belt in those cars. Some of these cars are very similar in appearance, and it would be very difficult indeed, unless one actually stopped a car, to determine in which year that car was manufactured. This applies particularly to Volkswagens.

I believe that it would be a very difficult law to police, and I wonder how in fact the law would be policed. I have heard it said that any law that cannot be policed is a bad law. Although I would not necessarily agree with that all the time, I believe that there are enough exemptions and enough anomalies in this law to make it a very questionable one. I am not suggesting that at some future time it may not be necessary to introduce this compulsion but, for the very reason that every person who drives a car or rides in a car today is encouraged by the present law to put on a seat belt but is not forced to do so, I consider that the present requirement is sufficient. If we had put this amendment to the law through previously, every person would have been required to put on a seat belt and some people would have been killed as a result. For that reason, I do at this stage indicate my opposition to the second reading.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): I have found this quite a difficult Bill to make up my mind about, and I should like to thank honourable members who have spoken for the assistance they have given me in my thinking. I think many of us have started off with the idea that a person should be entitled to wear a seat belt or not according to his choice because it does not affect other people; if he chooses not to wear a seat belt and get hurt, it is his own fault and it is not going to kill anyone else.

On the other hand, the Hon. Mr. Springett put up a very telling argument on the basis of hospital charges, insurance premiums and so on whereby he pointed out quite successfully that the non-wearing of a seat belt can affect other people, financially at least. I should like to say at this stage that I always wear a seat belt myself and have done so for a long time. After the Hon. Mr. Springett's effective speech, I was rather inclined to support this Bill *in toto,* but having taken delivery of a new car last Friday I have completely changed my outlook. I may add that this Bill does nothing to specify or standardize seat belts.

When I took delivery of that car I found a new type of seat belt that was extremely difficult to get undone, and I am still finding this. It is spring loaded, it is awkward, and it seems the catch is in the wrong place. Certainly, when I first drove this car on Friday, if I had gone into the river or if it had caught fire I would have been stuck in the car; I could not have got out. If the wearing of seat belts is made compulsory this is is the sort of situation that will arise. There is no attempt in this

Bill to standardize or specify the nature of seat belts. Any seat belt at large is covered in the definition, which states in part:

"seat belt" means a belt or device fitted to a motor vehicle and designed to restrain or limit the movement of a person . . .

There is no attempt to standardize or to specify.

The Hon. V. G. Springett: The Bill specifies that it must come up to standard.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: A belt cannot be provided in a new car unless it meets the specification of the Standards Association of Australia.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: This may be very true about the belts themselves, but as far as I know there is no standard specification relating to the catch on the belt. I have seen on seat belts a variety of devices, all apparently complying with the requirements, which are tremendously varied in their application and in their nature. In my new car, for instance, there is a sort of centre press that is spring loaded and rather hard to press. I have also a car in which the belt is more like the aircraft type. I just lift it out of the catch, and in my opinion it is much easier to operate. I am prepared at this stage to vote for compulsion for the driver to wear a seat belt, because he should know how to operate it; otherwise he should not be driving a car. I feel disposed to make him wear his seat belt, and in those circumstances I think it would be a good thing.

Now let us examine the position of anyone other than the driver being required compulsorily to wear a seat belt. I could get into someone else's car as a passenger, never having seen the seat belt before and not knowing how it operated, and I would be expected within a few seconds not only to be able to put it on successfully but also to be able to take it off.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: And to adjust it to your size.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Yes.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: To wear it correctly—that is the point.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: That is right, because if you do not wear it correctly you may as well not wear it at all. I can see nothing in the Bill to exclude young children from the obligation to wear belts. Perhaps there may be a regulation declaring them a class of person to whom the Bill does not apply under clause 3(2)(a), but there is no suggestion that that is about to be done.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I thought it was covered somewhere, but I am speaking from memory.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I thought it was.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It was proposed to be introduced by regulation.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Perhaps it was proposed, but we are being asked to vote for it without a regulation being in force, without seeing the regulation and without knowing whether the regulation will be approved. We are asked to vote for the Bill as it is, not as it may be. I do not want to over-emphasize that point. This applies to everyone and I think the argument regarding adults is sufficient to raise in the minds of honourable members very serious doubts as to whether or not this form of compulsion is a proper thing.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Some seat belts cannot be adjusted unless a screw is altered in the anchor.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: There is a variety of seat belts, and if you get into someone else's car you have to know how to operate each one of them, because sooner or later you will come upon one you have not operated before.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: And you will not have an air hostess to help you, either.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: That is right. I agree that in the normality of cases seat belts save people from injury and death. I have no doubt about that. The statistics show it and we all know it, but we also know that occasionally there are accidents where seat belts in themselves can be a death trap, although they are rare cases. However, if we pass this Bill compelling everyone to wear a seat belt, whether or not he or she knows how to work it, then sooner or later we are going to murder someone by legislation. Sooner or later someone will be trapped by a seat belt we will be obliging them to wear, because they do not know how to operate it.

As I have said, at this stage I am prepared to vote for the driver of the vehicle being compelled to wear a seat belt on all occasions, because I think he should know how it works. If I am to be asked to extend that any further I will want a much more perfect Bill than this. I will want proper standards laid down by the Bill for seat belts, simple standards so that everyone can operate them and so that people cannot get caught when obliged to wear a seat belt which they cannot properly operate and which could cause their death.

We have the situation now where seat belts must be provided on new cars, and this is very proper because many people, including myself, like to wear them. Most people feel safe in a seat belt. Because the belts must be provided they will be available if you have to get into someone else's car, as we all do at times. At present there is no obligation to wear them if you do not know how to work them. Until this Bill is made much more perfect I think the law should remain at that except for the driver. I support the second reading and I will go into the matters to which I have referred in the Committee stage.

The Hon. C. R. STORY secured the adjournment of the debate.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Minister of Health) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Medical Practitioners Act, 1919-1970. Read a first time.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Medical Board has subjected the principal Act to a substantial review, as several administrative problems have arisen in the past few years. This Bill seeks to remedy these problems, to correct some inconsistencies that have been revealed, and to effect sundry Statute law revision amendments. The principal Act presently provides that the provisions of the Act relating to the Foreign Practitioners Assessment Committee shall expire on June 30, 1972, and that no applications for registration will be considered by that committee after December 31, 1971. The board is satisfied that these provisions are working well and that the committee should continue to exist without any limitation on its life. Experience has shown that frequent inquiries are made each year by "foreign" practitioners about registration in this State. In order to achieve this object, it is imperative that the Bill be passed without undue delay this session.

The various other amendments sought by the Bill shall be explained as I deal with the clauses of the Bill, which are as follows: Clause 1 is formal, and clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Act on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clauses 3, 4 and 5 effect Statute law revision amendments to sections 3, 9 and 16 respectively of the principal Act. Clause 6 effects two minor Statute law revision amendments to section 19 of the principal Act. It also substitutes the words "qualifying for" for the word "obtaining" with respect to a degree, thus ensuring that the year as resident medical officer may commence after the date on which the person concerned qualified for his degree (that is, about December) instead of the date on which he actually receives or "obtains" the degree (about the following April or May).

Clause 7 merely tidies the language of section 20 of the principal Act: no substantive alteration has been made to the effect of the section. Clause 8 amends section 22 of the principal Act which deals with the payment of registration and annual practice fees. Paragraph (*a*) effects a Statute law revision amendment. Paragraph (*b*) inserts new subsection (2*b*), which provides the board with a simple method of removing from the register the name of a person who has requested that his name be removed, and provides that the name of a person who has failed to pay his annual practice fee in respect of the next year remains on the register until the end of the current year (for which he has already paid) and will not be removed therefrom if he pays a restoration fee. This provision removes some existing inconsistencies and will save the registrar some unnecessary removals and subsequent restorations. Paragraph (c) contains an amendment consequential upon the proposed enactment of two new sections 22a and 26c. Paragraphs *(d)* and *(e)* effect Statute law revision amendments.

Clause 9 enacts a new section 22a which provides that, if a person's name has actually been removed from the register for non-payment of the annual practice fee or because his whereabouts are unknown, the board has a discretion to refuse an application for restoration to the register, if he is not of good fame or character or if he has in the interval had his name removed from another medical register. Such a person is given a right of appeal to the Supreme Court. This new section covers a serious gap in the principal Act as at the present moment a practitioner who had been off the South Australian register for perhaps a number of years and who had been guilty of misconduct in another State could be restored to the register in this State simply upon application and payment of the required fee.

Clause 10 amends section 24 of the principal Act so as to enable the President of the board to issue a provisional certificate to a person applying for limited registration (for example, a person about to do his year as a

resident medical officer). At present provisional certificates may be given only in respect of full registration, and this has caused administrative difficulties. Provisional certificates are considered and confirmed or cancelled by the board at a later date.

Clause 11 amends section 24a of the principal Act which deals with limited registration. Paragraphs (*a*), (*b*) and (*c*) merely tidy up ambiguous language contained in the section. Paragraph (*d*) inserts new subsection (5a), which provides that a person on limited registration who is completing his year as a resident medical officer does not have to pay a further annual practice fee in respect of a period of not more than a month running into the next registration year. The registrar has found that, as the compulsory year of hospital residency may overlap into the next registration year, the case often arises in which the registrar must demand payment of a further full annual practice fee from a resident medical officer in respect of only the last few weeks of his compulsory year. The board wishes to have the power to exempt payment in such cases.

Clause 12 enacts new section 25a of the principal Act which enables the board to deal with practitioners who have been guilty of unethical, improper or unprofessional conduct, by censuring such a person or by requiring him to give an undertaking to abstain from the particular conduct. The board can require that person to give a full explanation of the conduct and if he fails to do so he is liable to a penalty of $50. If he fails to give an undertaking or commits a breach of an undertaking, the board may suspend his registration in accordance with the other provisions of the Act relating to suspension. It must be borne in mind that there is a right of appeal against any order for suspension. This new section again covers a considerable gap in the Act, as at present the board has no express power to deal with relatively minor complaints which do not amount to "infamous conduct", which is provided for in section 26. The board wishes to have the power to ask a practitioner for a written explanation of a complaint made by a member of the public, without having to launch the full inquiry required by section 26.

Clause 13 amends section 26 of the principal Act which deals with the cancellation or suspension of registration. Paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*) effect a change in the wording of the present offence of "infamous conduct in a professional respect", which the board considers to be an out-of-date expression. The new wording is "serious misconduct in any professional respect", which is based on wording chosen by the United Kingdom in a recent amendment. The substance of the offence is not in any way altered. Paragraph (*c*) empowers the Supreme Court to make a conditional order for restoration to the register in the case of cancellation of registration. It is envisaged that the carrying out of a refresher course may in some cases be necessary as a condition attaching to such an order. Paragraph (*d*) is a consequential amendment.

Paragraph (*e*) provides a sanction for the situation where a person fails to give or commits a breach of an undertaking which the board is already empowered to require under this section. In such a case the board may suspend his registration, or the Supreme Court may cancel his registration. Under the Act as it now stands, where a person is guilty of infamous conduct, the board may require him to give an undertaking to abstain from that conduct but cannot take any action for a failure to give the undertaking or for a breach of that undertaking. Paragraphs (*f*), (*g*) and (*h*) contain consequential amendments. Paragraph (*i*) enables the board to serve a person personally (as well as by post) with the notice required to be given before suspension of his registration. Paragraph (*j*) contains a consequential amendment.

Clause 14 effects Statute law revision amendments to section 26a of the principal Act. Clause 15 enacts two new sections. New section 26b provides that, when a practitioner's registration has been suspended, the name of that person shall be removed from the register but will automatically be restored to the register at the expiration of the suspension upon payment of the required fee. The board considers that this provision is necessary for the protection of the general public. New section 26c provides that a person whose name has been removed from the register (excluding removal on suspension) may be required to carry out a refresher course to the satisfaction of the board before his name is restored. Such a person shall be on limited registration during the refresher course. It is patently obvious that a person who has not practised for several years should, not only in the public interest but for his own benefit as well, undergo some type of refresher training. At present the board has no power to insist on this.

Clause 16 effects Statute law revision amendments to section 27 of the principal Act. Clause 17 corrects certain ambiguities contained

in section 29 of the principal Act and brings the wording of the section into line with later provisions relating to the publication and evidentiary effect of the specialist register. Clause 18 amends section 29a of the principal Act, which deals with the registration of specialists. Paragraphs (*a*), (*b*), (*c*) and (*d*) contain Statute law revision amendments. Paragraph (*e*) inserts four new subsections, which provide for the payment of an annual specialist practice fee and for the procedure on non-payment of that fee. These provisions substantially follow those sections of the Act dealing with the payment of the ordinary practice fee. As the Act now stands, there is provision for payment of an annual specialist practice fee but not for the collection thereof, which is an obvious gap to be filled.

Clause 19 enacts three new sections. New section 29d provides that removal from the specialist register must automatically follow removal from the general register and that upon payment of the required fee restoration to the Specialist Register will follow restoration to the general register in those cases where the board thinks fit. The need for these provisions is self-evident: if a person cannot practise as a general practitioner, he obviously may not continue to practise as a specialist. New section 29e provides for the availability of the specialist register for public inspection. New section 29f provides for the publication and evidentiary effect of the specialist register. No fixed intervals for publication have been set as this register does not change as rapidly as the general register, which must be published annually. The evidentiary effect of a copy of the specialist register has the same effect as a copy of the general register.

Clause 20 amends section 31a of the principal Act by adding a new subsection, which gives the board power to waive, reduce or defer payment of the fee which at present must be paid by all persons who apply to the board for a review of an account alleged to be excessive. The board considers that, in those cases where the amount in dispute is comparatively small, it is not reasonable to ask for the prescribed fee, which at present is the sum of $5. The new subsection further provides that the board may extend the time within which such an application for review may be made from three months (as the Act now provides) to six months. The board has had the experience of not being able to review an apparent excessive account lodged by a migrant who did not become aware of his rights in the matter until more than three months after his receipt of the account.

Clause 21 effects a Statute law revision amendment to section 33 of the principal Act. Clauses 22 and 23 increase the penalties set out in sections 35 and 36 of the principal Act to bring them into line with the penalties provided elsewhere in the Act for offences of similar gravity. Clause 24 enacts new section 37a, which provides an immunity from the provisions of the Act for a doctor from another State who may be required to perform some emergency treatment in this State. This provision was recommended by the 1968 conference of the Australian Medical Board for inclusion in the relevant Acts of all States.

Clause 25 amends the second schedule to the principal Act, which deals with the registration of foreign practitioners, that is, practitioners from places that do not recognize the qualifications of persons registered in this State. Paragraph (*a*) contains a Statute law revision amendment. Paragraph (*b*) is designed to overcome a difficulty in interpreting the meaning of the passage "any person who is or has been qualified to practise medicine or surgery in any country . . .". It has been thought that this could prevent from applying for registration a foreign doctor who had the necessary medical qualifications to practise in his home country but not the legal right so to practise, that is, a person with some nationality or citizenship problem. It is hoped that the substituted passage will make it clear that the board is interested only in the medical and professional qualifications of an applicant.

Paragraphs (*c*), (*e*) and (*g*) provide the board with the power to consider an application made by a foreign doctor who has resided in Australia for a period of three months or less. Such a person cannot apply for registration under the Act as it now stands as the requirement is for a three-month period of residence in South Australia. This stringent requirement has meant that foreign doctors who have been licensed by the New South Wales Medical Board to work in base hospitals or outback regions must leave their employment and reside in this State for a full three months before they can even undergo the necessary examination by the Foreign Practitioners' Assessment Committee. This seems unnecessary when references can easily be obtained from sources from other States. Also, foreign practitioners who have been registered in another State ought to be able to apply for registration here without any waiting period at all. The board wishes to have a discretion in this matter and, of course, it envisages that the three-month so-called

"acclimatization" period should still apply to foreign doctors coming direct from overseas. Paragraphs (*d*) and (*i*) strike out those provisions that limit the life of the schedule to June 30, 1972. The board and the Foreign Practitioners' Assessment Committee will, therefore, continue beyond that date to have the power to entertain and adjudicate upon applications by foreign practitioners for registration in this State, and so continue to tap a valuable source of medical talent. Paragraph (*f*) is a consequential amendment. Paragraph (*h*) is a Statute law revision amendment.

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

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE ERADICATION FUND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

DAYLIGHT SAVING BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 21. Page 1501.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I support the second reading of this Bill with some misgivings. At the same time, however, I recognize the difficulties facing the Government because all the Eastern States have decided to adopt daylight saving from November 1 to the end of February. Two years ago, Tasmania adopted daylight saving, and now Victoria, Queensland and New South Wales are doing so.

In his second reading explanation, the Minister outlined the history not only of daylight saving but also of standard time, beginning in the early 1890's at an inter-colonial conference of surveyors held in Melbourne. I found that history most interesting. However, the history and experience of this State in relation to daylight saving has not been a happy one. Indeed, a general sigh of relief was heaved in the district in which I live when daylight saving was discontinued after the Second World War.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: And that is on the eastern side of the State.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is correct, and that is the point I was going to make. This happened in a district in which the actual time was almost identical to the real sun time. One can imagine the sigh of relief that was heaved by the people in the west of the State when South Australia stopped using daylight saving. This Bill introduces daylight saving for a trial period, during which we will have an opportunity to assess whether it should be continued in South Australia or whether it should be discontinued, as it was 20 or 30 years ago.

Some people in the community will be seriously affected by the adoption of daylight saving. One could enumerate in this respect and deal with the various effects that the move to daylight saving will have on certain industries. However, I do not intend to deal with this matter at length. No doubt the few to which I will refer will be elaborated on by other honourable members. The first industry that comes to mind is the drive-in theatre industry. If one examines the Tasmanian experience, one sees that drive-in theatres are virtually a thing of the past, as they have found it almost impossible to operate under a daylight saving system. This industry is not a small one in South Australia, and it employs many people, generally on a casual basis.

The introduction of daylight saving, even for a trial period, will be a serious matter for the drive-in theatre industry. Even if the Government decides not to introduce a similar Bill next year, this four-month trial period will upset this industry so much that it will be difficult for it to adjust. Some people are in the habit of using drive-in theatres, and people's habits will change. I therefore doubt whether the drive-in theatre business will ever be the same again, irrespective of what happens in the future.

Rural industries will generally be unhappy with the change to daylight saving. The rural industries were happy when daylight saving was discontinued about 30 years ago. Industries in the west of the State will be seriously affected, and it does not matter whether one looks at the dairying industry, the woolgrowing industry or the beef industry: all will be seriously affected.

One of the difficult problems that will be created by daylight saving is the transport of schoolchildren in the metropolitan area and in the country, particularly the latter. The problem in country areas has been compounded by the recent development of area schools. Schoolchildren of the tender age of six or seven years must catch a school bus in some cases at 7.30 a.m. or earlier, and some children have to travel many miles to catch the bus. It is no joke that, at 7 a.m. (which is really 6 a.m. with daylight saving), a child of tender age must catch a bus to get to an area school. I realize that the Government may have to examine this matter and come to an arrangement, allowing school hours to be altered to cater for these children. I realize, too, that I

am examining this matter superficially, and that this problem is not insurmountable.

School hours would need to be changed only from the beginning of November to early in December, a matter of five or six weeks, and from the middle to the end of February, a matter of only two weeks. Therefore, the total time to be changed would amount to only about eight weeks. However, the Minister did not refer to this matter in his second reading explanation. No doubt this problem has come to the Government's notice and the Minister will refer to it when he closes the second reading debate.

I have referred to one or two difficulties that will be created by South Australia's adopting daylight saving. I intend to adopt the approach of some honourable members who have been in this Council for many years and who, having made their points, have said, "On the other hand". In this instance, I have some sympathy for the Government because of certain problems which have been created but which are not its fault. As I said at the beginning of my speech, it must be admitted that the decision of the Eastern States to adopt one hour's daylight saving during November, December, January and February presents serious problems for South Australia. Indeed, I think every honourable member would agree that this is so. I do not wish to put forward in detail all the difficulties that have been created as a result of this move by the Eastern States. However, I believe that one or two problems that come to my mind are somewhat insurmountable.

If one examines for a moment the question of train schedules and staff schedules on the railways alone, one sees that with a difference of 1½ hours between South Australia and the Eastern States the problem would be extreme. One could speak at length on the subject of airline operations. Many people in the business and commercial world travel by air from South Australia to Melbourne and Sydney, particularly, and one can see the difficulties that would be inherent if we did not adopt a system of daylight saving paralleling what is happening in the Eastern States.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill mentioned some time ago in this Council the great difficulties that would occur if we did not make a move to adopt daylight saving, seeing that the Eastern States had done that. We would have the situation that at 9.30 p.m., really, the airports in the Eastern States would be closed, as a person travelling from Adelaide to Melbourne or Sydney would be arriving there virtually at 11 p.m. their time. There would be a great loss of time, particularly of contact time, if we did not make this move.

I am touching on these matters only very lightly. On balance, I believe that the Government is correct in making this move to introduce daylight saving. I believe, too, that it is correct in having the legislation operate for only 12 months. Whilst the move will not be received with any great joy by and will not suit many sections of the South Australian community, I believe that it is necessary that we have such legislation, at least for a trial period. For those reasons, I support the second reading.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.24 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, September 23, at 2.15 p.m.