# LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, August 23, 1973

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

## QUESTIONS

### TOTALIZATOR AGENCY BOARD

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Will the Chief Secretary ascertain for me the amount of money, if any, owing to the Totalizator Agency Board since it introduced credit telephone facilities? If there is any money owing as a result of these facilities, has any of the money owing been written off as bad debts?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will inquire and obtain a reply for the honourable member.

### WINE INDUSTRY

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Can the Minister of Agriculture say, as a result of the Commonwealth Government's Budget and Mr. T. W. Hardy's comments in today's press that the wine and grapegrowing industry has been hit severely by the Budget, what action he has taken or recommended or what action he contemplates taking to assist grapegrowers in South Australia?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I do not think that the Budget will affect grapegrowers as much as it will affect wine-makers.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It will affect both.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: As I did not read Mr. Hardy's comments in today's *Advertiser* (I have not had the opportunity to read them), I am unable to say anything on them. I point out that it is not possible for this Government to do anything in the Commonwealth's field.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Because of the large increase in brandy prices announced in today's press, will the Minister ask the Premier to draw the attention of the Commonwealth Government to the fact that, as 90 per cent of Australia's brandy is produced in South Australia, this imposition will have a marked effect on the sales of grapegrowers and brandy producers?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am willing to do that for the honourable member.

### SCHOOL MILK

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Will the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Education, inquire regarding a statement in today's *Advertiser* that the supply of milk to schoolchildren will be reduced? Will the Minister ensure that this valuable food will continue to be supplied, particularly to children who do not get milk at home?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I understand that the Commonwealth Treasurer's programme for phasing out the supply of milk to schoolchildren will be carried out only where it is necessary to do so. In other words, if there are cases where it is essential that free milk be supplied, I understand that it will be supplied. Nevertheless, I did intend to take up this matter with the Minister of Education to see exactly what the situation would be in South Australia. When I have done that, I shall be pleased to inform the honourable member.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Has the Minister any idea of the method or priorities by which the schools will be phased out in respect of supplies of free milk for schoolchildren? Secondly, assuming milk is not available for certain schools, will he consider introducing a scheme for supplying another valuable food, orange juice, for schoolchildren?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will talk this over with the Minister of Education and, if we can reach a satisfactory solution, I will inform the honourable member.

### YORKETOWN HIGH SCHOOL

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question refers to the projected construction of a new high school at Yorketown. Some two months ago I asked a question of the Minister on this matter. At that time tenders had been called for the new school, and the Minister kindly informed me what would happen in due course, for which I thank him. However, I have had it put to me by constituents in that area that they are concerned that no tender has been accepted, and they are wondering whether the Minister is still considering tenders, whether he intends to accept one of them or whether tenders will be called again. The reason for this further question is, of course, the great urgency for this facility and the considerable time lapse which has occurred in constructing this high school, with consequent great concern of the people in that area. Can the Minister say whether tenders are still being considered or, if not, when they will be called again?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring him down a reply when it is available. However, I remind him that, as far as school buildings in South Australia are concerned, I do not think we have seen a more accelerated programme of school building in this State than in the last three years.

### ADELAIDE TO PORT PIRIE LINE

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary, as Acting Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: There seems to be a great quietness about the Adelaide to Port Pirie railway line and many people are expressing concern about so many years of promises and statements, with no action taken or decisions made in respect of when work will start on that important scheme. Will the Chief Secretary tell the Council exactly what the problems are as to why this work has not started and when it is expected that work will start on the Adelaide to Port Pirie or to Crystal Brook standard gauge railway line?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Last week the Hon. Mr. Hill asked me a similar question, to which I am endeavouring to get a reply as quickly as possible. I think the reply I shall give to the Hon. Mr. Hill's question will answer this question, too. So I will get an answer to both questions as soon as possible.

### EFFLUENT DISPOSAL

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Health any further information regarding the complaint made by Mr. B. F. J. Cavanagh, the Secretary of the Miscellaneous Workers Union, concerning the disposal of effluent at the Christies Beach High School, which complaint I know is being investigated at present by the Minister of Education? Because there may be cases of hepatitis in the Christies Beach area, has the Minister of Health been able to investigate this serious health problem and has he any comment to make about it?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: My department is looking at the matter, but I do not yet have a report. However, I will bring one down for the honourable member when it is available.

**LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

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

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Chief Secretary): I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

First, I want to say how much I appreciate the opportunity to give this second reading explanation now. Several other Bills will be coming from the other place and I shall be glad if the same consideration is given to me on those Bills so that I can give the second reading explanations and get them on the Notice Paper. Honourable members will then have more time to study the Bills. This Bill proposes a number of amendments to Part III of the principal Act, the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1972. This Part deals with totalizators, and honourable members will no doubt be aware that it is through the licensing of totalizator operations that the principal statutory control over racing generally is exercised.

The proposed amendments have either been requested by, or have arisen from, discussions with those bodies which control the various aspects of racing in this State. The amendments fall into a number of groups and they may be summarized as follows:

(*a*) one substantial group provides for the transfer of control over the granting of totalizator licences from the Commissioner of Police to the Chief Secretary. Already in this Part provisions exist requiring that certain actions of the Commissioner in relation to the grant of licences be approved by the Chief Secretary, so it seems appropriate that the whole of the licensing function which is not, in any sense of the term, a true police function should be transferred to the Chief Secretary . This transfer of function, which will involve no additional administrative expense, is in line with the general policy of freeing the police from as many extraneous duties as possible;

(*b*) the second group is concerned with increasing the permitted flexibility in granting licences for meetings at the various racecourses throughout the State. The amendments proposed will permit the transfer of meetings between racecourses if the Chief Secretary is satisfied that a reasonable cause exists for doing so and the racing clubs concerned have agreed. At least two situations may give grounds for a transfer. The first is weather conditions that may inhibit racing on one racecourse but would permit racing on another racecourse; the second is a more cogent economic one where it may be to the considerable financial advantage of a country racing club to transfer one of its "feature" meetings to a more convenient location;

(*c*) the third group provides for an increase in the permitted number of trotting meetings in the metropolitan area and certain country areas and also provides for the transfer of meetings between country areas but not between the country and metropolitan areas; the reasons for providing for these transfers are much the same as those mentioned in connection with the transfers of horse-racing meetings;

(*d*) finally, the fourth group of amendments is concerned with extending the deduction of the additional 1 per cent of the amount wagered for double, treble, and jackpot betting to all such contingencies whether or not the Totalizator Agency Board is involved in the transaction. An amount represented by this 1 per cent is, as members will be aware, paid to the Racecourse Development Fund, and its deduction will not only accord with present practice but will ultimately benefit the clubs concerned.

In addition, other minor and consequential amendments have been made to the principal Act, and these will be adverted to during the discussions of the clauses. In considering the Bill in some detail, clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clauses 3, 4, and 5 are amendments consequential on the vesting of responsibility for the issue of totalizator licences in the Chief Secretary rather than the Commissioner of Police.

Clause 6 at paragraph (*a*) provides for the vesting of responsibility adverted to, and at paragraph *(b)* substitutes for a reference to the Governor a reference to the Chief Secretary, thus empowering the Chief Secretary to determine the disposition of profits derived at charitable meetings that should be paid to various charitable institutions. It now seems appropriate that this matter should be determined by the Chief Secretary. Paragraph (*c*) provides for the transfer of totalizator licences between racecourses and, as has been adverted to, will enable the venue of meetings to be changed speedily in the event of inclement weather or in other contingencies and also the transfer of "feature" meetings from the country to more convenient locations. In fact, this amendment has been requested by the South Australian Jockey Club acting on behalf of the other clubs in this matter.

Clause 7 again deals with the transfer of control from the Commissioner of Police to the Chief Secretary, and as a consequential amendment substitutes a new subsection (1a) in section 20. Clause 8 has been prepared after consultation with the Totalizator Agency Board and the trotting clubs concerned, and at paragraph (*a*) provides for the transfer of control over the issue of totalizator licences to the Chief Secretary. However, the most significant amendments made by this clause are, of course, the increase in numbers of trotting meetings that may be held in the various areas. The new maxima will be as follows: (*a*) in the metropolitan area, 53; (*b*) in the South-East, 26; and (*c*) in the areas other than the metropolitan area, Eyre Peninsula, the South-East, and the Murray area, 70.

In addition, provision is made for transfer of meetings within the country areas but not from country areas to the city. It is considered that this provision for transfer, which is set out in paragraph (*k*) of this clause, will, as has been mentioned, provide for unexpected contingencies and also assist in the more profitable operation of some meetings. Clause 9 deals with the transfer of responsibility in this area from the Commissioner of Police to the Chief Secretary, as do clauses 10 and 11. In addition, clause 9 provides that trotting meetings may be held on days or nights in the metropolitan area. Clause 12 gives effect to the proposition relating to the "additional one per cent" adverted to at paragraph (*d*) in my introductory remarks to this measure.

Clause 13 again provides for the transfer of control over the issue of totalizator licences from the Commissioner of Police to the Chief Secretary, as do the remaining clauses. Clause 15, besides providing for the transfer of control over the issue of totalizator licences from the Commissioner of Police to the Chief Secretary, also recognises the establishment of the South-Eastern Greyhound Racing Club Incorporated, and provides for that club to hold not more than 50 meetings in each year at which the use of the totalizator will be permitted.

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

## ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Chief Secretary): I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It is introduced following discussions with the Aboriginal Lands Trust which was constituted under the principal Act, the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act, 1966-1968. As honourable members will be aware, the trust is intended to be, so far as possible, independent of the Government and, in fact, section 12 of the principal Act recognizes this. However, the Government has a substantial and continuing financial interest in the activities of the trust and it seemed appropriate at the time that the Government would be fully and formally informed of the trust's activities. For this reason, the principal Act provided that the then Director of Aboriginal Affairs should be Secretary to the trust and that the Secretary should be present at every meeting of the trust.

Since that time, the trust has developed an administrative organization of its own and the principal officer in this organization is the Manager. The situation has now arisen that the Statutory Secretary has no other function than to attend meetings of the trust and to report to the Minister. The ordinary secretarial and administrative functions of the trust are performed by the Manager. Thus, amongst other things, this Bill recognizes this changed situation but, at the same time, still gives effect to the Government's continuing financial interest in the affairs of the trust. Certain other amendments effected by this Bill will perhaps more conveniently be discussed during my outline of the scope of the clauses.

In considering the Bill in detail, clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 3 of the principal Act which relates to the interpretation provisions of that Act. It strikes out the definition of "Minister" which is not required in view of the definition of "Minister" contained in section 4 of the Acts Interpretation Act and inserts a definition of Minister's representative in its place. Clause 4 amends section 6 of the principal Act which relates to membership of the trust by recasting subsection (5) of that section. No change in principle is envisaged by this recasting. Clause 5 provides for the appointment of a Minister's representative and for the appointment of a deputy to act in his stead. This is done by the insertion of a new section 9a in the principal Act.

Clause 6, which amends section 10 of the principal Act, provides that no meeting of the trust shall be held in the absence of the Minister's representative and is, as was the provision that it replaces, intended to ensure that the Government is kept fully and formally apprised of the activities of the trust. Clause 7 repeals section 14 of the principal Act which provided for the then Director of Aboriginal Affairs to be the Secretary to the trust, as this provision is now redundant. Clause 8 substantially repeals and re-enacts section 15 of the principal Act, which related to officers and employees of the trust, and sets out in somewhat extended form the original section 15. An appropriate transitional provision has been provided at new subsection (6) of this section. Clause 9 inserts two new subsections in section 16 of the principal Act. The effect of these amendments is to restrict entry, prospecting, exploration and mining on lands vested in the trust to the same extent that these activities are restricted in relation to Aboriginal reserves under section 88 of the Community Welfare Act. This restriction has been specifically requested by the Aboriginal Lands Trust.

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

## AGED AND INFIRM PERSONS' PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It is intended to deal with a matter that has been brought to the attention of the Government by their honours the judges of the Supreme Court. Honourable members will be aware that the principal Act, the Aged and Infirm Persons' Property Act, 1940-1968, is intended to provide protection for certain classes of person who, by reason of some mental or physical disability, are unable to manage their own affairs and, as such, the principal Act may be regarded as part of the historically based "protective" jurisdiction of our Supreme Court. In actions for damages for personal injury it not infrequently happens that, as a result of that injury, the plaintiff may be rendered incapable of managing his affairs. In this case it has been usual for the judge presiding in the matter to suggest that those responsible for the plaintiff's interests secure his position by making application under the principal Act for a protection order in favour of the estate of the plaintiff.

The adoption of such a suggestion by the plaintiff's advisers, however, involves the initiation of proceedings separate and distinct from the action for damages with concomitant delay and the possible incurring of additional expense. Since the facts on which such an application would be granted have in all likelihood emerged in the course of the action for damages, there seems considerable merit in providing for a procedure by which the protection order may be made on the motion of the court seized of the action for damages or on application to that court. This then is the substance of the matter covered by this Bill.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 is, in effect, consequential on clause 3. Clause 3 amends the principal Act by inserting a new section 8a which, at proposed subsection (1), provides for protection orders to be made on the court's own motion or on application in the circumstances set out therein. Proposed subsection (2) provides for intervention in the matter by interested parties. Proposed subsection (3) is, in effect, a type of transitional provision, and proposed subsection (4) spells out the definition of prescribed persons. Clause 4 makes drafting amendments that merely recognize the existence of the Community Welfare Department, which has replaced the Social Welfare Department. Clauses 5 and 6 are amendments consequential on those effected by clause 3.

The Hon. C. M. HILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

## POLICE ACT REPEAL BILL

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

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Chief Secretary): I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

This Bill, which repeals the Police Act, 1936, and certain other Acts amending that Act, is introduced as a part of the law revision programme. Honourable members may

be aware that, by the Police Regulation Act, 1952, and the Police Offences Act, 1953, the Police Act, 1936, was, for practical purposes, repealed and this short Bill completes the process by repealing the Police Act, 1936, and repealing certain other Acts which amended that Act. The enactment of this Bill will relieve the editor of the proposed consolidation of the Statutes of the necessity to reprint the Police Act, 1936, of which only certain formal portions at present remain on the Statute Book.

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

## POLICE PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Chief Secretary): I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It is introduced following representations made by the Police Association, on behalf of contributors to the Police Pension Fund, to correct what is in their view an anomaly in the principal Act. In funds of this nature pensions are calculated on an average salary, usually over a period of three years. In the provision relating to average salary in its present form the average annual salary that determines the pension payable will vary slightly depending on when the contributor's last increase of salary occurred. If this increase occurred after his last "review day", as defined in the principal Act, the pension payable on his death or retirement will not be affected by that increase of salary.

Accordingly, this Bill introduces, as an element in the calculation of pensions, the salary that was payable to the contributor immediately before his death or retirement, notwithstanding the fact that that salary was payable after his last "review day". This will result in a slightly higher benefit in some cases being paid on the death or retirement of the contributor depending on when his last salary increase occurred. There is only one operative clause in the Bill, clause 2, which strikes out the definition of average annual salary and provides a method of calculation of that salary depending on whether or not three, two, one or no review days have occurred in relation to the contributor who has died or retired. In each case recognition is now given, for the purpose of calculating the benefit, to the salary payable to the contributor immediately before he retired or died.

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

## PROHIBITED AREAS (APPLICATION OF STATE LAWS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Chief Secretary): I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

This Bill, which is a law revision measure, amends the Prohibited Areas (Application of State Laws) Act, 1972, by substituting for a reference to the Police Act, 1936-1951, a reference to the Police Offences Act, 1953, as amended. Section 4 of the principal Act somewhat expands the meaning of the definition of "public place" in the Police Act, 1936-1951. The purpose of this expansion was to ensure that, in prohibited areas, the meaning of the term "public place" would not be read down because of the fact that, in such places, entry of members of the public could be restricted.

However, since the enactment of the principal Act, the Police Act, 1936-1951, has been substantially repealed and in fact the only operative section of that Act remaining on the Statute Book is the section that contains the definition of "public place". As a result, the reference in the principal Act to a "public place", as defined in the Police Act, 1936-1951, has become nugatory since there are now no offences created by that Act to which the expanded definition could attach, and a specific reference to the Police Offences Act, 1953, is obviously the reference required if the intentions of Parliament as expressed in the principal Act are to be given effect to. This reference is effected by clause 2 (*b*) of the Bill. At the same time, opportunity has been taken to make a formal amendment to the principal Act by clause 2 (*a*) *of* the Bill.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT secured the adjournment of the debate.

## FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

## POLICE REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

## PHYSIOTHERAPISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Physiotherapists Act, 1945-1972. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It makes a number of miscellaneous amendments to the Physiotherapists Act. The most important of these enables the board to grant licences to permit the practice of physiotherapy. At the moment the principal Act provides only for registration. Where a physiotherapist is registered, this connotes that he is fully qualified to practise physiotherapy in his own right without supervision. Circumstances do arise, however, particularly in the case of foreign graduates coming to live in this State, where some more limited right to practise physiotherapy is desirable. The present Bill is designed to provide for this more limited right to practise physiotherapy.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 inserts a definition of a licensed physiotherapist in the principal Act. Clauses 5 to 8 make amendments consequential on the insertion of the licensing provisions. Clause 9 provides that a member of the Physiotherapists Board is to be appointed by the Council of the South Australian Institute of Technology. This amendment arises from the fact that the training of professional physiotherapists in this State will in future be undertaken wholly by the institute. Clause 10 makes a consequential amendment. Clause 11 provides for the Registrar to keep a register, which will include in future the names of licensed physiotherapists as well as the names of registered physiotherapists. Clause 12 provides that the names of licensed physiotherapists need not be published each year in the *Gazette.* Clause 13 deals with the manner in which the register is to be kept.

Clauses 14 and 15 make consequential amendments to the principal Act. Clause 16 provides that, where a person has been licensed as a physiotherapist, the Registrar must notify him of that fact and of the conditions under which he has been licensed by the board. Clause 17 provides that, where a person is six months in arrears with his payment of registration fees, he may be deregistered by the board. At present the period is 12 months. Clauses 18, 19 and 20 make consequential amendments. Clause 21 provides for the payment of licence fees. Clause 22

enables the board to grant registration to a foreign graduate where he holds a degree, diploma, or other qualification in physiotherapy obtained outside this State and is competent to practise physiotherapy in this State.

Clause 23 provides for the licensing of physiotherapists. Where a person proves to the satisfaction of the board that he is of good character, that he holds a degree, diploma, or other qualification in physiotherapy obtained outside the State and that he is competent to practise physiotherapy under supervision or under other conditions that may be stipulated by the board, the board may license him as a physiotherapist. New subsection (2) deals with the conditions under which a person may be licensed as a physiotherapist. The conditions may stipulate that the licensee may practise physiotherapy only under supervision and may be required to undergo specified training in the theory and practice of physiotherapy. Where a person has been licensed and subsequently proves to the satisfaction of the board that he has fulfilled all the conditions under which the licence was granted and that he is competent to practise physiotherapy in this State, the board may register him as a physiotherapist. The licence may also be granted to a lecturer in physiotherapy who is temporarily within the State. No person is to hold a licence for more than three years.

Clause 24 makes a consequential amendment to the principal Act. Clause 25 provides that the decision of the board on an application for a licence shall not be subject to appeal. Clauses 26 to 30 make consequential amendments to the principal Act.

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

## PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 22. Page 444.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill. In this financial year the Australian Loan Council supported a Loan programme for State works and services and housing amounting to $1,085,000,000, an increase of about 10.3 per cent over the amount for the preceding year. This year, however, the allocations have been made in two separate parcels—one for State works and one for State housing. In previous years there has been a lump sum and the States themselves have been able to make their own allocations to the various areas, including housing. I am not over-impressed with the change as I believe that the determination of how the Commonwealth allocations are to be spent and in what areas they should be allocated should be the prerogative of the States, not of the Commonwealth.

Every day that passes, we see little indications of the States becoming more and more tied to the decisions of the Canberra bureaucracy, and once again I raise my voice against such intrusion. An amusing side-issue regarding the second reading explanation given by the Chief Secretary is that in the copy given to me the word "Commonwealth" has been struck out and over the top have been written the words "Australian Government". That term is used right through the second reading explanation. I agree that the correct title for the Loan Council is the Australian Loan Council, but the Commonwealth Government is not the Australian Government; the Commonwealth is only a part of the Australian Government. An instruction has obviously been issued to the Government on this matter. Fortunately, I am not in the position of being dictated to, and I will continue to use the correct phrase, "the Commonwealth Government" or "the Federal Government". Last night I heard a senior Commonwealth public servant giving a lecture on a certain matter, and time and time again he referred to "the Commonwealth Government" and then paused, went back, corrected himself and said, "It is now called 'the Australian Government'."

The State's allocation for housing last year was about $30,000,000, and this year under the new system it has been increased to $32,750,000, an increase of about 9 per cent. Over the last 20 years South Australia has adopted the practice of allocating to housing a higher percentage of Loan moneys than has any other State. New South Wales has come close to South Australia in this respect. One can see from the figures that that has been the case. However, the new allocation, under any reasonable scrutiny, can be seen to be less than allocations in previous years, by comparison.

No honourable member would deny that there has been an increase in building costs in South Australia. It would be difficult to place a figure on the increase over the last 12 months but, from inquiries I have made in the last few days, I believe the increase would be between 12 per cent and 15 per cent. The allocation of housing moneys this year is therefore not keeping pace with the escalation in building costs. Added to this factor has been the announcement that the limit on housing loans will be increased from $10,000 to $12,500, an increase of 25 per cent, whilst available moneys for housing have increased by only 9 per cent.

While we have done exceptionally well in the housing field in the past, it appears that there will be a downturn in housing activity in the future for three reasons: first, the increase in building costs; secondly, the inability of new moneys for housing to match the rate of escalation in building costs; and, thirdly, the increase in the limit for housing loans from $10,000 to $12,500. This process will have a serious effect, particularly on young people. I know this to be so because of the number of anxious inquiries I have had over the last few months from young people who have been saving over the last three or four years to build a house.

The two groups in the community most seriously affected by any escalation in costs and any rampant inflation are young people saving to build a house and the older section of the community on fixed incomes. I should like to compare the two areas that have been separated in the Loan allocations—works and housing. The increase in housing moneys is about 9 per cent and the increase in money available for the works programme is about 15 per cent. This means that in South Australia this financial year there will be a static works programme and a slight downturn in the housing programme.

If I had to direct any criticism of housing policies in South Australia over the past 20 years, it would be that we have concentrated too much of our effort and finance on providing rental accommodation and not enough on encouraging home ownership. I have not undertaken a detailed study of the position, but I believe an economic advantage lies with the person who relies on the Government to provide his accommodation. We have not given enough incentive in our housing programme over the past 20 years to people who want to own their own houses. An interesting study could be undertaken on this matter, but I believe that what I have said is correct; if so, the emphasis has been wrongly placed, and it should be the other way around. Every encouragement should be given to each person to stand on his own feet, be responsible for his own accommodation, and own his own house or, if necessary, build his own house. In any period of rapid expansion there is a case, where necessary, for the Government to be responsible for housing development

in connection with some identifiable categories and for the Government to be the responsible landlord, but the time is now ripe for a recasting of these policies and for placing greater reliance on the individual.

In last year's Loan Estimates documents the Treasurer complained that the Commonwealth Budget contained no alleviation of sales tax on consumer goods. I remind him that he has not referred to that matter in this year's documents although, again, there is no alleviation in this year's Commonwealth Budget of sales tax on consumer goods. Indeed, by comparison, the Treasurer should be far more outspoken this year than he was last year, because important South Australian industries, as referred to by the Hon. Mr. Hill in a question today, are affected by the Commonwealth Budget which previously were unaffected. One wonders how "saviour A1" is making out in the River districts of South Australia. Over the years I have always been critical of the Commonwealth Government's attitude toward State finances. The only constructive approach to this problem was achieved partially during the Gorton Administration and mainly during the McMahon Administration. I referred fully to this matter last year, and I will not go into it as fully this year. Full credit must go to those two Administrations for the improvement achieved. The position is again static now in one sense, but in another sense one can see a deterioration towards centralized control. To illustrate that, I will quote what the Chief Secretary said in his second reading explanation, as follows:

> The Australian Government had also offered to take over responsibility for the financing of tertiary education from January 1, 1974, on condition that reductions be made to State general purpose revenue grants and Loan allocations corresponding to the relief given to Revenue and Loan Budgets from the take-over.

I ask honourable members to note the wording of that sentence. The Commonwealth Government has offered to take over responsibility but, corresponding to that take-over, reductions will be made from general purpose revenue grants and Loan allocations to the States. The Commonwealth Government offered to take over responsibility for financing tertiary education on those conditions. I stress the point that every honourable member should be able to see. There is no generosity from the Commonwealth Government in this question: it is purely and simply a transfer of power and responsibility. Considerable publicity was given about the Commonwealth Budget's increase in money for education purposes, but little publicity was given to the fact that the allocation to the Revenue and Loan Accounts had been reduced to the States commensurate with the responsibility assumed by the Commonwealth Government. If one deducts the saving to the Commonwealth Budget from the announced education expenditure, it is realized that the increase in education expenditure will not be as great as is claimed by the Commonwealth Treasurer. To obtain accurate figures one has to deduct the amount of reduction in the general revenue and Loan allocations to the State.

What is the next step? What will we see in future in regard to our Loan Estimates? We will see a continuing process of gradual Commonwealth control of all education: I think I can predict that with some certainty. The next step could be either matching grants for primary and secondary education, with the Commonwealth stating that the money will be available provided the State matches it with so much money and provided the State does what the Commonwealth says it will, or will we see the situation in which the Commonwealth states that it has saved the State so much money in tertiary education that the State will spend money on primary and secondary education as suggested by the Commonwealth Government? I have been told that such an approach has already occurred.

This is another indication of the creeping paralysis of centralism that can so quickly overtake all of us. In this movement towards centralism (and I believe the Estimates illustrate my point), we are lagging five years behind the rest of the world. I emphasize that in most democratic countries of the world the experiment with centralism has failed. In the United Kingdom the active political question at present does not concern the Common Market but concerns the decentralization of authority in the United Kingdom. In America, after flirting with centralism since the end of the Second World War, the people of America in the past five years have begun to realize that a centralized bureaucracy cannot solve their problems. The strong pressure at present is for a return to true federalism in America, with a remarkable revival of the popular faith in federalism and a marked down-grading of the national Government as the chosen instrument for solving domestic ills. This was the theme of a report filed in 1970 by the United States Advisory Commission on Inter-governmental Relations, which stated:

> Historians may single out the 1960's as one of the half-dozen periods of the country's history that were the most crucial for the survival of federalism in the United States.

The report attributed the death of the concept of an all-powerful Federal Government to "programme indigestion". The reaction against centralism and towards true federalism is a matter mainly of spirit; a realization that, in the long run, the only enduring progress is made locally where people live. That society is best that spreads human fallibility among several power centres, so that error can cancel error, rather than one which concentrates fallibility at a central point of maximum power. This briefly is the new perception in Great Britain and America that is forcing people back on themselves. Our system was originally designed on this perception, but if one reads the Loan Estimates one can detect that the power players of the centralized bureaucracy in Canberra, coupled with a centralist political leadership, are forcing the issues away from the new perception so obvious in America and Great Britain and which was obvious in Australia many years ago. The theme in this document is one of centralism: it is the theme in the regional council idea, the theme in nationalized medicine, and it was the theme in nationalized banking that saw the downfall of the Chifley Administration a quarter of a century ago.

In turning to the various allocations that have been made, I refer to the amount of $4,000,000 for roads and bridges. Last year the amount was $800,000. In his statement last year the Treasurer set out how the Eyre Highway was to be sealed. It was a rather intriguing financial arrangement in which money was to be transferred from the Electricity Trust Loan Account to the Highways Department: over five years the money was to be repaid to the Treasury, which would refund it to the trust. In his second reading explanation of this Bill the Chief Secretary said:

> I reported last year that the estimated cost of work remaining to complete the sealing of the Eyre Highway was about $7,500,000. Having regard to limits imposed on rural expenditure under the existing Commonwealth legislation and other pressing road needs in the State, it was obvious that, in the normal course of events, it would take between 12 and 15 years to finance the remaining construction. The Government regarded this prospect as unacceptable and it was resolved that the highway be sealed in the minimum time physically practicable. Alternative proposals, based on a four-year programme, were

adopted. In August last year, the Australian Government agreed to make a grant of one-third of the then estimated cost. The grant, extending over four years, was to total $2,500,000 payable at the rate of up to $625,000 a year. The Highways Department proceeded with the project. An amount of $1,087,000 was spent in 1972-73, and work was in progress on a length of some 140 miles (225.7 km). Construction of the remaining part of the highway is planned to begin in 1973-74.

The report states that the cost is now $9,300,000, and an approach was made to the Commonwealth Government to increase its contribution and to make money available for a shorter period of three years. The Commonwealth Government indicated that the shorter term was acceptable but it would not increase its contribution. Whilst I am pleased that this work is to continue, I have never favoured Loan funds being used for road construction. Perhaps I am old fashioned; nevertheless, I believe that any proposal for utilizing Loan funds for this purpose should be viewed with extreme caution. I mentioned this last year, and I mention it again now.

Since becoming a member of Parliament I have almost constantly drawn attention to the need in this State for a scheme to encourage an increase in private afforestation. In Victoria a scheme exists at present, but I believe that scheme would be of little value to existing private afforestation in South Australia. Particularly now with the proposed removal of the dairy subsidy at the Commonwealth level, assistance for the economic development of private forests becomes even more important. A scheme could be devised to increase the acreage of forests in South Australia. Such a scheme would cost the taxpayer nothing and would add considerably to the economic development of many parts of this State. I have put forward my ideas on this subject for many years, and I do not intend to bore the Council by restating that scheme, except to say that there are many references in *Hansard* to it. All I do is to draw the attention of the Council to the need for such a scheme.

I believe the department must examine the need for maximum timber production, because when one examines the total Australian imports of softwood one can see that there is a large list of them. Therefore, we must consider a scheme for diversifying the use of land at present under tree cultivation. Unless the department is prepared to diversify its land use policy then, inevitably, timber production will decline. I suggest that after one rotation a pasture development be undertaken for some years, because I am sure that, if the present policy of no crop rotation is continued, problems will arise in future in this State's forest enterprises. It may be possible to correct the problems that arise from mono-crop culture, whether trees or not. Scientific ways may be found to overcome the difficulties that are caused by mono-crop rotation, but the sure way to achieve an increase in fertility and an increase in production is by using crop rotation, which applies to the growth of trees as well as to any other crop. I hope the Government will experiment with crop rotation, because I am certain that the results would be well worth while.

I refer again this year to the subject of fishing havens. The allocation this year rises from $200,000 to $300,000, and I am pleased to see that increase, because I took very strong exception last year to the reduction that was made. In South Australia we are dealing with a fishing industry that has an export earning capacity of about $8,000,000, and is one of our important export earners. I believe, and have believed for some time, that there should be an increase in the facilities available to service this industry. There are two aspects that need to be considered: one is the need for more facilities for fishermen and the other is the need for more research to be undertaken. I firmly believe that our fishing resources are still largely untapped, and that more money should be allocated in both these areas to enable the industry to be brought to its maximum potential.

I turn now to the question of hospitals. This year the major amount to be spent for hospital buildings will be on the Flinders Medical Centre on which I commented rather fully last year. Everyone is looking forward to the completion of that centre, the concept of which is excellent. Whilst the Premier at times appears to take all the credit for the present concept I assure the Council that there have been several Ministers involved in that concept, and many of the changes were made when I held that portfolio. There is nothing more I need say except that the concept is one of the most advanced in Australia; indeed, it has excited comment from people overseas.

The establishment of a land commission in South Australia would, I am certain, engage the attention of some honourable members for some time in relation to constitutional questions that could arise. There are aspects I could discuss relating to irrigation, drainage, harbors, water works, sewerage and education, but I have taken the points which I believe are of great interest to me.

The lift in total allocation for housing this year is 9 per cent, and the works programme is up 15 per cent. If one compares these figures with rising costs and the obvious inflation, which someone reported to me today could be about 19 per cent for the last 12 months, one can see that the actual and physical result of the increased expenditure will probably see a slight down-turn in the amount of works completed in South Australia in the next 12 months. I support the Bill.

The Hon. C. M. HILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

## MARGARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 22. Page 449.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I rise to support this Bill and to make a few comments on it. It is not a matter of great contention; in fact, I believe the Minister is to be commended that this agreement was reached. In his second reading explanation the Minister stated that the Bill arose from an agreement between State Ministers of Agriculture. I presume that agreement was reached at the Australian Agricultural Council or at a meeting aligned thereto, in which the quotas were discussed. As the Minister said, our quota has been increased to 700 tons (711.2 tonnes) from about 520 tons (528.32 tonnes). I believe we can take some satisfaction from this increase. Clause 2 amends section 16 of the principal Act which provides that no licence under the Act shall be granted to any premises situated within 100 yards (91.44m) of a butter factory; this distance has now been extended slightly, by this amendment, to 100 m. We will no doubt come across clauses in other legislation that will make the necessary corrections, in the same way as we did when we converted to decimal currency. I think that all honourable members would agree that the problems envisaged in the change to decimal currency were satisfactorily overcome, but whether this will be so with metrication remains to be seen, because there may be more problems with metrication than there were with decimal currency.

The Hon. Mr. Story said that we had had a fairly low quota of about 460 tons (about 467.35t) in the early stages, but the amount was very gradually increased to 520 tons (528.32t). He also said that the increase

granted to South Australia was nothing like the increase granted to New South Wales, and that margarine that had been manufactured in other States and sold in South Australia could well have been made here. This can now occur. In the past, there have been divisions of opinion between margarine manufacturers and dairying interests, and for years we were subjected to the conflicting views of these people. However, apparently there is no division of opinion in this case, and this pleases me.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Which side are you on?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I am on the side of the primary producer. Nevertheless, I am pleased that the present solution has been found. There is now no conflict of views, so I am reliably informed, at least in official sources, if not among all the individuals concerned. I commend the Government for introducing the Bill, and I am always pleased to commend the Government when I have the opportunity to do so.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That's fairly often.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: From time to time, anyway. I support the Bill.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (Southern): I, too support the Bill. "Margarine" or "marjarine", depending on one's pronunciation, has been a matter of concern for a long time in arguments between the dairymen who produce butter and the margarine manufacturers. The constituent parts of margarine, which vary, are not laid down and strictly enforced. For instance, a factory in England that I visited professionally during the Second World War had to stop production because it did not have sufficient whale oil to put into its margarine. Apparently week by week these constituent parts varied, depending on what materials came from overseas. Cooking and table margarine are the two main types. Margarine is a substance that is capable of being used as a substitute for butter and that is prepared wholly or mainly from fats or oils, or a combination of the two, the fatty contents of which are not derived exclusively from milk. That is a wide definition.

Inspectors of butter, subject to the Margarine Act, may enter and search any place in which margarine or any fats, oils, or substance commonly used in the manufacture of margarine are stored, packed or sold, or are suspected of being manufactured, stored, packed or sold. That is a wide power. Understandably, dairymen are a thorn in the flesh of margarine manufacturers, and it is easy to understand how the makers of a table substitute that is popular with and accepted by many people in the world should have been subjected to criticism in the past. The 1939 legislation imposed a limit of not more than 312 tons (317t) on the quantity of margarine that could be manufactured here. However, in 1947 the specified limit was increased by one-fifth, and it was laid down that butterfat should not be included in margarine, although it provided that butterfat derived from skimmed milk containing no more than one-twentieth of 1 per cent of butterfat could be used as an emulsifying agent in the manufacture of margarine.

Similarly, margarine had to contain one-tenth of 1 per cent of dry starch or arrowroot intimately mixed with the other constituents of the margarine so that they could not be separated at any future time. The legislation provided that "margarine" had to be printed on the wrapper in bold faced black capital letters of not less than 30 points face, that is, about one-half an inch (12.7mm). Yet all this time people in the butter industry had no difficulty. They did not have to label their goods, so this tension between margarine manufacturers and dairymen must have grown considerably. Any premises which served food and which used margarine on rolls, sandwiches, etc., was compelled to display a notice that margarine was used on the premises. Failure to display the appropriate warning to the public gave the inspector the right to seize and retain any margarine pending a court decision.

The 1956 amending legislation removed the necessity of permits coming into effect in January each year and being valid for one year only. From 1956, the permits came into operation on the first day of any quarter of the calendar year. At this time, the manufacturers were permitted to make 528 tons (536.45t) of margarine. Understandably, there has always been and there still is strong feeling between the large and important dairying industry and margarine manufacturers. I pay my respects and offer my sympathy to the dairymen, whose problems are not always of their own making. In common with other primary producers, dairymen suffer many hardships that urban dwellers do not always fully appreciate.

It is reasonable to regard butter and margarine as different substances. Although they are different, they have certain similarities. To use an analogy, coal is a fuel, so are wood and oil. Although they are used as substitutes for each other, they are entirely different substances. I contend that we should think of margarine only as a substitute. Butter and margarine, although entirely different substances, serve the same purposes, and it is wrong that one should even try to masquerade as the other. Unfortunately, the most ardent advocates of freedom of choice must agree that the legislation regarding labelling and other regulations for margarine have too often been observed in the breach—and this is understandable when the authorities are trying to set up and expand a new thriving industry and are being hindered most of the time by various restrictions.

One of the commonly asserted views is the insistence upon the value of poly-unsaturated fats in the prevention of heart disease. It cannot be proved that that statement is accurate. What most medical authorities now agree upon in the present situation is that they recognize poly-unsaturated oils as a possible, and perhaps even probable, benefit to people with existing heart troubles; but it is of no benefit to people with no existing heart trouble. In other words, the cholesterol level in the blood would not seem in normal healthy people to be affected by diet and therefore primarily cause heart trouble.

I must add that medical researches and studies may one day well prove that I was telling an untruth in 1973 in this connection, if not in another connection, but recognized research over long periods of observation seems to make it quite definite that the use of poly-unsaturated fats does not affect the serum cholesterol level and, therefore, trigger off high blood pressure trouble. I emphasize that cases that already show a high blood pressure are generally advised to make use of poly-unsaturated fats, and this means table margarine instead of butter. Under this amending Bill, the amount of table margarine permitted to be made is now increased from 522 tons (530.35t) to 700 tons (711.2t). That is fair enough. Obviously, as I live in an area where a lot of dairying is carried on, I ask myself: how will this Bill affect the dairying industry? It is difficult not to accept that people have a right to freedom of choice of what they will spread on their bread.

Therefore, it is obvious that the amount of butter consumed could decrease, and the new quota level of 700 tons (711.2t) means that more people will be able to obtain margarine if they want to. But, if it is to be equated to an ever-increasing population and a widening

market both at home and overseas, coupled with the high quality of Australian butter—healthy competition—one wonders whether the dairying industry will suffer as badly as some people imagine it will. I hope not. For myself, I must truthfully confess that, living in an area where butter is produced, I like butter; I find the taste of margarine less palatable. So I assure the butter industry that it has at least one permanent supporter as a customer. I support the Bill.

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

**STOCK MEDICINES ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 22. Page 450.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): It is not often that twice in one afternoon I have the pleasure of commending the Government, but I believe that this Bill is commendable. As the Minister has said, it makes several more or less disconnected amendments to the principal Act, one of which indicates that there will be an increase in fee. This is regrettable, but one would be surprised if it were not so in the present inflationary situation. The amendment which allows registration for three years instead of one year is to be commended. I cannot commend the increase in fee, but it is sensible to have a registration situation in which a stock medicine can be registered for three years instead of one year.

I query one or two points in the Bill. I do not wish to deal with all the Minister's second reading explanation, but he said that clause 6 would repeal section 8 of the principal Act, which preserves the confidentiality of the information as to the prescription or composition of stock medicine. The Minister later said that any improper disclosure of information could be dealt with under the Public Service Act. I have established that all the members of the Stock Medicines Board are members of the Public Service, and have been for some considerable time. Presumably, the Government will be at pains to see that those gentlemen in future are members of the Public Service, in which case they would be subject to the Public Service Act. However, I query whether it is necessary to repeal completely section 8 of the principal Act. I notice that the Minister said that the existence of the provision somewhat inhibited the proper exchange of information between the States. Possibly, the exchange of information through the correct channels could be preserved without the complete repeal of this section.

I now refer briefly to clause 8, which the Minister said repeals section 14 of the principal Act and puls in its place a new section 14. I commend the provision in paragraph (*a*) of new subsection (1), which the Minister mentioned, which refers specifically to the possibility of problems with our exports, if they should contain certain substances used in stock medicines. I am aware that some prompt action would have to be taken in such a situation. Therefore, the Government is justified in inserting a provision such as this.

Speaking generally with regard to this Act, I consider that some variations should be made to the availability of antibiotics used as stock medicines from time to time. I was in another State not so long ago, where I was able to walk straight into a chemist's shop and buy a 30 cc phial of veterinary penicillin for stock. The chemist did not know me and had no means of satisfying himself whether or not I would use that penicillin correctly. That is not a good situation: it is an "open slather" situation, which is anything but wise. However, in this State the reverse situation obtains and there should be some relaxation of the availability of such drugs, particularly in areas where veterinary services are not readily obtainable. This could be achieved by a provision that people buying this material should sign a book similar to the poison book. The present situation there is that, if a primary producer wishes to get an antibiotic and he is regarded as a competent and experienced person by a veterinary surgeon, he will not find it very difficult to get a prescription from that veterinary surgeon and to get the material required.

The situation that could apply is that some availability and control could be provided by a chemist where a veterinary service was not readily obtainable. At present in other States there are areas where one can get the necessary commodity from a chemist and use it, provided that one is known and is regarded as a responsible stock-owner. However, in this State one must go to a veterinary surgeon, get a prescription, and often even get the material itself from the veterinary surgeon. The Government should therefore look again at this situation, particularly in areas far removed from veterinary services, and provide for availability of necessary drugs. This is the first time that the principal Act has been amended since the original Bill was passed in 1939. It is a good Bill, and I support the second reading.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (Southern): I, too, support the Bill. When I was preparing my speech I found the following definition of "stock medicine":

> "stock medicine" means any substance, or mixture, or compound of substances, or biological product, which is intended to be administered or applied to stock by any means for the purpose of:
>
> (*a*) preventing, diagnosing, curing or alleviating any disease or injury in or to such stock; or
>
> (*b*) improving the condition or increasing the capacity of such stock for work or production or show or racing purposes.

Regarding paragraph (*a*) of that definition, if we change the word "stock" to "human" we have a description of what I have done for all my working life. It is amazing that there is so much similarity of thought between the human world and the animal world.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: They treat animals like humans today.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: That is jolly decent of them; I wish they would treat humans like animals sometimes. I see no reason why the registration period for stock medicines should not be increased from one year to three years. New drugs are coming on to the market all the time, and some of those drugs have to be added to the list. So, it is obvious that a reasonable registration period must be provided. Of course, the longer the registration period the greater the fee. When I was thinking of stock medicines I thought of the risk that so much modern medicine carries.

Drugs are potent weapons with side effects, some short lived and some long lived, some mild and some serious. Indeed, some side effects can even be fatal. I am saying this is as a result of my medical experience; I do not know the reaction of animals to many of these drugs. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether any regulations are laid down whereby the person administering the medicines has to adopt protective measures?

Clause 7 is intended to relieve the Chief Inspector of Stock of the duty of publishing the register of stock medicines in the *Gazette* each year. In view of the ever-increasing use of antibiotics, can the Minister say whether any literature is sent to primary producers instructing them how to use such substances? Is there any way of quickly notifying a primary producer that a drug, once

considered harmless, is now revealed as being potentially dangerous? I was thinking of the tragic consequences of the use of thalidomide in connection with humans; perhaps a drug could have a similar side effect on animals. I support the Bill.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYM1LL (Central No. 2): I support the contention of the Hon. Mr. Dawkins about the lack of availability of antibiotics, except on prescription. As a grazier of some note myself, I have run up against this self-same problem. This relates particularly to sheep. The cost of getting a veterinary surgeon to an ordinary sheep last year would have been greater than the value of the animal itself. During the last two years we had this problem on my little farm. We knew exactly what one or two of our sheep needed, but we could not get it without calling in a veterinary surgeon, and it was not worth doing that. Finally, by a bit of skulduggery, we managed to get what we wanted, and that was that. In that way we managed to cure stock that would otherwise have died. The unavailability of antibiotics to the ordinary grazier is probably related in some way to a fear that he might be obtaining the antibiotics for use on humans.

The Hon. V. G. Springett: It has been done.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Yes. I believe that the Hon. Mr. Dawkins' suggestion should be followed up. If people are certified as being competent to use these medicines, they should be entitled to get them, within reason.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: How would you define "competent grazier"?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I would define "competent grazier" as a man who makes money out of running a grazing property. Until recently there were no competent graziers at all! However, there are quite a number of them this year, I am happy to say. I must say seriously, from my small experience, that there is something wrong here that ought to be cured: I do not know what the solution is, but I imagine that the reason I have given in connection with the unavailability of some drugs is the correct one. There must be a way of overcoming the difficulty. One does not have to call in a veterinary surgeon to know that a sheep needs an injection of antibiotics; any experienced grazier can tell what is needed. It is a farce to call in a veterinary surgeon at a fee that bears no relation to the value of the animal.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Are they higher than doctors' fees?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I do not know. I have much sympathy with doctors and I do not consider that they should be the only people who cannot increase their fees.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They are not the only people!

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: The Hon. Mr. Shard was in scintillating form yesterday, but he seems to be covered in some sort of gloom today. However, I think I know what he means. I hope that the Minister will consider the question raised by the Hon. Mr. Dawkins in order to ascertain whether the problem can be solved. He would be doing a great service to many graziers if he could produce a solution to this problem. I think there may be a drafting imperfection in clause 8, which repeals section 14 of the Act and substitutes a new section that is rather different from the old one. I draw the attention of honourable members to that new section, which provides:

14. (1) Where the board is satisfied on such evidence as it considers reasonable that the use or continued use of a registered stock medicine—

(*a*) constitutes or may constitute a danger to public health;

Paragraph (*c*) provides:

constitutes or may constitute a danger to stock; or

Paragraph (*d*) provides:

affects or may affect the export from this State of products derived directly or indirectly from the animals or birds in respect of which it is intended for use,

Paragraph (*b*) provides:

does or may not achieve the results claimed for that use;

If honourable members care to experiment with a few commas, they will realize that as at present drawn new paragraph (*b*) is ambiguous. I think it is intended to mean "does not or may not achieve the results claimed . . ." However, it does not state that. If a comma were placed after "does" it would then read "does, or may not achieve the results claimed for that use". This would mean that it does achieve or may not achieve the results claimed for that use. However, if the comma is also placed after "may" it would read "does, or may, not achieve the results claimed for that use", and I think that is what is meant. I think the Minister should consider placing commas after the words "does" and "may", and this would place the interpretation as it should be, as the paragraph should read "does not or may not achieve the results claimed for that use". I support the Bill, and I hope that we will hear more about the points that have been raised before it is passed.

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

## ADJOURNMENT

At 4.4 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 28, at 2.15 p.m.