HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, October 26, 1961.

The SPEAKER (Hon. B. H. Teusner) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

GLANDORE BOYS' HOME.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the Glandore home for boys?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No provision for funds has been made in this year's Estimates to enable construction to commence on this work. The present planning is that plans, specifications and quantities will be ready for call for tenders later this financial year. The calling of tenders will be subject to funds being made available for the project in the 1962-63 Estimates.

EGG INDUSTRY.

Mr. LAUCKE: As the well-being of each of our primary industries is vital to the national economy in providing overseas credits, the present parlous position of the egg industry calls for urgent consideration. The cost of production looms up as a matter for vital consideration. As in the case of the poultry industry, the bottom has fallen out of the pig market. It could well be that, getting down to tintacks in the light of overseas economic policies, thought should be given to the Commonwealth Government's subsidizing feed wheat purchased by the poultry, pig and dairying industries, as applied to a certain extent in the early days of wheat stabilization. The wheat farmer is entitled (and must continue) to receive his cost of production as now determined. This is paramount. To enable the poultry, pig and dairying industries to compete on overseas markets, the price of wheat to these ancillary industries must be comparable with that which the overseas feeder pays for his wheat. A subsidy on feed wheat which would in no way intrude on the growers' cost of production price would be of major assistance to these ancillary industries. Will the Minister of Agriculture take up this question of subsidy, as I have outlined it, with the appropriate Commonwealth authority?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This question involves policy and I shall give a considered reply as soon as possible.

TAPLEY HILL ROAD BRIDGE.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Roads to my recent question about negotiations between the Glenelg and West Torrens councils and the Highways Department for the construction of a bridge on Tapley Hill Road over the Sturt River?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: No, but I will try to expedite a reply.

POWER GENERATING.

Mr. COUMBE: Earlier this year I asked the Premier about the possibility of generating power by the pumped water method in the southern waters of St. Vincent Gulf. He replied that there was some doubt about that method's efficiency. Has the Premier any further information on this topic?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Electricity Trust obtained advice from consultants on this matter and the trust's general conclusions were that any economies that might be achieved by this method would be counterbalanced by disadvantages. Unless Mr. Colyer, who has been investigating these plants overseas, has any different information when he returns soon, I do not think the project will be worth proceeding with.

SALISBURY SCHOOLS.

Mr. CLARK: Recently my attention was drawn to the fact that in the area south of Salisbury, bounded by Spains Road and west of the railway line, much housing development has occurred: new houses have been built, others are in the course of erection, and further subdivision is taking place. Interested people, including councillors representing that area, seek information about the possible provision of schools in the area. Can the Minister of Education say whether schools are projected for that area and whether land has been obtained?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: I shall obtain a report as soon as possible.

TOWN PLANNING.

Mr. DUNNAGE: Can the Premier say whether the Town Planning Committee has furnished a report on its activities and, if so, when it will be available to members? In Tuesday's *Advertiser*, Professor Denis Winston, Professor of Town and Country Planning with the University of Sydney, was reported as saying during a recent lecture:

> Modern urban developments are too large, too complex, to be fitted into old city patterns without overall replanning and stringent controls.

Did the Premier see that report and can he comment thereon?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Town Planning Committee has been working upon a plan, and some time ago it submitted a request for its material to be printed. Much printing, which will cost thousands of pounds, is involved and I believe the plan is being printed in sections. I do not think the committee's investigations are completed. I do not know when the report will be completed or available, but I will inquire.

FRAUDULENT PRACTICES.

Mr. DUNSTAN: A constituent complained to me that his wife, who was not well, received a call from a firm in the city of Adelaide and that after much persuasion and pressure she signed an agreement (not a hire-purchase agreement but a time-payment agreement) to purchase a "sick call" crucifix. In other words, her illness and religious feelings were played upon by the salesman and, because the agreement was in this form, it did not have to comply with the provisions in the Hire-Purchase Agreements Act that both husband and wife must sign an agreement. In consequence the wife is bound by the agreement, which is for an amount the husband cannot afford to pay, and the firm is pressing for payment. It is difficult to get in touch with this firm personally: it has no telephone, and I called at its office but there has been nobody in attendance. Its office is in Angas Street and some disused signs of A.M.I. are in the corridor. The name of the firm is Supreme Distributors Ltd. and, when I searched to find where I could get in touch with its members personally (as at the moment their address is a post office box), I found that two members of the firm had improperly given in the register of business names the address in Angas Street, which has no residence in it. This sort of thing is most distressing to people like my constituent, who cannot afford to contest a court case and is worried about his wife's health. Will the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General, say whether the Government is considering introducing legislation to deal with the fraudulent and undesirable activities of these door to door salesmen?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: This afternoon I shall ask for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Police Offences Act to deal with one aspect of the problem—the actions of book salesmen, particularly those employed by interstate firms and companies using high pressure salesmen in an endeavour to sell books, particularly to women. As in the case mentioned by the honourable member, these firms do not have Adelaide or South Australian addresses or, if they do, they cannot be contacted at the addresses given. If people do not pay the sums demanded, they receive summonses out of the court in Victoria. I shall explain the Bill on Tuesday, and perhaps the honourable member can consider the aspects he has raised today when dealing with that Bill.

RADIUM HILL PROJECT.

Mr. McKEE: Recently I asked the Premier whether he would consider payment for *pro rata* long service leave for employees placed out of work by the closing of the Radium Hill mine and the Port Pirie uranium treatment plant, and he said he would not consider these payments as he was not prepared to create a precedent. When the Glen Davis mine in New South Wales was closed the Commonwealth Government was faced with a similar problem, and it not only paid its employees *pro rata* long service leave but made other generous concessions. I have a copy of the award in existence when that mine was closed, and I can give it to the Premier for perusal if he wishes. Because the closing of the uranium industry was brought about by uncontrollable circumstances, I appeal to the Government to consider sympathetically the payment of *pro rata* long service leave to employees. I ask this because the Premier said that the uranium industry had been a successful venture and that it had no financial liabilities. I therefore consider that the people who have put so much time into the field deserve consideration for their work. Some of them have up to 10 years' service, and that is one reason why I ask that they be given consideration. I ask that an employee be permitted to leave his family at Radium Hill until he finds suitable employment and satisfactory accommodation, and that travelling and removal expenses be paid by the Government; that families be left on the field in cases of necessity and be free of rent, light, water and other charges; and that the Government make a definite statement on all matters directly affecting employees relative to the closing of this project. Will the Premier bring these matters before the committee set up to deal with these unfortunate circumstances?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have already informed the honourable member that these matters are being examined by the committee and that in due course a report will be issued after Cabinet has approved the matters submitted by the committee. Again,

I say that the Government would not be prepared to give *pro rata* long service leave payments. Long service leave was not granted when the Glen Davis mine was closed. All these things have been examined by the Government. When Glen Davis closed, the employees did not get long service leave.

Mr. McKee: But they were compensated.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: They got some assistance, but not long service leave. What they got did not create the precedent that the granting of long service leave would have created. If it is any news to the honourable member, I believe the committee will recommend something infinitely better than was given when the Glen Davis mine was closed. What happened at that mine and at one or two other places has been examined by the committee, which is in an advanced stage regarding its report. However, until the report is made and accepted by Cabinet, obviously I am not able to disclose its contents. Many jobs are terminated, but it has never been accepted that the employer is automatically responsible for such things as free lighting and housing which the honourable member mentioned. The Government could not accept that as a precedent, but it will do its best to see whether it can obtain re-employment and fair conditions for the men.

PORT AUGUSTA HOUSING.

Mr. RICHES: Recently I asked a question of the Premier regarding the Housing Trust's housing programme at Port Augusta. Last Saturday I was called over to the caravan park at Port Augusta to see the conditions under which a couple with five children were living; their accommodation was a 4ft. high 8ft. by 8ft. tent, no house being available for that family. I was called because the Mothers and Babies Health Association's sister was worried about the tiny baby living in those circumstances. The housing problem at Port Augusta is as serious as it has ever been, and the local people consider that the announced programme of 20 houses a year is not nearly adequate to meet the situation. The Premier promised to discuss this matter with the Housing Trust. Has he a report?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Chairman of the Housing Trust reports that the trust is now building at Port Augusta at the rate of about 20 houses a year only but, as existing houses become vacant at the rate of about 70 a year, accommodation is provided for about 90 families a year. It is considered that this is sufficient to meet the present needs at Port Augusta for rental houses. I point out that there are a considerable number of empty houses in country towns. Applications have been made to the trust far in excess of the actual requirements of these towns, and as a result the trust has empty houses in some instances. The trust will examine the matter from time to time to see whether it is necessary to step up the programme.

TRAFFIC OFFENCES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question concerning traffic offences?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: A report by Sir Edgar Bean states:

Conduct of the kind mentioned by Mr. Walsh is punishable under existing provisions of the Road Traffic Act and other Acts. The new Road Traffic Bill contains the same provisions relative to this topic as the old Acts. The exact charge which might be laid against an offender would depend on the circumstances. Possible charges under the Road Traffic Act are careless driving, dangerous driving, or driving without reasonable consideration for other road users. If damage to a vehicle or other property were caused by the offender he could be charged under the Police Offences Act with wilfully damaging property. If any person were injured as a result of a deliberate attempt to force a car off the road, a charge for assault might be laid.

ELIZABETH TRAFFIC.

Mr. LAUCKE: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question concerning the present speed limit through Elizabeth?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Subsequent to the honourable member's question I inquired of the Commissioner of Police who informed me that speed zoning depended on the passing of the Road Traffic Bill, as before zoning can operate there must be an abolition of the limit of 25 miles an hour over crossings and the introduction of the "yield" signs. As honourable members know, both those matters are provided for in the Bill which has now nearly completed its Parliamentary consideration. As soon as the matter is finalized, speed zoning can be introduced.

WHYALLA LAND ALLOTMENTS.

Mr. LOVEDAY: On October 3 I asked a question regarding the practice of the Lands Department in advertising land as being open for application when it had already been built on by the Housing Trust or allotted to the trust. Has the Minister representing the Minister of Lands a reply?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Director of Lands reports:

The practice of gazetting blocks at Whyalla for application with a footnote in favour of the South Australian Housing Trust is one of many years' standing, under which the Department of Lands and the trust have co-operated in the development of the town. The trust advises the department when further blocks are needed for its home-building programme in the town, and the department then surveys an appropriate area, in an agreed-on location, into the required number of blocks for allotment to the trust. Under the provisions of the Crown Lands Act, such lands cannot be allotted, either under perpetual lease or grant in fee simple, without first being offered for application. To comply with the Act, therefore, gazetting for application to a specified date is unavoidable, but to fulfil the arrangement made, a footnote is included in the gazetted notice that an application by the Housing Trust will receive favourable consideration by the Land Board. This practice of advertising land for application with a footnote in favour of a particular person is often adopted when, because of the requirements of the Act, it is necessary to offer the land for application, while at the same time it is necessary to protect the interest of the person in question.

In the gazetted notice relating to the blocks at Whyalla under discussion, the footnote regarding an application by the Housing Trust was clearly shown, and the statement in the *News* also called attention to that footnote. The manner in which the press statement was set out was, of course, the prerogative of the newspaper. The method of offering blocks in Whyalla has been in operation for many years, and it seems unlikely that the people of Whyalla would have been misled by it on this occasion. It sometimes happens that the Housing Trust has its builders available immediately on completion of the survey, and as the whole purpose of the subdivision is to provide blocks for the trust, the department raises no objection to the trust going ahead with its building programme while the preparation of details, plans, the pricing of the blocks, and the gazettal of the blocks for application are being dealt with by the department. That is what happened in this instance. Apart from blocks intended for the Housing Trust, other blocks at Whyalla are gazetted for general application from time to time.

Mr. LOVEDAY: What the Minister said was not a reply to my question but simply a statement of the procedure carried out by the department. In my original question I pointed out that the blocks I mentioned had been built on, yet a notice in the *Government Gazette* said that applications would be received and would have to reach the department by October 17. This obviously has misled people; I can produce evidence to that effect. When the land is advertised by the Lands Department for application, will the department make it clear that it has already been allocated to the Housing Trust (if that has actually been done) so that prospective applicants will not be misled? Also, will the Minister make it possible for the Whyalla Town Commission to have necessary alterations made in its assessment book so that rates can be charged from the time when they should be charged? If the Lands Department is unable to comply with these requests because of regulations or legislative provisions, will the Minister take steps to have this altered?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The reply I gave was prepared as a result of the discussion on the Estimates. My memory may not be correct, but I believe the honourable member asked several questions and raised the matter during that debate. The statement was prepared by the Director of Lands at my request, and was about procedure; I think it unlikely that it was prepared as a direct reply to a specific question. I will draw the attention of the Minister of Lands to the matter, as I am not now Acting Minister of Lands.

ABORIGINES.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: In an article in this morning's *Advertiser* dealing with aborigines, farmers and squatters in South Australia are accused of poisoning wells so that natives who take water from those wells will be poisoned. Will the Minister of Works refute those statements emanating from England, and prove to the people there that not all Australians are lunatics? In my electorate there are some hundreds of aborigines, most of whom are very civilized, although some are only semi-civilized, and I do not think any settler in my district has a grudge against an aborigine. I resent the statements that have appeared in the daily press.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I saw the article to which the honourable member has referred, but I did not take much notice of it because I thought the statement was of such a nature that it indicated a complete ignorance of the facts. As I said yesterday, I have travelled widely through South Australia (and, incidentally, in many parts of the State where few white people have been) and I have never heard of this being done, considered or discussed.

Mr. Shannon: If you poisoned the water, you would be poisoning your own stock.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That is so. In any case, as regards the natives in the areas where stock is pastured, nearly all the people make contact with the owners of the stations, and they know precisely what is

being done by the owners. Indeed, they know as much about the area as do the owners themselves. The statement did not indicate to me that it was one that needed to be considered seriously, because it betrayed a complete ignorance of the facts. I appreciate the honourable member's resentment, that of his constituents, and also that of people represented by other honourable members in this House, at the charge of such inhumanity as the article suggests.

HENLEY HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. FRED WALSH: As a result of assurances given to the Henley high school council, the council went to considerable expense to erect cyclone backstops for tennis courts in that section of the grounds to the west of the original buildings. The council was given to understand that these courts would not be affected by the final sealing of the area. The backstops have been removed to permit paving work on this section, but the new grading will apparently render the area utterly useless for tennis courts. Apart from the monetary loss, this is a matter for concern in view of the limited playing space available at this high school. Will the Minister of Works take up with the Director of Public Buildings the question of this section being regraded before sealing so as to permit the re-establishment of the courts in their original position?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will take that matter up.

RIVER TORRENS.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I have two associated questions related to the River Torrens. The first is that some time last year the Minister of Works, after inspecting an area of the River Torrens in company with me and certain other people, decided that he should refuse to issue licences for sand-washing in the bed of the River Torrens after June 30 of this year. Most of the sand-washing plants associated with the River Torrens have not, in fact, been sand-washing in the river, but the one that the Minister and I inspected on that occasion was then doing it and is now doing it. Although a licence was not issued in that case, sand-washing has been going on down the bank of the Torrens. The people in that area are perturbed that it should go on. Indeed, one of the neighbours of this sand-washing plant has been driven to sell his property rather than put up with the continued nuisance from the carrying on of that work in this purely residential area. What has happened? I understand that, since the administration of the River Torrens Protection Act has been entrusted to the councils in the area, the question of prosecution has been referred to them. Has the Minister had any request from the councils to prosecute the sand-washing plant involved?

My second question concerns the same section of the river and relates to the creation of a new oval in that area. It is now some considerable time since this project was first mooted. In the whole of the St. Peters area no adequate playing space is available other than by kind permission of St. Peter's College, which has allowed certain of its lower ovals to be used from time to time by school and other sporting bodies in the area; but this is by no means adequate for the demands of the populace. The creation of a new oval there could greatly benefit the citizens in that area as well as the whole State, because we need a second oval in the metropolitan area. What progress has been made in transferring a certain area to the Corporation of St. Peters, and the creation of an oval with the diversion of the River Torrens bed there?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: In reply to the honourable member's first question, I advised the licensees that no further licences would be issued after June 30, and no further licences have been issued. Subsequently, one or two of the owners of plants took legal advice, which was to the effect that, because they were not operating on the actual banks of the river, they did not need a licence, so they have continued to operate without one. I think they would be entitled to do so legally. The plant the honourable member said we had visited together was the subject of several exchanges of letters between the secretary of the joint River Torrens body, which is a body constituted of several of the councils that control that area, and they asked whether investigations could be made. Investigations were made and a police report was obtained, a copy of which has been sent to the secretary of the committee. The last I knew of the matter was that I asked the committee to tell me if it desired to prosecute. The honourable member will recall that, in delegating my powers under the River Torrens Protection Act, it was not legally possible for me to delegate authority to prosecute, but I informed the committee at that time that any request by it for permission to prosecute would receive immediate attention. I have not received a formal request to prosecute but I can tell the honourable member, as I have told the people concerned,

that I would grant them authority to prosecute if they desired it. I have had no reply to that latest communication. The second question does not come within my purview, but I will refer the matter to my colleagues in Cabinet for a reply.

MILLICENT COURT.

Mr. CORCORAN: I understand that the Premier has a reply to my recent question about the clerical work at the Millicent local court.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have inquired into this matter. There has never been any suggestion of closing the Millicent local court. In fact, an amount was provided on the Loan Estimates for building a police station and courthouse at Millicent. What has probably given rise to this rumour is the fact that the amount of court business at Mount Gambier and Millicent is extremely heavy and is far too much for the police officers who have been doing that work. It is interrupting their other work. The Attorney-General is investigating proposals to enable some other authority to do this clerical work. I assure the honourable member that Millicent will be fully considered. I do not know whether the authority that is appointed to do the work will be at Mount Gambier or at Millicent.

VICTOR HARBOUR JETTY.

Mr. JENKINS: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to my recent question about the erection of a protective fence around the Victor Harbour jetty before the holidays?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Harbors Board has accepted a contract from a local firm to erect the fence, and I understand that the time for completion of the contract is within three weeks of the date of acceptance. The date of acceptance was several days ago, so the honourable member can expect the fence to be erected within the next three weeks.

DECLARED VEGETABLE AREAS.

Mr. BYWATERS: Has the Minister of Agriculture, in the temporary absence of the Minister of Irrigation, a reply to my recent question about declaring areas near Mannum and Murray Bridge for vegetable growing, to conserve underground water supplies?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: No, but I will refer the question to the Minister of Irrigation for a reply.

RAILWAY REFRESHMENT ROOMS.

Mr. RICHES: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the sale of cool drinks in the Port Pirie railway refreshment rooms?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have received a lengthy report from the Minister of Railways, but have not had time to read and summarize it. I will make it available to the honourable member so that he can ascertain the information he seeks.

Mr. RICHES: As the report is of interest to people other than myself will the Minister make it available for publication in *Hansard*?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will make the report available, and I ask leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without its being read.

Leave granted.

RAILWAY REFRESHMENT ROOMS.

With reference to the remarks by Mr. Riches, M.P., vide *Hansard*, October 4, 1961, I have to advise the Minister that I have obtained a full report on this subject from the Supervisor, Refreshment Room Services, Mr. Coleman, and a copy is given hereunder:

With the exception of Gladstone, where our soft drinks requirements have for all times been obtained locally, all other aerated water supplies for country railway refreshment rooms operated by the department, are purchased under Supply and Tender Board contract from one of the State's leading manufacturers. Apart from the conveyance of aerated waters, bulk and bottled ale from the city to country stations, various other lines purchased in bulk, such as butter, hams, smallgoods, fruit and vegetables are forwarded to country railway refreshment rooms. Mr. Condon, manager of Moyles Limited, called on me some time ago, inquiring as to the possibility of our stocking some of Moyles' soft drink lines at the Port Pirie Junction refreshment rooms. It was pointed out to Mr. Condon at the time that aerated waters for various Government departments were covered by Supply and Tender Board contract, and that the present contracts were for a period of two years from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1963.

However, I suggested to Mr. Condon that he might contact Mr. Coombe, Secretary, Supply and Tender Board, who, I understand, intimated to Mr. Condon that if application was made to the board, consideration might be given to Moyles Limited sharing a portion of the requirements of the Port Pirie Junction railway refreshment rooms, providing the quality of the local soft drinks was up to the required standard. Inquiries have been made into the several matters raised by Mr. Riches, viz. transport, and the support of local industries, and I would like to point out that Moyles are the direct representatives and local distributors of Coca Cola products in the northern area, and that a new bottling plant was recently installed in their factory at Port Pirie, which suggests a definite link with an American bottling company. However, in connection with the suggestion of purchasing from other aerated water manufacturers, it has been ascertained that at least three other South Australian firms, viz. Woodroofe's Limited, Pepsi-Cola, and

Mirinda, are concentrating on the shops in the town of Port Pirie and are transporting supplies by road from Adelaide, which, in itself, suggests that Moyles are faced with a considerable amount of soft drink opposition.

The Port Pirie Junction refreshment rooms have been in existence for a period of thirty years, but according to our local manager, it is only during the last two years that this firm has displayed any interest in the supply of drinks to the refreshment rooms. With reference to the supply of Moyles' soft drinks to the lessee at Bowmans, it is pointed out that these supplies are not forwarded from Port Pirie by rail, but are being transported by road motor lorry.

I should like to make it clear that the refreshment rooms at Port Pirie are operated by the department, and it is necessary for us to obtain our supplies through the Supply and Tender Board. On the other hand, at Bowmans the refreshment rooms are operated by a lessee, who is permitted to purchase his stocks from any source provided the quality of the goods meets our requirements.

BORDERTOWN HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on October 17 about additional buildings for the Bordertown high school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: The enrolments at the Bordertown high school are as follows:

1960	190
1961	204
1962	250 (estimated)
1963	250 (estimated)

It was proposed to include in the 1961-62 permanent building programme provision for additional accommodation of solid construction for 200 pupils including classrooms, science room and library. Unfortunately it has been necessary to defer this project for the time being. A timber classroom and a timber art room have been provided for the school this year and it is proposed to build the following additional timber buildings in 1962: one classroom 32ft. x 24ft.; one classroom 24ft. x 24ft.

As the estimated enrolment for 1963 is the same as the estimated enrolment for 1962, it appears that there will be sufficient accommodation for the Bordertown high school by the start of 1963.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Works obtain from the Public Buildings Department details of the cost of the timber structures to be provided this year and next year?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, I shall obtain those figures for the honourable member.

CONCESSION FARES.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked recently about concession fares for country people visiting specialists in Adelaide?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Railways Commissioner reports:

No concessions of the nature described by Mr. McKee are given to country passengers. I am informed, however, that the Hospitals Department does refund the cost of travel to patients visiting the Royal Adelaide and Queen Elizabeth hospitals on the presentation by the patient of the train or tram ticket.

PORT PIRIE MEAT PRICES.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about meat prices at Port Pirie?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Prices Commissioner reports:

Two officers of the department visited Port Pirie on October 10 and 11 and investigated meat prices. The investigation disclosed that, in the main, all butchers at Port Pirie operate on uniform retail prices despite any differences in the classes of meat being purchased and sold by individual butchers. It was also disclosed that in recent months some price reductions have been made, the latest of which were implemented on October 5.

Whilst there are considerable variations in the prices being paid for livestock by individual butchers, the department considers that the present uniform level of meat prices is far too high, having regard to the decline in market prices in recent months. A letter was forwarded to the president of the Port Pirie master butchers on October 18 expressing the department's concern regarding the present position and requesting that action be taken to review prices with a view to making further and substantial price reductions as follows:

Beef	7d. to 8d. per lb.
Mutton	4d. to 5d. per lb.
Lamb	6d. to 7d. per lb.
Pork	2d. to 3d. per lb.

The matter will receive further consideration depending on the action taken by the Port Pirie butchers as a result of the department's letter to which a reply has not yet been received.

TAXATION ALLOWANCES.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about deductions from income tax in respect of the employment of emergency housekeepers?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have received the following letter from the Prime Minister:

I have discussed with my colleague, the Treasurer, the request by Mr. McKee, M.P., that expenses incurred by a taxpayer for the employment of a housekeeper during a period when his wife is confined to bed for medical reasons be an allowable deduction for income

tax purposes. You will appreciate that the expenditure in question is essentially of a private or domestic nature and that the allowance of the deduction sought could be authorized only if the income tax law were amended for that purpose. In this connection, the Government has received numerous requests for the allowance of taxation concessions in respect of various other classes of private and domestic expenditure which are at present not deductible. Accordingly, the matter raised by Mr. McKee could be considered only as part of an overall review of the concessional allowances. I have therefore arranged with the Treasurer to have Mr. McKee's request noted and he may be assured that it will be kept in view when the relevant provisions of the law are next under review.

WALLAROO PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. HUGHES: Can the Minister of Education give particulars relating to alterations and additions required to the Wallaroo primary school, including a new headmaster's residence?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: The departmental property officer has written to the council concerning the closing of William Street between the two sections of the school grounds but so far has not received a reply. The Director of the Public Buildings Department has been asked to erect a shelter shed on the playing area west of William Street, and it is intended to make the following improvements and alterations to the site: (1) purchase of a new residence for the headmaster; (2) the demolition of the existing old residence and the erection of a classroom and administrative rooms in its place along with the absorption of the residence grounds into the play area; (3) the replacement of the old boundary walls with modern fencing; (4) the modernization and enlargement of the windows in the northern wall of the school building; (5) the improvement of the folding partition between two classrooms. However, because of the present financial position, it is not possible to say when these improvements and alterations will be made.

RODWELL BRIDGE.

Mr. JENKINS: On August 8 the Minister of Works gave a reply from his colleague in another place stating that the proposed Rodwell bridge was included in this year's programme and that it was expected that tenders would be called before the end of 1961. Will he ascertain from his colleague whether tenders have yet been called?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I shall endeavour to ascertain that.

BUNDALEER RESERVOIR.

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the Bundaleer reservoir, in which I asked for an analysis of the saline content of the water being reticulated in the Wallaroo district?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have a report containing an analysis of the water, which shows that the total saline content is 730; converted to grains to the gallon (the most easily understood term) this has to be multiplied by 0.07 or divided by 14. The honourable member will therefore see that the saline content is about 50 grains to the gallon. That is of total salts, including sodium, chlorine and magnesium, which are present but not in significant quantities. I think the honourable member will agree that the quality of the water at present is satisfactory.

GERIATRIC AND CUSTODIAL HOSPITALS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: In the temporary absence of the Premier, has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about geriatric and custodial hospitals?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Director-General of Public Health reports:

The Geriatric and Custodial Hospitals Association of South Australia was formed for the purpose of ensuring that the standard of member hospitals would be adequate for the proper care of ill and helpless aged people. I reported on this association previously in the following terms:

> The proposal to set up a Geriatric and Custodial Hospitals Association has been examined in detail. The standards to be observed by member hospitals are substantially those already required by law in the Health Act and Regulations. In some respects they are a little more demanding. The present legal requirements for licensing as a private hospital are not high, and private hospitals accept them readily. The department's greatest problem in this sphere is to determine whether certain institutions are in fact hospitals or rest homes requiring to be licensed as such, or whether they are mere boarding houses. (The case cited by Miss Taylor is well known to us.) The proposed association might well help to clarify this position, as the public and the department would have a clear idea of the nature of any institution which was advertised as a member of the association. If the association is set up I think it would be helpful for a member of the staff of this department to be a member of the committee or board. Rule 3 (*e*) under the heading "Objects" suggests that the association would be likely to seek financial assistance from the Government to assist the care of the aged sick. I feel sure that you would prefer to continue to give

financial assistance to individual institutions based on their needs and merits, rather than to make substantial subsidies to an association for the assistance of its members.

TEA TREE GULLY SEWERAGE.

Mr. LAUCKE: The District Council of Tea Tree Gully is concerned at the possible serious health problem that could arise in this rapidly developing area through difficulty in disposing of septic tank effluent. This problem will be accentuated as more houses are built. Since 1956, 1,000 new houses have been erected in the area, and a sewerage system is called for. Will the Minister of Works consider a sewerage scheme for Tea Tree Gully at an early date?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The District Council of Tea Tree Gully and the honourable member, acting for the council in this House, requested that the matter of sewerage for Tea Tree Gully be referred to the Sewerage Advisory Committee. The Engineer-in-Chief has advised me that the principal function of that committee is to investigate and recommend priorities for the installation of sewerage in country towns, and that as Tea Tree Gully is contiguous to the metropolitan area it logically can be included in sewerage schemes that embrace the metropolitan area proper. He concludes his report by saying that the sewers of the metropolitan area will be extended to Tea Tree Gully when the many subdivisions taking place are sufficiently developed to warrant this provision.

NORWOOD GIRLS TECHNICAL SCHOOL.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent questions concerning the Norwood girls technical high school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: No. The honourable member asked me a series of questions, and I have submitted those to the Director of Education and also the Director of the Public Buildings Department for a comprehensive report on all the matters raised. This will probably take a little time, but I hope to be able to reply to the honourable member next week. I shall let him know when the report is ready.

FREELING RAILWAY STATION.

Mr. LAUCKE: The Railways Department has built an imposing new railway station building at Freeling, but the old building is becoming derelict. Will the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways, ascertain when the old building is to be removed?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will ask for a report from my colleague, the Minister of Railways.

CHILDREN'S INSTITUTIONS SUBSIDIES BILL.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (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 provide for the granting of financial aid to certain persons, institutions and authorities for the purpose of assisting them to provide, acquire, or construct buildings and equipment for the accommodation, care and training of children in need.

Motion carried.

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

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to enable the Government, acting through the Minister administering the measure, to grant financial aid in deserving cases to persons, institutions and authorities engaged in the care and training of children who are destitute or in needy circumstances to assist those persons, institutions and authorities in providing buildings and equipment for the housing, care or training of such children. Clause 2 will confer on the Minister the necessary power to grant such financial aid from time to time. Before making a grant the Minister must be satisfied that the accommodation, care and training for which the buildings and equipment are intended will not be conducted for profit. To assist the Minister in assessing the merits of each application for assistance, the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board will furnish him with a report on such matters relating to the applicant as the Minister requires and such other matters as are brought to his notice by the board.

Clause 3 appropriates the sum of £50,000 out of the general revenue for the purpose of meeting the grants to be made under this measure and provides for the appropriation of further moneys from time to time for that purpose. Clause 4 provides that any grant shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Minister may, as he thinks fit, impose.

The clause also limits a grant to a maximum of one-half of such amount as the Minister considers to be the fair and reasonable cost of the buildings and equipment to be provided with the assistance of the grant.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

STUDENT HOSTELS (ADVANCES) BILL.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON (Minister of Education) 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 provide for the making of advances by the Government of the State for the provision of assistance to student hostels, and for other purposes.

Motion carried.

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

The Hon. B. PATTINSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object, as its long title indicates, is to enable the grant of advances out of Loan funds to assist persons in the establishment or improvement of student hostels. The Bill is short, its principal clause being clause 7 which empowers the making of advances for the purchase or construction of land, furniture, equipment or buildings for use for the purpose of students' hostels, reasonable preference in accommodation being given to students from outside the metropolitan area. Advances are to be limited to 90 per cent of cost of land or buildings and 50 per cent of cost where furniture or equipment is concerned. The term of the advance is to be not over 40 or 12 years respectively (clause 8), advances are to be secured by mortgage (clause 9), and carry interest to be fixed by the Treasurer (clause 10). The remaining clauses are of a machinery nature covering administration by the State Bank and accounting procedure (clauses 3, 4, 5 and 6). Clause 4 (2) provides that the necessary funds are to be provided by Parliament from time to time. Clause 11 of the Bill empowers the making of regulations.

Such are the provisions of the Bill. It is introduced because the Government believes that there are many institutions catering for the accommodation of students who find themselves unable to improve their facilities or to expand for lack of finance. The Bill is, as honourable members will see, designed primarily to assist country students. The living-away-from-home allowance instituted by the Government some years ago gave some assistance in this regard, but one result of the excellent operation of the scheme is that adequate accommodation has become unavailable. This Bill will enable the Government through the State Bank to make advances for the erection or improvement of hostels along lines very similar to those of the Advances for Homes Act, under which loans are made for the erection of houses. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

Mr. CLARK secured the adjournment of the debate.

REGISTRATION OF BUSINESS NAMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This is a short Bill, the object of which is to prohibit the use of business names for the purpose of inducing members of the public to lend money to or deposit money with firms, individuals and corporations. Certain undesirable and unscrupulous practices of some firms and individuals have in recent months been causing the Governments of this State and of the Commonwealth and the other States a great deal of concern. One of these practices is the use of high-sounding business names suggesting substantial assets or association with large business interests and of highly coloured and exaggerated advertisements to induce members of the public to lend money to firms and individuals at attractively high rates of interest but without any security or guarantee of repayment.

There have been many cases in other parts of Australia and some cases, unfortunately, in this State of invitations to the public to lodge money on deposit at high rates of interest by persons and firms masquerading under business names. Large sums of money have been collected from the public in this fashion and the borrowers have in many of those cases either misappropriated the money or gone bankrupt. The provisions of the Companies Act regarding invitations to the public by companies to subscribe for shares and debentures, to some extent, control the activities of corporations in this field by requiring the issue of a prospectus in relation to such invitations while private and proprietary companies are precluded from making such invitations by their constitutions. However, it is felt that no company should be allowed to use

a business name, as distinct from its corporate name, for the purpose of obtaining loans and deposits from the public.

The Attorneys-General of the Commonwealth and the States have recognized that a strong case exists for uniformity in the field of business names legislation and Commonwealth and State officers are at present endeavouring to reach a basis of agreement in relation to such legislation. Although there is a considerable amount of work to be done before the respective Ministers will be in a position to seek the approval of their Governments to the introduction of the uniform legislation, there is general agreement among all the Governments that there is urgent need for such legislation as is proposed by this Bill to be brought into force throughout Australia without delay.

Clause 3 inserts a new section 4a in the principal Act which prohibits the use of or reference to a business name in any invitation to the public to deposit money with or lend money to a firm, individual or corporation carrying on business in the State under that business name. The prohibition, however, applies only to cases where the firm, individual or corporation is registered or required to be registered under the Act in relation to the business name. As the Act does not require the registration—

(*a*) of a firm carrying on business under a business name that consists solely of the true names of all the partners of the firm; or

(*b*) of an individual carrying on business under a business name that consists solely of his true name; or

(*c*) of a corporation carrying on business under a business name that consists solely of its corporate name,

the new provisions will not preclude the use of such business names by such firms, individuals and corporations in any invitation to the public to lend money to or deposit money with them. In other words, the Bill will not preclude persons from advertising in their own names for loans for their private needs. On the other hand, the Bill is designed to prohibit activities of a fraudulent and unscrupulous character and it has been agreed by the representatives of the Governments of all the States and the Commonwealth that the penalty for the offence created by the Bill should be severe and deterrent. A maximum penalty of £500 has accordingly been prescribed. If the Bill becomes law, I am sure it will prove of great benefit to a large section of the public who are only too easily victimized by the fraudulent and unscrupulous practices the Bill is designed to prevent.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It effects two amendments to the Real Property Act. The first, which is made by clause 3, repeals section 20 of that Act which requires every Registrar-General, Deputy Registrar-General and Acting Registrar-General to make a formal declaration that he will perform his duties before a judge of the Supreme Court. Although there is no objection in principle to such a provision, the fact is that in practice it causes delays where appointment of an Acting Registrar-General for however short a period is required. In any event the taking of such a formal declaration appears to serve no useful purpose—all officers of the Registrar-General's Department are bound by law to perform their duties. The Government therefore considers that section 20 should be repealed for practical reasons.

The other amendment, made by clause 4, inserts a new clause into the principal Act which is designed to get over certain practical difficulties arising out of the operation of the Town Planning Act. By section 14a of that Act, upon the deposit of any plan of subdivision which provides for an easement to the Minister of Works or a council for sewerage, water or drainage purposes, the land is made subject to such easement without compensation. The Registrar-General of Deeds is required to register such easement. It frequently happens, however, that an easement is no longer required by the Minister or council, or is required over a different portion of the land. Where the easement is no longer required the Registrar-General can do nothing about the title and this means that the registered proprietor holds a title showing an easement which has been disclaimed by the person entitled. The object of the new section is to enable the Registrar-General to make the necessary entries in such cases. It provides that the written consent of all persons having an interest in the land must

be obtained. The amendment is of a practical nature and will operate to avoid some difficulties which have occurred in the past.

Mr. JENNINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

MARRIAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes certain necessary amendments to the Marriage Act that will be required following upon the proclamation of the Commonwealth Marriage Act. Although further amendments to our Act may be required in the light of experience, there are four small amendments which are considered essential. The first amendment effected by clause 3 is to insert into the principal Act a definition of "authorized celebrant". Under the Commonwealth Act persons who can celebrate marriages are specifically defined, and, as the provisions of the State legislation on this matter will be superseded by the Commonwealth provisions, it is necessary for this provision to be inserted in our Act.

The second amendment is made by clause 4, which relates to procedure. Under our State law the celebrant of the marriage completes three certificates. One is handed to the parties, one is sent to the central office of the Registrar, and one to the District Registrar. Under Commonwealth law the celebrant still completes three certificates, one of which is handed to the parties and only one to the central office for entry in the general register. The third copy is retained by the celebrant for church records. It will therefore be necessary for the central office to copy its registration and forward the copy to the District Registrar for entry in his register, thus preserving the present practice in this State. Clause 4 accordingly makes the necessary amendment to section 33 of the State Act.

Section 49 of the State Act provides that any Registrar who wilfully registers a marriage contravening the State Act shall be guilty of an offence. It is considered desirable to add to that section words which will cover contravention of Commonwealth law. This is done by clause 5 of the Bill. The last amendment concerns the fees payable for celebration of marriages after 10 days' notice (under the Commonwealth law this period is seven days), and clause 6 accordingly amends the sixth schedule of the State Act. I should point out in connection with this Bill, which is purely of a technical character, that the State Act provides not only for marriage but also for the registration of marriage certificates. The Commonwealth Act does not, however, cover registration, so that the registration provisions of the State Act will remain in force. That is why it is necessary for the present Bill to make the alterations in the State registration provisions.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN AUSTRALIA CONSTITUTION BILL.

Mr. COUMBE brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received. Ordered that report be printed.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its chief object is to extend the range of permissible investments of friendly societies and branches so as to include any securities whatever, subject to the consent of the Chief Secretary on the recommendation of the Public Actuary and to such conditions as he may impose. Section 12 of the principal Act at present restricts the investments which may be made by trustees of societies and branches to Government securities, fixed deposits, City of Adelaide loans or municipal corporation debentures, mortgages or freehold property and the purchase of freehold property. There are thus excluded such investments as loans to the Electricity Trust, Gas Company or the Housing Trust.

But the amendment needs some further explanation. As members are no doubt aware, the Friendly Societies Medical Association has operated for many years for supplying its members with medicines at low costs. It appears that the only way in which the benefit of manufacturers' prices can be obtained is through a wholesale organization. But the association is prevented from investing moneys in a wholesale organization of its own because of the limitations upon investment prescribed by the Act. Because it cannot so invest its moneys, it is unable to obtain and pass on the benefit of manufacturers' prices to its members. The amendment would enable the association, or, for that matter, any friendly

society, being unrestricted as to the nature of the securities in which its funds may be invested, to form a wholesale organization itself. Another possible benefit from this amendment is that it would enable societies to operate organizations to provide dental and physiotherapeutic benefits. As I have said, there is a proviso to the amendment that the consent of the Chief Secretary be obtained in every case. A further proviso will preclude investments in companies unless a friendly society or friendly societies, by making the investment, will obtain a controlling interest in a company and the operations of the company will assist the society in carrying out its objects. Another exception prevents friendly societies from investing in any of those companies which carry on a pharmaceutical business in pursuance of the special provision inserted in the Pharmacy Act in 1942 when future operations by companies in that business were prohibited. I believe that the object of the amendment will commend itself to all members and that the safeguards suggested will prevent any possible abuse of the proposed extension.

Clause 6 accordingly adds a new paragraph to section 12 of the principal Act. The Bill makes some other amendments which will raise the maximum limit of benefits available to members—in general terms, to double the amounts of benefits. Clause 3 will amend section 7 of the Act, which limits assurances to £1,000 and annuities to £5 5s. a week. It is proposed that these amounts be doubled, bringing the Act into line with the corresponding provisions in Victoria. The same section limits weekly sick benefits to £7 7s., which it is proposed to increase to £10 10s.

It will be noticed that clause 3 (1) strikes out the proviso to section 7 (2) of the principal Act, which limits the aggregate of assurances by an individual to £1,000. The proviso is almost impossible to police in practice, and the Public Actuary has agreed that it should be deleted. Clause 3 (2) makes a consequential amendment. Clause 4 raises the limit of superannuation benefits from £5 5s. to £10 10s., and clause 5 increases the limit of £100 which a member may obtain from a small loans fund to £200. Clause 7 will raise the amount which may be paid out by way of death benefits from £200 to £500. This amount has not been altered for some years, and the suggested amount will take account of variations in the value of money.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

PREVENTION OF POLLUTION OF WATERS BY OIL BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 25. Page 1520.)

Mr. RYAN (Port Adelaide): I fully support the objects of this Bill. Whereas some Bills are confusing in their intention, this Bill is extremely clear, understandable and precise in its intention. The only criticism I offer is that it is long overdue. I fully realize that an international conference held overseas in 1954, at which Australia was represented, agreed that the decisions arrived at could not be implemented for three years. However, the Commonwealth Government, as one of the signatories of the convention, legislated, in accordance with the powers vested in it, in May, 1960. The Commonwealth Government was able to legislate in accordance with the powers conferred upon it by the Constitution, but it cannot over-ride the Constitution of a State and hence this State Government has been requested to legislate in accordance with its constitutional powers.

The Bill is designed for the prevention of something that may happen, and whilst it may sound of minor importance, what could happen without such legislation is of major importance and could cause a major disaster at a shipping port. Only those who realize what could happen appreciate the importance of the legislation. Clause 5 states that the penalty for discharging oil or any mixture containing oil shall be £1,000. The Bill defines what is oil and what is a mixture containing any oil. In that respect it is clear and easy to interpret. The Bill prescribes not a fine up to £1,000 but—according to my interpretation—a flat penalty of £1,000. It goes further and gives the court the power to impose that penalty not only on the master of the ship but also on the owner, so it could result in a penalty of £2,000.

Whilst the Commonwealth Government can legislate in accordance with its powers it has no powers over intrastate shipping. Much of the Bill deals with the powers this State Government has over intrastate shipping. The State Government, in its wisdom, has taken into account the major disaster that could be caused by anybody who wished to contravene this legislation and has prescribed, in clause 8, a penalty of £500 for intrastate ships. The Bill defines the Harbors Board as the authority under the legislation. It authorizes persons employed by the board to

make inspections at any time. It also prescribes that ships shall be fitted with certain equipment, and if that equipment is not provided and does not come up to the required standard, a penalty of £500 shall be imposed on the master or the owner of the ship. Under the legislation, information concerning the discharge of certain inflammable cargo and information about working outside what are called sunlight hours, must be conveyed to the Navigation Department. The Bill also requires the owners of ships, if they wish to discharge inflammable cargo, to supply that information to the Harbors Board. If any owner or master does not conform with that clause the penalty is rather severe. It is also severe for not notifying the board of its intention to work outside daylight hours; it is a fine not exceeding £200.

Realizing what could happen, certain prominent citizens in Port Adelaide 12 months ago devised a plan to overcome any pollution of waters by oil in that port. The whole of Port Adelaide has been organized as a disaster section; it has been accounted for with fire, transport and medical arrangements. Some of the most disastrous fires that have occurred in any part of the world have occurred in major seaports, and the cause has been the pollution of water by oil. I congratulate the Government on this occasion, although the Bill is long overdue. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Mr. JENKINS (Stirling): I, too, support the Bill. We have never been faced with the need for such legislation, but it now has to be implemented following the establishment of the oil refinery at Port Stanvac. With the welcome establishment of the Stanvac oil refinery, the need immediately becomes apparent. Stanvac is situated on our southern coastline and, as unloading is on an open or exposed coastline, the concentration of oil will not be as great as it would be if the unloading were carried out in a more enclosed area or harbour.

This coastline is subject to strong winds and tides, which will disperse oil to some extent, but adjacent to the refinery are several popular tourist beaches which could during long calm periods be affected by oil lost in discharge or going overboard for some purpose or other, as there would be little dispersal. Oil is inclined to hang to the beaches, permeate the sand, and move backwards and forwards with the tides. This would be disastrous to the prosperity of the beaches where surfers and swimmers congregate. Towns further along the coast (such as Victor Harbour and Port Elliot) would not be affected detrimentally as the long, rough coastline between is sufficient to disperse any oil that might drift in that direction.

The provisions in the Bill should ensure that adequate care is taken by the masters of ships discharging oil in the area covered by State limits. Clause 5 provides for a £1,000 fine for committing an offence such as discharging oil in the waters in the area. Clauses 8 to 12 are the main provisions of the Bill. Clause 8 requires intrastate ships to be fitted with proper equipment to prevent oil pollution, and it provides for inspections and tests. Clause 9 empowers regulations requiring masters of intrastate ships to keep oil records. Clause 10 requires the master of any ship in waters within the board's jurisdiction to report any discharge of oil to the board, which is given powers of inspection. Clause 11 empowers the board to provide oil reception facilities, while clause 12 deals with restrictions on transfer of oil at night. Clause 13 provides for the making of general regulations, and clause 14 empowers inspection. Those are necessary provisions, and I welcome them. This legislation is necessary to ensure that every care in oil discharge shall be taken. With normal care and the carrying out of the provisions of the Bill little or no inconvenience should be caused the refinery.

Probably honourable members have had no experience of oil contamination of coastal waters. I should like to tell of an experience I had where oil contaminated the beaches of a coastline for many months. It was about the year 1910 when I was living on the Scilly Isles off the Cornish coast, and the largest sailing ship afloat at that time, the *Thomas Wilfred Lawson*, a seven-masted sailing ship laden with crude oil from America, came into the Scilly Isles to shelter. A gale of about 100 miles an hour was blowing. The ship cast her anchors just off the coast, but she broke away and drifted on to some rocks called the Haycocks where she was wrecked. She broke up and sank. Some lives were lost. Within two or three days the whole coastline of the islands and the sea for at least a depth of two to three inches were covered with crude oil. It was staggering the number of fish that were poisoned by the fumes or the oil covering the sea for an area of two or three miles out from the coastline. Most of the fish in the shallow water died. Not only that, but those beaches were covered with a black, oily, sticky substance for months afterwards, and it took a long time

to clear up. That could not happen here from the normal loss in the discharge of oil, as would take place at the Stanvac oil refinery. This could happen only in the case of the wrecking of one of these large oil tankers through its getting off course and becoming wrecked or breaking loose from its moorings. I hope that that will never happen and am sure that, with our modern devices for identification of coastlines and other ships, it is not likely to happen.

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore): I support this Bill and concur in the sentiments expressed by the two previous speakers. This matter has caused us trouble for many years. I remember that in 1946 when I first entered the House we had an oil deposit in the river adjacent to Birkenhead, which caused much pollution and trouble. We have had other such instances, but none as bad as that in 1946. What appeals to me about this Bill is that it is internationally framed. It started with a convention held in 1954 in London, when 32 countries, including Australia, were present. After those seven years, at last we have something that I consider will be worthwhile because it is uniform in its intention.

In 1960 the Commonwealth Government brought down a Bill to coincide with the determinations made in London in 1954 and after, and that seemed to give adequate protection, from the Commonwealth standpoint. The territorial limit is three miles. Within three miles, control will be by State legislation that we are now discussing but, beyond three miles, control will be exercised by the Commonwealth Government. Ten years ago the question of oil deposits in harbours and rivers was not as bad as it is today. Today, nine out of every 10 steamers or vessels are driven by diesel fuel whereas 10 years ago coal was practically the only fuel used, and we did not have the pollution we have today. This Bill is most essential.

As regards territorial waters, some nations of the world have different opinions about the line of demarcation. For instance, one nation claims that its control extends as far as 60 miles from the shore. Three miles from our own shores will be sufficient for us to control any menace of this sort. Clause 5 is the important clause. It imposes a fine of £1,000 upon the owners or captain of the vessel that causes oil to be emitted in our rivers or harbours. In recent years there have been cases where masters of vessels have appeared before the court to answer charges of allowing oil to pollute the river at Port Adelaide. On two occasions that I can recall the captains were fined £100. Today, even without the limitation in this Bill, the Harbors Board has a regulation whereby it can take a captain before a court and, if he is found guilty of such an offence, either he or the owners of the vessel can be fined £100. The new suggested penalty of £1,000 is not too severe, in view of the damage such an offence might inflict on other craft in our rivers and harbours.

Some years ago a steamer emitted oil in the Port River, and I had many complaints from members of the Port Adelaide Sailing Club and swimmers because of the oily state of the river at that time. Members of the Port Adelaide Sailing Club had to spend thousands of pounds in re-painting their boats, and swimmers, emerging from the river, were dark with oil.

The legislation in New South Wales provides that warning notices to the effect that a penalty of £1,000 can be imposed for polluting the waters must be posted in the enginerooms of vessels. Such a provision could be incorporated in this legislation. It is a serious offence to eject oil into rivers. Clause 6 provides that prosecutions will not be launched against a vessel or its master if oil is jettisoned to prevent a disaster. If oil rests on the floor of a vessel it can become a hazard and it is essential to discharge that oil to avert damage to the vessel and danger to human life.

Clause 7 empowers the board to recover damages from the vessel or the master for clearing the oil from the river. This is in addition to the £1,000 penalty. Clause 9, by regulation, requires masters to keep records of the brands of oil and quantities received from oil companies. If 24 vessels were in port at the same time and oil was ejected into the river it would be difficult to trace the offending vessel, but if effective records are kept they will assist in detecting the offender. Clause 12 restricts the transfer of oil at night except under special circumstances and with the approval of the port authorities. This is a valuable provision. At evening in restricted light it would be difficult to transfer oil from a barge to a vessel, and oil could be spilled into the sea, causing pollution. In Victoria and New South Wales oil is transferred by bringing a barge alongside the steamer that requires it. In South Australia the vessel needing oil generally berths alongside the oil depot and oil is pumped into it from the installations on LeFevre Peninsula.

This is a most satisfactory method of transferring oil.

The member for Stirling referred to the oil refinery that will be constructed at Port Stanvac. Unless stringent measures are taken oil from the refinery or from vessels berthed there could be deposited into the sea, causing pollution to our southern beaches. I understand that at Kwinana there is occasional discoloration of the waters. This has had an effect on the fish life there. Apparently two species of fish take nourishment from the oil, and when they are caught and served on a plate they are oily in taste.

We must take particular care of our beaches. About a year ago the beach from Semaphore to Outer Harbour was affected, and from my inspections I believe the discoloration was caused by oil. Those who crossed the beach to go swimming found that the substance adhered to their feet. Although I have not travelled overseas I believe that our beaches are among the best in the world. They are safe and many people visit them in the summer. It is essential that we should safeguard and preserve them to attract tourists to South Australia. I understand that English beaches have been spoiled by pollution from oil. As this is an international matter, the 32 countries to the agreement will undoubtedly find that this legislation will be a means of preserving beaches and of safeguarding boats in rivers.

From my reading, I understand that much trouble arises from the bilges of boats. The bilge is a compartment in a steamer which receives excess water, but at times, through misadventure, oil gets into it, seeps through to the floor of the steamer, and becomes a hazard. The Bill provides for inspections by Harbors Board officers who will closely watch these matters. This is excellent legislation, and, as it has an international flavour, I wholeheartedly support it.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I support the Bill. As ships of all nationalities call at Wallaroo and other South Australian ports to load or discharge cargoes, the State should have power to control the discharge of oil into the sea from ships of foreign countries as well as from our own vessels. Some years ago the master of a ship was taken to court for permitting oil to be pumped into the sea while his ship was berthed at Wallaroo. For a considerable time after this the rocks along the foreshore between the two jetties were polluted with a dirty black scum and every time the tide went out the sand on the north beach was left with a dirty oily film. In view of the enormous building programme that has taken place at the north beach and the two new subdivisions in the course of being established near the beach, oil pollution on that beach would invite severe criticism of those responsible from people in the area. However, having strict legislation on the Statute Book will act as a strong deterrent to those in charge of ships.

Practically every master of a ship is conscious of the seriousness of this world-wide problem. Wallaroo, Port Pirie and Whyalla handle 800 to 900 ships annually. To berth at Whyalla or Port Pirie, ships must pass Wallaroo on the way up the gulf and on their return. Should any of these ships discharge large quantities of oil into the sea, Wallaroo would certainly know all about it because of the flow of tides in the gulf and because Wallaroo is a bay. I do not know of any complaints from those sources yet, however. It is confidently expected that dredging will soon be carried out at Wallaroo to enable vessels of up to 16,000 tons capacity to load fully at the port. This again will bring to Wallaroo ships from other parts of the world. Clause 5 will give a measure of security against the discharge of oil into the sea within the limits prescribed in the Bill. I do not think any master or shipping company will wilfully throw away £1,000, the penalty under this clause. With this legislation in force, I feel more care will be exercised by shipowners to see that the master and officers of their ships are made fully aware of the penalties involved.

Clause 6 safeguards masters in the event of damage to ships whereby oil flows into the sea or where it is necessary to discharge any oil in the interests of safety. Clauses 9 and 10 are closely related. Clause 9 seeks the co-operation of a ship's master to keep records of oil, and clause 10 requires either the owner or the master of a ship to report the discharge of oil to the Harbors Board. This clause will mean that an investigation will be carried out by the board to obtain the reasons for the discharge or loss of any oil, and it will depend entirely on this report whether proceedings are taken. I have much pleasure in supporting this measure.

Mr. FRED WALSH (West Torrens): Although I support the second reading of this Bill, I am critical of the Commonwealth Government's laxity concerning ratification of international conventions. It has taken the Commonwealth Government about seven years before attempting to get South Australia to implement the provisions of this convention. We have

been told that other States have legislation similar to this Bill. The Commonwealth Government has played its part in that it has enacted legislation to give effect to the provisions of the convention relating to waters outside territorial waters, which I suppose means outside the 12-mile limit. The member for Semaphore said he was not sure how far the limit extends; I do not think anybody is sure of it. Some apply limits according to their own convenience, as instanced by the feud between Iceland and Britain in respect of fishing. I do not know if that has been satisfactorily settled yet. Another country, which I shall not name, contended that 50 miles was the limit. Before that controversy it was generally accepted that 12 miles was the limit in any country, and I daresay the Commonwealth legislation applies to that distance.

I should like the Commonwealth Government to be more active in ratifying international conventions, about which Australia has a poor record. Every year the International Labour Organization carries conventions, many affecting the working people of this country, and the Commonwealth Government has in most instances taken the stand that this is a matter for the States and not the Commonwealth, which is true up to a point. Those working under Commonwealth awards are, of course, dealt with by the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act, and those within the jurisdiction of the State by the State industrial machinery. However, regarding international conventions there is nothing to stop the Commonwealth Government from doing exactly what it is doing on this measure—approaching the States and getting them to pass identical legislation to implement conventions carried at Geneva from time to time. As I have said often, the Commonwealth Government has an obligation to present conventions of the International Labour Organization (a special agency of the United Nations Organization) to member State Parliaments within 18 months of their being adopted by the International Labour Organization, but that is rarely done. I agree that the Commonwealth Parliament is limited in its powers, but it could do in other matters what it has done regarding the measure now before the House—get the States by conference to present to their Parliaments legislation to implement the provisions of different conventions.

I agree entirely with what has been said by the Minister and by members who have supported the Bill. I raised the question when the establishment of the oil refinery at Hallett Cove was first mooted. I feared the possibility of the pollution of our nearby beaches unless some action was taken in the matter, and the Premier assured the House that there would be no risk of any such pollution. At that time it was thought that with the discharge of oil off Hallett Cove there would be certain leakages which, if not strictly controlled, would, because of the tidal stream, ultimately settle on our beaches. The member for Semaphore (Mr. Tapping) pointed out that our beaches were much valued by everybody. I should be the last to participate in anything that did not protect those beaches from possible pollution by oil, no matter whether it was the discharge of oil from tankers that might be delivering oil to the refinery or from ships when being bunkered at any of the ports. We must take the necessary steps to protect our beaches and to avoid the dangers to which the member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan) referred.

I have seen the effect of the pollution of beaches by oil. Some years ago I was in Durban, where they had one of the most beautiful stretches of beach in the world prior to its pollution by the bunkering of ships. When I saw it there was a long, dirty, yellow strip right along the high tide mark, stretching for about a mile or so. I was told that before oil was used in the powering of ships, those beaches were as white as snow, and I would not doubt it. That beach was virtually completely ruined from a bathing point of view; I should not like to see the same thing happen here, and it is only by legislation such as that contained in this Bill that it can be prevented. It is to the credit of the Government that it has seen fit to hasten to give effect to the wishes of the Commonwealth in respect of the implementing of this phase of the 1954 London conference. The high penalties prescribed will be sufficient to ensure that masters of ships will take sufficient care that there is no undue leakage from their ships when bunkering or discharging oil. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

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

BRANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 12. Page 1234.)

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I support the Bill with rampant enthusiasm, but, Sir, I rather forget why. It has been so long the next business on the Notice Paper that I believed it would still be the next business on

the Notice Paper after we had sung *God Save the Queen* on prorogation night. Unfortunately, in the interim I have lost my notes. It is a great embarrassment to me—something in the nature of a natural (or national) tragedy, I am sure! As I have had so much advice from these North Terrace farmers about this, I think perhaps it would help to enlighten the Minister if we could go into conference on it at some time; it might be a better way of doing it.

This Bill provides something that surely it should not be necessary to put into legislation. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

Manufacturers have complained that Australian wools have sometimes been found to contain tar, enamel paint and other unscourable substances and the special treatment necessary to get rid of those substances from wool increases the cost of manufacture considerably.

This could be one of the understatements of the year. It gravely underestimates the position. I have been in the position of classing wool in the shed and giving instructions that every piece of tar so far as possible be taken out of the fleece on the table. Anyone who has been in a shed knows that the operation is quick and it is not possible to take all of it out there. Sometimes, of course, a lot more wool is taken out of the fleece than necessary, so there is a waste there to begin with. Also, I have seen a clip on the show floor where in the catalogue and perhaps on the bale itself the brands are removed, but nobody is fooled when told that the brands are removed in the catalogue or on the bale: when the prospective buyer rips open the bale, he sees a lot of tar. I have not had much to do with wool since being in Parliament, except pulling it over the eyes. If no brands are put in the catalogue or on the bale, there is a chance that it might be taken a little more seriously. A black list is kept by the buyers and, if anyone is caught once, it is noted on the list. Often buyers rush in for a few days from other States or overseas and perhaps have to spend about £250,000 in three days. So the sellers have to be careful because, if they are caught once, a black list is kept. Conversely, if a certain property is known to be careful in the preparation of the clip, then buyers do not worry too much about that brand. Therefore, I think that most people are careful about what they do. I do not know why it is necessary to have some of these provisions—not in this Bill but in some of the things we are trying to avoid by this Bill. For example, is it necessary to brand sheep at all? In these days of earmarking and tattooing, I do not think it necessary.

Mr. Nankivell: It is not compulsory in Victoria.

Mr. JENNINGS: I have never been able to understand why people brand lambs running with their mothers, because they are certainly not likely to stray and we know that, if the demand is right, lamb wool can be valuable at times because the binders (as we call them in the profession) are not properly established for about 12 months; there is no way of holding the fleece together so, when the tar is thrown on right through the fleece, it makes it all the harder to pick it out. Of course, the brand is the same size, so it means that a much greater proportion of the wool is affected by it. I do not know why people need to do this sort of thing. If we examine wool after it has been scoured and see that there is still a lot of tar left in it, we can appreciate how much wool we are losing. It is still all right to use tar for wounds—the old traditional thing called tar boy. Veterinary science has reached a stage where we can get something that is probably much more effective than tar for healing. This is good legislation but I do not know why some of these provisions are necessary.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I support the Bill. I appreciate the remarks of the member for Enfield. I know he has had firsthand experience of wool disposal and sale after it leaves the farms and comes to Adelaide. He asked: why brand it? That is a matter of opinion. Many people would be proud of their sheep; they would promote their brand and like it to be seen; they would like their sheep to be known on sight without a close examination. They are conscious of the aid that the brand is in helping dispose of their sheep. We have thefts, not on a big scale but where six to 12 sheep are missing. Then, the brand on sheep is a great deterrent to thieves. We must ensure that the Australian wool clip does not lose its reputation through the actions of a few careless people. It is essential to prevent its contamination by the use of undesirable substances and tars, but I am not happy with placitum (ii) of new paragraph (*da*) which provides that it is an offence to place on any sheep any substance whatsoever, other than raddle, grease crayon or a substance prescribed as a scourable substance or as one with which a paint brand may be made. That is a limiting provision, and as I read it only the substances mentioned in that placitum may be placed on a sheep.

Mr. Nankivell: The substance must be scourable.

Mr. HALL: The limiting point is that it must be prescribed. Will the department have to prepare a list of the items that may be placed on a sheep? There are various dipping agents used to control lice and mites; there are blowfly solutions; there are medical solutions that are applied to sheep; and there are innumerable solutions all necessary and all harmless to the wool. It is impossible to expect the department to stipulate all those items. In Committee I will move to amend that placitum to include in the substances that may be placed on a sheep those necessary for medicinal purposes and for pest or vermin prevention. With that reservation I support the Bill.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): This is an important Bill because it prohibits the use of black as a branding medium. Woolgrowers today must take every care to ensure that wool can be sold profitably. That is vital also to the Australian economy. Wool is our main export and it provides the overseas credits without which our secondary industries could not continue to operate. Many woolgrowers are producing at the bare cost of production.

Mr. Lawn: They are broke!

Mr. HEASLIP: Some will have grave difficulty in meeting their obligations. There is little profit in woolgrowing today. The position is much different from what it was 10 years ago, but unfortunately many people do not realize that. All of our pastoral areas are in a serious position because of the present drought conditions, and many woolgrowers who have worked hard for 12 months will have to work for a further 12 months before they gain anything. They are not protected by awards and are not bound by a 40-hour week. They work long hours and receive far less than workers in secondary industry. I agree with Mr. Hall's comments about placitum (ii) of new paragraph (*da*). Unless many substances are prescribed woolgrowers will not be able to apply necessary solutions to their sheep. This provision could prohibit the application of dressings at shearing time and prevent the use of fly treatment substances. It could exclude the dipping of sheep, which is compulsory.

Mr. Shannon: Does this provision deal with anything other than brands?

Mr. HEASLIP: It is much wider than mere branding. Section 70 of the Act, which clause 3 amends, provides penalties for certain offences, and the provision we are now discussing means that if a person applies to his sheep any substance whatsoever, other than raddle (which is a brand), grease crayon (which is a brand), or a substance prescribed as a scourable substance or as one with which a paint brand may be made, shall be guilty of an offence.

Mr. Shannon: The only objection I can see is to the words "or otherwise".

Mr. HEASLIP: Exactly, but the clause as it stands is far too comprehensive. Unless I can get an explanation in Committee of why it is so wide, I shall oppose this part of the clause.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I support this Bill because on Yorke Peninsula are over 1,000,000 sheep and, as I represent a large portion of Yorke Peninsula, I therefore represent many producers. I consider this Bill to be one of the most important introduced this session, as it relates itself to the high financial returns to producers in this State and Australia. Despite statements to the contrary from time to time, the prosperity of this country still rides on the sheep's back and the wool cheque is vital to the economy of Australia. This is borne out by a report in the *Advertiser* on October 14 headed "Wool Cheque £9,000,000 Higher", which stated:

> Australia's wool cheque for the first three months of the current season to September 30 realized £58,100,000, an increase of £9,000,000 on the corresponding period of the previous season.

Mr. Nankivell: It represents 40 per cent of our overseas funds; that is how vital it is!

Mr. HUGHES: I thank the honourable member for the statistics. Many other industries have grown up in Australia since the wool industry started, but wool will remain the main source of export income in the foreseeable future and, despite the gloom of the member for Rocky River, the industry is used to facing and overcoming difficulties ranging from droughts, floods and rabbit plagues to ruinous prices. Historically, wool provides the biggest success story in Australia's development, and any development affecting it has an Australia-wide significance. The supreme importance of wool to the Australian economy is proved by the fact that in recent years wool exports have earned about half the country's overseas income. (I think my figure agrees fairly well with that given by the member for Albert.) One out of every three farms, or about 100,000 rural holdings, carries more than 100 sheep. In about 160 years the Australian wool population has increased from a flock of about a dozen to 150,000,000, and this industry is the biggest wool industry in the world.

Production, however, is only part of the story. Marketing presents its own problems, especially as about 90 per cent of Australian wool is exported. In the production of wool, three sections of people play a big part—breeders, scientists, and pastoralists or farmers; I group the last two because both market wool. Australian breeders have been able to develop and produce sheep to suit all climates and have increased wool or fleece weights and the size of the animal itself. Unless Australian breeders had been able to produce sheep to suit varying conditions, the wool industry would have been more restricted than it is. Australian scientists, particularly those of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, have made many valuable contributions to the progress of wool, ranging from myxomatosis to kill off rabbits (which I understand has saved the industry £50,000,000 a year), and the cobalt bullet (a cobalt compound that prevents sheep from sickening of certain types of pasture) to the solvent de-greasing process of scouring wool.

The SPEAKER: Order! I trust the honourable member will come back to the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES: I am relating this legislation to the fleece of sheep. Pastoralists and farmers have just as much responsibility as breeders and scientists in this matter; in fact, they have more because they must take every care to see that their wool is placed on the market as free as possible from foreign matter. The Minister said that the main reason for introducing this Bill was the carelessness of some producers, which necessitated special treatment in scouring wool, that this added to the cost to the industry, and consequently had to be borne by the producer. This is unfair to the breeder who, in an endeavour to maintain a high standard of production, does not use a brand. This type of breeder was referred to by the member for Enfield; he said that some relied on earmarks. Fears have been expressed that outback producers will unwittingly commit breaches of this legislation, but I do not think for a moment that that will happen. Section 7 (2) of the 1955 Act provides:

If the colours of any paint brands are altered as aforesaid the Minister shall before the day fixed by proclamation pursuant to subsection (2) of section 5 of this Act, by notice published in the *Government Gazette* and at least twice in each of three newspapers circulating throughout the State, give public notice stating that as from the said day all paint brands registered in the colour specified in the notice will be deemed to be registered in the other colour specified in the notice.

Because of this, I do not think outback producers will commit any unwitting breaches of the legislation. Despite the prominence given in the press and by stock firms to advising producers to refrain from using tar or black paint to mark sheep, there is always a percentage (as I have learnt from experience over the years with farmers) of producers who ignore such warnings and will on the spur of the moment dab any paint, irrespective of colour, on the fleece of sheep. Prior to August, 1955, many brands were registered in black, but the fluid used was of a recommended brand. I can also remember tar being used—and that has been referred to this afternoon—as a dressing for wounds incurred by sheep. This legislation will definitely prohibit the use of black fluids, either as a dressing for wounds or for the marking of fleeces. Therefore, I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ALCOHOL AND DRUG ADDICTS (TREATMENT) BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object, as its title suggests, is to make provision for the treatment, care, control and rehabilitation of persons who are addicted to the consumption or use of alcoholic or intoxicating liquors or certain kinds of drugs to excess, and to repeal the Inebriates Act, 1908-1934, and the Convicted Inebriates Act, 1913-1934. For some considerable time the problem of the alcohol and drug addict has been causing increasing concern throughout the world. Several countries have provided special centres for the treatment of such addicts and the treatment carried out at those centres has contributed largely to the cure and rehabilitation of addicts.

It is now well recognized that imprisonment is not the answer to the problem and that an addict should not be subjected to cellular treatment. Imprisonment has no curative value in such cases and it provides no treatment other than food, shelter and sometimes clothing. This view is almost unanimously supported by the members of the medical profession and prison authorities throughout the world, but unfortunately very little has been

done in the way of any constructive attempt to deal with the problem in Australia and many other parts of the world. In more recent times experts throughout the world have been advocating that with special treatment at appropriate centres, divorced from the environment of a prison or mental hospital, a high percentage of cases of addiction to alcohol and drugs could be cured of their addiction and restored to the community. Forty-three per cent of the total number of admissions to the Adelaide gaol for the year ending June 30, 1960, were for drunkenness. That proportion includes a number of short-term readmissions for drunkenness (some occurring as frequently as 20 times in the 12 months) but does not include persons convicted of offences committed while under the influence of alcohol or drugs.

Considerable expense is incurred by the Government each year in connection with persons addicted to alcohol and drugs, particularly in relation to their maintenance at hospitals and gaols, their apprehension and escort, incidental court proceedings and their conveyance to and from gaols, hospitals and the courts. In April this year the Government appointed an advisory committee to advise and report on the establishment of centres for the reception, care, control and treatment of alcoholics. That committee met on several occasions, examined schemes in operation in other countries and the incidence of alcohol and drug addiction in South Australia, and considered how the problem of addiction could best be met in this State. The committee reported to the Government that, in its opinion, the most effective means of meeting the problem was to establish one or more special centres for the reception and treatment of addicts and recommended that measures be taken at an early date for the provision of such centres but stipulated that such centres should not be associated with either a prison or a mental hospital. The committee also considered the nature of the legislation necessary to give effect to its recommendations, and this Bill is designed to give effect to those recommendations.

Clauses 1 and 2 deal with the title, commencement and arrangement of the Bill. Clause 3 repeals the Inebriates Act, 1908, the Convicted Inebriates Act, 1913, and the enactments amending those Acts as set out in the schedule. Clause 4 contains the definitions for the purposes of the Bill, and here I would like to invite particular attention to the definitions of "addict" and "specified drug". An addict is defined as a person addicted to the consumption or use of alcoholic or intoxicating liquors or specified drugs to excess. A specified drug is defined as a drug to which the Dangerous Drugs Act applies, namely, a drug such as opium, morphine, cocaine and similar drugs, but power is reserved in the definition to declare by proclamation other harmful substances and drugs to which persons can become addicted. It is not intended to extend the list of specified drugs beyond those to which the Dangerous Drugs Act applies without due consideration of all the implications of such action. Consideration, however, will be given to the advisability of extending the definition to certain substances and drugs listed in the Poisons Regulations under the Food and Drugs Act which cannot be sold except on a medical practitioner's prescription.

Clauses 5 to 12 contain administrative provisions under which alcoholics centres may be established and constituted under the supervision of an officer who will be known as the Director of Alcoholics Centres and who will be appointed by the Governor. Power is also conferred on the Governor to appoint such other officers and servants as are necessary, with specific provision for the appointment of a Deputy Director and a superintendent for each centre. The general functions and responsibilities of these officers are defined. Special provision is also made for the appointment by the Governor of two official visitors for each centre, one of whom must be a special magistrate and the other a medical practitioner. Clauses 13 to 29 deal with the admission, custody, control, leave and discharge of patients. Under clause 13 provision is made for the admission to an alcoholics centre of any addict upon application personally or by a relative, an adult probation officer or a member of the Police Force, supported by a recent medical certificate.

Clause 14 provides that upon conviction of a person by a court of an offence of which drunkenness is an element or which was committed by the person while drunk or under the influence of alcoholic or intoxicating liquor or a drug, the court may, in lieu of or in addition to any sentence it may impose, release the person on condition that he undergoes treatment at a centre for a period of not less than six months, and for a period of not more than three years remains under the supervision of a probation officer. If the person has two or more similar convictions within the preceding twelve months, the court may commit him to a centre for treatment for a period ranging from six months to

two years, or release him conditionally as mentioned earlier. In order to facilitate proof that an offence was committed by a person while drunk or under the influence of alcoholic or intoxicating liquor or a drug, courts are empowered to make an endorsement to that effect on the record of the conviction, but such an endorsement is not to be admissible in evidence in any proceedings except for the purposes of the proposed legislation. Clauses 15 and 16 provide for the admission to an alcoholics centre of persons committed or released conditionally by a court.

Clause 17 requires persons admitted to an alcoholics centre to comply with the rules of discipline of the centre and the regulations applicable to patients, and clause 18 provides that a person who escapes or absents himself from a centre or from the custody of any person under whose care or charge he is placed under the proposed legislation may be retaken and returned to his former custody. Under clause 19 members of the Police Force will be required to give assistance where necessary in enforcing the provisions of the legislation.

Clauses 20 to 24 provide for the removal of patients to hospitals or other institutions for treatment; for the transfer of patients from one centre to another for treatment; for patients to be brought before the courts to be dealt with; for prisoners who are addicts to be transferred to alcoholics centres; and for unruly patients to be transferred to prison for the unexpired portions of their periods of committal.

Clauses 25 and 26 provide for the discharge of patients with power to extend the period of treatment in appropriate cases. Clauses 27 to 29 provide, with suitable safeguards, for the placing of patients under the care and charge of suitable persons and granting them trial leave. These provisions are considered most important and essential as they provide a means of testing a patient's power to resist the urge to return to his old habits after a period of treatment. Clauses 30 and 31 require an inquest to be held on the death of a patient within a centre and provide that the superintendent of the centre shall notify the Director and the patient's spouse or other known relative. Clause 32 provides for the assignment of duties and the granting of privileges and indulgences to patients.

Under clause 33 each patient will receive a gratuity at such rate not exceeding four shillings a day as is prescribed. Provision is made in clause 34 for every patient to be classified by a classification committee whose constitution, function and duties are defined. Under clause 35 it will be an offence to supply any alcoholic or intoxicating liquor or any specified drug to a patient or person committed to a centre or conditionally released by a court under the legislation with a penalty of £100, but such supply on the advice or authority of a medical practitioner or in ignorance of the fact that the person supplied was a patient or a person so committed or released would be a good defence. Ill-treatment of a patient by an officer of a centre or by a person under whose care or charge the patient has been placed will also be an offence under clause 36, punishable with a fine of £50.

Clauses 37 and 38 prescribe certain minor offences which, when committed by a patient in a centre, may be dealt with by the Director or the official visitor who is a special magistrate. Clauses 39 and 40 provide for the making of rules of court and regulations for carrying out and giving effect to the objects of this legislation. Clause 41 provides for the summary disposal of all proceedings for offences under the legislation, and clause 42 contains the financial provision necessary for the administration of the legislation.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

MENTAL HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to ensure that any State child who is received and detained in a mental institution in accordance with the provisions of section 31 or 35 of the principal Act retains the status of a State child. In 1958 the principal Act was amended to enable State children to be admitted to mental institutions without their being classified as criminal mental defectives. At the time that amendment was proposed, it was felt that such a child should not be classed as a State child during the period of his detention in the mental institution and the amendment provided accordingly. Experience, however, has proved that that provision was not a wise one. Previously, for many years, all State children admitted to mental hospitals remained State children for the periods covered by the relevant court orders. The 1958 amendment, unfortunately, varied this position so far as admissions under sections 31 and 35 of the principal Act are concerned, whereas State

children admitted as voluntary patients to mental hospitals remain State children and those admitted to Minda Home and to other hospitals and institutions continue to remain the responsibility of the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board. Apart from these anomalies, certain difficulties have also arisen in relation to the exercise of control over and the granting of relief to children who have been affected by the 1958 amendment.

Under section 126 of the Maintenance Act, the Governor has power, upon the recommendation of the board, to extend the period of supervision of a State child beyond the date specified in the relevant court mandate until the child attains the age of 21 years in the case of a male or for any period in the case of a female. This power is used in appropriate cases for the benefit of a child in need of assistance beyond the age of 18 years, but can be exercised only if the child is a State child. It could, therefore, not be availed of since the 1958 amendment came into force in relation to a State child who had been admitted to a mental institution under section 31 or 35 of the principal Act and who thereby ceased to be a State child.

When a child so ceases to be a State child, contact between that child and departmental welfare officers is virtually lost as such officers, for instance, have no right to approach such a child while on trial leave from the mental institution. It is felt that the supervision which the board has power to exercise over a State child should not be interrupted by the child's admission to a mental institution. The supervision which the board exercises over State children is essential for the welfare of the children themselves and the community at large. The removal of these anomalies and difficulties has been recommended by the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board, with the concurrence of the Director-General of Medical Services and the Director of Mental Health. Clause 3 accordingly gives effect to that recommendation by striking out from subsection (1) of section 37a of the principal Act the provision whereby a State child ceases to be a State child whilst detained in a mental institution pursuant to section 31 or 35 of the principal Act.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

HOUSING IMPROVEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CITY OF WHYALLA COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.22 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 31, at 2 p.m.