HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, September 27, 1955.

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

QUESTIONS.

BROKEN HILL ROAD.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Last December I introduced to the Minister of Roads a deputation from a Broken Hill organization known as the Better and Safer Roads Association, which asked for a substantial improvement of the Broken Hill road. The Minister pointed out that it would not be possible within a reasonable period to bituminize the road, but agreed that steps should be taken to make it trafficable in all weather. I recently visited the area and found that the road is good except for a section between Mingary and Cockburn, where traffic has been held up frequently during recent rains, including that of Friday last. Will the Minister ascertain from the Minister of Roads whether steps are being taken to make that section trafficable in all weather and, if so, when the work is expected to begin?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I shall be glad to do that, but I point out, with much deference, that what one would usually regard as an all weather road does not quite apply in this case because of the glorious season enjoyed by our northern areas, which has brought with it some disadvantages. Having regard to those factors, however, I will ask my colleague to indicate what it would cost to make the road impervious even in the best of seasons.

TONSLEY SPUR RAILWAY LINE.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I understand that the Premier has received from the Marion Corporation a plan of a proposed new route for the spur railway line to Tonsley. Has he submitted it to the Public Works Committee for report?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have the altered plan and have submitted it to the Railways Department for comment. After the department has reported on it I will informally submit it to the Public Works Committee to see whether it has considered the matters suggested. The proposed route is not nearly as direct as that already recommended by the committee. I believe it crosses the Marion Road and joins the Brighton line halfway between the Marion Road intersection and the bridge over the Sturt Creek; so it would mean coming to Adelaide by a devious route, because, for the first part of the journey at least, the line would run directly away from Adelaide. I hesitate, however, to express any opinion on it until the Railways Department has examined it and I have had a chance to submit it to the Public Works Committee.

WILD ONION WEED.

Mr. HEASLIP—Together with many country people I am much concerned about the uncontrolled spread of wild onion weed. Hundreds of thousands of acres are covered by it, and once it gets control it cuts down carrying capacity. In agricultural areas it can be controlled by agricultural methods but in the pastoral and marginal areas where cultivation is most undesirable it is practically out of control. This year seems to have been very favourable for its spread and there are little clumps coming up everywhere in areas where it was not previously seen. Will the Minister of Agriculture, through his department, warn land holders where it is not under control, and see whether the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization can evolve some method of extermination? I understand that certain money has been granted for the eradication of the soursob, but that is not nearly as serious as the onion weed. If the onion weed can be eradicated, or at least controlled, incalculable value to South Australia will result.

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—Unless effective penalties can be provided or landholders encouraged to handle this problem themselves, unfortunately they tend to neglect it, hence the very wide areas now covered by the weed. Merely warning them has no effect; in fact, in the more closely settled areas under the control of district councils the weed is just as bad as, if not worse than, in the outlying districts. Much work has been done on spray materials, and, although sprays have been developed, they are far too costly for profitable use. The only known method still open to landholders at present is either cultivation where possible or hoeing out the weed. I realize, of course, that in many localities it has got beyond that stage of control, but pending the development of some reasonably economic spray I cannot see that much can be done in the outlying districts. A Noxious Weeds Bill is now being drafted and if Cabinet approves and Parliament passes it provision will be made for more effective and realistic control.

HOME DEPOSITS.

Mr. TAPPING—It was reported last week that the Victorian Government would introduce legislation to enable persons to purchase Housing Commission homes on a deposit of £150. Does the Premier contemplate introducing similar legislation in this State?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—At present the resources available for housing are fully taken up with present deposits. If the amount of the deposit is lowered to any individual it can only mean that fewer houses are made available to the many. If the amount of deposit were lowered to £150, then, as always happens, that minimum would become the maximum, and under those circumstances we would provide assistance to many fewer people.

GRASSHOPPER INFESTATION.

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS—Last Sunday Mr. Donald Gunn, who lives four miles from Victor Harbour, reported hatchings of grasshoppers in three areas. On Monday a further hatching, which was not apparent on Sunday, was discovered a short distance away. Should further hatchings of a similar nature occur in the district it could be serious for the pasture and crops in the South Coast area. When hatchings are reported to the department, will the Minister of Agriculture take every possible means to publicise them by newspapers and over the air, in order that farmers in the district may be alerted to keep a close watch on their properties with the object of spraying and eliminating the pests before they get on the wing?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—I am quite prepared to give still further publicity to this matter and to report individual cases of hatchings in any district. I point out, however, that on a number of occasions every district council has been circularised and advised, both through the press and over the air, of its obligations, and landholders likewise have been made fully aware, so far as is possible, by publicity, of their obligations. No-one should be ignorant of what measures he is expected to take. As I have indicated earlier, materials are available from district councils free of cost to the landholder. All the landholder has to do is to apply them where the hatchings occur. I suggest that before the spraying is done the landholder make sure that all eggs have hatched. There is no harm in delaying the spraying for three or four days and possibly longer, because it takes from seven to 10 days before the hoppers get on the wing. It might be wise not to spray immediately the hatchings occur, but to wait until all eggs are hatched; otherwise, after the initial spraying a further hatching may occur, and the landholder may think that the spray material is not effective. That possibly occurred in regard to one report which we have already received. I suggest that landholders ascertain the correct period of waiting and then spray effectively.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether a provision has been devised under which the necessary spray or other material for the destruction of grasshoppers can be made available to landholders outside district council areas, and, if so, what arrangements have been made?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—Under the Noxious Insects Act a regulation was made some years ago providing for poison materials to be made available to landholders outside district council areas by either the Director of Lands or the Pastoral Board, who are the responsible authorities for the distribution of the materials to landholders in those areas, under similar conditions to those applying to their distribution by local government bodies.

DESTRUCTION OF GARDEN PESTS.

Mr. TEUSNER—The Minister of Agriculture has stated that the Government is making available to landholders in certain areas, free of charge, materials for the spraying of grasshoppers. I represent a horticultural district where many of the gardens are from time to time invaded by destructive pests other than grasshoppers. Will the Minister consider making spraying materials available to them?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—That is definitely a matter of Government policy and I will confer with my colleagues on the question.

QUORN PROJECTS.

Mr. RICHES—The Premier will remember having received a deputation from the corporation of Quorn concerning measures it suggested to compensate Quorn in some way for the loss it is sustaining as a result of the diversion of the railway route. Among the 10 points suggested was the damming of Boolcunda Creek as a means of providing a permanent water supply. I know that some investigations have been made. Can the Premier say whether any decision has resulted? Also, has he anything further to report on the representations he was making to the Commonwealth Government for a grant for the Pichi Richi Pass road?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The report on the investigations into the damming of Boolcunda Creek has not reached me. In connection with the second matter, I negotiated with the Minister of Roads and Transport, Senator McLeay, but unfortunately he has since died. I have forwarded communications to the other South Australian Minister, the Minister for Defence, Sir Philip McBride, and have discussed the matter with him and hope to receive an early reply.

HOUSE BUILDING CONTRACTS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—It came to my notice recently that in mid-March a builder submitted a price of £2,450 as an estimate for the building of a home. Towards the end of April the contract was signed and the price was revised to £2,540, an increase of £90. This was considered to be a marginal increase. Since then there has been a further increase of £34. Can the Premier indicate whether there is any authority to increase a contracted price because of marginal increases in items such as cement, timber, tiles and electrical fittings?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It is impossible to answer the question off hand. In the first place, it is not known whether the contract had a provision to meet rises and falls in costs of materials or labour. Secondly, some of the items mentioned are decontrolled in relation to prices, and the prices order provides that only a fair price shall be included or added. Unless I have the names of the owner and the contractor, so that the Prices Department can make an investigation, it is hard to give a direct answer, but, generally speaking, I do not believe that increases in price have taken place in at least some of the items mentioned by the honourable member.

GIRLS TECHNICAL SCHOOL.

Mr. STEPHENS—My question relates to the Port Adelaide girls technical school. Some parts of the old buildings there, not school buildings, have been pulled down, a road has been closed, and one or two posts have been removed, but there is no fence around the buildings. I have had complaints from the school headmistress that some persons who use the buildings at night are becoming a nuisance to the school. Can the Minister of Education say when the fence will be built around the buildings, or whether arrangements can be made for the police to periodically visit the school to prevent these persons from becoming a nuisance?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I cannot inform the honourable member when it will be possible to fence the land, but I will confer with the Chief Secretary to see whether we can get police assistance.

GAOL CONDITIONS.

Mr. JENNINGS—Following on my question of September 20, has the Premier obtained the report he promised to get from the Comptroller of Gaols and Prisons regarding allegations made in an article in the *News* recently about conditions at the Yatala Labour Prison?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—In accordance with the promise I asked the Chief Secretary to get a report from the Comptroller of Gaols and Prisons. It has come to hand and I shall be happy to bring it down so that honourable members may peruse it. It stated that there was no foundation whatever for the statements made, and that they were derogatory to the personnel employed at the prison, to the visiting justices and to other persons assisting in the prison organization. The Comptroller asked whether the Government could take steps to prevent unwarranted attacks from being made on these people. I will have the report here tomorrow.

DUST NUISANCE AT MILE END.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Following on my question of September 1 about complaints of dust nuisance by residents at Mile End South, has the Premier obtained a report from the Central Board of Health, which I know has been making inquiries?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have received the following report from the Director-General of Public Health, Dr. Southwood:—

Inspections made this week by officers of this department show that premises at Manchester Street, Mile End, are subject from time to time to dust invasion, mainly from neighbouring factories. Samples of the dust from several premises are being analysed as to chemical content and possible source. In the vicinity there are several places whence dust could arise. Further work is being carried out to determine what can be done to reduce the trouble.

CROYDON PARK SEWERAGE.

Mr. JENNINGS—On several occasions I have addressed questions to the Minister of Works about sewerage extensions in the Croydon Park district. His last reply was that the work was going ahead satisfactorily, but since then there has been some hold up, and I have had many approaches about this matter from local residents. Can the Minister give a report on the present position?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I think the statement that there has been a hold up of the work does not accurately describe the position because I have been advised by the Engineer for Sewerage that there were several difficulties due to ground water and traffic density associated with the construction of the Croydon Park scheme which could be solved by commencing three portions of the work simultaneously. As two gangs were completing projects two or three weeks before it would be possible to transfer them to the new town as intended, they were temporarily transferred to Croydon Park, together with the gang allocated for that scheme. Although these two gangs have now been re-transferred to the new town, one large gang, as intended, is proceeding with the construction of the Croydon Park scheme and will continue working there until its completion. Labour is being used by the department to the best advantage and there is no intention to give priority to any one work at the expense of another. The action taken in temporarily transferring two extra gangs to Croydon Park will result in the completion of the work well in advance of the date at which it could otherwise have been done.

RAILWAY HOUSES AND SEPTIC TANKS.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (on notice)—

1. Did the Commissioner of Railways decide some years ago that railway houses situated at various points beyond Peterborough along the Cockburn line would be provided with septic tanks where practicable?

2. Have all such houses been provided with septic tanks?

3. If not, in which localities have such houses not been provided with septic tanks?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The Railways Commissioner reports:—

1. Yes.

2. Of the eighty-three cottages situated on the Cockburn line beyond Peterborough, septic tanks have been installed at twenty-three and it would be practicable to install them at fifty-six of the remainder.

3. As under—

Location.	No. of cottages.	Septic tank installations. Installed.	Not installed.	Under construction.
Ucolta	4	—	4	—
Oodla Wirra	6	1	5	—
Nackara	7	2	5	—
Paratoo	6	2	2	2
Yunta	7	—	7	—
Olary	9	5	4	—
Mannahill	16	7	9	—
Mingary	6	2	4	—
Cockburn	18	4	14	—

The installation of septic tanks at two cottages is at present in hand, and it is intended that the provision of this facility at other cottages along the line will be undertaken as labour is available from year to year.

TECHNICAL SCHOOL REGISTRARS.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (on notice)—

1. By whom are the salaries of registrars of country technical schools fixed?

2. If these salaries are not fixed by the Teachers' Salaries Board will the Government consider transferring their fixation to the jurisdiction of that board?

3. What was the date of the last increase granted to these officers?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The replies are:—

1. Salaries of registrars of country technical schools are fixed by the Government and published as part C of Regulation XXVII of the regulations under the Education Act.

2. Registrars are not teachers. Their work is more in line with that of public servants and the Government seeks the advice of the Public Service Commissioner when fixing salaries.

3. The last increase was granted to registrars on April 13, 1950. On June 27, 1955, a request for the Public Service Commissioner to investigate and report on these salaries was forwarded to him at the suggestion of the chairman of the Teachers Salaries Board. This report has not yet been received.

KINGSTON JETTY.

Mr. CORCORAN (on notice)—Is it the intention of the Government during the present financial year to have repaired that part of the Kingston jetty which is between the first and second landings, in order to render it serviceable?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The inshore portion of the jetty for a distance of 930ft. out to the first landing was repaired several months ago. The storms washed four deck planks away and lifted a number of others. This

damage has since been repaired. The further reinstatement asked for would cost at least £12,000 and the board reports that this expenditure cannot be justified as only four fishing boats at present land their catches at the Kingston Jetty, the others going to Cape Jaffa at which place they requested the board to construct a landing. This landing (estimated to cost £5,500) is in course of construction, and when completed the four fishermen who now use the Kingston Jetty can use their own discretion as to which landing to use. Under all the circumstances, the board considers that any further expenditure is not warranted.

CARRYING OF FIREARMS.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice):—Is it the intention of the Government to amend the Firearms Registration Act to compel users of firearms to remove the bolt and dismantle the barrel from the butt when carrying firearms?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It is not proposed to submit any amendments to the Firearms Registration Act this year. It is considered that, provided ordinary care is exercised in the use of firearms, no accident should occur.

TRAMWAYS TRUST BUSES.

Mr. Tapping for Mr. LAWN (on notice):—How much has the policy of the Municipal Tramways Trust in replacing trams with buses cost to date for—(*a*) purchase of buses; (*b*) dismantling overhead wires and lifting tram lines; and (*c*) any other necessary work done in implementing this policy?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The General Manager of the Tramways Trust states:—

During the period July 1, 1953 to August 31, 1955, the trust has spent £800,000 on its rehabilitation programme. Included in this amount are the following costs:—

Purchase of buses (70 under-floor-engined fuel buses) ..	£460,000
Restoration of roadways	£40,000
Construction of new bus depot at Hackney	£120,000

The dismantling of overhead wires returns a credit which offsets the cost of dismantling. I would add that a considerable portion of this expenditure would have been incurred in any case and cannot all be considered as flowing from the trust's policy of converting from trams to buses.

METROPOLITAN MILK SUPPLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Introduced by the Minister of Agriculture and read a first time.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILIZATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN (Minister of Agriculture) moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—

That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Wheat Industry Stabilization Act, 1954.

Motion carried. Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move:—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It deals with succession duty in cases where a person who has succeeded to dutiable property on the death of another, dies within five years after his predecessor in title. As honourable members know, it was found necessary in 1952 to raise the rates of succession duty and it has been represented to the Government that in cases of quick successions, as they are often called, the payment of two amounts of duty within a short time may now cause considerable hardship.

The Government has been asked to grant some relief in these cases. The same problem has arisen in England and New Zealand and has been dealt with by legislation in those countries. The principle which has been adopted elsewhere is to grant a rebate of duty in any case where a person succeeding to property dies within five years, so that the property again passes to others. The amount of the rebate varies according to the interval between the deaths. In England the concession is limited to cases where the property passing twice is land or a business. The New Zealand Act applies to all kinds of property, but the rebate is only granted where the property passing on the second death is the same as, or represents, the property passing on the first death. It is, however, often difficult to determine whether any property represents other property and this idea has been avoided in drafting the present Bill.

The Bill provides that when property has passed to a successor on the death of his predecessor and the successor dies within five years thereafter, a rebate will be granted in respect of the duty on property passing on the

second death. The proposed rebate is a percentage of the duty paid on the first death. If the second death occurs in the first year after the first death, it is 50 per cent. For a death in the second year it is 40 per cent, in the third year 30 per cent, in the fourth year 20 per cent, and in the fifth year 10 per cent. Where the second death occurs more than five years after the first there will be no rebate.

There are two other factors which may affect the amount of a rebate. The first is that the estate passing on the death of the successor may be less than the amount to which he succeeded on the death of his predecessor. In this case it would not be just to base the amount of the rebate on the duty paid on all the property derived from the predecessor because only a part of this property is subject to double duty. In such cases, therefore, the rebate will only be a part of the normal rebate proportionate to the amount of the property passing on the second death.

The other factor which will affect the amount of a rebate, is that the property taken on the first succession may have been a terminable interest, that is, an interest which came to an end on or before the death of the successor. Obviously, interests of this kind can never be subject to a double duty and there is, therefore, no reason why the duty paid on them on the first death should be taken into account in working out the amount of the rebate to be allowed on the second death.

The amount of the rebate allowable on the second death will be apportioned between the several amounts of property passing on that death in proportion to the amounts of duty payable on the respective amounts of property. The scheme in the Bill is a simple one which contains no difficulties of administration, and is not likely to lead to litigation in order to determine whether a rebate is allowable. It is estimated by the Commissioner of Succession Duties that under present conditions the rebates provided for in the Bill are likely to cost about £8,000 a year.

Clause 4 of the Bill amends the provision in the principal Act which enables an insurance company in certain cases to pay money due under a policy of life assurance before the succession duty has been paid. The general rule laid down in section 63a of the principal Act is that an insurance company is not entitled to pay over the life assurance moneys except on a certificate from the Commissioner of Succession Duties that all succession duty payable on the money has been paid or that security has been given for such payment. The section, however, contains an exception enabling payment to be made without production of the certificate in any case where the gross value of the estate does not exceed £500 and the amount of the insurance policy does not exceed £200. This exception was inserted in the Act at a time when the value of money and the exempt amount of property were different from what they are now; and it is proposed in this Bill that insurance companies should be permitted to pay money due on a life policy up to £500 without production of a succession duties certificate in any case where the value of the estate does not exceed £1,500.

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

Y.W.C.A. OF PORT PIRIE NC. (PORT PIRIE PARKLANDS) BILL.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Minister of Lands), having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to vest certain land in The Young Women's Christian Association of Port Pirie Incorporated, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I move:—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to provide for the vesting of a portion of the Port Pirie parklands in the Young Women's Christian Association of Port Pirie. The Government has been approached by the Port Pirie Corporation with a request that a portion of the parklands at Port Pirie be vested by Act of Parliament in the Young Women's Christian Association of Port Pirie. The land in question is about three-quarters of an acre in area, and is on the corner of Gertrude Street and David Street, Port Pirie. It is next to an area of parklands which was vested by Act of Parliament in 1910 in the Port Pirie Young Men's Association, and subsequently on the same terms in 1918 in the Young Men's Christian Association of Port Pirie. The Port Pirie Corporation asked that the land be vested in the same manner as the land vested in 1918. The Port Pirie Corporation no longer requires the land as parklands.

The Government is willing that the Young Women's Christian Association of Port Pirie should have the land. After giving careful consideration whether the land could not be made available under the Crown Lands Act, the Government has decided that the best course would be to make the land available to the association by Act of Parliament. The Government has undertaken to proceed with the necessary Bill. It is felt that, as the

Government undertook the introduction of legislation for the Port Pirie Young Men's Association and subsequently the Young Men's Christian Association of Port Pirie, it is reasonable that the Government should do the same for the Young Women's Christian Association of Port Pirie. The Government is accordingly introducing this Bill.

With small variations the Bill follows the lines of the Act of 1918. The variations are for the purpose of avoiding difficulties which might arise under that legislation. Clause 2 is an interpretation clause and requires no explanation. Clause 3 provides that the Governor may, after resuming the land pursuant to the Crown Lands Act, grant it to the Association in fee simple, subject to the provisions for resumption and the restrictions on sale contained in the Bill. Clause 4 enables the Minister of Lands if he is satisfied that the land is not being used principally for the objects and purposes of the association, to give notice to the association requesting the association to use the land principally for the objects and purposes of the association. If the association does not comply with the notice within three months, the clause provides that the Governor may resume the land, subject to any rights obtained by any person under or through a mortgage of the land.

Clause 5 provides that the association may not sell or otherwise dispose of the land, but may nevertheless mortgage the land for not more than £3,000. Clause 6 provides that the land shall be exempt from rates while it is occupied by the association. The only variation from the terms of the Act of 1918 which calls for comment is in clause 5. The Act of 1918 does not specifically prohibit the Young Men's Christian Association of Port Pirie from selling the land, but its terms are such that it is most doubtful whether or not the land could be sold. The Government has decided that this point should be made clear, and takes the view that the association should be restrained from selling or otherwise disposing of the land. This would be consistent with the power of resumption given by the Bill and clause 5 provides accordingly.

Mr. DAVIS (Port Pirie)—I support the Bill. This matter has been discussed by the Port Pirie Council, which was approached by the association. The property is next to the Young Men's Christian Association property and the council is anxious to enable the Young Women's Christian Association to enjoy similar facilities. The association desires to erect a building on the property. The Minister suggested that the land is no longer of use to the council for parklands but the position is that most of the parklands have been acquired by the Hospitals Department and there is little remaining for parklands. However, the council is quite willing for this land to be made available for use by the young women of Port Pirie.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of the Minister of Lands, Messrs. White, Davis, McAlees and Heaslip; the Committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records and to report on October 11, 1955.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Code, 1920-1951.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is a short Bill, the sole object of which is to alter the system of pensions for the President of the Industrial Court and any Deputy President who may be appointed. The present pension scheme for occupants of the Industrial Court Bench was introduced in 1947, and followed the principles which up to that time had usually been followed in judicial pension schemes in Australia. In particular, it was very similar to the scheme applicable to Judges of the Supreme Court.

Since 1947, however, the pension scheme of the Judges of the Supreme Court has been liberalised, and there has been a general tendency to adopt more liberal schemes in the other States of Australia. The Government considers it just that the President and Deputy President should now be given the benefit of the new principles which are now commonly adopted. The present scheme, among other provisions, provides that the full pension contributed for is not payable unless the President or Deputy President serves for at least 15 years. As the retiring age is 65 it is quite possible that some appointees could never obtain a full pension.

Another deficiency in the existing scheme is that there is no provision for the wife of a

President or Deputy President in the event of his death, and no provision for any pension at all if a President or Deputy President should break down before completing five years' service. Another feature of the present scheme which now needs alteration is that for the purpose of computing the rate of pension the salary of the President is to be taken as £1,500 a year, and that of a Deputy President as £1,200 a year, although as a result of recent movements their actual salaries are now more than twice these amounts. All the restrictions of this kind which were formerly applicable to the provisions of the Judges of the Supreme Court have now been repealed, and it is proposed by this Bill to repeal the existing provisions relating to the Industrial Court pensions and to enact others similar in principle to those of the Judges of the Supreme Court.

The benefits now proposed are as follows: On retirement at the age of 65, or on permanent invalidity or infirmity, the President or Deputy President will be entitled to a pension equal to half his salary at the time of retirement. This pension will be available irrespective of the length of service. If a President or Deputy President dies, whether before or after retirement, and is survived by a widow she will receive a pension equal to one quarter of her husband's salary immediately before his death. If a President or Deputy President dies before retirement without leaving a widow his personal representatives will be entitled to a refund of his contributions; and if he retires in any circumstances not giving a right to pension he will also be entitled to a refund of his contributions. The existing provision that the amount of the pension is to be based on an assumed rate of salary, which is lower than the true rate, is repealed. It is provided that the pension will be based upon the actual rate of salary of the President or Deputy President.

As a consequence of the more liberal benefits it is proposed that the contributions of the President and Deputy President should be increased a little. The present contribution is 4 per cent of the President's or Deputy President's salary. In lieu of this it is proposed to require a contribution varying from 5 per cent to 8 per cent of salary according to the age at which the President or Deputy President commenced to contribute to the Fund. These percentages are similar to those applicable to the Judges of the Supreme Court, but as the retiring age for the President and Deputy President is five years younger than that of the Judges the respective percentages apply to ages five years less than the corresponding percentages in the Supreme Court.

There is one other provision of this Bill to which I draw attention. It provides that if a subscriber to the Public Service Superannuation Fund is appointed as President or Deputy President he may elect to remain in the Superannuation Fund instead of subscribing for a pension under the Bill. Stipendiary Magistrates (who are required to subscribe to the Superannuation Fund) are sometimes appointed to the Industrial Court, and in some cases it might prove more satisfactory for such an appointee to remain in the Fund. As it makes very little difference from the point of view of cost to the Government whether the appointee is in one pension scheme or the other it is considered desirable to give him the option of electing to which scheme he will subscribe. This option is given by section 12d contained in clause 3.

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

REGISTRATION OF BUSINESS NAMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move:—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its principal purpose is to enable regulations to be made under the Registration of Business Names Act providing for increased filing fees to be paid where an application for the renewal of the registration of a business name is filed by a firm after the time laid down by the principal Act. Last year the Auditor-General reported to the Government that considerable expense was being incurred in pursuing persons who failed to file returns under the Industrial and Provident Societies Act within the required time and also persons who failed to renew the registration of business names under the Registration of Business Names Act within the time required by that Act. He suggested that to encourage the filing of the documents concerned at the right time, increased fees should be charged for late filing. He pointed out that a system of late filing fees under the Companies Act had given people a strong incentive to file documents within the time fixed by the Act. The thirteenth schedule of the Companies Act provides that a fee of 5s. is payable for the filing of certain documents within the period provided by law, a fee of £1 5s. if the documents are filed within

one month of that period, and a fee of £5 5s. if they are filed after that. The schedule provides that the Registrar may, if he thinks just in any special case, reduce the increased fee. The Registrar of Companies recommended the adoption of the Auditor-General's proposal.

A Bill was passed last year to amend the Industrial and Provident Societies Act in the manner suggested, and the Government introduces this Bill to amend the Registration of Business Names Act to provide for the payment of late filing fees. Clause 7 provides for the making of regulations providing for late filing fees based on the same general principles as the provisions of the Thirteenth Schedule of the Companies Act. The clause provides that regulations may be made requiring that where a statement of particulars on an original application for registration, or on an application for renewal of registration, or a statement of a change of particulars, is not filed within the time required by the principal Act, but is filed within a certain period after that time, an increased fee shall be payable, and where the statement is filed after that period a further increased fee shall be payable. The regulations may enable the Registrar to reduce the increased fee in a particular case if he is satisfied that just cause exists for so doing.

The regulations may provide that on the renewal of registration the first increased fee shall not be payable until after the expiration of a period of grace. This period of grace is allowed in order to give the persons concerned a little more time to file their application for renewal of registration. The Government, while wishing to encourage early filing, does not wish to penalize members of the public unduly, and it appears that in all the circumstances members of the public might be unduly penalized if the increased fee became payable as soon as the time for renewal of registration expired.

It will be noticed that the regulations may apply not only to applications for renewal, but also to original applications and applications for change of particulars. The Government thinks it desirable that if a late filing scheme is to be introduced it should be applicable to the filing of all three kinds of application. The clause provides for the system of late filing fees to be introduced by regulation because the fees chargeable under the principal Act at present are fixed by regulation, and in any event the matter is one which can properly and conveniently be dealt with by regulation.

The Bill deals with a number of other matters which have been raised by the Registrar of Companies. The first of these is the question of the attestation of a statement of particulars required under the principal Act for the purpose of registration. At present the statement, if made in South Australia, must be attested by a justice, proclaimed bank manager, commissioner for taking affidavits, or solicitor; or if made outside South Australia by a justice, British consul or notary public. The Registrar of Companies has received numerous complaints that it is often difficult to find a witness authorized under the Act. Members of the public may be required to travel long distances to find a witness and generally are put to expense and trouble. The Government considers that the list of authorized witnesses should be expanded. It is thought that, as well as simplifying matters for the public, this would lead to more prompt filing of statements. Clause 3 accordingly enables a statement to be attested in the Commonwealth by any elector of the Commonwealth Parliament, and outside the Commonwealth by any such elector, a notary public a British or Australian consul, a person having authority to administer an oath in the place, or any other person before whom a document may be signed or acknowledged outside the State under the Evidence Act. It is anticipated that this amendment will greatly facilitate the attestation of the statements.

The second matter is concerned with notification to the Registrar of Companies that a business name has been given up. The principal Act provides that it shall be an offence if a person fails to notify the Registrar that he has given up the use of a business name within one month of so doing. The Justices Act provides that a complaint cannot be laid after six months from the time when the matter of the complaint arises. It seems almost certain that this rule prevents the prosecution of a person for the offence of failing to notify the abandonment of a business name if the offence is discovered more than six months after the failure to notify begins. In practice, offences are only discovered after a long delay, so that if this view of the law is correct prosecutions would generally be impossible. Clause 4 removes any doubt about the matter by laying down that a complaint may be made at any time during the continuance of the failure to notify, and at any time during the six months after notice has actually been given.

Thirdly, the Bill deals with a difficulty the Registrar has encountered in the exercise of his power to strike a business name off the register. The Registrar has reported to the Government that business names are sometimes registered solely for the purpose of preventing others from using them, the person registering the name having no intention of carrying on business under the name. There is a procedure under the principal Act whereby the Registrar can require a person to state whether or not he is carrying on business under a registered name. The principal Act provides that if the Registrar receives the answer "No," or no answer at all, he can strike the name off the register, but does not give the Registrar any power to strike the name off the register if he receives an affirmative answer which he believes to be untrue. The Registrar is approached from time to time by persons who genuinely desire to use a business name which has been registered by some other person purely to protect the name. On requiring the latter to state whether he is carrying on business under the name, the Registrar is told that the person is so doing, and is thereby debarred from taking any further action. The Registrar has suggested that he be enabled to strike a name off the register if, notwithstanding the answer given, he is satisfied that business is not being carried on under the name.

While the Registration of Business Names Act gives a measure of protection to a business name by providing that a name the same or almost the same as a name already on the register may not be registered, it was never intended that the Act should be used merely to give a kind of copyright to a business name. The Government has accordingly decided to enable the Registrar to strike a business name off the register after receiving an affirmative answer which he believes to be untrue. Clause 5 makes the necessary amendment to the principal Act. Clause 5 requires the Registrar, if, on receiving the answer, he is not satisfied that business is being carried on under the business name, to give the person who registered the name a month's notice in which to show cause why the Registrar should not strike the name off the register. If cause is not shown the Registrar may proceed to strike the name off the register.

There is an appeal under the principal Act to the Supreme Court against the striking off the register of a business name, so that the exercise of the power is amply safeguarded. Finally, the Bill extends the power of the Registrar to refuse to register certain words in business names. The principal Act at present enables the Registrar to refuse to register certain words as part of a business name. Thus he may refuse to register a name containing the words "proprietary," "bank," "limited," "unlimited," or "co-operative" where he is satisfied that the words are inappropriate to the business. On several occasions, applicants who are not incorporated have attempted to register business names containing the words "incorporated" or "corporation," and in the absence of a specific power to refuse to register the names, the Registrar has had great difficulty in preventing them from being registered.

It is clearly undesirable that unincorporated persons should be able to carry on business under a registered name which is misleading as to their legal status, and it has accordingly been decided to enable the Registrar to refuse registration of the words "incorporated" and "corporation." Clause 6 makes the necessary amendment to the principal Act. Clause 6 does not permit the Registrar to refuse the renewal of the registration of a business name containing those words which may have been registered before the passing of the Bill.

Mr. HUTCHENS secured the adjournment of the debate.

MINES AND WORKS INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move:—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its principal object is to enable the Department of Mines to take measures for the protection of property against damage from quarrying or mining operations. Under the Mines and Works Inspection Act, as it stands at present, the department can only control quarrying and mining for the purpose of securing the safety and health of the employees and the general public. The Act was not designed for the protection of property, and contains no provisions aimed directly at that object. In recent years the Government has received numerous complaints from householders and local governing bodies in the metropolitan area alleging that buildings, mainly dwelling houses, have been damaged as a result of blasting in quarries and brickworks. Quite a number of the complaints were individually investigated by the Inspector of Mines and in most cases it was found that the damage complained of was due to causes

other than blasting. However, the complaints continued to be made on such a scale that the Government appointed the Chief Inspector of Mines, Mr. Armstrong, to make a full investigation of the whole problem.

In his report the Chief Inspector pointed out that complaints by house holders concerning damage from blasting were common in England, the United States and a number of Continental countries and a good deal of scientific investigation had been carried out in connection with this problem. Although in a number of cases it was proved that damage thought by householders to be caused by blasting was, in fact, due to other causes, it was quite possible that quarrying operations could result in damage to property. For example, stones thrown by blasting could cause damage to houses besides endangering persons. Ground vibration caused by blasting could result in the cracking of walls, and subsidence of ground brought about by faulty mining methods could cause their collapse.

In the metropolitan area suburban settlement is now closer to quarries than ever before and it is necessary that the new homes near the foothills should be protected against damage from the quarries. As I mentioned the Mines Department at present does insist on precautions being taken to secure the safety of persons. In many instances the measures necessary for the safety of persons are very similar to those which have to be taken for the protection of property; and in order to simplify administration it is most desirable that the inspectors of mines should be able to devote their attention to the protection of both persons and property. It is very doubtful whether any of the local authorities in this State have officers qualified to supervise mining and quarrying. The Bill therefore makes a series of amendments to the principal Act by which its provisions are extended so that they may be used for the purpose of preventing nuisances or damage to property. The amendments provide that the present provisions of the Act which enable regulations to be made by the Governor and directions given by mining inspectors shall authorize regulations and directions for the protection of property and the prevention of nuisances.

There is one other amendment in the Bill. It deals with the time within which proceedings for offences against the Mines and Works Inspection Act must be commenced. The normal time for commencing a prosecution in the Police Court is six months after the offence was committed; but the Mines and Works Inspection Act provided that prosecutions had to be commenced within three months after the offence was discovered by the inspector. It has been found in practice that in some cases, owing to the technical and legal investigations which have to be made, this period of three months after discovery of the offence is not long enough. It is therefore proposed to extend it to six months. At the same time the Bill prescribes an overriding rule that every prosecution under the principal Act must be commenced within 12 months after the commission of the offence.

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

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON (Minister of Education)—I move:—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes two amendments of the Supreme Court Act. The first empowers the Governor to extend the term of an Acting Judge to enable him to complete cases which are part heard at the time when his appointment would normally come to an end. Although this question arises in connection with Mr. Justice Hannan's appointment, it is an old problem and has occasioned some difficulty in the past. An Acting Judge is appointed to act in the stead of a permanent judge until the permanent judge returns to the execution of his duties. The date of return is sometimes not known in advance, and as a result the acting judge may commence the hearing of cases which may be part heard at the time when the permanent judge returns. On the other hand, if the acting judge is to take only cases which can be quickly disposed of his usefulness is considerably limited. In any event one never knows what difficulties may arise or what adjournments may be necessary even in an apparently simple case. The Government considers that in the interests of the public it should have power to extend the term of office of an acting judge, if that course should be found necessary in order to enable him to complete pending cases. It is proposed to confer such a power by clause 3 of this Bill. Honourable members will notice the Governor, before granting an extension, has to be satisfied that such extension is necessary in order that the Acting Judge may complete cases which may be pending before him at the time when his acting appointment would normally expire.

The other clause in the Bill deals with the powers of Commissioners appointed to hold circuit sessions of the Supreme Court. In the past it has been found necessary from time to time to appoint a person who is not a Judge as a Commissioner to hold circuit sessions of the Supreme Court. The terms of the Commissioner's appointment are that he is to hold circuit sessions of the Supreme Court at the time and in the place named in his commission. Under these terms doubts have arisen whether a Commissioner who is not a Judge has power to adjourn a case to Adelaide, for example, for the taking of further evidence, or for argument, or for delivery of judgment. These doubts are shared by His Honour the Chief Justice. It is certainly arguable from the language of section 53 of the Supreme Court Act that the Commissioner must, as the law now is, complete the case in the place named in the commission.

The Government considers that the opportunity should now be taken to settle this question and asks Parliament to remove the doubts by providing expressly that a Commissioner shall have power to sit and act at any time and in any place and to adjourn from time to time and from place to place, as provided in section 45 of the Supreme Court Act. As there is some urgency about this Bill the Government submits it with the request that members will give it consideration as soon as possible.

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

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move:—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes a number of administrative amendments to the Health Act. Section 147 of the Health Act empowers the Governor, on the recommendation of the Central Board of Health, to make regulations on a variety of topics. Among other things, the section authorizes the making of regulations as to the measures to be taken for preventing or limiting tuberculosis and infectious diseases, the prevention of the spread of infectious diseases by the agency of "carriers," and the imposition of isolation or medical observation of persons suffering or suspected to be suffering from tuberculosis or infectious disease. It will be remembered that the Health Act was recently amended to provide for two categories of disease, namely, infectious disease and notifiable disease. The Central Board has recommended that these regulation making powers should apply both to infectious and notifiable diseases and clause 2 extends the powers accordingly.

Clause 2 also provides that the Governor may make regulations prescribing the qualifications to be possessed by persons employed as health inspectors by local boards of health and county boards. The regulations may authorize the Central Board to conduct examinations and to issue certificates of competency to persons passing the examinations or who possess other qualifications prescribed by the regulations. The regulations may provide that every inspector appointed by a local board or county board must possess a certificate of competency issued under the regulations. However, it is provided that the regulations are not to apply to or diminish the status of any person holding the office of health inspector at the time the regulations come into force. This provision is introduced as a result of representations of the Australian Institute of Public Health. It is considered that it is in the public interest that health inspectors should be properly qualified to carry out their duties and clause 2 will enable regulations to be made to achieve this purpose. At the same time, provision is made whereby inspectors holding office at the time the regulations are made but who do not possess the qualifications which may be prescribed will not be affected.

Paragraph (*h*) of subsection (1) of section 147 of the Health Act authorizes the Governor to make regulations as to septic tanks. Under this paragraph, regulations have been made providing in general, that a septic tank is not to be installed unless it has been approved by the Central Board. The Central Board has reported that, in some instances, tanks are being made which do not comply with the requirements of the Central Board. One particular objection is that the tanks are "five person" tanks which have been found to be too small and have proved unsatisfactory. These unsatisfactory tanks are sold by the maker to unsuspecting householders and, if any action is taken, it must be taken against the householders and not the maker. Obviously, the manufacturer of septic tanks should know what is required and it is proposed by clause 3 to place upon him the duty of seeing that the tanks sold by him are of the kind approved by the Central Board.

Clause 3 therefore provides that it will be an offence for any person to sell, expose for sale, manufacture for sale or have in possession

for sale, any septic tank unless it is of the size and is constructed of the materials and in the manner approved either specifically or generally by the Central Board. The Central Board has pointed out that it often occurs that breaches of the law relating to septic tanks do not become known until after the expiration of the six months' period provided by the Justices Act as the time within which prosecutions may be launched. Clause 3 therefore provides that, as regards proceedings for offences against the clause or against the regulations relating to septic tanks, proceedings may be taken within 12 months of the commission of the offence instead of the usual six months.

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

METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 22. Page 861.)

Mr. BROOKMAN (Alexandra)—The member for Flinders (Mr. Pearson) said the Bill would be of inestimable value to his constituents, but although I have perused it I cannot see of what value it will be to anyone. I support it because I believe it to be a good thing that the Minister rather than the Abattoirs Board should control the quotas, but at the same time it seems to mean very little. Indeed, I do not know what difference it will make unless there is a change in Government policy on the killing of meat. I strongly hope that under this legislation small country abattoirs will get a go in selling their meat in the metropolitan area, and that may happen if the Government wishes it.

Up to the present, however, the Government's attitude has not encouraged one to make that forecast, although the Minister said in his second reading explanation that the Government intended to allow quotas from country abattoirs to come into the metropolitan area. On previous occasions I have mentioned the Noarlunga Meat Company, which has its works in my electoral district. For several years I have asked the Government to permit that company to kill lambs for export. I do not intend to discuss that matter in this debate because this Bill has nothing to do with the export of lambs. I point out, however, that the company has been prevented by the Government from taking out an export licence under section 52a of the legislation, which places some restrictions on the issue of permits to abattoirs situated within 80 miles of Gepp's Cross. That decision has been challenged and I will not go into the history of the case, but I point out that the restriction refers to killing for export only. Section 52a is not amended by this Bill, which refers only to the new section 78b relating to the selling of meat within the metropolitan area.

The Noarlunga Meat Company under section 70(*c*), is at present able to sell and is selling meat in the metropolitan area, provided it is inspected in accordance with the provisions laid down. These inspections, however, are so inconvenient that the company is prohibited from selling more than a portion of the carcasses that it would be able to sell were meat inspectors employed on the premises. Under section 70(*c*) a firm may sell meat in the metropolitan area provided it has been inspected at either the Gepp's Cross abattoirs or some other specified place in the city—I think it is Light Square at present. The section states:—

While abattoirs are available under this Act for slaughtering stock no person shall within the metropolitan abattoirs area—(*c*) sell or attempt to sell or expose for sale or allow or cause to be sold or expose for sale any carcass or meat slaughtered outside the metropolitan abattoirs area unless the carcass thereof together with the pleura, peritoneum, lungs, heart, kidneys, tongue, and such other organs as are prescribed, and in the case of cows the udder also attached in natural connection, has been first brought to the abattoirs or some other premises established by the board for that purpose within Hindmarsh, Gawler, Grey, or Young Ward of the City of Adelaide and inspected and branded by an inspector as provided in section 93.

Mr. Macgillivray—What is the purpose of that section?

Mr. BROOKMAN—The preservation of health, which is important. No one disagrees with that principle, but under this section the inspection is used, as far as I can see, as a brake on the selling in the metropolitan area of carcasses slaughtered outside the metropolitan area, because they must be slaughtered at the Noarlunga or any other abattoirs, transported with all the organs attached to Gepp's Cross or a specified city centre, unloaded, hung on hooks, inspected, branded and re-loaded, whereas the best method of inspection that would give smooth production is to inspect the meat as it is being slaughtered, as at Gepp's Cross. Indeed, this procedure is adopted with export carcasses slaughtered at Noarlunga where the Commonwealth have qualified inspectors; but those inspectors are not qualified under our State laws.

Inspection under section 70(*c*) is laborious and inconvenient to the abattoirs. The remedy would be the appointment of an accredited inspector at the works, and this would enable the output to be increased many times over. Even though the company has asked that the services of an inspector be made available and is prepared to pay for those services, the State Government will not allot an inspector to the works unless there is a strike at the Metropolitan Abattoirs. Then an inspector is allotted, output increased greatly, and the people of Adelaide supplied with meat.

The Government might consider one of two actions: firstly, accrediting the Commonwealth inspectors at present at the works so that they may inspect meat under the State Act (and their qualifications seem to be at least equal to those of inspectors under the South Australian legislation), or secondly, providing a State inspector to inspect meat at the works. The meat could then be sent directly into the metropolitan area. I cannot see any point in protecting the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board as much as it is being protected, because such a big organization should be able to stand up to competition from smaller abattoirs. There is no prospect of Noarlunga growing to the size of the Metropolitan Abattoirs. I will not argue at this stage about section 52a, which protects the Metropolitan Abattoirs Board in the matter of export meat, and where the 80-mile radius applies, but there is no reason why that board should not be able to cope with a little competition in selling meat in the metropolitan area. In most countries killing is done in many smaller centres than we have in South Australia.

The only other advantage I can see in the Bill is that under it the Government may some day assist in the establishment of a killing works on Kangaroo Island. At present that does not seem to be practicable because such a works would have to have chilling or freezing apparatus and be of considerable size. When Kangaroo Island develops there will be sufficient lambs and sheep to warrant killing works there. I imagine that under this legislation it would be possible to establish such works and the meat killed there could be sold in the metropolitan area. Although there is little of benefit in the Bill it contains nothing harmful.

Mr. HAWKER (Burra)—I support the Bill. However, it does not go nearly far enough towards combating what has become rather a grave situation. South Australia is particularly suited to the production of fat lambs. Much of its soil is either a tight clay or sand and is rather subject to erosion if cropped continuously. Consequently, a large number of livestock are necessary and that is why our fat lamb production has increased considerably in the last few years. On my recent trip to the United Kingdom I visited Smithfield. Prior to that I was last there in 1937. On both occasions it was pointed out to me that Australia is in a position to effectively compete with lambs from other parts of the world. Now that the United Kingdom has given up bulk buying for private buying the English housewife can select the meat she requires and is becoming choosy. If we are to export we must export our best and not our second best. With the prices of our exports declining any scope for export which is acceptable to importing countries must be fully developed. Lamb comes within that category. On November 18, 1952, in reply to a question, the Premier expressed concern at the hold-up in the slaughtering of lambs during the flush of the season. He said:—

> A matter which is exercising the mind of the Minister of Agriculture at the moment is a possible reversion from the present system to giving export licences to bodies other than the abattoirs if we find that advantage is being taken by the operatives there every year when there is an urgent demand for the facilities to be used to their full extent.

Later in that year almost all primary producing organizations interested in lamb production waited on the Premier. The meeting was reported in the *Chronicle* of December 24 under the heading "The Government is Prepared to Consider Applications from Private Firms to Slaughter Lamb for Export." The Premier then stated that the Government was prepared to consider granting licences to private enterprise to kill. In reply to that statement the secretary of the union concerned said that there were facilities in the Metropolitan Abattoirs to kill all meat offering and that overtime would be worked if certain conditions were granted. The next step was the Premier's broadcast stating that negotiations had started for the establishment of the Metropolitan Meat Works at Kadina. In May, 1953 the manager of the abattoirs and the secretary of the union issued a joint statement to the effect that in respect of certain conditions and in connection with any relevant disputes the union would go before the Abattoirs Industrial Board. Following that we experienced two good killing seasons in which the abattoirs satisfactorily killed all the stock offering. However, the position has deteriorated.

This Bill has been introduced in an endeavour to encourage country abattoirs and will permit the sale of meat in the metropolitan area. That, of course, is absolutely necessary because the lamb season is of short duration and if the works are to be occupied throughout the year there must be an outlet for meat other than during the export season. One of the main features of the Bill is that it permits the Minister, by proclamation, to allow a specified proportion of carcasses from a specified country abattoirs for a specified period to be brought into and sold within the Metropolitan Abattoirs area. I do not know whether that is sufficient to encourage private enterprise to invest a considerable sum in an abattoirs.

One way to encourage lamb production is to assure producers that when their lambs are ready for killing for export they can be killed. If they are held too long they get overweight, are affected by grass seeds, become fly blown or lose their bloom. We must have facilities to enable producers to have their lambs killed when they are ready for killing. It is quite obvious that the Metropolitan Abattoirs has been unable to cope with the position. There are various private enterprises which could assist in killing for export. I would not confine this to country areas. There are certain disadvantages in having abattoirs in country areas. One relates to shipping. When I was at Smithfield I was told that New Zealand and Argentina had the edge on Australia because they loaded the ships at only one port. The hatches were opened, the freezers filled, everything closed and the ships left for the United Kingdom. In Australia a ship has frequently to go to several ports. That results in additional shipping costs and frequently some of the lamb is in the freezers for as long as it takes the ship to get to England while it is being filled in Australia. There should be a limited number of ports for filling a ship with frozen lamb, mutton or beef. If an abattoirs were established at Kadina, for instance, the lamb should be sent to Port Adelaide for shipment so as to obviate the necessity for the vessel going to Wallaroo. The longer the lamb is in the freezers the more it is affected and the less attractive it is when it reaches the consumer.

The South Australian season is very short and if an abattoirs were established in the north there would only be a short time for working, whereas if situated centrally it could draw not only from the area nearby but from north and south and keep operating for a longer period. I think the Government's purpose in encouraging country abattoirs is to ensure that if disputes occur in the metropolitan area some killing would still be undertaken. There are several abattoirs located around Sydney where there have been 17 strikes since May, 1953, but at no time have all abattoirs been affected and as a result Sydney has never been desperately short of meat during any of those strikes. I cannot see why that should not be the position here. There seems to be too much talk about works being established in the country. If it will work, that is the best place for them, but if people are willing to set up abattoirs in the metropolitan area for export purposes they should be given the opportunity to do so. We will not have peace in the industry until there is substantial competition with the Gepps Cross Abattoirs. The Government has always spoken about their capital cost and that nothing should be done to undermine such an enterprise. That is all right up to a point, but it is far more important to safeguard the export trade. A considerable amount of capital is tied up in the breeding of lambs. British stud breeders have invested much capital in importing stock from overseas. It all adds up to a greater amount than the capital cost of the abattoirs. The 1954 report of the Metropolitan Export Abattoirs shows that the capital cost, after allowing for depreciation, is not much more than £1,000,000.

During the year ended June 30, 1955, we exported about 709,000 lambs. If we take £5 as the price per head, South Australia has exported lambs to the value of £3,500,000, possibly three times as much as the present capital cost of the Gepps Cross works. If the abattoirs cannot handle the export trade we should get rid of it, but I do not know that that need be done. Much of the land opened up in the South-East is now coming into production. There is room for additional killing and export licences, and the selling of meat in the metropolitan area, as well as the Metropolitan Abattoirs. During the strike here lambs were sent to Melbourne to be slaughtered, yet that capital city has more abattoirs than the one metropolitan monopoly we have. An exporter told me that the exporters were asked to supply a consignment of old ewes up to 64 lb. each. That is a type of meat that England does not want, yet the order could not be taken because at the Metropolitan Abattoirs priority had to be given to lambs. The firm that got the order had asked the Government for a licence to build abattoirs in the metropolitan area for export purposes and to sell

rejects in the city. It is silly to turn down overseas orders in order to protect the Metropolitan Abattoirs.

The Hon. A. W. Christian—I have an amendment framed to look after that.

Mr. HAWKER—I am pleased to hear it and I hope the Minister has a lot more amendments. Mr. Brookman spoke about the Noarlunga meat works. Although I do not agree with all he said I appreciate the reason why the Minister did not grant an export licence to the works. They were not the only people in the field and if a licence were granted to them licences would have to be granted to others. We cannot go back to indiscriminate killing by a large number of abattoirs. We should concentrate the killing, but I think we are overdoing it. The history of private enterprise in this State has not been encouraging. The Port Lincoln works were started by private enterprise, but they failed and had to be taken over by the Government. Shortly after the war there was a move for stockowners to have a co-operative killing concern for export purposes, but insufficient capital could be found and the proposal fell through. I can see the Government's point in not wanting to give a licence to a number of small people because it might find them going out and the Government having to take them over. Events have proved that the Government was ill-advised in not giving an export licence and a quota. The Bill does not indicate a quota, but I think it would be a good idea to make it what the abattoirs kills for export.

The Hon. A. W. Christian—That is the intention.

Mr. HAWKER—I am glad to hear that also. On the average the Metropolitan Abattoirs would kill for export the same quantity as for home consumption. In 1953 it killed 550,000 lambs for home consumption and 416,000 for export. In 1954 the numbers were 497,000 and 369,000. In 1955 the export number had increased to 709,000, whilst the local consumption figure was 477,000. When basing the quota on the number exported, I think notice could be taken of the number killed at the works and the difference made up with meat consigned to the metropolitan area. The High Court's decision is making the position difficult for the Government. I think those who sponsored the approach to the Privy Council, especially the primary producers organizations, did not work in the best interests of the primary producers. What will happen to them if the matter is not to be controlled by our State, where we can approach the Minister or the heads of the department, but by a department in far off Canberra?

The Hon. A. W. Christian—In other matters these organizations have been noisy against Commonwealth control.

Mr. HAWKER—Yes. The policy of the State Government can be altered, but once a State right is handed over to the Commonwealth it is never returned. These primary producers' organizations were ill advised. I can see the difficulties facing the State Government, especially if the case goes in favour of the Noarlunga Meat Works. Summarizing, lamb is a commodity that can be sold overseas at present. South Australia is expanding and there is room for both metropolitan abattoirs and private enterprise. In the Loan Estimates provision was made for spending £100,000 at the Gepps Cross Abattoirs. Private enterprise has expressed its willingness to help. The capital cost of the abattoirs should not be safeguarded at the expense of our export trade. I hope that when the Minister brings in his amendment we shall have a Bill that will enable private enterprise to kill both in the country and in the metropolitan area so that they can sell their rejects in the metropolitan area and sell sufficient carcasses there throughout the year to enable their plants and equipment to function economically. I support the Bill.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River)—In rising to support the Bill, I first desire to reply to some of the remarks made by the member for Prospect (Mr. Jennings). He stated that the establishment of country abattoirs was the policy of the Opposition.

Mr. O'Halloran—Hear, hear!

Mr. HEASLIP—I do not doubt that for a minute, but the Premier, in arguing against the establishment of country abattoirs in the past—and this goes back to the last election speeches—mentioned that the grazier would get better prices at the Metropolitan Abattoirs and said that was one reason why country abattoirs would not work successfully. Any producer who supports country abattoirs will do so at a loss, and no doubt for that reason the Opposition supports country abattoirs.

Mr. Quirke—You must give some proof of that.

Mr. HEASLIP—We only need to consider the position at Port Lincoln. The producer cannot get the same price for his stock there as he can at the Metropolitan Abattoirs. Where the population is greatest the demand is greatest, and that is where the best price is obtained.

Mr. O'Halloran—Who suggested that the Opposition says there should be a restriction on country abattoirs?

Mr. HEASLIP—I am not suggesting that, but they will be restricted automatically because there is not the same demand in the country. The stock produced in the country must be killed and disposed of, much of it in the metropolitan area.

Mr. O'Halloran—It ought to come down more cheaply dead than alive.

Mr. HEASLIP—Because of transport difficulties it does not, and the producer has to pay the freight.

Mr. O'Halloran—But it has never been tried.

Mr. HEASLIP—It has, at Port Lincoln.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—And at a dozen places in Victoria.

Mr. HEASLIP—Yes, and when country abattoirs were first established there they were not supported. Many of them went bankrupt because the producers sent their stock to the better markets where they got better prices. That has been proved time after time, but there is a limit to what the producer can afford to pay. We have now reached the stage where, because of the continual strikes at the Metropolitan Abattoirs, the producers are losing more than they would if we had country abattoirs.

Mr. Hutchens—What percentage of lambs would be classed as rejects as a result of being transported alive from the West Coast to the Metropolitan Abattoirs?

Mr. HEASLIP—It would be impracticable to transport them from the West Coast alive. Producers on the West Coast have to accept less for their lambs if they are exported than if they are sold here. Because of continual strikes and go-slow methods of men at the Metropolitan Abattoirs producers are losing more than they would by the establishment of country abattoirs. Mr. Jennings gave the credit for the settlement of the strike at the Metropolitan Abattoirs to the Premier and to the executive of the United Trades and Labor Council. No-one else got any credit, but what about the efforts of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board?

Mr. O'Halloran—The board caused the strike!

Mr. HEASLIP—It always causes the strikes, according to the Opposition. The board consists of a chairman nominated by the Government, representatives of lamb producers, pig producers, stock salesmen, meat exporters, butchers, breeders of sheep and cattle, consumers, and a representative of the Australian Meat Industry Employees' Union, who was appointed in 1945. The report of the Joint Select Committee on the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board in 1945 recommended the appointment of a representative of this union to the board with the object of bringing about more harmonious relationships between employees and the board, but what has happened? Since that time we have had 43 industrial disputes there. Until today there were 42, but today's *News* states in headlines, "Trouble threatens again at the Abattoirs."

Mr. Quirke—Why?

Mr. HEASLIP—The Opposition will say it is the board's fault, yet the union's representative was appointed to bring about more harmonious relationships between employer and employee! I have been tempted to move for the reconstitution of the board because I am sure that that representative is not warranted.

Mr. O'Halloran—A few more are not warranted either.

Mr. HEASLIP—I would even agree to reducing the number on the board, but how can the union's representative sit on the board and try to settle a strike? He would be more of an embarrassment than a help.

The Hon. A. W. Christian—The employees would not accept his advice.

Mr. HEASLIP—If he is doing his job that representative must surely report to the union what takes place at the board's meetings. The position is impossible, and that man should be removed from the board. I am not saying anything against him as an individual, but the plan will not work.

Mr. O'Halloran—What about removing other representatives who are there to represent certain interests?

Mr. HEASLIP—At least they represent certain interests working together as a whole. Mr. Jennings did not mention the efforts of the board to settle the strike, but never before has that board put up a better show than it did on this occasion.

The Hon. A. W. Christian—He mentioned the board: he blamed it!

Mr. HEASLIP—Yes, for extending the strike, not for settling it. The producers lost thousands of pounds as a result of the strike, and but for the favourable seasonal conditions they would have lost much more. Further, Mr. Jennings gave no credit to the efforts of the Minister of Agriculture, but the dispute was handled very well by him, yet he and the

board only got the blame. The fact was that the men were illegally on strike and should have been prosecuted. Producers spend 12 months in bringing their lambs into the best possible condition. Then they must be slaughtered, otherwise they lose their bloom and put on too much weight. However, the men refused to slaughter, the result being huge losses to the producers. Therefore, we must establish country abattoirs. They may be expensive, but not as expensive as continuing the great monopoly at Gepps Cross, where the men only wait until the time is opportune and then go on strike. About 150,000 lambs were sent to another State for slaughter; therefore, there were losses to the slaughtermen, to the producers that had to pay freight to get their lambs to Victoria, and to the people of South Australia generally.

Unlike the members for Alexandra and Burra, I support the Bill wholeheartedly. It may not go far enough, but it is a step in the right direction. Of course, thousands of pounds are tied up at the Metropolitan Abattoirs, but it is better to forget any losses that may occur as a result of this Bill, though there is no reason why any losses should occur through establishing country abattoirs. Competition is a good thing. There has been very little so far in the slaughtering of stock, and if private people wish to compete they must be allowed to do so on a reasonable basis. We must not allow the Metropolitan Abattoirs to be able to kill all the year round and country abattoirs to kill only in the flush of the season. I am not greatly concerned about the quotas to be allotted to country abbattoirs, for that is a matter to be arranged between them and the Minister, but the quotas must be liberal enough to allow them to work all the year round. It is useless for a country abattoirs to get a team of men together, employ them for two or three months and then have to get rid of them. They must train men and keep them in order to have them ready when the flush of the season comes about. Mr. Jennings said he hoped that the union would have the recruiting of these new employees. As a primary producer I certainly hope it will not, and I do not think it will. Surely, if someone is paying men to do a job he should have the right of selection. Unfortunately, at the Metropolitan Abattoirs we have lost that right because there is no competition. If we are to establish a country abattoirs and maintain harmony that right should be preserved to the management.

The Hon. A. W. Christian—There is no other industry where the union has such rights.

Mr. HEASLIP—No, and I do not see why it should have them. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. WHITE secured the adjournment of the debate.

GAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjournment debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 22. Page 863.)

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore)—I support the second reading. I think the vital clause in this Bill is the one which gives the company the right to convert three-quarters of its share capital into redeemable stock. I would oppose that provision but for a safeguarding clause which allows shareholders who object to be paid in cash instead of stock. The main proposals embodied in this measure were discussed at a special meeting of shareholders some time ago, and by a unanimous majority, I understand, it was resolved that this Bill should come before Parliament. The reason given for converting shareholders' capital is that it will save the company a considerable amount in taxation, and I believe that any reduction in taxation and any other savings the Gas Company can make should assist in preventing increased cost to the consumer, and that is vital. I think the cost of gas is reasonable today, but no one would want to see it increased. I have always contended that the Gas Company has given excellent service to the people. I understand that the inception of the company dates back to 1861, and we have observed in recent years an endeavour by the company to extend services to the people in the city and some country areas. It is interesting to note that in the last three years the number of consumers of gas served from Brompton, Osborne and Port Pirie has trebled. If that is so, gas users must be satisfied with the service rendered by the company. The company is now laying a main along Grand Junction Road, Rosewater, from Osborne, to serve the satellite town, so it is obvious that it desires to decentralize its supplies to other than metropolitan users. I am pleased with that because I have always contended that gas is required by most people and it would be unfair if country people were not given the same service as those in the metropolitan area. When that main is completed and the new town is serviced by the Gas Company a very large number of consumers will be added to the already large list supplied today.

I understand that the Electricity Trust and the Gas Company share the patronage of new

Housing Trust homes, and it is pleasing to know that occupiers can almost have the choice of gas or electricity. Further, it is encouraging to know that in recent years there has been a great demand for gas refrigerators and gas fires. Of course this has boosted up the use of gas, and the more gas we use the better the chances of preventing an increase in the price. It is our duty to supply country people with as many amenities as possible and I hope that with research and further understanding of the transmission of gas country areas further afield will enjoy the service. As the result of a visit of a German scientist to Victoria some time ago gas produced at Morwell, 89 miles from Melbourne, is to be supplied to the city to supplement the metropolitan supplies and I hope that the practice adopted in Victoria will be developed in South Australia so that more country people will be able to get gas supplies.

Mr. Riches—Has gas an advantage over electricity?

Mr. TAPPING—As one who has used both I pin my faith to gas; I think it is more economical and more suitable for cooking. Clause 10 is a safeguard provision as it requires the company to furnish to the Minister and the Registrar of Companies annually a profit and loss account and balance sheet. As the Minister will have this information which can be transmitted to the House it will afford members the opportunity to voice any complaints they may have. The Bill is not controversial and I give it my support.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. G. T. Clarke, Lawn, Millhouse, Pearson and Frank Walsh: the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records and to report on October 11.

FRUIT FLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 22. Page 863.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I support the second reading. I have received no information to indicate that commercial gardeners in the district in which the outbreak of fruit fly occurred last summer have been affected. Although I realize that the eradication campaign has caused some hardship to home gardeners quite a considerable amount of the fruit and vegetables they produce is consumed in the form of jam, preserves or pickles. From a national outlook I think the measures taken by the department have been most beneficial. Of course, one gets all sorts of minor reports from people who have been peeved by the actions of some of the employees. I believe, however, that the department has done its best to instruct men engaged on the way to carry out their duties, although in some instances shrubs and plants have been affected by the spray getting a little out of hand. Generally speaking, it is the ordinary resident and not the commercial growers who have been affected this season and I hope that it will be possible, as a result of the action taken this year, to avoid a similar campaign next season.

Mr. TEUSNER (Angas)—I wish to compliment the Government, particularly the Minister of Agriculture and his department, on the excellent work they have done in the past few years in the attempt to eradicate the fruit fly. Although the outbreak has been confined to the metropolitan area, it is essential that active measures be continued to ensure the complete eradication of the fruit fly and, if it is not eradicated, to see that it is confined to a restricted area and that future outbreaks do not extend into the country.

I am particularly concerned about the large horticultural and viticultural areas outside the metropolitan area. For the quinquennium ended 1952-53 the 29,000 acres of orchards in South Australia produced an annual average of 533,333 bushels of apricots, over 1,000,000 bushels of oranges, and 856,274 bushels of apples. An area of over 60,000 acres was occupied by vineyards, and the average annual production of currants was 113,548 cwt. and of raisins 226,688 cwt. These figures make us realize the tremendous loss that could be suffered if the fruit fly were permitted to produce havoc on these holdings. I understand that some countries, including certain South and North American countries, have placed an embargo on the introduction of fresh and dried fruit from other countries in which the fruit fly is rampant. It therefore becomes more necessary to see that whatever we produce is not infested with the fruit fly because such infestation would mean a tremendous loss in our overseas trade with countries requiring dried and fresh fruits.

The Hon. A. W. Christian—Such an embargo operated this year in New Zealand in respect of New South Wales citrus fruits.

Mr. TEUSNER—That lends point to the fact that if we tolerate the fruit fly in this State we shall suffer considerably in our overseas trade, therefore it is all the more necessary to ensure the effectiveness of eradication measures.

I support the Bill and trust that the department's efforts will be as effective in the future as they have been in the past.

Mr. WHITE (Murray)—I, too, support the Bill. The orchardists in my district have been concerned about the finding of the fruit fly in the metropolitan area and have appreciated the Government's efforts to stamp out the pest. Although these efforts have cost much money—about £1,000,000 up to the present—it has been money well spent. The member for Angas (Mr. Teusner) referred to the possible loss of markets if we were unable to prove that our fruit was not infested, and his figures show the benefit being obtained from this expenditure. The battle against the fruit fly pest is being won in the metropolitan area, but we must be careful to see that the good results obtained there are not nullified by the carelessness of people who buy fruit in other States where the fly is prevalent and bring it here by car. Some time ago I asked a question about this matter. It is quite clear that in New South Wales the fly has been spread by careless motorists who have thrown portions of fruit from their motor cars, and it is pleasing to find that the Minister and his officers are doing all they can by warning motorists and co-opting the help of police officers in various parts. A certain sum is to be paid as compensation for the confiscation of fruit in the proclaimed areas, and in this matter the Government has been generous and the people generally co-operative. This indicates that South Australians realize the great importance of trying to stamp out this pest.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.57 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 28, at 2 p.m.