HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, November 1, 1951.

The SPEAKER (Hon. Sir Robert Nicholls) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

LANDLORD AND TENANT COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS laid on the table the report of the Committee of Inquiry on the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act, 1942-1950. Ordered to be printed.

MOORLANDS COALFIELD.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I noticed a report in this morning's *Advertiser* that, as the result of the exploratory boring programme carried out on the Moorlands coalfield by the Mines Department, the existence of 30,000,000 tons of coal capable of being won by open mining methods has been proved. It was also indicated that experiments are now being conducted by the Electricity Trust to ascertain if this coal can be used commercially. As I believe there are distinct possibilities of the production of power for local purposes being derived from this coal, as adequate water supplies are available, can the Minister of Lands, in the absence of the Premier, assure the House that these experiments will be prosecuted quickly and fully in order to test the possibility of establishing a power house at or near Moorlands to generate electricity for that area and the river districts?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I saw the report and I can assure the House that the Government is most anxious, if coal exists there in sufficient quantity and quality, to make the best use of it. I will certainly take up the matter with both the Treasurer and Minister of Mines and bring down a report.

KROEMER'S RAILWAY CROSSING.

Mr. TEUSNER—I draw the attention of the Minister of Railways to the large number of accidents which have occurred at Kroemer's railway crossing near Nuriootpa. I understand that a census was taken and it was found that in the past year there have been about 12 accidents at the crossing. Several accidents at the spot proved fatal. Though people in the locality are aware of the road across the line and the "S" shaped bend, it appears that many people living beyond the confines of the district are unaware of it. Will the Minister take up the matter with the Railways Department and ascertain whether the crossing is dangerous, and, if so, put a proper road sign in the vicinity to indicate the sharp bend, and take such other steps as are necessary to ensure safety at the crossing?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Yes. I will approach the matter from two angles. From the railway point of view I do not know whether we can do more than to erect a warning signal and perhaps, a "Stop" sign. From a road point of view, I do not know whether it is a main road.

Mr. Teusner—It is.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—In that case I will ascertain whether the Highway's Commissioner can suggest anything to further the safety of the public. All railway crossings are dangerous, as are tramway crossings, and every step will be taken and has always been taken to minimize the danger. I understand that South Australia has more automatic signals than any other State, yet we still have some fatal accidents. Anything useful that can be done I am sure will be done by both the Railways Commissioner and the Highways Commissioner.

OVERSEAS LABOUR FOR BRICK INDUSTRY.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—It has been brought to my notice that a prominent brick manufacturer is likely to make an overseas trip in the near future. I understand that the brick manufacturing industry is short of labour. Can the Minister of Lands, representing the Treasurer, say whether it would be possible for the Government to authorize this man to recruit overseas much-needed labour for the brick industry, and if suitable labour can be obtained, can accommodation be offered to people willing to come here to work?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—These obviously are questions for the Premier, who is Minister of Industry. I suggest that early next week, on the Premier's return, the honourable member introduce the man who is going overseas to the Premier with a view to discussing what can be done.

SALT WATER IN LOWER MURRAY.

Mr. DUNN—In this morning's Press there is a letter from H. A. Armfield drawing attention to the large amount of salt water that is being blown by the high winds beyond Goolwa into the lakes with the result that large numbers of fish are being killed. Will the Minister of Works obtain a report on the matter?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Yes.

SISAL HEMP PRODUCTION.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I understand the Minister in charge of the House has some information in reply to a question I asked on October 11, regarding the possibility of growing sisal hemp in Australia.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The Minister of Agriculture gave me the following report by the Senior Research Officer of the Department of Agriculture before the Minister left the State this morning:—

There is considerable confusion of names used to designate fibres and fibre producing plants. The name "sisal" refers to one of the hard fibres produced from the plant *Agave sisalana*, whereas hemp is applied to one of the soft fibres produced from the plant *Cannabis sativa*. As several species of agave are growing in the University grounds, it is possibly the former to which Sir Kerr Grant has drawn attention. However, to our knowledge no determined species of *Agave sisalana* occur in South Australia, although numerous well grown species of *Agave Americiana* occur. Sisal originated in the Yucatan Peninsula and is now cultivated commercially on large plantations in the State of Campoche, Mexico, and in Haiti in the American tropics, in Kenya, Tanganyika, Mozambique, Togoland, and Senegal in Africa; and in Java and Sumatra in the Netherlands Indies. As indicated, sisal is a tropical plant and all sisal plantations now in operation are within the tropics. The average annual rainfall at Yucatan is about 30in. and the temperature ranges between 50 deg. and 100 deg. F. rarely falling below 60 deg. F. Dry air and abundant sunshine are necessary for drying and bleaching the fibre. Well drained soils of rather loose or open texture, allowing aeration of the roots are the most suitable for sisal growing. On the best plantations in East Africa and Java the yield of dry sisal fibre is about 1,760 lb. per acre per annum during the period of production which ranges from four to six years. Considerable labour is entailed in planting, cultivation and harvesting of the crop. Athough there are undoubtedly areas in South Australia where sisal will grow satisfactorily under irrigation, it is considered that its cultivation in this State would not be economic. Some of the more tropical areas of Australia and possibly New Guinea may prove climatically and therefore economically more suitable for its cultivation.

COMPANY RETURNS.

Mr. CLARKE—Annual returns are required to be filed by every limited company 30 days after the end of September each year. I am reliably informed that an increasing number of persons are filing their returns one day late through the erroneous assumption that the filing day is October 31 instead of October 30. Will the Minister of Works take up the matter with the Attorney-General and see if it is possible to make the time one month after September 30, rather than 30 days, to avoid confusion and late filing of many of the returns?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Yes.

WHYALLA SEWERAGE.

Mr. RICHES—On October 18 the Minister of Works promised to make inquiries regarding the compilation of data on the Whyalla sewerage scheme. Has he anything to report yet?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—No. I am afraid that the data could not be given intelligently in a short reply to the honourable member's question. I will obtain the latest data and make them available to him, either by way of a docket or letter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: MR. H. S. DUNKS.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS moved:—

That one month's leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Mitcham (Mr. H. S. Dunks) on account of illness.

Motion carried.

LANDLORD AND TENANT (CONTROL OF RENTS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. C. S. Hincks for the Hon. T. PLAYFORD, having obtained leave, introduced a Bill to amend the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act, 1942-1950. Read a first time.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 10. Page 874.)

Mr. PATTINSON (Glenelg)—When this Bill was last before the House I was discussing clause 14, which amends section 48 of the principal Act and concerns increased penalties for driving a motor vehicle whilst under the influence of intoxicating liquor or a drug. The main objects of this Bill are, firstly, to empower the court, if it thinks fit to do so in a particular case, to impose a penalty of imprisonment for a first offence, and, secondly, to make imprisonment compulsory for a second offence. I was then confirming in some detail the statement made by the Premier in his speech that the present penalties have failed either to reduce or to stem these offences and that this Parliament should give the courts in this State the same powers as those possessed by courts in all other States and in the Australian Capital Territory.

Since the House last discussed the Bill I found there still appears to be a popular misconception that the State Traffic Committee

in recommending imprisonment for a first offence at the option of the court has recommended something novel, whereas actually if Parliament passes this clause it will only at long last come into line with the laws of the other States, the Australian Capital Territory, New Zealand, and Great Britain. It may be of interest to members to know that in the interests of public safety all the States of America have enacted laws providing penalties of varying degrees of severity for anyone driving whilst under the influence of alcohol. In most of the States of America this is regarded as a criminal or penal offence, and in many instances the person is committed for trial by jury for what seems to be regarded in some quarters in this State as a trivial offence. In various European countries it is regarded as very serious and long terms of imprisonment are often imposed, and in some cases permanent disqualification for driving a motor vehicle as well. It will be seen, therefore, that the amendment merely giving the option to the court to impose imprisonment for the first offence is by no means novel, and the suggested penalties, if agreed to, will be much less severe than in the other States of Australia and in most other countries. I am not a teetotaller and do not object to any other person drinking intoxicating liquor in moderation, but I believe that drinking and driving do not go hand in hand, and that a motor vehicle is a dangerous lethal weapon in the charge of a person who is intoxicated or not in full possession of his physical or mental faculties. Further, the average person who can afford to own and run a motor car can also afford to hire a taxi or make other arrangements for conveyance to his home if, unfortunately, on occasion he should drink a little to excess. Some people fear that an innocent man may be wrongly convicted of driving under the influence through some mistake on the part of the police or the police doctor who examines him.

Before the adjournment of this debate three weeks ago I explained what took place when a person suspected of driving under the influence was examined by the police doctor, but I am inclined to think, like some of the public and members of this House, that there is a possibility of error on occasions. In 1947 the State Traffic Committee was considering this matter and spent much time discussing whether there was some better method of ascertaining whether a person was under the influence of intoxicating liquor. The committee took evidence from Sir Stanton Hicks, Professor of Physiology and Pharmacology at the University of Adelaide, and Dr. A. W. Welch, who has been police doctor for at least 15 years, but they were somewhat at variance in their opinions. Sir Stanton advocated the introduction of blood tests, whereas Dr. Welch was not enamoured of that procedure. Sir Stanton considered that if blood tests were compulsory there would be a greater degree of accuracy in the evidence submitted to the court. He said a blood test was a reliable, objective test, and that a blood sample could be easily taken by a doctor or by the police and accurately analyzed chemically by a Government or other competent analyst for its alcoholic content.

Mr. Teusner—He did not regard it as infallible?

Mr. PATTINSON—No, but more reliable than the other tests. When I was speaking on the last occasion I was reminded by the honourable member that doctors in the country and other parts are not called upon to make frequent tests. Whether or not they are as competent as Dr. Welch and his assistants, Sir Stanton Hicks was not highly flattering about the ability of the average practitioner to make these tests without error. While he did not say that blood tests were infallible he considered they were a most reliable and accurate test. Dr. Welch was less enthusiastic about them and referred the committee to a textbook on *Applied Pharmacology* by Professor Clark in which he stated, "This test provides direct objective evidence regarding the amount of alcohol in the subject, although it does not provide any certain evidence concerning the effect produced by the drug on his conduct." He further stated, "It is very unsafe to assume that one test is more reliable than the other, because no blood alcohol test for clinical examination measures the power of the individual to manage a motor. Direct evidence on this subject is, however, available." Sir Stanton Hicks did not say that blood tests should be the sole test, but that the result of the test should be used as collateral to the direct evidence of the person who saw the suspect at the time and also the direct evidence of the police doctor who examined him at the relevant time. In any event members of the committee decided not to recommend to Parliament the introduction of compulsory blood tests—firstly, because they were not in favour of them and, secondly, they did not think this Parliament would agree to

them because they would be an unnecessary invasion of the liberty of the subject. It would, of course, be physical assault by the person who conducted the test. I am referring to the matter now because last week a noted authority, the City Coroner, Mr. T. E. Cleland, who is not only a legal expert, but, if I might say so, a legal-medical expert, who has done a great deal of study in the field where medical and legal science coalesce, referred, when giving a decision in a coronial inquiry, to the question of optional blood tests. He said that at least the person arrested and charged with the offence should have the opportunity of submitting himself to a blood test. I desire to place on record the exact words used by the Coroner on that occasion and they were:—

The effects of shock, cerebral injury and certain pathological conditions may be indistinguishable from signs of intoxication. It is recorded that of 1,150 consecutive cases admitted into a hospital with a diagnosis of acute alcoholism, 72 were found to have no alcohol in the blood and be suffering from other conditions. If in addition to the effects of some other condition liquor is smelt a court might come to a wrong conclusion. In such circumstances the determining factor would be the blood alcohol concentration. If, as I believe, Browne was sober a blood test would have established the fact beyond doubt. On the other hand, if Browne were intoxicated to the extent that the conduct observed by the police officers suggested a blood test would have established that condition. Blood alcohol may be equivocal only between certain limits. In other parts of the world a concentration of 0.05 per cent is evident that the subject was not intoxicated, and one of 0.15 per cent is evidence that he was. In South Australia experience is limited to the blood alcohol concentrations of deceased persons where the facts suggest that they may have been under the influence of liquor, and that experience indicates that the limits mentioned are sound.

In my opinion a person arrested and charged with being so much under the influence of intoxicating liquor as to be incapable of exercising effective control of a motor vehicle should at least be given the opportunity of submitting to a blood alcohol test. Indeed it might be argued that failure to give such an opportunity should operate in favour of an accused person and against the prosecution.

Compulsory blood tests have been in operation in Sweden for more than 20 years, and, according to all reports I have read, have proved a success. They are undertaken in some other European countries and in many of the States of America, in some of which they are compulsory and in others optional. Whether compulsory or optional, I believe that blood tests have the force of law in the majority of the States of America. I shall quote from Mr. Glenn C. Forrester, a well-known American authority, who in his book, *Chemical Tests for Alcohol in Traffic Law Enforcement*, says:—

The general value of chemical tests and the attitude towards such legislation can best be summarized by quoting expressions of the foremost national organizations concerned with safety and law enforcement. American Bar Association—"We approve the use of chemical tests for intoxication in the trial of traffic violations." American Medical Association—". . . these standards have proved themselves to be fair and practical . . . Chemical tests can be performed with remarkable accuracy and are the best means of proving alcoholic influence . . . Uniform legislation modelled after the Indiana law has been approved in principle by the board of directors."

Federal Bureau of Investigation—"The technical laboratory of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is fully equipped to handle for alcohol determination, blood, urine, saliva or spinal fluid specimens when submitted by law enforcement agencies. The Federal Bureau of Investigation will gladly submit reports and furnish testimony with regard to its laboratory findings." International Association of Chiefs of Police—"Give enforcement attention not only to the drunken driver but also to the drinking driver. To make this possible of accomplishment, adopt a scientific method of determining intoxication, using chemical tests. Prosecution for intoxication should follow in all cases where the blood alcohol content exceeds 0.15 per cent." National Safety Council—"Chemical tests of body fluids or breath should be used in all cases where influence of alcoholic liquor is suspected . . . Each State should consider adoption of legislation dealing with the use of evidence obtained from chemical tests."

The National Conference of Street and Highway Safety provided that cognizance be taken of the alcohol content of the driver's breath, blood, urine or other body substance as determined by laboratory test in determining the extent to which he is under the influence. It has been found that use of chemical tests results in an increase in the number of arrests which can safely be made for driving while under the influence, since the officers feel more secure in making the charge. A much higher percentage of guilty pleas is obtained, because the suspect learns that the usual subterfuges will not stand inspection in the light of scientific facts. The community is saved considerable trial expenses, and the courts and enforcement machinery are freed for other necessary work. A higher percentage of convictions in cases which do go to trial is secured thus assessing the costs to the true offender. Chemical tests eliminate the embarrassment to the officer of false arrests on this charge, and avoid the sometimes fatal mistake of jailing a suspect who may exhibit the superficial symptoms of intoxication but who, in fact, has been stricken by some malady

which urgently needs immediate medical attention. The blood alcohol standards set by the National Safety Council Committee on Tests for Intoxication are very liberal. The experiments cited and many others demonstrate that abstainers and many moderate drinkers show the influence of alcohol before a concentration of .05 per cent is reached; and even heavy drinkers, possessing the greatest tolerance to alcohol, show influence at concentrations between .07 per cent and .09 per cent. Chemical tests are eminently fair in apprehending the drinking driver and in exonerating the innocent.

I do not propose to take the discussion on medical tests any further this afternoon because this Bill will not proceed very far today, but I desire to place those opinions on record because I have a very great respect for the authority of the City Coroner and I think, out of courtesy to him if nothing else, I should endeavour to bring his suggestions before the appropriate tribunal, which is this Parliament. Probably in the committee stages I shall have something more to say on it.

I do not propose to go right through the Bill, but there is one other matter of importance I desire to touch upon, and that is clause 17, which seeks to amend the law with regard to compulsory insurance. Section 70c (2), which this clause amends, reads:—

(2) A policy of insurance shall be deemed to comply with this Part notwithstanding that the liability of the insurer—(*a*) is limited to two thousand pounds in respect of any claim made by or in respect of any passenger carried in the vehicle mentioned in the policy, and to twenty thousand pounds in respect of all claims made by or in respect of such passengers, and such limits shall be inclusive of all costs in relation to any such claim or claims:

I remind the House that those limits of compulsory insurance of £2,000 a person and a total of £20,000 for a passenger coach were introduced by this Parliament as long ago as 1937, when we had not emerged from the depression of the thirties, and £2,000 was then a considerable sum in purchasing power. The value of money, however, has depreciated enormously in the intervening 14 years and the ordinary member of the public who is run down by a motor vehicle, or his dependants, if he is killed, are placed in a false sense of security because they imagine at least that the owner of the motor vehicle is adequately secured against all claims for damage, whereas of course he is not, because the courts have given very substantial damages of up to £4,000 and £5,000 as the result of accidents caused by motor vehicles. One may imagine that a person who owns and drives a motor car is a man of substance, but probably one-half or two-thirds of the motor vehicles are purchased on hire-purchase agreement, and the average owner is not the man of substance he may be thought to be, and after the £2,000 is exhausted the dependants of the deceased person may be unable to secure the balance of the claim. This matter was referred to the committee by the South Australian Road Transport Association, the Metropolitan Omnibus Operators, the Country Road Passenger Service Operators, the South Australian Country Goods Services, and the Taxi Cabs and Hire Car Owners Association. They suggested that the law in this State should be brought into line with that in New South Wales and some of the other States, which requires a larger sum for ordinary compulsory insurance and unlimited liability in the case of vehicles carrying passengers for hire. The committee endorsed their view and recommended to the Government that the ordinary limit be raised to £4,000 in the case of the individual, and in the case of fare-paying passengers that the existing over-all limit of £20,000 should be removed altogether. In recent months tragedies involving large numbers of lives have been caused by accidents in Victoria, New South Wales and New Zealand, notwithstanding the high standard of driving, and the high vehicular standard of the buses concerned, and the passengers may not be as secure as they may have reasonably believed they were. I am referring to these things for the particular reason that I desire my remarks included in *Hansard* before the Bill reaches the Committee stage. There is only one other point I desire to touch upon. Clauses 20, 23 and 24, deal with the right of way of vehicles at crossovers on double roads, and clause 21 with the mode of turning to the right on the carriage way on a double road. The Premier, in his second reading speech (*Hansard*, p. 834-5), explained the reasons for the introduction of this amendment, and I do not desire to repeat what has already been recorded, but I want to say that the Commissioner of Police obtained a report from the Police Traffic Advisory Committee on the question of the control of traffic in crossovers and on dual highways, and I quote the following from its report:—

It was unanimously decided by the committee that in their opinion, a vehicle, when crossing a dual highway upon a crossover forming portion of a road which completely intersects such dual highway, should retain the right of way, as conferred by section 131 of the Road Traffic Act, 1934-50, whilst continuing on its course without change of speed. If, however,

the rider or driver of a vehicle in a cross-over at an intersection intends to make a righthand turn into a carriageway of a dual highway his right-of-way under section 131 should be removed under the provision of section 12 of the proposed amending Bill.

The report also stated:—

The committee is unanimously in agreement that riders or drivers of vehicles in any cross-over of a dual highway, not being portion of a complete intersection of such dual highway, should be deprived of right-of-way over any traffic on either of the carriageways which form a dual highway.

A further resolution by the committee was:—

That section 131 of the Road Traffic Act apply to any intersecting road and no restriction in regard to right-of-way should be placed on a vehicle proceeding straight ahead, but a vehicle loses the right-of-way if making a righthand turn, as defined by section 12 of the proposed amending Act.

The Royal Automobile Association of South Australia agrees with every recommendation made by the State Traffic Committee and included in the Bill, with the exception of this one, in regard to which the secretary of the association, Mr. Bruce Boykett, wrote to me as follows:—

At the direction of my committee I submit hereunder its views concerning section 21 (*b*) of the Road Traffic Act Amendment Bill 1951 which deals with the right-of-way at junctions and intersections as regards drivers about to make a righthand turn from an adjoining street. At the outset it is as well to emphasize that the committee is in full agreement with all other provisions of the Bill and regards the measure as an important contribution to safety on our roads. The effect of subclause (*b*) is that a driver entering an intersection or junction and about to turn right will be deprived of the right-of-way over vehicles on his left. This upsets the right-of-way rule which has stood the test of time, has operated satisfactorily, and is clearly understood. It is regarded as a drastic departure from established custom and practice. In the opinion of the committee nothing simpler nor more clear-cut than the existing rule could be devised because in all circumstances the direction from which a vehicle approaches an intersection or junction determines which shall have the right-of-way; whether the vehicle proceeds straight ahead or turns right in the intersection or junction is quite immaterial. In other words, the right-of-way comes into operation as the vehicles approach each other, so that the driver who has the other on his right automatically slows down and yields the way. Whether the driver on the right proceeds straight ahead or turns right when he reaches the intersection has no bearing whatever, because of the simple fact that he will have already been conceded the right-of-way.

It is necessary again to emphasize that this rule is fully understood and has worked satisfactorily over a long period of years. The Association Committee is seriously disturbed at the implications of the proposed alteration, and feels that to introduce any variation of the present simple rule is to manufacture complications and difficulties where none exist at present. To illustrate this point, it may well be asked how a driver would know the intentions of the driver on his right approaching an intersection. Under the present rule he gives way and there is an end of it. Under the proposed rule he cannot possibly know whether to give way or not until the driver on his right either proceeds straight ahead or turns to the right. Confusion and uncertainty will inevitably result, with much delay and congestion where none exists today. Summed up, therefore, the committee of the association is at a loss to understand the purpose in proposing such a sweeping alteration to a rule which has proved in practice as the ideal of simplicity and effectiveness. If any alteration is justified in order to clarify the position as regards turning to the right, then it should be in respect of the section which dictates the turn-right procedure, so as to make the right of way rule paramount.

Finally, an important factor in this regard which has much merit is that the present right-of way rule complies with the uniformity objects of the Commonwealth Traffic Code Committee. Even from this one angle it would, to say the least of it, be a pity for South Australia deliberately to become out of step at this juncture when the other States have agreed on the present rule.

There is a lot of merit in the contention in the letter. We had the report of the Police Traffic Advisory Committee to go on.

The Hon. S. W. Jeffries—Was your committee unanimous on the matter?

Mr. PATTINSON—The representative of the association dissented, but all the other members agreed to it. After giving the matter careful consideration they decided that it was satisfactory.

The Hon. S. W. Jeffries—Your committee had the benefit of the R.A.A. criticism?

Mr. PATTINSON—Yes, as well as evidence by Mr. Boykett. Frequently the committee asked him to come to meetings to discuss matters. On this occasion he asked whether he could come and discuss the matter with the committee, and he did so for an hour or more. Then the members of the committee discussed it. Finally they almost unanimously adopted the recommendation.

The Hon. S. W. Jeffries—No new matter has been raised in the letter?

Mr. PATTINSON—No.

Mr. Hawker—Were you at the committee meeting when the matter was discussed with Mr. Boykett?

Mr. PATTINSON—Yes. I was not at the final meeting of the committee when the matter

was discussed, but I approved of the recommendation. I am not a traffic expert, but I have had practical experience of driving many times a week over a dual highway. I refer to Anzac Highway; I do not know much about the Port Road. I am convinced that by and large the decision of the Traffic Committee, once clearly understood, will be of greater benefit to the travelling public than the suggestion by the Automobile Association.

Mr. Shannon—The letter from the association has an important bearing on the matter. I refer to the breaking away from the uniform approach by the Commonwealth.

Mr. PATTINSON—Several committees were appointed by the Commonwealth Government when Mr. E. Ward was Minister for Transport, one to deal with uniform traffic laws throughout Australia and another to deal with vehicle standards. The committees have met at various times in capital cities and have found great difficulty in arriving at uniformity, even by members of the Uniform Vehicle Standards Committee. I understand that it is coming to the end of its labours and is on the point of asking the six State Governments to refer its recommendations to their various traffic authorities in the very faint hope, I think, of persuading all State Parliaments to repeal existing laws, which have grown up by trial and error over a period, and adopt a new code of laws. I do not condemn the proposals as I believe there is considerable merit in a large number, but I am not sufficiently optimistic to think that Australia will ever get uniform traffic laws or uniform vehicle standards laws with six State Parliaments and a Minister in Canberra who makes traffic laws by ordinance.

I do not think that the point made by Mr. Boykett has as much merit as would appear. For example, uniform standards for vehicles, which might on the surface appear to be something on which we could obtain uniformity more easily than on uniform traffic laws, has caused much discussion. A committee of experts was appointed to deal with this question and, I believe, laboured for about four years. A few months ago the Uniform Vehicle Standards Committee visited South Australia and had a day's meeting with members of the State Traffic Committee. The meeting had not proceeded half an hour before some members of the Standards Committee had differences of opinion with practical members of my committee. One was Mr. Fred Stevens, President of the South Australian Road Transport Association, who has had long and wide practical traffic experience. There was a wide exchange of views between highly learned but theoretical members of the Standards Committee with the practical realism of the president of the South Australian Road Transport Association.

The Hon. S. W. Jeffries—Is there uniformity now?

Mr. PATTINSON—The Uniform Traffic Laws Advisory Committee has been meeting in various capital cities and, I am informed, has arrived at a decision recommending all States to adopt uniform rules.

Mr. Shannon—How many States adopt the short right-hand turn?

Mr. PATTINSON—Perhaps three or four.

Mr. Shannon—Is there any uniformity about that matter?

Mr. PATTINSON—No; Victoria certainly is not in agreement, but I think New South Wales and Queensland have uniformity. We adopted it largely on the recommendation of New South Wales.

Mr. Shannon—Has it been a success?

Mr. PATTINSON—I think so. We should endeavour to make our traffic laws simple and uniform, but we should not strive to get uniformity merely for the sake of uniformity. The Bill is essentially a Committee one dealing with wholly unrelated amendments to the law and I think it can be better discussed there. I therefore reserve any further remarks on the matter.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Goodwood)—I support the second reading and agree with the member for Glenelg and the Leader of the Opposition that the Bill can be more appropriately discussed in Committee. I congratulate Mr. Pattinson, who is chairman of the State Traffic Committee, on his explanations which should prove of great benefit to members. The question of protection for pedestrians arises and it would appear that we are becoming somewhat casual in our approach to this problem. Attempts are being made to make people use pedestrian traffic lanes in some of our main streets, but many seek to use crossings which are not meant to be used, particularly in our busy thoroughfares. Frequently people who stand in safety zones waiting for trams are subjected to injury by careless motor drivers. In the interests of safety people should be compelled to cross roadways at defined crossing points. Pedestrians crossing streets at night should cross under street lights and not at other parts where motorists whose lights are dimmed may be unable to see them. Clause 11 provides for the fitting of

mechanical signals on wide vehicles. How often do the drivers of cars fitted with such signals use them to show that they are about to turn, and after turning leave them showing for perhaps a mile or two before switching them off? This is most confusing to oncoming drivers. Consideration should be given to the undesirability of parking wide vehicles in streets insufficiently wide to allow a free movement of traffic. Some sporting people find it necessary to tow horse floats behind their cars; but often the drivers of such vehicles do not extend as much courtesy as they should to other road users. The only time such drivers seem to drive in an orderly manner is when a police outfit is in sight. No vehicle which is being towed behind another should exceed the width of the driving vehicle; but I have seen some horse floats much wider than the vehicles towing them. In some cases a single unit such as a motor lorry fitted out as a horse box is used; but a trailer designed to carry three horses must be constructed so wide as to be dangerous. The wheels of a double-box horse float being towed should not protrude beyond the box itself, but should be enclosed within the framework.

Mr. Quirke—That would increase the height of the superstructure and the vehicle could be easily tipped over.

Mr. FRANK WALSH——No horse float capable of holding three horses across its width should be permitted to be towed behind a motor car or truck. Parliament should pay particular attention to the question of the dipping of headlights. When legislation is passed Parliament should see that it is enforced. Many smaller types of sports models have fog lamps. The head lamps can be dimmed, but the owners forget they have fog lamps, which are not needed in the metropolitan area. Many cars have one bright light and one dim light. Oncoming motorists would not know whether they were approaching a motor cycle and side car or a motor car. Every year the Road Safety Council, Royal Automobile Association and police officers conduct free lighting tests in Cohen Avenue. They inform owners whether their car lights are faulty, but it is extraordinary that the following week there seem to be more faulty lights than there were before the test. The remedy seems to be an education campaign by police officers.

Mr. Quirke—Some cars are constructed so as to provide a bright light on the near side and a dim light on the off side.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—On some cars it is the reverse. I am concerned about motorists travelling in the opposite direction to those with faulty headlamps. Nothing is more intimidating to road users than to be confronted with an oncoming car having one bright light and one dim light. I have sometimes had to stop in the interests of my own safety to allow another motorist breaking the law to pass me. The police should prosecute more offenders who do not dip their lights.

Mr. O'Halloran—We might amend the law to enable their licences to be cancelled.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Yes. I often wonder why many English cars have particularly bright headlights. Clause 26 deals with the road-worthiness of vehicles. The time is long overdue when the law should provide that unsafe vehicles shall be subject to inspection and if found mechanically faulty prevented from further use until made roadworthy.

Mr. O'Halloran—You would not say that a poor old vehicle that chugs along at 15 miles an hour is a menace?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Sometimes they are a great menace because the driver wants more than his fair share of the road. If an old vehicle is to be sold, the onus should be placed on the owner to prove that it meets the standard proposed in this clause. Purchasers would then be protected. Some vehicles today are not roadworthy. It is time that police officers took action to warn those drivers who do not keep far enough over to the left. Apparently the police make a concerted drive against motorists who do not stop at "Stop" signs. I agree that the sign should be obeyed, but the police should have discretionary power. Recently a person I know was reported for not stopping at a "Stop" sign in a northern suburb on a Sunday afternoon at 5 o'clock. The report showed that he passed the sign travelling about four miles an hour and there was no other traffic in the vicinity. In the circumstances, the driver could be considered to have stopped, but the law provides that if a person does not actually stop he can be fined. On numerous occasions I have noticed drivers failing to stop at "Stop" signs before entering West Terrace. For that offence in such busy thoroughfares the penalty is not sufficiently drastic, because they are a menace to other road users. The Committee will be faced with making very important decisions on the Bill, chief of which relates to drunken driving. This provision should apply not only to the drivers of vehicles, but also to those who ride bicycles. One of

the greatest menaces on the road is the person who will drive a vehicle while inebriated. No penalty is too heavy for such offenders. Protection must be afforded to other road users. I support this provision and hope it will be a deterrent to those who attempt to drive vehicles after having taken intoxicating liquor. I support the second reading.

Mr. QUIRKE (Stanley)—I will first deal with the proposed increased fees for diesel-engined vehicles. This type is unduly blamed for damage to the roads, but they do not contribute as much to the damage as petrol-driven vehicles. The reason is the diesel-engined vehicle cannot be driven as fast because the revolutions of the engines are slower. I should say it would be exceptional to find a diesel truck exceeding 42 to 45 miles an hour, as the engines are necessarily governed back. I am not opposed to the provision that diesel-operated vehicles should pay a fee, but to place the total blame on them for the destruction of our roads is unwarranted. A petrol-driven truck will travel at 10 to 15 miles an hour faster than a diesel truck of similar power and will do greater damage to the roads. Drivers of diesel vehicles are accused of overloading, but we have a law governing the width of tyres, and if a vehicle is overloaded a charge can be laid against the owner. The charge that diesel trucks do greater damage to the roads than petrol-operated trucks is more an excuse for charging the former an extra rate than a well-founded reason for doing so.

The Traffic Committee should consider the question of the dipping of lights. I have driven motor vehicles for 15 years or more and have come to the conclusion that many drivers do not dim their lights in the face of an approaching vehicle because they are afraid to do so. Anyone who has driven at night knows that when two vehicles are approaching with lights at full beam or dipped, as they get closer there is on the right of one vehicle and on the left of the other a blind spot. In order to overcome that some cars are fitted with lights which, when dipped, divert the light beam to the left of the road. The car I drive operates in that way and it is a wonderful success, for it completely eliminates that blind spot which occurs when vehicles are approaching each other. The driver can clearly see the road in front of him and the lights of cars equipped in this way do not affect the vision of the driver of the oncoming vehicle. I suggest that the man who does not dip his lights very often refrains from doing so for fear rather than because of his negligence of the interests of the approaching driver. If any driver is charged with failure to dip his lights he should be tested for night blindness for, after years of experience, I am convinced that there are some who lack vision on the lefthand side of the road when vehicles are approaching each other at night. These people are a menace because they have a tendency to work in towards the vehicle approaching. On the Main North Road I have frequently been driven off the road by vehicles whose owners failed to dip their lights and moved over to their righthand side of the road. One one ocasion within the last few months, when driving north, a vehicle forced me off the road, and I would have been prepared to give sworn evidence that it passed me with the offside wheels as close as four feet to his righthand side of the road, and without the driver dipping his lights. In such cases it would be a good idea to test the eyesight of the driver and if found to be defective in the way I suggest he should not be permited to drive at night, and his licence marked accordingly. Limited licences are issued to elderly people; some are permitted to drive only on roads where the traffic is not dense, and some are permitted to approach a town only by certain routes. If the Traffic Committee would take up that question I think we might be surprised at the number of people definitely not safe to be on the roads at night time.

We have heard much about traffic proceeding to country trotting and race meetings, and I have experienced that, too, when races are being held at Gawler, Clare, or Balaklava. I hope one day to be able to drive against that traffic stream with a Mack diesel truck—something with an armour-plated front—and I will keep my offside wheel well inside that yellow line, and anyone who puts me off will be doing a good job, for I have been driven off that road by these people times without number. We regard ourselves as a civilized people, but to see just how civilized we are I suggest driving against that traffic stream when the race traffic is going north. In this matter I have a suggestion to offer. At present the police patrol travels mainly with the traffic stream and all is decorum behind it, but get half a mile away on either side and see what happens. Is it not possible for the police patrol to travel against the traffic stream? In those circumstances I think the change of attitude on the part of drivers would be remarkable, and it is something which could

easily be adopted. What is the use of travelling with the stream for if a traffic breach occurs half a mile ahead the patrol cannot prove it, but if driving against the stream it would have ample proof for a mile ahead of the vehicle that cut in, or outraged traffic legislation in some other particular? I offer those two suggestions for the consideration of the Traffic Committee.

Generally, I am in perfect agreement with the provisions of this Bill. The Traffic Committee has studied these amendments and has taken evidence, and I have confidence in the capacity of the committee to do the job for which it was appointed. I understand that it is in agreement with these amendments, and as one who has confidence in committees of this description I support the measures proposed to be adopted.

Mr. HAWKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

AGRICULTURAL SEEDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. M. McIntosh for the Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS (Minister of Agriculture)—This Bill is the result of consultations and conferences which have taken place over a period of years between the Departments of Agriculture of the Australian States with the object of securing improvement in the quality of agricultural seeds, and a greater degree of uniformity in the State laws regulating the sale of such seeds. As far back as 1938 the Standing Committee on Agriculture (which is formed under the auspices of the Commonwealth Agricultural Council and consists of the State Directors of Agriculture) recommended that steps should be taken to restrict or prevent the sale of substandard agricultural seeds throughout the Commonwealth and to secure uniform standards in all the States. In one important respect South Australian law on this question is out of harmony with that of the eastern States. The laws of the eastern States prohibit entirely the sale of seeds which contain an excessive proportion of non-germinable, noxious or foreign seeds or other impurities. Our laws on the other hand allow the sale of such substandard seeds so long as information of the percentage of foreign seeds, impurities, etc., is given by the seller to the purchaser by one of the methods prescribed in the Act. After full consideration of the reports of the experts the Government has decided that it would be in the best interests of primary producers and tend to the improvement of pastures if all seed sold were definitely required to conform to the prescribed standards of quality and purity. Most of the clauses of the Bill are accordingly for the purpose of making such amendments of the principal Act as are necessary to carry this principle into effect. Some other provisions, aimed at the improvement of agricultural seeds, and the better administration of the Act are also included in the Bill. The details of the clauses are as follows:—

Clause 3, in conjunction with certain provisions of clause 4, deals with noxious seeds. At present the Agricultural Seeds Act forbids the sale of agricultural seeds with which are mixed seeds of any plants which are noxious weeds throughout the whole State under the Noxious Weeds Act, 1931-1938. The effect of this provision, in practice, depends upon the question of what plants have been proclaimed under the Noxious Weeds Act. The provision automatically applies to seeds of all plants which are noxious weeds under the latter Act; but it cannot apply to any seeds, however noxious, unless they have been proclaimed under the Noxious Weeds Act. It is desirable that there should be power to prevent the sale of certain noxious seeds which are not derived from noxious weeds within the meaning of the Noxious Weeds Act. Some of these noxious seeds may come from plants which do not grow in South Australia, and are therefore not likely to be proclaimed under the Noxious Weeds Act. Apart from this it is unsatisfactory that the operation of the Agricultural Seeds Act should be limited by what is or is not done under the Noxious Weeds Act. It is accordingly proposed to delete the references to the Noxious Weeds Act from the Agricultural Seeds Act and to provide that the question of what are noxious seeds under the Agricultural Seeds Act will be determined solely by proclamations made under that Act.

Clauses 4, 5 and 7 re-enact a number of provisions of the principal Act with the amendments required to give effect to the proposed prohibition of the sale of substantial seeds. Under the present law regulations can be and have been made prescribing the maximum proportions and the kinds of noxious seeds, foreign seeds or impurities, which may be mixed with agricultural seeds. The maximum proportion of non-germinable seeds has also been laid down. But neither the Act nor the regulations definitely prohibit the sale of agricultural seeds

containing excessive quantities or prohibited kinds of noxious seeds, foreign seeds, or impurities. All they do is to say that the seller must give the buyer information of the defect. The amendments made by clauses 4, 5, and 7 will provide for the definite prohibition of the sale of seeds which contain more than the prescribed proportion of noxious, non-germinable or foreign seeds or impurities, or any of the prohibited kinds of seeds or impurities. It will no longer be open to a person who sells seeds of low standard, to protect himself by information shown on the package or invoice.

Clause 6 contains an amendment of section 24 of the principal Act. This section contains provisions enabling a person charged with a breach of the Act to escape liability by proving that the breach was due to the action of some other person acting without his knowledge or consent and that he himself had used due diligence to secure the observance of the Act. The object of the amendment is to bring the section into harmony with recent English statutory provisions on the same topic so that the decisions of the English courts will be available as guides to the interpretation of the provisions in question. The Bill has been considered by representatives of the seed merchants carrying on business in South Australia and in its present form is satisfactory to them. As the Bill has been designed in the interests of primary producers, and has the support of people whose business it is to sell seeds, the House can take it that a large measure of agreement on this matter has been reached. I move the second reading.

Mr. O'HALLORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. C. S. Hincks for the Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—This Bill deals with the topics of tuberculosis and dangerous substances and processes. I will explain the provisions relating to tuberculosis first. These provisions are very largely a consequence of the arrangement made in 1949 between the State and the Commonwealth. Under this arrangement we agreed to co-operate with the Commonwealth in taking steps to reduce, as soon and as far as possible, the incidence of tuberculosis and to provide adequate facilities for diagnosis, treatment, and control of this disease.

Before 1949 South Australia had by no means been inactive in this matter. Our Statutes provided for the compulsory notification of all cases of tuberculosis, and there were regulations providing for isolation, where necessary, of patients suffering from this disease. The State had made adequate provision for the reception and treatment in hospitals of persons suffering from tuberculosis, different institutions being available for different types of case. The standard of our public institutions was at least as high as that of any of the Australian States. In addition, private institutions taking tuberculosis patients were subsidized. The Adelaide Board of Health had in operation its well known scheme for X-ray examinations of the chest in the metropolitan area and the Government had a similar scheme operating in country districts. The Government had also granted substantial financial help to the organization known as Bedford Industries Limited which provided facilities for the rehabilitation of persons who had suffered from tuberculosis, and gave them the chance of acquiring a new interest in life while, at the same time, earning some money. However, since the arrangement of 1949 was entered into tuberculosis has received special attention. Parliament authorized the appointment of a Director of Tuberculosis who is required to devote the whole of his time to the problems of this disease and a competent specialist has been appointed to this office. There has also been a steady increase in the amount of work done for the purpose of detecting early cases of tuberculosis, as well as constant attention to the treatment and after care of patients.

The Government is now advised that an increased measure of success in both diagnosis and treatment will now depend largely upon the grant by Parliament of further powers to the health authorities. The Government, of course, is not anxious to ask for further compulsory powers if that can be avoided. But ever since the agreement with the Commonwealth was made, the Commonwealth has been urging all the States to pass legislation providing for compulsory examinations by X-ray and other means, and compulsory detention where that course is justified. All the other States except New South Wales have now passed or are in process of passing legislation on these lines. The Government, therefore, now feels bound both in the interests of the public as well as in fulfilment of its obligations under the arrangement with the Commonwealth

to ask for similar powers in this State. Another reason which may be urged in support of the proposed powers is that if other States have laws for the control of sufferers from tuberculosis and we do not, patients who dislike treatment will tend to come here from other States. Instances of this type of conduct are already known to our health officers.

The Bill now before members inserts in the Health Act, 1935-1950, a new part dealing solely with tuberculosis. The first provision to which I draw attention is the proposed new section 146c. This provides for the examination of individual persons suspected of being infected with tuberculosis. It empowers the Director-General of Public Health, if he has such a suspicion, to serve a notice on the suspected person requiring him to attend at a specified time and place for examination. At least 14 days' notice must be given. During that time it will be open to the person served with the notice, if he can, to convince the Director-General that he is not suffering from tuberculosis, or that he is or will be adequately treated for that disease, or that for some other sufficient reason the examination is not necessary. In any of these cases the Director-General may revoke the notice or may amend it, *e.g.*, by postponing the time of the proposed examination. But if the notice is not revoked it is binding on the person named in it, and if he fails to comply with it, he may be fined up to twenty-five pounds for a first offence and up to fifty pounds for a subsequent offence. A further remedy for non-compliance with a notice is that the Director-General may apply to a Magistrate for the issue of a warrant for the apprehension of the person to be examined. Such a warrant will be sufficient authority for bringing that person to the place appointed for his examination. This provision may appear a little drastic; but it will be obvious that without some such power it would not be possible to ensure the examination of a recalcitrant person. If powers are to be given at all, they should be made adequate for their purpose. The justification is the protection of the health of the public.

Section 146e deals with what are usually called mass X-ray examinations. This section enables the Minister, by notice advertised in the newspaper, to call up any groups or classes of persons for X-ray examination of the chest. For example, age-groups could be called up, or groups of immigrants, or of persons engaged in any industry or occupation in which there is a special risk of tuberculosis. A notice will be binding on each person of the class or group to which it applies and failure to attend for X-ray examination at the time fixed by a notice or on any adjournment of the examination, will be an offence rendering the offender liable to a fine of not more than twenty-five pounds for a first offence or fifty pounds for a subsequent offence. It is not intended that the holding of compulsory X-ray examinations will interfere with the present system of voluntary examinations. Arrangements will be made for both to go on concurrently.

Sections 146f to 146j inclusive deal with a longstanding problem—namely, that of the segregation and treatment of persons who are definitely known to be sufferers from tuberculosis, and who are unwilling to undergo treatment voluntarily. Under the existing provisions of the Health Act there is power for the Governor to make regulations for the isolation and observation of such persons. But it is very doubtful whether this power extends to compulsory detention and treatment in an institution. A person can be isolated if he merely remains in a room in his own house. The present law, therefore, cannot be regarded as a safe legal basis for compulsory detention and treatment in an institution. There is a further argument in support of some power of compulsory detention. For a good many years the medical officers in charge of our tuberculosis hospitals have felt strongly the need for some power to control the patients who have entered the institution voluntarily. There have been a fair number of unruly patients, some in a highly infectious condition, who from time to time leave the institution and get drunk. Some times they have returned in an inebriated condition and behaved offensively to nurses and other members of the staff. In other cases they have left the institution either permanently or for relatively long periods and gone to live among other people, thus exposing them to infection. In one case not very long ago the patient on leaving the institution whilst still in an infectious condition went first to a coffee palace and thence to the home of a recently-cured tuberculosis sufferer who had a family of young children.

The sections of the Bill dealing with the detention of sufferers have been drafted with care to ensure that persons are not detained without due cause, or any longer than is necessary. A patient can only be detained against his will on the order of a Special Magistrate. An order cannot be made unless the magistrate

is satisfied—and this word implies a high degree of certainty—that the patient is suffering from tuberculosis and is likely to infect others either because of his habits or the circumstances in which he is living. If a person is already a patient in an institution and a magistrate is satisfied that in order to prevent infection to others he should be detained in the institution, he may make an order accordingly. The period for which a person may be ordered to be detained must not exceed six months, but, of course, successive orders may be made in relation to the same person. Before any order for detention is made the patient will have notice of the intending application and will be entitled to attend before the magistrate and show cause why the order should not be made. An order for detention may be enforced by the issue of a warrant. All applications to magistrates for detention orders, and all appeals will be heard and determined privately in the chambers of the judge or magistrate.

By section 146h the Director-General of Health is empowered to order the release of any person who is detained pursuant to an order, and to extend any period for which a person is released. Further, a detained person has the right to apply to a special magistrate for an order of release and the magistrate, after hearing the Director-General, may make such an order if satisfied that it can be made without substantial risk of infection to others. Any decision of a magistrate whether to make or refuse an order for detention or release is subject to a right of appeal to the Supreme Court. It is, of course, contemplated that few orders for compulsory detention will be made. But the fact that power of detention exists will, in most cases, be sufficient to induce people to undergo the proper treatment. This was the experience under the venereal diseases legislation which, in principle, resembled this Bill.

Clause 4 deals with dangerous substances (including solids, liquids and gases) and dangerous processes. In recent years there has been a substantial increase in the number of dangerous and poisonous substances used in industry and sold to the public for general use. The increase is continuing. The following are examples of what I mean:—(*a*) X-ray machines, and radio-acive substances producing ionization are coming into very common use. X-ray machines are used for such purposes as to indicate the position of the feet in boots and shoes, or to take pictures of welds or castings. The persons using these machines or substances often have no knowledge of the effect of the ionizing rays—which may be quite dangerous to persons in the vicinity. (*b*) Many chemicals now being used to an increasing extent are poisonous when applied to the skin or absorbed into the body through the lungs, stomach or intestines. Among these chemicals are compounds of chromium and lead, benzol and other like solvents. Until recently almost all paints were mixed with linseed oil or turpentine which are relatively harmless. But there are now many special purpose paints, lacquers, thinners and paint-removers on the market containing a wide variety of solvents. Some of these solvents contain poisonous substances such as benzol, the acetones, ketones, terpenes and chlorinated hydrocarbons. These are all freely used by members of the public, many of whom are unaware of their nature or of the precautions which should be taken when they are used. The new organic phosphorus insecticides are dangerous poisons and many accidents have occurred with them in other countries. Warnings and precautions are necessary in connection with the use of these. (*c*) There are a number of substances used in industry and by the public which are harmless in themselves but when subjected to various kinds of treatment break down into poisonous gases or liquids. An example is the inert substance Freon 12 which is used in aerosol insecticide bombs and as a refrigerant. When subjected to heat it produces the poisonous substance hydrofluoric acid.

The object of clause 4 in connection with substances such as I have mentioned is not to prevent their use. but to ensure that by proper handling and by the giving of proper warnings they will not be a source of injury to those engaged in producing or using them. Members will readily appreciate that this is a matter which must necessarily be dealt with by regulation. Each substance will require special rules and the rules may have to be modified from time to time in the light of experience and the practice in other States. It is therefore proposed that regulations may be made on the recommendation of the Central Board of Health both for the purpose of declaring that substances shall be regarded as dangerous and what precautions shall be taken in connection with each substance. The regulations will be laid before Parliament and members will have the opportunity to disallow them. I move the second reading.

Mr. O'HALLORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. C. S. Hincks for the Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Minister of Industry)—This is a short Bill providing for the disposal of certain profits arising from transactions entered into by the Government in connection with the Wallaroo distillery building, which, together with the plant, machinery and tools was purchased by the Government from the Commonwealth for £105,000. It is now estimated that the sale of the plant, machinery and tools will produce £115,000 thus creating a credit in the Loan Account of approximately £10,000, representing profit. In addition, the Government still has the land and buildings the proceeds from which, if they were sold, would also be credited to the loan account. The land and buildings have been leased to S.A. Refractories Ltd., a company which has applied for a loan under the Industries Development Act for the purpose of enabling it to manufacture firebricks and high-tension insulators. On this application, the Industries Development Committee has recommended and the Government has approved of a loan of £65,000.

As the loan account is already in credit to the extent of about £10,000, following on the transactions to which I have referred, and that as the Government still holds the land and buildings at Wallaroo, which are of considerable value, the Government considers it appropriate that the proposed loan to the company shall be partly financed by means of a transfer of money from the loan account to the Country Secondary Industries Fund. The Bill therefore proposes that £25,000 shall be so transferred and shall be applied towards making the approved loan to the company. When the transfer has been made the loan fund will stand £15,000 in debit, which may be regarded as representing a nominal value of the distillery land and buildings still held by the Government. I move the second reading.

Mr. O'HALLORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.22 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, November 6, at 2 p.m.