HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, August 28, 1963.

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

DEATH OF SIR WALTER DUNCAN.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the House of Assembly express its deep regret at the death of the Hon. Sir Walter Duncan, former President of the Legislative Council and member for Midland in that House, and place on record its appreciation of his public services, and, as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased honourable gentleman, the sittings of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

I believe that no honourable member heard yesterday of the passing of Sir Walter without experiencing a feeling of deep personal regret. He had been associated with this Parliament for about 42 years, and everyone regarded him not only as a personal friend but, as was so aptly stated in this morning's *Advertiser*, as the "Father of the House". He played a conspicuous part in helping pass many measures that have been so beneficial to the development of this State. For instance, as a member of the board of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, he always strongly advocated the establishment of industrial development at Whyalla and, indeed, I do not doubt that he helped considerably in the acceptance by the board of a proposal in that matter.

He was always prepared to listen to the other person's point of view, although, in saying that, I do not mean that he would accept easily a view he knew to be wrong. I know of no-one so well able as was Sir Walter to consider the opposing point of view, particularly on political matters. He was a hard worker and, while he was Leader of the Government (I was nearly going to say Leader of the Opposition) in the Legislative Council, no-one gave more attention to the legislation introduced than did he. As a personal friend he always stood by one's side when one wanted a friend most. As every honourable member will realize, that is invaluable politically. When one had an assurance from Sir Walter on any matter he could be certain that Sir Walter would not, under any circumstances, vary the undertaking he gave. He was candid, and if he opposed anything one knew why he did. He was a friend to every member of this House. Politically he may have had opponents, but I do not believe that any member of this House had any personal feelings against him.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I second the motion. In paying a tribute to the late Sir Walter Duncan I express the views of my Party. I endorse the Premier's remarks. Undoubtedly, Sir Walter's life was brimful of energy. This was evidenced not only in his Parliamentary duties but in many facets of his normal living. His activities in companies that he represented were well known. He was a keen sportsman. He was an athlete, and he could be relied upon to keep his end up in the games of cricket we played against the press. He was also associated with horse racing, and he raced horses for love of the sport. The death of a person so well known is regrettable, but apparently age caught up with Sir Walter. He had a reasonably full life and he will be missed. We extend sympathy to his family.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I associate myself with this motion from a purely personal viewpoint. I had the great personal honour of being a close friend of Sir Walter Duncan for many years—but I will not state the number because that would draw attention to my own age. I pay a tribute to the personal qualities of the deceased gentleman. Although probably well known, they should be mentioned. He had the mental capacity to enjoy life, to express appropriate sentiments when things were not going as well as they ought to be going, and to turn the tide of fate in such a way that one could say, "Well, things aren't as bad as they look." He always looked on the bright side.

Reference has been made to Sir Walter's intellect. I visited him in hospital and at his home during his sickness: his mental ability did not fade. The body faded but the mind did not. How lucky is the person whose mental faculties outlast his body! That is one of the things that Providence can be thanked for. Sir Walter had much sadness in his home life, as everybody knows, but that did not weigh so heavily upon him that he could not enjoy his personal friendships. As one who had that great honour, I felt that I should express my appreciation of knowing such a man. I cannot express in words what I owed to him.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

(*Sitting suspended from* 2.10 *to* 2.40 *p.m.*)

PETITION: OPEN SPACES.

Mr. LAUCKE presented a petition signed by 2,146 residents of South Australia. It asked Parliament to act on the Town Planning Committee's recommendation to reserve open spaces,

particularly in the rapidly expanding cities within the State and the metropolitan area of Adelaide, and requested that an open spaces purchasing authority be appointed to assist in setting aside land for future requirements.

Received and read.

QUESTIONS.

AIR SERVICES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Recently I asked a question regarding air services to Kangaroo Island and other parts of South Australia. Has the Premier communicated with the appropriate Commonwealth Minister on this matter, as he promised to do, and has he anything to report concerning the provision of these intrastate services by Trans-Australia Airlines?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, I have communicated with the Commonwealth Minister. I draw the Leader's attention to a statement in the Senate by the Minister in reply to a question asked by Senator Hannaford, I think last Wednesday, on this subject. I have also received a letter from the Minister for Civil Aviation (Senator Paltridge), as follows:

My colleague, the Minister for Air, has passed to me your letter of August 8 in which you advise that your Government would concur in any proposal to permit Trans-Australia Airlines to operate services within South Australia. As you may recall, this question has already been the subject of rather definitive correspondence between you and the Prime Minister which resulted in the special arrangements under which Trans-Australia Airlines currently serves Leigh Creek.

You will also be aware that the Commonwealth Government has given a great deal of attention to civil aviation in Australia, and has endeavoured to foster the industry in a number of ways without placing an undue burden on the general taxpayer. The Government's policy is based on two broad principles—first, that there should be two operators of air services on the main trunk routes, one being the Commission and, second, that some encouragement should be given to operators to provide air services on other routes, particularly in remote areas where alternative means of transport are limited. The growth and stability of the industry in recent years have clearly demonstrated the soundness of this policy.

The operation of services within South Australia falls, generally speaking, under the second heading. Airlines of South Australia Proprietary Ltd., by efficient management and with the benefit of a few routes which generate a reasonable volume of traffic (although certainly not enough to permit two operators to compete on a profitable basis as your comments in the State Parliament might suggest) has been able to operate with very modest profit while still providing air services on a number of routes where revenue is obviously insufficient to cover the costs of operation. At no time has a Commonwealth subsidy been paid to this company.

The Commonwealth Government does not consider that intrastate air services are necessarily the preserve of private enterprise, and, indeed, it has welcomed the opportunity for Trans-Australia Airlines to continue the network of intrastate services in Queensland formerly conducted by Qantas Empire Airways Ltd. It has also facilitated the possibility of intrastate services in Tasmania by adopting a reference because there are at present no significant intrastate services within that State. On the other hand, the Commonwealth Government has made it very clear on numerous occasions that when an efficient intrastate operator is providing air services to low traffic ports as well as on profitable routes, it would be unwise to upset the economic balance of this operator's business by countenancing the introduction of competitive services by the Commission or, for that matter, any other airline.

In the case of South Australia, it is certain that, if Airlines of South Australia were faced with this competition, the Commonwealth would inevitably be asked for some financial assistance by that airline or its competitor or both to ensure the continuation of the uneconomic routes now absorbed in the company's total operations.

In the present circumstances, therefore, the Commonwealth Government would not favour any intrusion of Trans-Australia Airlines into the field of intrastate services in South Australia, where another airline is already able and willing to provide satisfactory air transport facilities. Should the traffic and economic patterns change, it would, of course, be fully consistent with this policy to review the matter in the light of the new circumstances.

ADULT EDUCATION.

Mr. SHANNON: Yesterday I asked a question of the Minister of Education regarding the fees charged for adult education and I apologize for importuning him again so soon on this matter. Fortunately for me, the publicity given to this matter by the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) on a previous occasion has aroused the interest of the people in the district I am happy to represent. Obviously, many people are being lost who would like to avail themselves of this opportunity. I know that the honourable Minister, as a wellknown enthusiast for this form of education, has taken considerable interest in it. Can the Minister of Education say whether a decision will be reached on this matter as early as possible so that some losses from the adult classes will be regained, as this would be for the benefit of the people concerned and, eventually, of the State?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: As I informed the honourable member yesterday, in January I approved a substantial increase in

the fees charged for adult education classes conducted by the Education Department, to commence as from the beginning of this year, with the object of bringing them into line with the scale of fees charged for courses conducted at the Institute of Technology. Several factors, however, have since convinced me that, in so doing, I made a mistake. First, because the departmental classes are not parallel with the courses conducted by the institute, as the latter are on a higher plane. Secondly, no fees were increased for the courses conducted by the Adult Education Branch of the university and by the Workers Educational Association, although I have been assured from time to time that there would be proper liaison between all the various bodies with no unnecessary duplication of effort or uneconomic competition. Thirdly, I received numerous protests from members of both sides of this House, and my colleague (the Attorney-General, who represents me in another place) received similar protests. I have received widespread protests from adult education centres throughout the State, and from many individuals, particularly from those who lacked formal education in their youth, who are now trying to remedy the deficiencies, but who cannot afford the increased fees. I take full responsibility for having increased the fees, but I did not wish to take the personal responsibility for any reduction or reversion; therefore, I consulted my Cabinet colleagues who agreed to my recommendation that the fees should revert to their former scale. That has been decided upon, and they will be restored to their previous scale as from the beginning of the next term, about the middle of September.

DRIVING LICENCES.

Mr. LOVEDAY: A young European migrant arrived in Whyalla on May 28 this year, and immediately registered his motor car. He came from Western Australia and had a Western Australian driver's licence expiring in April, 1964. He understood that he was fully covered, but he has been charged by the police and fined £5 with 30s. costs for not having a South Australian driving licence. It appears that the regulations provide that a person who ceases to be a visitor in this State has to take out a South Australian driver's licence, but nothing in the regulation states at what time the person ceases to be a visitor. Will the Minister of Education take up with his colleague, the Attorney-General, the possibility of having a common policy in all States so that a driving licence taken out in one State is current wherever the licensee may be until the licence expires, and that when a person takes out a new licence, he may do so in the State in which he is then residing?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to do so. When I was Chairman of the State Traffic Committee some years ago this was a burning question, but a lack of reciprocity between several States was apparent, probably caused by the absence of practical driving tests in this State. Maybe a different attitude prevails now in view of the changed law in South Australia.

QUEEN MOTHER'S VISIT.

Mrs. STEELE: It is now known that Her Majesty the Queen Mother will be in South Australia for 10 days in March of next year, when she has graciously consented, as Patron, to open the Adelaide Festival of Arts. In my district of Burnside is the finest and most expensive school yet built in South Australia—the Adelaide Technical High School—which occupies a splendid site looking down on a long vista of playing fields, including the Glenunga Oval which has been developed and is maintained by the Burnside City Council. Can the Premier say whether the school's official opening by Her Majesty the Queen Mother could be considered by Cabinet when the programme of the visit is being drawn up?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have already received sufficient requests to fully occupy Her Majesty in South Australia for twice the proposed 10 days, but I will keep the honourable member's request in mind when the programme is being drawn up. I think members will agree that in submitting a programme for Her Majesty's approval we have to consider two matters as paramount. First, we should prepare a programme which is reasonable from the Royal Visitor's point of view. I think every member will realize that there is a tremendous strain and stress if a programme is filled to the extent that there is no leisure time. Secondly, I think that the programme should be designed to afford as many people as possible the opportunity of seeing Her Majesty. In fact I doubt whether Her Majesty will be in Adelaide for the 10 days. I believe some travelling time will be involved. She will certainly be in South Australia, but not necessarily in the metropolitan area. I will consider the honourable member's request.

BLINMAN MAIN STREET.

Mr. CASEY: Recently on a trip to the Far North I was surprised to notice that the main

street of Blinman, which had been sealed some time ago, was badly cut up in places. Will the Minister of Works ascertain whether this street can be resealed at some future time, particularly as much traffic will be in that area later this year? In the meantime, will he take up with his department the possibility of filling the various potholes in the main street in order to prevent further deterioration?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member mentioned this matter to me a few days ago, and this morning I discussed it briefly with the Engineer-in-Chief and suggested to him that temporary repairs might be effected by some local person, pending the visit to the area of a gang to make more extensive repairs. Mr. Dridan said that he would examine the matter and inform me, but I am not able at this stage to say what can be done. The matter is being considered.

WIRRABARA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. HEASLIP: During consideration of the Loan Estimates I asked the Treasurer whether he would ascertain whether a water supply would be available for residents of Wirrabara in time for the coming summer. Has he a report?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Engineer for Water Supply reports:

The District Engineer returned from the Musgrave Ranges last night and this morning I discussed the possible progress of the Wirrabara scheme with him. He informed me that a start on the laying of the 8in. feeding main was made a few weeks ago and that rapid progress was being made at present. However, the excavation where the main was now being laid was very good, but rock excavation is expected ahead of the present point of laying and this will slow down the present rate of progress. The District Engineer is of the opinion that the scheme cannot be completed in time for next summer but by concentrating a number of gangs on the project and by using a temporary 30,000-gallon squatters tank water will be available to one or two points in the township by about the beginning of February, 1964. It will be some time after this before the permanent tank is constructed and all reticulation mains and services are installed.

WATER RATES.

Mr. TAPPING: Recently I have been approached by pensioners and people on fixed incomes who are concerned about the recent increase in water rates. They have expressed alarm that they will not be able to meet their commitments within the time prescribed in the Act. Most of these people are confronted with council rates at the same time. I understand that the department has some method whereby a concession can be granted to people who want their rate payments deferred. Will the Minister of Works explain the method that is adopted?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As stated by the Premier yesterday, there has been no general increase in water rates this year. The price of water has been slightly increased, but there has been no general increase in rates. The only increases that have appeared on assessments are in cases where the capital value of properties has been improved or where properties have previously been assessed below the average of other properties. The accounts for rates, where sewerage is also included, carry a note to the effect that if the ratepayer desires it the sewerage and water rates may be split. If a pensioner applies for an extended period in which to pay his rates, that is almost invariably granted. The department accepts an undertaking from a pensioner to pay rates in instalments. That may assist some of the cases the honourable member has in mind. In the case of other people in necessitous circumstances, particularly older people, the department does not press for payment of rates to the point of causing distress. If a person is genuinely unable to pay, the department does allow, where an application has been made, the rate to remain in suspense as a charge on the property. The honourable member will see from the points I have made that the department does everything possible to assist people over this problem. If the honourable member has any particular cases in mind I should be pleased if he would supply me with names and addresses so that I might try personally to assist.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I understand, following upon representations that I have made to the Premier and to the Minister of Local Government on behalf of the Pinnaroo District Council, that Cabinet has decided to amend section 435 of the Local Government Act to enable councils to borrow money by way of debenture for the purpose of carrying out drainage projects. Can the Minister of Works say whether this is so? If so, when is this legislation likely to become effective?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Such an amendment is proposed to the Local Government Act this year and, although it is not contained in the Local Government Act Amendment Bill now before the House, another Bill will be introduced to enact the provision referred to.

THALIDOMIDE BABIES.

Mr. HUGHES: I address my question to the Premier, representing the Minister of Health, and because the Premier was absent on Government business when I asked an earlier question on this subject, I ask leave to read from *Hansard* the question I directed to the Minister of Works on that occasion. My question was:

According to a recent press report, the New South Wales Government has decided to co-operate with the Commonwealth Government in providing artificial limbs to assist in the rehabilitation of thalidomide babies by paying half the cost of the project. New South Wales has 12 babies with limb deformities resulting from the use of the drug thalidomide by the mothers during pregnancy. Does the Minister of Works, as Acting Leader of the Government, know of any such babies in South Australia? If there are any such babies, will the Government co-operate with the Commonwealth Government, as has been done in other States, to help such children lead as near as possible normal lives?

The Minister of Works replied:

I cannot say from my own knowledge whether any deformities have occurred in this State as a result of the use of this drug, but I will pass the question to my colleague, the Minister of Health, and ask him what Government policy will be regarding assistance if there are such cases.

I have been informed by the member for Gawler that there is in his district a thalidomide baby that will require treatment and assistance soon. Can the Premier, representing the Minister of Health, say whether this matter has been discussed by Cabinet, and can he say what the policy is regarding the Government's assisting in such cases?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have not previously had this matter under my notice, but the Minister of Health, in accordance with his promise, has taken the matter up and a report has come through to me. That report, from the Director-General of Medical Services, states:

A letter dealing with this subject from the Acting Prime Minister and addressed to the Acting Premier on July 9, 1963, was forwarded to me for report by the Chief Secretary on July 16, 1963. The terms of the letter were briefly, an offer by the Commonwealth to pay half the cost of the supply and repair of a prosthesis for any child born deformed as a consequence of its mother taking the drug thalidomide during pregnancy, if the State agrees to pay the other half. The offer by the Commonwealth is contingent upon the State's agreeing to provide complete rehabilitation services (other than the supplying and fitting of limbs) for the children so deformed. Following receipt of this letter, I wrote on July 22, 1963, to Professor L. W. Cox of the Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology at the University of Adelaide in the following terms:

"I enclose a copy of a letter dated July 9, 1963, from the Acting Prime Minister to the honourable the Chief Secretary of South Australia, regarding assistance to be given to children born deformed as a consequence of their mothers taking the drug thalidomide during pregnancy. I would greatly appreciate your opinion on this matter, and details of any information you have regarding the number of these cases in South Australia, and some idea of the extent of the deformity in each case".

When a reply has been received from Professor Cox, a full report on the offer by the Commonwealth will be prepared and forwarded to the Chief Secretary.

BOTTLE COLLECTIONS.

Mr. COUMBE: Does the Premier recall that on July 23 this year I asked him a question concerning the administration of the Marine Stores Act? The purport of my question then was that boy scouts and lads of various organizations had been collecting empty bottles from people's residences and selling those bottles to marine store dealers, from the proceeds of which they had collected many hundreds of pounds to build youth halls and to improve amenities for those halls. I drew the Premier's attention to the fact that a senior police officer had issued a warning that these boys were breaking the provisions of the Marine Stores Act, and I asked the Premier to take the matter up with the Chief Secretary to see whether legislation could be amended to legalize the activities of these boys, who are doing a really worthwhile job in the community. Has the Premier a reply to my question?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As I promised, I took this matter up in Cabinet, where the general consensus of opinion was that the boys were not doing much harm in collecting these bottles and that it would be desirable to take steps to see that they could legally continue to do so; and that will be done.

PORT PIRIE RAIL SERVICE.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways, an answer to a question that interests the member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens) and me regarding the provision of air-conditioned cars for the Adelaide to Port Pirie line?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Railways, informs me that the sum of £80,000 provided on the Loan Estimates for 1963-64 will allow preliminary work to be

undertaken in connection with the construction of nine air-conditioned passenger cars for the Adelaide to Port Pirie trains connecting with the Transcontinental service. The programme provides for the construction of the nine cars during 1964-65 and 1965-66.

JUSTICES ACT.

Mr. RYAN: Some time ago I raised the question of certain anomalies that exist under the Justices Act, and subsequently I received information from the Attorney-General that these anomalies did exist and that it was thought wise to amend the Act so that the matter could be adjusted. Will the Minister of Education take up with his colleague, the Attorney-General, the question of whether the Justices Act will be amended for the purpose of correcting these anomalies?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yes.

DRY CREEK RAILWAY STATION.

Mr. JENNINGS: The Minister of Works will recall that recently I asked him a question about a matter the Australian Railways Union had brought to me concerning an amenities block at Dry Creek railway station. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Railways, informs me that it is true that the Railways Commissioner has approved of the provision of an amenities block at Dry Creek station. However, it is not a fact that the detailed plans and estimates of the structure have been prepared. The work will be undertaken as soon as possible, but the architectural officer who would have done the work has resigned, and the Railways Department has not yet been able to replace him.

SCHOOLS.

Mr. HALL: Can the Premier reply to my recent question concerning the comparative costs of solid construction and prefabricated schools?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have received the following report from the Director of the Public Buildings Department:

No complete school is constructed entirely of timber. A spine is provided in solid construction providing toilets, ablutions and shelter areas, with wings of classrooms and offices in timber construction. There is no such school which can be directly compared with any school of solid construction to give comparative total cost figures, but this type of school costs 15 per cent to 20 per cent less than the cheaper types of new schools of solid construction.

CLARENCE PARK RAILWAY STATION.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question regarding the erection of a new railway station at Clarence Park?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Railways, informs me that the new station buildings at Emerson have been completed and it is hoped to be able to provide new station buildings at Clarence Park during the present financial year.

REPOSSESSION OF TELEVISION SET.

Mr. LAUCKE: An embittered constituent has written to me referring to the circumstances attending the repossession of a television set by a finance company. The set was voluntarily surrendered by the hirer because of his inability to maintain instalments; and following upon the surrender, the hirer received an account from the company for £114, being, I understand, the difference between the balance of the commitment and the proceeds of the sale of the set. It appears that the sale was effected at a give-away price, very much to the detriment of the hirer's interests. As similar instances have been referred to in recent years in this House, will the Premier consider the possibility of more adequately protecting the interests of hirers in the event of repossession of goods obtained under hire-purchase agreements?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This is the subject of uniform legislation that has been passed by all States. The protection of the interests of the hirer as to repossession is set out fully in the legislation and I believe it is common to all States. If the honourable member will give me the name and address of the person concerned I will have inquiries made to see whether the repossessed article was disposed of in accordance with the law.

STIRLING WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. SHANNON: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question regarding progress on the water scheme to serve Stirling and Crafers?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Engineer for Water Supply reports:

The scheme was approved by Cabinet on November 26, 1962, "for consideration with next year's Estimates". However, additional Loan funds became available toward the end of the last financial year and it was possible to purchase most of the pipes required for the scheme and a start was made on the laying of the pipes before the end of the financial year.

The Highways Department has made available details of their planning regarding the Crafers-Germantown Hill freeway as far as planning has proceeded. Fortunately, the

Crafers-Stirling end which most concerns our department is the first section being planned, but a great deal remains to be decided even in this section. No details have yet occurred, but the freeway and by-pass road proposals will materially affect some parts of the scheme. Some alteration in the proposed location of mains will undoubtedly have to be made and it is expected that there will be some ultimate delay in supplying some parts of the area because of the Highways Department proposal.

Although main-laying is in progress, it will not be possible to make water available during the coming summer. The construction of two pumping stations and two storage tanks is involved and this work is not expected to be completed before the end of the financial year.

TOTALIZATOR LICENCE.

Mr. FRED WALSH: My question relates to section 20 of the Lottery and Gaming Act. I understand that the intention of the South Australian Jockey Club is to introduce a new system at its race meeting next Saturday by running a tote on the Victorian races. The intention is to have this totalizator on the basis of a 5s. unit and I understand that section 20 provides that a totalizator licence is issued on condition that the club provides a totalizator in each portion of the racecourse and issues tickets to the public on the basis of either 2s. or 2s. 6d. I should like to know whether having a basic unit of 5s. for this totalizator to be run on the Victorian races will cut across the provisions of that section of the Act as regards the system and whether the Premier will have the matter investigated with a view to correcting the position if there is a prospective breach of the provisions of the legislation?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have not previously been informed of the contemplated action and I have not heard of any report or information in connection with it. If the honourable member will ask the question again tomorrow, I hope to be able to give him a reply.

SEWERAGE PROGRAMME.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I understand the Minister of Works has a reply to my recent question regarding sewerage at Whyalla.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Engineer-in-Chief reports:

Preparation of plans and estimates of cost are well advanced for the sewerage scheme required to serve the South Australian Housing Trust houses at Whyalla. This scheme provides, firstly, for the Housing Trust houses which already exist, as well as for those which are to be built in future. The scheme does not provide for the sewerage of the town area, but is capable of being extended to cope with the town area if the Whyalla City Commission so desires. It is hoped that the report will be ready for submission to Cabinet in about two months' time for reference to the Public Works Committee.

EGG PULP.

Mr. McKEE: I have received complaints from several bakeries regarding the varying prices for egg pulp charged by the South Australian Egg Board. I believe that large firms that are able to purchase big quantities are able to buy egg pulp as much as 3d. a pound more cheaply than can smaller businesses. I understand that this gives the larger firms a decided advantage and means a saving of several thousands of pounds a year. These varying prices are considered unfair, and as the Premier recently said that the Government was considering legislation to control restrictive trade practice, will he investigate this matter with a view to bringing about a fairer method of trading?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Crown Solicitor has ruled that, where Parliament has established an authority with specific power to deal with the price of any commodity, that over-rules the Prices Act regarding that commodity. In other words, if Parliament has set up an Egg Board and given it power to fix the price of eggs, it is not within the authority of the Prices Commissioner to interfere with that price, because he does not have the power. The special Act over-rides the general Act for all commodities. Under those circumstances, I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Agriculture, and ask him to take it up with the Egg Board.

INTEREST RATES.

Mr. SHANNON: I spoke to the Premier some time ago about the interest rates that had been reduced by certain lending institutions in respect of house builders. I have received a complaint that the State Bank is not allowing this reduced rate, and that the Savings Bank has outstripped it in providing cheaper rates of interest for house builders. Will the Premier investigate and report on this matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have spoken to the Under Treasurer about this matter, as he is also the Chairman of the State Bank Board. He reports to me that only the Commonwealth Savings Bank has a lower rate, but its loans are restricted to its customers. The Savings Bank has also reduced rates on existing loans. The State Bank has reduced the rates for new loans because it has been able to borrow money at a lower rate, but it is not

able to reduce rates on existing loans as the money was originally borrowed at a higher interest rate. Obviously, the State Bank cannot borrow money on a long-term rate and then adjust interest rates from day to day. Neither this nor any other bank can do this, except the Savings Bank, which can adjust interest rates according to its deposits.

RIVER MURRAY BRIDGES.

Mr. CURREN: My question refers to investigations into sites for bridges across the River Murray at Kingston and Berri. This matter is creating much public comment and interest. Will the Minister of Works obtain a report from his colleague, the Minister of Roads, as to what action has been taken by the Highways Department to test the suitability of a site for each bridge?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I think that this matter could well be the subject of a question on notice.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MORPHETT STREET BRIDGE.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I wish to correct a statement which I made yesterday in the House in reply to a question about the reconstruction of Morphett Street bridge. I quote from the *Hansard* pull, which states:

Although I glanced at the report only casually, I noticed that it stated that it was necessary for this improved highway to be in operation by, I think, 1970, and that the council intended that the work would not start for two years.

On checking that information I find that the report that the Town Clerk gave to the City Council states:

The progressive and very heavy increase in traffic density over the three traffic routes named above will involve the provision of additional trafficway widths in order to cope with the predicted traffic volumes of the future. It is commented that the Morphett Street-Montefiore Road route is more greatly restricted than the other routes, and, moreover, it is predicted that this route will have to carry the greatest traffic in the future. The completion of the freeway system encircling the city area, viz., the ring road at the outer boundary of the parklands predicted for the year 1976, and the interchanges at the junctions with the major east-west roadways within the city proper, will establish a connection with the northern routes beyond the city and the major east-west roadways within the city proper. In consequence, at this stage the traffic on the northern routes travelling directly through the city is likely to decrease.

However at this juncture, although traffic studies reveal that congestion is not yet limiting the daily traffic over this route, it may be anticipated that the capacity of the Morphett Street bridge will be exceeded for more than two hours during the evening peak period by the year 1968. Consequently, it would seem desirable that the initial work involved in widening the bridge, and associated work, should be commenced at this juncture, and that the widening should be completed within five years.

The SPEAKER: This seems to be getting beyond a personal explanation and is almost a statement. Does the House agree that the Premier have leave to make a Ministerial statement?

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The other reference to the timing of the construction of this project is on page 15 of the report, which states:

It is anticipated that preliminary site investigations and design would occupy a period of approximately 12 months and the construction 18 months to two years. As previously stated, *vide* 2nd paragraph, page 9, the new structure will be required by 1968 in order to cope with anticipated traffic densities. It would therefore be desirable for site investigation and detailed design to commence as early as possible with the objective that construction of the bridges might be commenced not later than September, 1965.

Honourable members will see that I was in error when quoting the figure of "1970".

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides that motor vehicles registered for the first time after the beginning of 1965 shall have two seat belts fitted—one for the driver and another for the front seat passenger. As members are aware a seat belt, or safety belt, is a device designed to secure a person in a motor vehicle in order to mitigate the results of any accident in which that vehicle may be involved. I do not propose to speak at length on the value of these belts in saving lives and serious injury when accidents occur. All the evidence and the whole weight of informed opinion is that they do. Seat belts have this effect for two reasons:

(1) A person is safer inside a motor vehicle than if thrown out of it. When catapulted out of a car the body runs greatly increased hazards not only from being smashed directly

on to the roadway or other objects (such as electric light poles), but also from the danger of being hit by oncoming traffic. Furthermore, a motor vehicle normally acts as protective armour for objects inside it taking the initial shock of collision with another object. This absorption of the initial shock often marks the difference between life and death, or between minor and serious injury.

(2) A person wearing a belt is less likely to be dashed against the interior of the vehicle. Without a safety belt to hold the body in place, it acts like any loose object and can fly around inside the vehicle. The belt thus reduces the likelihood of being smashed against the windshield, the steering column or other protruding objects.

The opinion that seat belts do reduce the risk of death and injury has been publicly expressed in this State on a number of occasions. On August 15, 1962, in this House the Premier replying to a question by the member for Albert read a report from the Commissioner of Police which stated *inter alia*:

"As the necessary finance is available Police Department vehicles are being fitted with safety belts . . . . The equipping of police vehicles with safety belts is not only considered desirable but also a very important safety measure."

It was reported in the *Sunday Mail* of January 12 last:

The medical superintendent of the Royal Adelaide Hospital (Dr. B. Nicholson) said today it was generally agreed that the passenger in the front seat was much better off with a safety belt. In one recent crash the driver unclipped his safety belt and got out of the car uninjured. His passenger without a safety belt was thrown out and received multiple injuries.

In the last few days I have spoken to Sergeant Swaine, a senior and experienced member of the Police Accident Investigation Squad. He has been investigating this particular matter. It would be very helpful to the House if the result of his investigations were to be made available to members. Perhaps the Government will have this done. Sergeant Swaine summed up his opinion to me by saying that "there is absolutely no doubt at all" about the effectiveness of seat belts. I expect all members have received a brochure entitled "The Truth about Safety Belts", prepared by the Life Offices' Association of Australasia. It has been widely distributed throughout Australia. In it we read:

Every nine minutes, every day of the week, someone is killed or injured on Australia's roads. . . . Until road safety education takes full effect, we must take steps to defend ourselves and our families. . . . There is a simple, quick and inexpensive way in which you can do this right now—by fitting safety belts in your car and by using them every time you drive.

Finally I refer to the report of the Senate Select Committee on Road Safety, 1960. In paragraphs 158 and 159 we read:

Present statistics from overseas research projects establish to reasonable satisfaction the beneficial effects of safety belts in vehicles, for example. Exhaustive tests have been carried out of varying types, and the work has been extended to Australia to the extent that the Standards Association of Australia has drawn up specifications for approved belts and harness assemblies. The most thorough research on seat belts has been carried out by the Cornell University Automotive Crash Injury Research Group. The results of their inquiries showed that there was an overall improvement in the frequency of injury (of all degrees of severity) of 60 per cent reduction. Complete answers were found to the common criticisms of safety belts, and the results were sufficient to satisfy a Congressional committee that safety belts, properly manufactured and installed, are a valuable safety device.

The Senate Select Committee recommends that "the motor trade should install seat belts of an approved standard in all motor vehicles" and that "road safety authorities should give publicity to the advantages of wearing seat belts". The carnage on the roads in Australia is appalling. The Senate Select Committee report (paragraph 2) says:

The stark fact remains that every year over 2,000 lives are lost on the road, over 50,000 persons are injured, untold suffering and anguish are experienced, and a fantastic financial loss is experienced by the community. This cost is estimated by the committee at a figure of £70,000,000 per annum.

The use of seat belts will not wipe out these grim figures—there are obviously many accidents in which seat belts make no difference—but such use will greatly reduce them. It has been estimated that by wearing a belt the likelihood of fatality is cut down by as much as 50 per cent and that of serious injury by 60 per cent. Even if the estimate of fatality is cut in half—the most conservative estimate I have seen—the saving in lives would still be about 500 annually. The solution to the problem of road safety has everyone baffled. There is, in fact, I believe no complete or easy answer. However, the compulsory installation of seat belts will very definitely help.

If then seat belts are such an aid to safety, are they being voluntarily installed and used in

motor vehicles in Australia? A recent survey by the Australian Road Safety Council showed that 5 per cent of cars have seat belts and the owners of four out of five of these vehicles said they wore the belts regularly. This is a very small proportion of all vehicles on the road. Although it is rising, it is not rising fast enough. Although voluntary installation is so low proportionately, members will no doubt be interested to know that an increasing proportion of people in Australia thinks safety belts should be compulsory. I refer to the Australian Gallup Poll findings for May-July, 1962, as follows:

In this Gallup Poll in April, 1,800 people throughout Australia were asked: "In your opinion, should safety belts be compulsory, or not, on all new cars?" Similar questions were asked in 1959 and 1961. Comparison of answers then and now shows that an increasing proportion of people would make belts compulsory in new cars:

SAFETY BELTS.

	Compel them. Per cent.	Don't compel them. Per cent.	No opinion. Per cent.
1959	60	24	16
1961	64	28	8
1962 April .	67	26	7

State by State the vote for fitting safety belts in all new cars ranged from 61 per cent in South Australia and Tasmania, to 65 per cent in New South Wales and Queensland, and up to 71 per cent in Victoria and Western Australia. Belts are favoured by 65 per cent of people with cars in the family, and by 72 per cent of other people. Of people aged 21-39, 70 per cent would compel the fitting of belts in all new cars. So would 67 per cent of people aged 40-49, and 63 per cent of older people. Those in favour of seat belts were asked whether they should be compulsory for all seats, or for only front seats. Answers show that only one in three would vote to compel car manufacturers to fit belts to all seats in all new cars, but two in three would vote for belts for the front seats alone. So far as I am aware no State in Australia has yet legislated in this way. I hope that South Australia will in this, as in so many other things, take the lead.

Mr. Jennings: Do you use seat belts in your car?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. I make it a rule never to drive outside my front gate without fastening my seat belt.

Mr. Fred Walsh: What percentage of motorists use them?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The survey shows that four out of every five motorists who have them fitted regularly use them. There is legislation overseas. I refer especially to the United States of America. I am very much indebted to Senator Edward J. Speno of the New York State Legislature for a great deal of information on this matter relating to research and legislative action. Senator Speno is the Chairman of the Joint Legislative Committee on Motor Vehicles and Traffic Safety in New York State. There the compulsory fitting of seat belts in automobiles sold after June 30, 1964, has already been made law. New York State has 14 per cent of all motor cars in the United States. Senator Speno has sent me an issue of the *Traffic Laws Commentary* issued by the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances which shows that besides the State of New York such a law had already (April 25, 1963) been enacted in 13 other States and the District of Columbia. I have a table that I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* without the necessity of my reading it.

Leave granted.

SEAT BELTS LEGISLATION.

State.	Date of Adoption	Law Applies to New Vehicles as of:
Wisconsin	1961	1962 models
Mississippi	1962	1963 models
Rhode Island	1962	1964 models
Virginia	1962	1963 models
District of Columbia	24/10/62	1964 models
New Mexico	22/2/63	1964 models
Indiana	7/3/63	1964 models
Tennessee	15/3/63	1964 models
Minnesota	19/3/63	January 1, 1964
Nebraska	20/3/63	1964 models
Washington	25/3/63	January 1, 1964
Vermont	3/4/63	1964 models
Georgia	9/4/63	January 1, 1964
North Carolina	25/4/63	January 1, 1964

Mr. Casey: How many States do not have such a law?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the honourable member subtracts 14 from 50 he will get the answer. The traffic law survey, which was issued in May, said that up until that time 46 State Legislatures had been convened in 1963, so only four remained, and that in those 46 Legislatures 44 had introduced Bills on this subject. I do not know how many more have been adopted since the end of April. If such legislation can be enacted so widely in the United States of America I know of no reason why it should not be enacted in South Australia. I have accordingly taken the step of introducing this Bill as, alas, from various comments and answers to questions during last session, I have come to the regretful conclusion that the Government is not prepared to do so.

I turn now to an examination of the clauses of the Bill. Before doing so, however, I should like to say that I have had great assistance in its drafting from the former Parliamentary Draftsman, Sir Edgar Bean. While the "instructions" are mine, the drafting is his. When I was considering this Bill I naturally turned to Sir Edgar for help. As members know, Sir Edgar Bean is the chief architect of the Road Traffic Act, 1961, and I am sure that all members will agree that I could not have asked anyone better qualified for help. I am very grateful for his kindness to me yet again, and for the help which he has given me.

Clauses 1 and 2 of the Bill are formal. Clause 3 enacts new section 162a. This section will therefore fall within Part IV of the Road Traffic Act, "Equipment, Size and Weight of Vehicles and Safety Provisions". It will be grouped with sections 159 to 162, which have the sub-heading "Safety Provisions" and deal with such matters as certificates for passenger carrying vehicles, defect notices, the suspension of registration of unsafe vehicles and the securing of loads. This seems the appropriate place in which to insert a section dealing with seat belts. New section 162a will have eight subsections.

Clause 3 (1) provides that the section applies to every motor vehicle having seating accommodation for one or more persons sitting by the side of the driver either on the same seat or on a separate seat. This will, I expect, include all or substantially all motor cars and most motor lorries. It will not, however, include buses, most of which have a single seat for the driver but none for a passenger next to him. The subsection also provides that the section applies to every motor vehicle registered for the first time after December 31, 1964. I have deliberately set the date of operation a long time ahead—over 12 months—so that everyone—manufactures, merchants and the public—will have ample time to be able to comply with its requirements. I do not think any of them will have any difficulty, and my only doubt is whether it is necessary to wait so long.

Subclause (2) provides that a person shall not drive a vehicle which does not comply with the section. It thus puts the obligation for observance of the section upon the driver of the vehicle; it could have been the owner, the manufacturer or the seller. However, from the point of view of proof of non-compliance it seemed most satisfactory to place the obligation to have belts upon the driver. I confidently expect that in any case the results will be the same—belts will be fitted by the manufacturer before sale. Subclause (3) makes provision for the fitting of a seat belt for the driver and for any person sitting by his side. It is well known that the front passenger seat is the "suicide" seat, and the incidence of injury in this seat is higher than in any other seat in a motor car. The front seat passenger above all others should be protected by having the opportunity to wear a seat belt. I have not provided for the fitting of seat belts in the rear seats of cars. Statistics show that comparatively few people ride in back seats of vehicles, and the incidence of injury to these persons is less. The section will not, however, preclude the voluntary fitting of seat belts in the back seats of cars should that be desired. Sergeant Swaine made one very pertinent point to me, namely, that while the person in the back seat of a car often does not suffer a serious injury in an accident, he himself or his body is often flung forward on to the back of the front seat, thus causing more serious injury to the person sitting in the front seat of the car. However, I have not provided in this Bill for seat belts in the back seats of vehicles. Subclause (3) also provides for anchorages for seat belts so fitted. Obviously, it would be useless prescribing the installation of seat belts if it were not possible to anchor them securely to the frame or chassis of the vehicle.

I pause here to say that I have made as extensive inquiry as possible amongst manufacturers and sellers of motor vehicles in Adelaide and have found that without exception provision in manufacture is now made for the installation of seat belts in new motor vehicles. I think, therefore, that the trade will have no technical difficulty in complying with the Bill.

What I expect is that the maker will himself install seat belts at the time of manufacture, and I hope that this will reduce the cost of this equipment which even now is quite low. I have expressed that in the form of a hope.

Mr. Freebairn: Do manufacturers provide all the necessary anchorages?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. I have inquired from a dozen or more motor houses in Adelaide, and I have obtained a good deal of literature which actually sets out that anchorages for seat belts are now provided in all new cars; there is no difficulty about that at all. Subclauses (4) and (5) provide for the Road Traffic Board to lay down specifications for seat belts and seat belt anchorages. It seems that the board is the obvious authority to lay down these specifications. It is certainly more convenient to make this provision rather than to include in the section itself specifications which will undoubtedly vary from time to time. Subclause (6) gives the board power to approve of seat belts and anchorages in any particular motor vehicle, even though they may not comply with the gazetted specifications. Subclause (8) empowers the Governor to make regulations exempting vehicles or classes of vehicles from the provisions of the section. It may well be that some vehicles—for example, heavy transport vehicles—should not for one reason or another be fitted with seat belts. This subclause makes provision for such eventualities. Members will see that subclauses (6) and (8) provide exemption where that is desirable.

Finally, subclause (7) provides that seat belts and anchorages fitted pursuant to the section must be maintained in sound condition and good working order. This is an obvious corollary of the obligation to install seat belts. In conclusion I point out to the House that this Bill imposes an obligation to fit seat belts. It does not make it mandatory upon anyone to use a seat belt. So far as I am aware, no Legislature has yet adopted a law of general application to passenger cars requiring the use of seat belts while the car is in motion. Naturally, I hope that once seat belts become standard equipment in motor vehicles—as they gradually will from 1965 onwards if this Bill is passed—there will be an increasing use of the belts by the public. I believe this will happen. Obviously, the first step in this process is to make sure that they are in motor cars to be used if desired. I have not in the explanation canvassed any of the common arguments used against seat belts. We have, unfortunately—because I think that all these arguments are groundless, on examination—heard one or two arguments from time to time in this House, and they are usually along the lines that it is an inconvenience or a discomfort to use a seat belt. All I can say is that after one has been using one of these belts just for a few days it becomes second nature to slip it on, and then one feels uncomfortable when not wearing it; and there is no noticeable inconvenience at all.

Mr. Hall: Do you feel more confident on the road?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think it gives one a greater sense of responsibility, because one realizes that one is all the time taking a safety precaution and it makes one more careful.

Mr. Hall: You don't feel more confident?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think so: I do not think I have had that feeling. Even though there may be inconvenience—and I do not believe there is—surely it is worth some grain of inconvenience to have the protection—the greater chance of survival and the lesser chance of severe injury—if one is involved in an accident. The same goes for those people who may find some discomfort in a seat belt; all I can say is that I myself do not.

Other arguments, perhaps, can be brought up against these things. Perhaps I have been rather too engrossed in this subject, for I myself cannot see any valid argument against the provisions of this Bill. All I can say is that those who oppose the Bill—and that is for every member to make up his or her own mind—in view of the statistics I have quoted of the greater chance of survival in an accident if wearing a seat belt, must take a very heavy responsibility in the matter of road safety. I cannot see any valid reason for opposing the Bill. I earnestly ask members on both sides of the House at least to consider seriously what I have said in support of the second reading, and also the provisions of the Bill itself.

Mr. FREEBAIRN secured the adjournment of the debate.

FOOD AND DRUGS REGULATION: MEAT AND MEAT PRODUCTS.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That Regulation No. 15 (amending the principal Regulation No. 40) relating to meat and meat products, made under the Food and Drugs Act, 1908-1962, on April 11, 1963, and laid on the table of this House on June 12, 1963, be disallowed.

(Continued from August 21. Page 610.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I have been informed that I shall be wasting my time

speaking against the disallowance of this regulation, but let me say that, whether I am wasting my time or not, I believe it is imperative that the facts concerning this regulation should be placed before the House in relation to what the health authorities, who framed the regulation, have stated. There are not many matters that this House deals with of more importance that health regulations, which play such an important part in the wellbeing of any community.

The report concerning Regulation No. 15 relating to meat and meat products was forwarded for the information of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation and I think it might be stated what the reasons for the regulation were and why it was necessary that the House should consider the report in disallowing this regulation. The report of Dr. Woodruff is as follows:

The proposal is to delete the present standards for meat and meat products and to substitute the uniform draft standards for meat and fish recommended for adoption by all States by the National Health and Medical Research Council. The reasons are the proposed regulation does not to any large extent vary the present requirements; the principal differences are as follows:

(1) Minced meat—Preservative is no longer permitted; with proper refrigerated storage minced meat can be sold unpreservatized.

(2) Manufactured meats—Where other foodstuffs are included, their presence must be declared.

(3) Meat pie—A meat content is provided for meat pie; there was no previous standard.

(4) Pre-packed meats—Frozen, cooked and smoked meats when pre-packed will no longer require the date of packaging on the label.

In addition, I would point out—

(1) Minced meat—There has been considerable controversy as to whether preservative should be permitted; the consensus of opinion of all States was that minced meat could be prepared and handled without preservatives; the disallowance of preservative was therefore recommended. The States of New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and Western Australia have never permitted preservative.

Meat trade representatives have claimed the regulations are inconsistent in allowing preservatives in sausage but not in minced meat. Sausage contains starch which will "sour" by action of yeasts even under refrigeration. Preservative is necessary to prevent this, but effective refrigeration will keep minced fresh meat quite adequately. Preservative serves to cover up the product which has been carelessly handled.

(2) Manufactured meats—The presence of other foodstuffs was required to be declared because of the practice of adding skim milk powder which analyses as meat without acknowledging its presence.

(3) Meat pie—The regulation provides that a meat pie shall contain at least 25 per cent meat. There is at present no standard, and the customer has no ground for complaint as long as some meat is detectable. Meat trade representatives considered the 25 per cent standard too low. Some pastrycooks on the other hand considered it too high. The public wish to be assured that a meat pie complies with a standard for meat content. Twenty-five per cent of the total weight is considered a reasonable minimum.

A member of the Committee on Subordinate Legislation asked me whether a similar standard could not be set for pasties. It is not proposed to do so because of the wide differences in recipes for this product, and the strong liking people have for their own particular type of pasty. Pies are much more uniform.

(4) Minimum starch content of 3 per cent in sausage meat—this was included to supplement the prohibition of preservative in minced meat because it was found that in Victoria butchers were selling minced meat with a dusting of starch as coarse ground sausage meat; minced meat as such went off the market.

(5) Tripe—There has been some difficulty at the Metropolitan Abattoirs in preparing tripe within the reaction and value range of pH 6.5 to pH 7.5 due to the alkalinity of the water used; however, the use of treated water would overcome this difficulty and ensure that tripe was not too alkaline for consumption.

(6) Game, *e.g.*, kangaroo was excluded from the definition of meat in order that if it was included in smallgoods its presence would have to be declared, *e.g.*, "Beef and kangaroo hamburgers".

Honourable members will see that, if the regulation is disallowed as proposed, it will deal with more things than minced meat and tripe, on which the honourable member focused his attention. He gave the impression that if this regulation were disallowed, then the previous regulation would automatically come back into force and no harm would be done, because the only things affected are the two controversial ones—minced meat and tripe—and all the other regulations would automatically come back into operation. That is not the position.

Mr. Millhouse: That is not what I said, either.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member spent most of his time talking about the investigation the committee made. If honourable members like to take the trouble to study what is in the original regulation, they will see that in one hundred ways the public is being protected by the new regulation proposed to be disallowed. I emphasize to honourable members who have not had the opportunity of looking at the regulation that is proposed to be deleted that it is printed on about five pages. It deals with many food commodities that were not previously set out, and is the result of a long study by health authorities throughout Australia on what is necessary to protect the foodstuffs of the public. It would be highly undesirable to lightly disallow a regulation which has been drawn up by experts after examination and which is in force in every other State. If I were the only person to vote against this disallowance, I would still call for a division to have my name registered. I should probably be wasting my time as it seems to me that this has been fixed anyway. I detail examples of the difference between the old regulation and the one now to be disallowed, regarding one or two products. The old regulation contained only two small provisions about fish. I must confess that I shall have difficulty in quoting, because the first regulation contains the name of a chemical that I have not heard of and do not know how to pronounce. The regulation states:

Canned fish may contain sodium hexametaphosphate in the proportion not exceeding 0.5 parts per centum; the proportion of sodium hexametaphosphate shall be declared on the label.

The other states that canned fish may be coloured with a matter without declaration. In the old regulation they are the only provisions regarding the selling of fish. The new regulation contains massive provisions for the protection of the public. It contains details of the additives that may be used; labelling; fish products; handling of fresh and chilled fish, frozen and smoked fish, oysters and other shellfish. This is not a simple matter of ruling out a regulation that deals with two things, tripe and minced meat, so that the other regulation automatically takes over and protects the public. I assure honourable members that that is not the position.

Mr. Dunstan: Could not the rest of it be re-enacted in some other way?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not know what the honourable member is talking about. Since the regulations have been the subject of dispute I have inquired regarding the provision about minced meat. The results have been borne out by scientific investigation undertaken by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization. The practice in the past, of the butcher putting any old scraps aside and later mincing them and putting preservatives in them to make meat suitable for sale, is not only highly undesirable, but is dangerous to the public.

Mr. Jennings: Do you think that is done?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I know it is done and has been done. What's more, the honourable member interjecting knows that it has been done.

Mr. Jennings: I shall speak for myself.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member for Mitcham in moving for the disallowance of this regulation is correct when he says that the committee cannot amend a regulation. The committee has the power either to approve a regulation or to move for its disallowance. This committee has operated for many years, and the moving in this House for the disallowance of an important regulation is of comparatively recent origin. When Mr. Anthoney was chairman of the committee, if a regulation caused concern the committee considered it was imperative to report to the authorities concerned that it was having difficulty, in order to enable an alternative to be suggested. On numerous occasions it asked a local government body, when an objection had been stated—for instance to zoning regulations—to consider the problem with the object of the committee's working out a satisfactory alternative without disallowing the regulation. I believe that that would be a good practice to adopt in the future.

Mr. Millhouse: The committee does it nearly every week.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member did not do it in this case. When I asked for some information on this matter I was surprised to hear that the honourable member for Mitcham, as chairman of the committee, was not present when a principal witness was being questioned on this matter.

Mr. Millhouse: That is a very unfair thing for you to say, and I resent it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not mind whether the honourable member resents it or not.

Mr. Millhouse: That is a personal matter which I resent very much, coming from you.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The only questions asked of the witness were, I am informed, not with the object of supporting the regulation but of condemning it.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you blaming me for that in my absence?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No, I am not. I believe that every effort should be made not to disallow this regulation outright as is proposed now, but to allow it to function. It functions in other States, and there seems to be no reason why it should not function here. Why is it that every other State can have a standard of minced meat that will provide a suitable product to the public without its being highly preservatized, yet we cannot do it in this State? The C.S.I.R.O. fully investigated this matter, and the result of its investigation is available for honourable members. The member for Mitcham has handed me a note which I accept. I withdraw what I said previously. He has pointed out to me that when this witness was being examined by the committee, his father was undergoing a serious operation. I apologize to him. It was not a matter of his not being concerned in this matter. I hope that the honourable member will accept my apology. I believe that instead of disallowing regulations it is necessary to try to get regulations that protect public health. If we disallow this regulation many things it provides for will not be covered in the existing regulation. I ask members to seriously consider that when voting on this motion. I strongly oppose the disallowance of the regulation.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion. First, let me try to put the Premier back on the rails. It is no use standing in this House and opposing recommendations from the Subordinate Legislation Committee. This committee has been in existence ever since I have been a member of this House. On several occasions I have urged that the committee have power to amend regulations, rather than to simply disallow them because of some unsatisfactory feature, but the Premier has always opposed the Opposition's suggestions. Let there be no mistake about this! The Premier should not shoot off his mouth just to try to curry favour. In the past he has always had the majority and has always been able to refuse the Opposition's proposals to give the Subordinate Legislation Committee power to amend regulations. However, the Premier has been caught up with this time, and it is no good his referring to the member for Mitcham as he did. The Premier mentioned what was done when the late Hon. Ernest Anthoney was Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee. I can go back further to the time when the Hon. John McInnes was Chairman. It was his practice to closely examine all regulations. He sat is his office every day, even when the House was not sitting, studying the regulations that were put before him.

Mr. Shannon: How many motions for disallowance did he move?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: The honourable member will have his turn. I will answer him when I can hear him properly. Mr. McInnes went to the extent of suggesting that regulations be re-considered by organizations. He would intimate that although a regulation had been approved by the Crown Solicitor's Department it was not completely satisfactory and that it would be better for the organization to get, as it were, half a loaf rather than none, by re-considering the regulation. The Subordinate Legislation Committee should be given power to amend regulations. If it had power we would not witness a recurrence of what has happened today. The committee has sufficient talent among its members to amend regulations. I can guarantee the Government that the Opposition members of that committee will devote their time to the work of that committee: they will not have other jobs that occupy their time.

Mr. Jennings: We were at Elizabeth at 9 o'clock this morning.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I do not know why the committee members should have been at Elizabeth then. Be that as it may, although the Premier submitted much information in support of his opposition to the motion, I propose to quote from a document I have received from Master Butchers Limited. It states:

> The new regulation forbids the addition of "any preservative, salt or other foreign substance" in chopped or minced meat. The main objection to this regulation, and it is a most serious one, is that preservative, usually in the form of sulphur dioxide, must not now be added to minced meat. The prohibition in the use of preservative in minced meat cannot be sustained on the grounds of any harmful effect, because as is well known, it is used in other articles, such as soft drinks.
>
> I understand that one fluid ounce is used in every 35 lb. of raw meat used as minced meat.

Mr. Laucke: One fluid ounce to 30 lb. of meat.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: The document continues:

> Also the claim that sulphur dioxide enables butchers to use stale meat for mincing cannot be sustained.

So, the Premier's argument is destroyed. He said this afternoon that he knew that some

butchers chopped up all sorts of waste meat and threw it into the mincer. According to Master Butchers Limited—and I am prepared to take notice of it—that sort of thing is not done. Preservative is still permitted in sausages and in manufactured meat as defined in the regulations. The document continues:

The claim that other States have managed without the use of preservative in minced meat is very misleading indeed. Firstly, the number of prosecutions for the use of preservative in other States must surely indicate, in some measure at least, that great difficulty is experienced in keeping minced meat without preservative. Secondly, the meat trade in the other States "get around" the prohibition by adding farinaceous substances (flour) to minced meat, and thereby alter the character of the meat so that it comes within the definition of sausage meat. As a result, preservative may be included.

Other information I have received discloses that even under the regulations coarse minced meat—coarser than sausage meat—can have preservative added. The document continues:

Under our new regulation, provided that a minimum of 3 per cent starch is added to minced meat, it becomes sausage meat and may have preservative added. The main problem in the prohibition of preservative is that minced meat, with a far greater surface of meat exposed to the air, will keep but a short space of time, even if fresh when made, if it has no preservative in it. One reason for this is that the temperature of meat is increased by approximately 20 per cent when minced, due to the heat generated by the worm and plate on the mincer. Furthermore, in our hot climate, the problem of high temperatures with a greatly increased growth of bacteria aggravates the difficulty. It cannot be guaranteed that every housewife will place her purchases from a butcher shop into her refrigerator immediately after purchase. It is not difficult to imagine that minced meat may be carried on the back seat of a closed car on a hot summer day for an hour or two. This would, without doubt, make the minced meat smelly and unfit for human consumption without preservative. A case concerning a butcher in the Upper Murray area clearly illustrates this point. He bought a bullock on April 11, 1963 . . . In the rush to prepare the mince, the apprentice omitted to add preservative. The minced meat was sold on that day, and by the weekend the butcher had received 30 complaints from customers who either complained that the meat had mould growing on it or that it smelled mouldy. The remaining half of the carcase was prepared on Wednesday, and the minced meat had preservative added. It was subsequently sold, and not one complaint was received.

That indicates that complaints were received when the meat was prepared without preservative; subsequent to that the minced meat from the same carcass, with a little preservative added, was perfectly all right. It is regrettable that the whole of the regulation has to be disallowed merely because of the procedure governing the operations of the Subordinate Legislation Committee. I firmly believe that the matter must be ventilated. The meat industry in this State compares favourably with that in any other State; it sets a high standard in the sale of meat, and those standards should be maintained with minced meat. If meat is tainted or stale it cannot be minced and converted to fresh meat, even with preservatives added.

The Secretary of the Meat and Allied Trades' Federation of Australia told me that, although the union had no particular association with this matter, the members of that organization engaged at the abattoirs and in the retail trade were the people who would receive all the complaints if no preservative was added to minced meat: it would not be the owners of the shops who would be receiving the complaints. The members of his organization have been responsible in the past for preparing the minced meat, and they contend that they should be permitted to carry on the traditions of the trade which have been so well founded in this State. I agree that it is regrettable that the whole of this regulation must go overboard. However, that is not the fault of the Opposition. It may be that perhaps the matter could have been safeguarded had there been more time to recall the witnesses sponsoring this regulation, but now there is no alternative. I hope that more staff will be provided in the Crown Law Office so that some of these matters can be attended to more speedily and forwarded on so that the committee itself and Parliament in turn can deal with these regulations more expeditiously. I support the motion for disallowance.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): As often in my political career, I find myself today in a hopeless minority, but I shall still fight for what I believe to be right. I remind members that the Subordinate Legislation Committee in this State was the first of its kind in the Commonwealth. It was set up largely as the result of the efforts of the late Hon. R. J. Rudall, who was one of the founders of the committee. The Leader mentioned another man for whom I had a great admiration. That was the Hon. John McInnes, who followed Mr. Rudall as chairman. I wish to say a word or two about Mr. McInnes so that members will understand how this committee operated when it was conducted by that gentleman. Rarely did we have a motion for disallowance from the committee in those days.

Mr. Hall: Do you think that comes within the ambit of what we are discussing?

Mr. SHANNON: I think it is very appropriate, and I intend to give some of the junior members a lesson in the matter of procedure. Whether or not the lesson is accepted depends upon those members' grey matter, but I will do my best. At the time to which I refer it was the custom of the committee to refer back to a department a regulation which it felt might not be 100 per cent satisfactory. In fact, the committee did on occasions find flaws in regulations. What the Leader said about Mr. McInnes is true: he spent the whole of his time in his office dealing with these problems, and on occasion he found flaws in regulations. However, the committee did not disallow a regulation merely because of that flaw: it was referred back to the department, the matter was corrected, and the new regulation was brought forward and the whole thing went along smoothly and swimmingly. The Leader made a song and dance about the committee's not having power to amend regulations. May I offer a word of advice to my fellow members on this matter? Please do not set up members of Parliament as experts in framing regulations. I should hate to have that task put on my shoulders.

Mr. Hall: You are certainly avoiding it in discussing this matter.

Mr. SHANNON: My young friend is a little too eager: he wants me to come to the crux of the matter too quickly. I do not want to do that; I really want to give the honourable member a lesson in what I think he ought to understand, which is that Parliament was meant to work and not to balk people. I consider that this is an attempt to balk the department in carrying out what in its opinion is a wise provision for the public. I do not suppose any other department of this State is as much concerned with the public welfare as is the Department of Public Health. It is the purity of the foodstuffs supplied to the community which have a tremendous bearing on everyone's health and wellbeing. I would have thought that if there were a valid objection to any one of these numerous regulations and the numerous articles mentioned in them, the head of the department would have been brought back to discuss with the members of the committee the question of either amending or withdrawing, if necessary, a particular section.

Mr. Millhouse: The question of the standard of tripe was raised.

Mr. SHANNON: I will deal with that in a moment, because it is part of the honourable member's stock in trade, and I should not like to rob him of it. I am one who has no doubt about the honourable member's assiduity, honesty of purpose and ability. I should like that to be properly understood. Nothing I will say this afternoon will in any way offend him in that regard.

Mr. Hall: You are soft-soaping him!

Mr. SHANNON: I think the honourable member will be prepared to accept some advice from an older statesman. Obviously, I did not come here unprepared this afternoon. It would be unwise to do that here, because a member generally cops something if he does not have his facts straight. I had the opportunity to speak to Dr. Woodruff, but Mr. Millhouse, owing to family affairs, was denied the opportunity to be present on that occasion. I am as certain as I stand here this afternoon that if the honourable member, as chairman of the committee, had approached Dr. Woodruff and extracted evidence from him, it might have changed his view on this problem. I do not think that the case for the department was sufficiently probed when the chief of that department was before the committee. I do not blame Mr. Millhouse for that, but it was bad luck for him. After all, it was Dr. Woodruff who was cross-examined. I think that Dr. Woodruff was a little worried, and I told him that he was to blame in this respect: that any witness appearing before a Parliamentary committee has a free hand to state his case. I do not know whether Dr. Woodruff was a nervous witness, as I have never had him before me in that capacity, or whether he did not realize that he could go ahead and say what his department thought about this problem.

Dr. Woodruff told me that he regretted that some questions which he thought would be asked were not put to him. An expert witness in that position should make sure that the points he wants brought forward are brought forward, whether or not he is asked questions on them. It did not happen on this occasion. I do not think that anyone knowing anything about the work this department does would question the ability of these officers to assess a situation concerning health. The Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization had been called in, had given some assistance in this field, and supported what is common practice in the mainland States, with the exception of South Australia. As to the provision of standards for the protection of public health, Dr. Woodruff had an almost ironclad case. It is a pity that Parliament did not have the full benefit of the knowledge of an expert witness.

Here, I shall tender a little advice to my respected colleague, the member for Mitcham. When one has an expert witness before him and proposes some reservations, one wants to make sure that he has told the committee sufficient. It is customary on some occasions to test an expert by calling another expert, but not to test an expert witness by calling evidence from interested parties who are not experts in the field of science and who are purely business people making a living in industry. First, I would have some caution in accepting evidence from a person whom I knew was an interested party in such a matter.

Mr. Bywaters: You might say, on the consuming side.

Mr. SHANNON: I am referring to evidence from a party who is making a profit in the industry, denying what the head of the department was putting forward in the public interest. I think that is a matter that Mr. Millhouse himself should feel some twinge of conscience about, because I understand samples of unpreservatized and preservatized minced meat were delivered to the committee from the party concerned. The preparation of these meats was not supervised by any member of the committee or by someone deputed by it. I think that the honourable member would agree that no court of law would accept purely hearsay evidence: it would discard it out of hand. No-one can say for certain that the committee was not being misled. It accepted evidence in a form that no court of law would accept.

Mr. Millhouse: That's a bit sweeping.

Mr. SHANNON: Would the honourable member be prepared to go into court and fight a case and accept evidence that has been submitted to this Chamber in support of a disallowance motion on samples of minced meat sent to him by a manufacturer or trader, in the absence of any supervision in their preparation and without any actual first-hand knowledge from someone deputed by the Subordinate Legislation Committee to see them prepared? In all justice, would the honourable member try to hoodwink a court and expect it to accept that as conclusive evidence?

Mr. Millhouse: Yes, because I have faith in the integrity of the witness.

Mr. SHANNON: Then, the honourable member has greater faith in his ability to hoodwink a court than I thought. What is the next step in connection with these samples—were they passed around? They were passed around to two lady members of this Parliament and a member of the House staff.

The SPEAKER: I do not think the committee is on trial.

Mr. SHANNON: Mr. Speaker, we should test the basis of the argument adduced by the member for Mitcham in asking the House to disallow a regulation, and that is what I am doing. We have had the people named as his test agents, and he quoted them as giving unsatisfactory answers to the question, "Were the unpreservatized meats satisfactory?" I listened carefully to the member for Mitcham, because I was intrigued by his methods. The answer from the ladies concerned was that the unpreservatized meat did not keep.

Mr. Millhouse: Mrs. Cooper did not say that.

Mr. SHANNON: I accept that retraction. Let us get down to the fundamentals of the matter. If I were placed in the position where I wanted to test these samples, I know what I would do. The function of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science is to render a service to the public generally and, more particularly, to any Government department in this field. It could have given the honourable member a first-hand test, and told him exactly the correct deterioration in the sample, if that is what the honourable member is looking for, and the conditions under which it handles samples.

Mr. Millhouse: We were content with the opinions of a couple of practical housewives.

Mr. SHANNON: I thought the honourable member would be content with anyone. When one is in trouble getting supporting evidence, one does not mind where it comes from. Since we are dealing with experts, it is wise to be cautious if one wants to rebut any evidence tendered. The first thing the honourable member should have done was to obtain assistance from this institute. The Premier has explained the ramifications of the regulation, and what he said was important. We shall leave many of the foodstuffs where Mohammed's coffin is—between heaven and earth. I draw the committee's attention to this evening's *News*, which, under the heading "U.S. Hygiene Demands", states:

> The Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board plans to spend about £50,000 on improvements to hygiene facilities to maintain the American beef export market.

This points a moral. If it is good for the person overseas who is going to eat our meat, then it must be good for us to have all the protection and restrictions necessary to ensure that nothing faulty is sold to the public. If this is necessary for our export trade, then it must be necessary for home consumption—the principle is on all fours in both cases. A company in which I am interested deals in meat and processing, and I wanted to know

the management's opinion of the regulation. It was wise that I should know. I have confidence in the people who handle the company's business because they are experts. This regulation was carefully examined by the senior officers of the company charged with the handling of meat, and they said that they would have nothing to fear from it. They said that if they had to, they could operate under those conditions. I asked them for an honest opinion and they gave me one, and said that they could comply with the regulation. That sounded reasonable to me. This opinion is shared by people in Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia who operate under these conditions.

Our local butcher at the behest of the Master Butchers Association was asked to contact me as his local member. He asked me to oppose this regulation dealing with minced meat. I asked him why he wanted me to oppose it, and he said that he had no particular reason for wanting me to do so, but that he had been told by the association to ask me to do that. I asked him what he knew about it, and he said that the same thing was happening in Victoria and that no-one was complaining about it there. He said that he had been to Victoria and knew about the regulation. Another of my butchers also had the same story; he had been prodded by the Master Butchers Association, which had an axe to grind. The bigger the business, the more pressure you get as a result; the bigger the vested interests, the greater the pressure applied. I am referring to the people who, at the moment, are putting up a case for the disallowance of this regulation. They have an axe to grind, and it may hurt them in their pockets.

Mr. Clark: Big firms try to look after their own interests!

Mr. SHANNON: Yes, I agree, but why prod the little fellow? Perhaps the large firms wish to make more money, but why have the little fellow fighting their battles? Both the butchers told me that they were prodded to approach me. I was at once suspicious that there was something really worth while in this for some people. These are matters that should be considered by the Opposition members before they rush in.

Mr. Ryan: Why pick on us?

Mr. SHANNON: Perhaps I should have picked on some Government members rather than the Opposition.

Mr. Ryan: It was the Subordinate Legislation Committee.

Mr. SHANNON: And now it is the House. We have been told that sulphur dioxide is used in soft drinks and in foods that the public consumes. I believe that is so, but why did the Eastern States decide that sulphur dioxide should be excluded from minced meat? Did they do it without thought, and merely say, "It is a preservative: we will knock it out"? Of course not! Sulphur dioxide is not only a preservative: it has a destroying action. If members doubt this, let them refer to experts. Once minced meat has been treated with sulphur dioxide, vitamin B1 ceases to exist after a short time. Vitamin B is one of the vitamins of some real value in food. No member of the Subordinate Legislation Committee mentioned this factor. It was not brought out in evidence. It could have been, and should have been, brought out in evidence, and possibly would have been by a proper examination of the expert witness who tendered evidence.

Mr. Hall: Does vitamin B1 remain after cooking meat?

Mr. SHANNON: I understand that vitamin B in fresh meat remains and is available to the system after the meat has been prepared for the table, but if the meat has been treated with certain preservatives the vitamin is destroyed before it reaches the pot.

Mr. Hall: I should like more evidence on this.

Mr. SHANNON: I do not know whether the honourable member is a member of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, but I recommend that he talk with the Director of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. He is a friend of mine, but he will still tell the truth. It would be a wise way for the honourable member to become informed on technical problems. My information is that sulphur dioxide, when used as a preservative, destroys vitamin B. Fresh minced meat is as good, after it comes out of the pot, as any other meat in nutritive quality. Does that satisfy the honourable member?

Mr. Hall: No.

Mr. SHANNON: I know that nothing will satisfy the honourable member. I am sorry that I am such a poor teacher, but I have done my best. I agree with the Premier that this regulation is so vital to public health that the motion for its disallowance should be opposed. The member for Mitcham drew my especial attention to tripe and said that he would like me to deal with it. The Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board does provide about 75 per cent of the tripe consumed in

South Australia. It would not have any difficulty in meeting the requirement of pH 6.5 to pH 7.5 if it adopted a simple expedient. It would cost a mere bagatelle, compared with the £50,000 the board proposes spending for the export meat market, to install a water treatment plant to control the water used in the treatment of tripe.

Mr. Millhouse: If you read Mr. Waterhouse's evidence you will find that it is a little more difficult.

Mr. SHANNON: Perhaps. At the moment I am not giving Abattoirs Board evidence. It is an interested party to this regulation, because it wants to make a profit. It does its best to make a profit. I went to school with David Waterhouse and I do not believe that he has changed his colours yet. He still likes to be on the right side of the ledger at the end of each year. I advise the Subordinate Legislation Committee when it is dealing with technical problems in future to seek advice from technicians.

Mr. Millhouse: That is what we thought we were doing when we sought evidence from Mr. Waterhouse.

Mr. SHANNON: The committee was dealing with a practical man, but a scientific approach was available to the committee. A telephone call would have obtained the necessary information.

Mr. Millhouse: The Abattoirs Board asked Dr. Woodruff to give evidence, but he still had not attended three months later.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has made his speech: it's the member for Onkaparinga's turn now.

Mr. SHANNON: I do not object, Mr. Speaker, because the honourable member is trying to help me. My information is that the difficulties that some people regard as inherent in the narrow limit of pH 6.5 to pH 7.5 are simply overcome at no great cost. If this is a desirable pH standard in the interests of public health, is it unwise to spend a little money in achieving it? No! Definitely let money be spent to achieve a desirable result. I am satisfied that what the Premier has said adequately outlines the case from the department's point of view. I thank those people that I had the temerity to approach for their help: they have satisfied me that this regulation will not embarrass any industry.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I support the motion. I am sorry that what I thought was going to be a rather interesting debate has degenerated, first, into the Premier's confessing to the House his megalomania because of the fact that for once he is not going to get his own way. Before I go further, may I, as a member of this House, take umbrage at the snide suggestions by the member for Onkaparinga which are reflections on what are surely good honest business people in this State. Not only do I resent this, but I have had made available to me a letter from Mr. Mase who was called to give evidence before the Subordinate Legislation Committee. He is an extremely busy man, and he was not paid for his attendance. I do not know why it is that the member for Onkaparinga thinks that every businessman is dishonest. It may be because he is chairman of directors of a firm and knows a little bit more about the subject than we do.

Mr. Lawn: Is the Farmers Union honest?

Mr. JENNINGS: Unless I find differently, I do not believe that anyone is dishonest. I do not think we should get to the cynical stage of not trusting a person, because if we do we will never be able to trust ourselves. The letter from Mr. Mase states:

I have been reliably informed that during the debate in the House of Assembly last Wednesday, August 21, when a motion for the disallowance of the regulation relating to preservative in minced meat was moved, a certain member of the House, in a disparaging manner reflected on the honesty in which one of the samples could have been produced—namely, minced steak without preservative. As the writer was instrumental in preparing all the samples submitted to you and your committee, I assure you they were prepared from the same batch of meat, which consisted of 24 lb. of fresh stewing steak. The manner in which these samples were prepared was as follows: All the abovementioned steak was put through the large plate of the mincer—

What that means, I do not know—

Four pounds of the large-size mince was then put through the medium-size plate, thus completing the sample of mince without preservative. This was the sample in question, and was one of those presented to your committee the following day; 15 lb. of the remainder was then placed in a container to which was added one-half cup of water which included half an ounce of liquid preservative. All was thoroughly mixed and put through the medium-size plate to complete the samples of mince with preservative, which would give an analysis of approximately three grains per pound. Then 6 lb. of mince with preservative was spread out on a stainless steel table, 5oz. of flour sprinkled on it, and another half cup of water added, thoroughly mixed and put through the medium-size plate again.

The writer then said:

I sincerely hope that the foregoing explanations will clear any doubts as to the genuineness of the samples presented to your committee, and also to the member who so ungraciously suggested that dishonest motives may have been resorted to.

I think that it is not only ungracious but basically wrong for any member of this House to make such an improper imputation about such a reliable and honest citizen as Mr. Mase.

Mr. Shannon: Are you speaking from first-hand knowledge now? Did you see the samples being prepared?

Mr. JENNINGS: I have read his letter, and I am willing to believe him.

Mr. Shannon: Were you out there when the samples were being prepared?

Mr. Lawn: Who is making this speech? You have finished yours.

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not a cross-examination; it is a debate. The honourable member for Enfield!

Mr. JENNINGS: I am prepared to believe the writer of the letter.

Mr. Lawn: The member for Onkaparinga probably thinks this is "My committee".

Mr. JENNINGS: That is an astonishing thing. The member for Onkaparinga, as Chairman of the Public Works Committee, speaks about "My committee". It is like Caesar's wife: it is above suspicion. However, when another committee spends much time genuinely investigating a matter (which Parliament has asked us to do, after all, by appointing the committee) and brings forward a certain recommendation, the honourable member's attitude is, "Oh, well, it does not matter, it is not my committee."

Mr. Shannon: That's very smart.

Mr. JENNINGS: It is not so very smart. The honourable member, in the course of a rather peculiar speech, said that the Subordinate Legislation Committee, just because it had a lawyer for its chairman—and I do not like lawyers any more than anyone else does—

Mr. Millhouse: I hope everyone likes them a lot.

Mr. JENNINGS: It is good for business.

Mr. Clark: Are any other lawyers on the committee?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, the Hon. Mr. Potter. The suggestion was made that the committee looks for a "t" without a cross or an "i" without a dot, and that there is a great feeling in the committee that to show its authority it must move regularly for disallowance of by-laws or regulations. Let me say that over the last few weeks the committee has written back to councils that have submitted by-laws and to departments that have submitted regulations and pointed out that certain things were not practicable, and as a consequence we have received replies saying, "We did not quite see that point; we will fix it," and the matter is rectified. Certainly, there is no suggestion—and there cannot be any suggestion—of the committee's using its authority just for the sake of doing so. The member for Onkaparinga referred to Dr. Woodruff's evidence. By interjection the other day, when the motion for disallowance was being moved, the honourable member adopted a tactic that we are used to hearing from the Premier.

Mr. Shannon: It must be clever.

Mr. JENNINGS: It does not endear itself to me. He said, "This man is a good public servant, so why disparage him?" Any person who has been a member of this House for a few years and has done his job properly has had plenty of occasion to get in touch with Dr. Woodruff as a public servant; he is an extremely good public servant and, what is probably rarer, he is a very fine gentleman.

Mr. Shannon: Did I suggest anything to the contrary?

Mr. JENNINGS: The honourable member did not suggest anything to the contrary, but he suggested that we were writing down Dr. Woodruff.

Mr. Shannon: If that is a fair sample of the standard of debate, I do not wish to hear any more.

Mr. Lawn: The honourable member wants to go and preserve himself.

Mr. Heaslip: I thought you said Dr. Woodruff was a butcher of another kind.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, I did.

Mr. Heaslip: That is writing him up!

Mr. JENNINGS: Mr. Speaker, I have been rather at a loss to understand the Premier's attitude on this matter.

Mr. Ryan: You wouldn't be an orphan there.

Mr. JENNINGS: I think that attitude must be associated with the current vendetta the Premier is conducting with the member for Mitcham.

Mr. Millhouse: That is only supposition.

Mr. JENNINGS: I know it is only supposition, but I should be rather astonished if I were not right. I do not care how much members opposite fight among themselves.

Mr. Clark: You would encourage it.

Mr. JENNINGS: No, I would not provoke it, but I would welcome it, because when thieves fall out honest men come into their own. I ask the House to read the regulation and then to read the evidence (which is available to every member of this House), and to take time in doing so in order to understand it properly, which is something the Premier did not do.

Not every member of this House is dumb, blind and stupid. When the motion for the disallowance was moved by the chairman of the committee it was obvious to us that the Premier walked across and got the papers from the Clerk Assistant. That was the first he had seen of them. He was then prepared to go on because of the current vendetta with the member for Mitcham, and opposed the motion immediately. The bells rang at 4 o'clock, which saved the Premier for a week. In the meantime he has done as much study on the matter as he did before, which is precisely nothing. I ask the House to support the motion for the disallowance.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I, too, support the motion for the disallowance. I echo some of the sentiments expressed by speakers before me in asking why it is that we appoint the Subordinate Legislation Committee and then do not accept its recommendations. When all is said and done, we appoint members from this House who are our equals, and they make up half the committee. The other half of the committee members come from another place, and they may be considered to be our peers. They have the opportunity firsthand of hearing evidence on matters that go to the committee for investigation. If we did our job properly, as my friend the member for Enfield has just said, we would take the opportunity to read the evidence that is taken down at meetings of the committee. We have all had the opportunity to read the evidence given on the matter before us. When the member for Mitcham, as chairman of the committee, moved for the disallowance of the regulation he paid me a compliment by saying that I was a practical housewife. As such, he asked me to take part in an experiment that he was conducting to show the difference between meat with preservative in it and meat without it. I was happy to collaborate with him on this matter. I expressed the opinion to him at the time that I should not think of buying the meat that did not have preservative in it: first, because of its appearance, and secondly, because even at that stage the meat, which was not then old, had a distinct odour.

Mr. Hughes: The member for Onkaparinga did not agree.

Mrs. STEELE: The Premier and the member for Onkaparinga did not think the experiment was in order, but I think it was a practical way to look at the matter. I was not the only woman asked to have a look at it. Today I again spoke to my female collaborator in this experiment and she said definitely that she would not touch minced meat without a preservative in it. We know that the preservatized minced meat kept under refrigeration and looked at next day had a better appearance than that which did not have preservative in it, even when kept under refrigeration. The meat with the preservative in it was still looking and smelling good, whereas the meat without preservative had deteriorated.

Mr. Harding: What was the temperature?

Mrs. STEELE: The ideal temperature for the preservation of meat is from 38 to 42 degrees. Domestic refrigerators are continually being opened and shut and the temperature, I imagine, would probably be about 50 degrees. This unpreservatized meat did not see the distance because I believe our much esteemed Miss Bottomley ordered it to be removed from the refrigerator after two or three days.

Mr. Millhouse: After the weekend?

Mrs. STEELE: I think it was on the Thursday that I first saw it, and I saw it again on Friday, and it was removed after that. I was given some interesting figures that came from the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization with regard to the ideal temperatures under which meat should be kept. I am confining my remarks on the regulation to minced meat because in these days I do not indulge in tripe, so I know nothing about that at all. At a constant temperature of 34 degrees minced meat with a preservative added has a life of seven days or perhaps more. At 41 degrees it has a life of two days, but it then has a strong odour and is discoloured. At a constant temperature of 55 degrees it lasts less than 18 hours. As I said, the ideal temperature for the preservation of meat under ideal conditions is from 38 to 42 degrees. With no preservative in it there is a different story. Meat minced at 8 a.m. and sold by 5 p.m. has a life of only 12 hours, even if put under refrigeration under ideal conditions. Here is a point that did not occur to me before. In the processing of minced meat the friction of the cutting blade on the fresh meat engenders heat and therefore all minced meat, preservatized or not, deteriorates to a small extent. I am told that a number of butchers who process meat under ideal conditions chill the machine and the meat beforehand, and also the vessels into which the meat goes. Actually the amount of preservative added to minced meat is one fluid ounce to 60 lb. of meat. Perhaps we could take one fluid ounce without having any ill effects.

Mr. Millhouse: Is it one ounce to 60 lb. of meat?

Mrs. STEELE: I telephoned a butcher who told me it was the usual thing to do. I was interested in the evidence given by Dr. Woodruff. He was asked:

If sulphur dioxide is added the meat can be kept much longer, can it?

His answer was, "Yes". He was then asked:

Do any chemical changes occur with the addition of sulphur dioxide?

He replied:

No obvious or apparent changes, but I am sure there must be some because the fermentation process must be held up. There is no apparent change, however; it looks nice and smells nice.

He was then asked:

We have been eating meat containing sulphur dioxide for many years in South Australia, haven't we?

His answer was: "That is so". He was then asked:

Are there any cases where people have been affected?

His reply was:

I am not aware of any.

He was then asked:

It is used in other foods, such as soft drinks, isn't it?

His answer was "Yes". To try to follow this up I looked at the various tinned and bottled goods in the pantry at Parliament House. Miss Bottomley kindly gave me the opportunity to have a look at them. I was under the impression that if goods had preservatives in them it had to be stated on the label. Apparently this is not so; they do not have to indicate this, but we know that any tinned or bottled goods must have the preservative added. When first married, women do not know much about the types of meat to buy for certain things (any way, that was so in my case) and the look of meat is an indication or encouragement to them to buy some of one kind of meat or another. Naturally, a young, inexperienced housewife would be immediately attracted by the minced meat that had a good colour and was attractive either in a bag or on trays in the butcher's refrigerated counter. For instance, if she bought meat that was not preservatized and took it home, and did not know that it should be kept under ideal refrigeration conditions, with the refrigerator not opened too often so that the temperature would not drop, she would come to use it next day, and it would have an unpleasant odour and would not look good. It does not take long to grow a mould, as I know from experience. She would blame the butcher and say that he was selling her stale meat.

South Australia sells more minced meat per capita than any of the Eastern States, which get over the difficulty of adding preservatives to minced meat by adding, I think, about 3 lb. of farinaceous matter to 80 lb. which then, by law, gives them the right to add a preservative.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: It is not minced meat like ours; it is more like sausages.

Mrs. STEELE: Apparently. Apart from that, this State sells much more minced meat. I have spoken to many women since the motion was first introduced, and I would say that 90 per cent of them who had experience in buying minced meat said that they would naturally buy the minced meat that looked fresh and that had preservative added to it. Few housewives do not buy minced meat for use in cooking of some kind or another. With these few remarks, I support the motion for disallowance.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I, too, support the motion. Earlier this year when the press prophesied this was to be a lively session, I did not think for one moment that it would take the turn that it has taken during the last couple of weeks. It appears to me that as the session progresses, more ill-feeling is growing between certain members of this House. Because of this, it does not augur well for good legislation. I am referring to what happened on the other side of the House.

Mr. Millhouse: I think you will find that appearances are more apparent than real.

Mr. HUGHES: I hope the honourable member is sincere, because when we see this sort of thing happening within the Government ranks, it does not promise good legislation.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: There seemed to be some dissension on your side of the House last night.

Mr. HUGHES: Not that I know of. There was no dissension on the action that our Leader and Deputy Leader took last night. It does not sound pleasant when the Leader of the Government and the Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee state with venom in their voice on two consecutive Wednesdays that they resent the statements made. If that is not dissension within the ranks, I do not wish to see it in its real form.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You sound as though you would like it to be real.

Mr. HUGHES: No. The position was clarified by the member for Mitcham and I was willing to accept his statement, but the members on the other side of the House apparently thought the member for Mitcham was not correct, and they wanted to take the matter

further. The chairman is only one of a committee appointed from members of both Houses. It is not right that, when he places before the House a unanimous resolution of the committee, he should, by virtue of his position, be attacked as he has been attacked in this House. If members disagree with anything that the chairman has presented, it should be referred to the committee. The chairman should not be attacked. What he does is the result of a unanimous decision of his committee. This afternoon an unwarranted attack was made on the chairman of the committee. Certain remarks were made by a member on the Government side regarding the probing of a witness. When the Government finds itself in trouble within its own ranks it seems to call on the big guns to try to make a case in support of it. I maintain that, despite the absence of the chairman of the committee on a particular day, if Dr. Woodruff had certain information that would have convinced the committee that the regulation should be accepted, the excuse made on behalf of this gentleman was unwarranted. The mere fact of Dr. Woodruff's position would belittle him if after he presented evidence to the committee, it should be implied that he did not know that he could have given this information to that committee. I do not accept that because I believe, with great respect, that if Dr. Woodruff had anything further to place before the committee, he would not have required the chairman of the committee to be present to drag it out of him. The Premier took strong exception this afternoon to this regulation's being disallowed. I notice he did not indicate that he could re-enact the very provisions that were objectionable to him. I stand to be corrected on this but I have been given to understand (and I think I am right) that any provisions in this regulation objectionable to the Premier he could have re-enacted tomorrow.

The Premier also referred to butchers using "any old meat" and having it made up into minced meat. Many of us resent that statement. There has been much resentment in this House in the last couple of weeks. It was unfair to say that butchers were taking advantage of the general public by taking any old meat, having it made up into minced meat and selling it.

Mr. Clark: They would not be in business very long if they adopted that attitude.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes. The butchers of this State would have resented this statement by the Premier if they had heard it today. I resented it on behalf of the butchers in my district. I know them all personally. I have visited many of their killing-houses and been present when they have turned out minced meat and sausages in the workshops at the back of their premises. Never could I say that they had thrown any old meat into the making up of minced meat and sold it to the public. Every member here, whether on this side of the House or the other, would say that butchers generally would resent that statement.

Mr. Bywaters: They are all subject to health regulations.

Mr. HUGHES: Of course they are.

Mr. Bywaters: And health inspectors.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, and if for one minute it was found that butchers were doing this sort of thing, action would be taken against them in the normal way. But what would condemn them more than any action taken by the health inspector would be the housewives, who would soon find out whether any old meat was being thrown into the mincing machine and turned out for the making of pies and that sort of thing. They know good pies and good minced meat when they eat them. I am sure the Premier will regret, in his anger, making this statement about the butchers. He did not say whether any old meat was good meat or bad meat, but I inferred it could be bad or otherwise.

Mr. Clark: It was not complimentary.

Mr. HUGHES: That is true; it was not complimentary to the butchers of this State. Much was said about Dr. Woodruff when the member for Mitcham presented his case. I have great respect for Dr. Woodruff and the experts, whatever avenue they tread. I must congratulate the member for Mitcham on the presentation of his case. Although he would have obtained most of his material from the evidence presented to his committee, he still had to build up a case and present it to this House on behalf of his committee. He did a really good job in his research in that respect. We must all be guided from time to time by men like Dr. Woodruff, our Director-General of Public Health. However, from an analysis of the case presented to us by the member for Mitcham, it would appear that the only thing sought by this regulation was uniformity between the States. But that is not what experts are for. I should hate to think that the motive for calling Dr. Woodruff before the committee was merely to achieve uniformity between the States, but the member for Mitcham's case to this House left me with no alternative than to assert that all the motion was trying to achieve in respect

of minced meat was uniformity between the States. I think that the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) tried to build up the case by saying that this regulation applied in other States. Even if that is so, it does not matter. If the adding of preservatives to our meat is beneficial from the housewives' point of view, I do not think that just because we want uniformity between the States we should change our method. That is one reason why I support this motion. The suggestion that minced meat should not contain a preservative or salt (we know that they are two things that can contribute to keeping good meat fresh) seems to deny to meat users the full use of a commodity that has been used by housewives in South Australia for over 50 years.

I think Dr. Woodruff himself in reply to a question by the Hon. Mr. Potter, a member of the committee, substantiated the claim that during all those years there had never been any ill-effects, to his knowledge, from the eating of this meat. The Premier claimed that if proper refrigeration were used, minced meat would keep. Obviously the Premier and my wife have not had the same experience, because my wife recently pointed out to me that minced meat in our Kelvinator refrigerator was not keeping as well as it used to keep. Inquiries from our local butcher revealed that preservative had not been added to the minced meat. I do not need to know of the results of the tests conducted by the member for Mitcham and the two practical housewives from this Parliament, because that was the experience in my own home. Some regard should be had for the opinions of housewives because, with all respect to the experts, it is the housewives who look after the stomachs of the experts. If this regulation is allowed it will mean that the housewife will have to visit her butcher more frequently than hitherto.

Mr. Nankivell: Do you eat only minced meat?

Mr. HUGHES: No. I come from a Cornish family and Wednesday is recognized as pasty day, but my wife will now have to visit her butcher on Thursday if she wants to prepare minced meat for our meal that day.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You will have to have pasties on Thursdays as well as Wednesdays; that's the only way out.

Mr. HUGHES: The only way out is to support this motion for the disallowance of the regulation. My wife, and other Cousin Jacks, would be insulted if it were suggested that they put minced meat in pasties. We do not want housewives to have to work harder. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

SCAFFOLDING INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Committee's report adopted.

[*Sitting suspended from 5.57 to 7.30 p.m.*]

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to increase the number of Ministers of the Crown from eight to nine. The Bill also provides that one of the Ministers of the Crown shall bear the title and fill the Ministerial office of Premier. (There is no Premier's Department in South Australia at present.) Clause 3 of the Bill accordingly amends section 65 of the Constitution Act by providing for these matters and also increasing the maximum number of Ministers in this place from five to six. From time to time honourable members on both sides of the House have advocated the proposed increase and I do not think that it is necessary for me to labour the point that, with the considerable development of the State and increase in governmental activity, there is a real need for the appointment of an additional Minister.

I shall mention some problems arising today. Since the number of Ministers was increased from six to eight many new types of activity have been undertaken in this State. At present no Minister is charged particularly with representing the Electricity Trust in this Parliament. If a financial query were raised it would probably come to me, whereas if it were a physical matter it would go to the Minister of Works, so that both the Treasurer and the Minister of Works would have some dealings with the trust. The Housing Trust is not represented in Parliament by a Minister although it deals with the Treasury for finance. The State Bank is attached to the Treasury and that is a logical arrangement. Strangely enough the Immigration, Publicity and Tourist Bureau is attached to the Treasury, but certain functions of the bureau, particularly the control of motor vehicles, are attached to the Lands Department under the Minister of Lands. The Minister of Lands deals with many apparently

extraneous matters. Honourable members should consider the number of functions Ministers in this State perform and compare that number with the number of Ministers in the Cabinets of other State Governments, even Tasmania.

I need not emphasize the necessity for an additional Minister. One aspect of our Cabinet's work is not covered at all. The Minister of Labour and Industry (who is also the Attorney-General) on the industry side of his operations deals purely and simply with industrial matters. He deals with factory inspection, scaffolding inspection, the policing of awards and other miscellaneous duties. In no way is this department equipped to encourage and assist secondary industry. The future of South Australia will depend to a marked degree on whether we continue to attract new and worthwhile employing industries here. Anyone who has studied the geographical features of South Australia, particularly the rainfall and distribution of rivers and water, will appreciate that if we are to cope with a large population we must develop new important mineral resources and continue to attract major industries as we have been able to attract them over the last few years.

If any honourable member doubts this, I ask him to contemplate what the economic position of South Australia would be if, by some mischance, one or other of the large motor industries in this State decided to transfer its operations to another State. These industries receive attractive offers to move. Some years ago South Australia did not have keen competition from other States in attracting industries. I remember when Mr. Forgan Smith (the then Premier of Queensland) said at Premiers' Conferences and Loan Council meetings that it was not the policy of the Queensland Government to attract secondary industries. He said that Queensland was a rural State and that it was his Government's policy to maintain a rural tradition.

Much water has flowed under the bridge since then and today Queensland, in common with Victoria, Western Australia and New South Wales, is pushing to attract any business enterprises it can. I need not stress the fact that an additional Minister is needed to give impetus to following up the possibilities of attracting new industries. I emphasize the word "new" and place a special meaning on it. The Government takes the view, which I believe honourable members opposite will share, that we should not give any special concession or privilege to an industry which is only a duplication of an industry already in operation in this State. We cannot take sides to the extent of showing favouritism to a new firm which will be competing with one already established. Therefore, when I use the word "new" I mean it not in the sense of a duplication of an existing industry but an entirely new type of industry. In those instances I think honourable members will agree that it is reasonable, without doing anyone any harm, for us to take special means to attract any new industry to this State.

I believe that one particular industry has now decided to come to South Australia. Its executives have reached the stage where they have made an economic survey of industry in Australia; they have negotiated for a number of outlets for their commodities, and they are training a manager for the plant to be established in Adelaide. Of necessity, the manager will need a knowledge of South Australian conditions. I believe that when a new industry is established here, particularly if it has no knowledge of Australia, it is very important that it have someone who has an appreciation of Australian traditions and industrial conditions. In the case to which I am referring it meant that a person with knowledge of South Australia had to be taken abroad, and it will be necessary for that person to spend a year in the firm's plant overseas obtaining the necessary information to enable the establishment of the plant here. If that eventuates—and I hope it does—it will be an entirely new type of production to Australia. I instance the coming to South Australia of the British Tube Mills. This company brought to Australia an entirely new type of production at that time, and as a consequence all sorts of secondary production sprang up around it. The industry I mentioned earlier, incidentally, has already made a thorough tie-up with an Australian industry, so although it will have foreign capital in it it will be a fairly strongly financed Australian industry.

Mr. Casey: What does it manufacture?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the honourable member does not mind, I would prefer not to take the matter further than I have taken it. Any industry likes to make its own announcement in its own way, and in this case all the discussions have been on the basis that the matter would not be given any publicity. However, it is the type of thing that I believe South Australia can go after. If any honourable member is interested, I can bring down details of a survey which has been made and which I have found extremely useful.

Although the survey in itself is not completely comprehensive, it sets out fully the gaps that exist at present in Australian industrial production. The survey has been compiled by an expert committee, which has gone into the question of importations into Australia; the survey details every importation into Australia where a figure of more than £100,000 for any particular commodity is involved. I have given the Agent-General in London a copy of this survey, because we have found it very much more valuable to go for a particular industry than to do a world tour in the hope that something will turn up. Although we sometimes miss out badly, opportunities do exist and on a number of occasions this approach has been successful.

Mr. McKee: Would any industries be interested in going to a country centre?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: On some occasions it is possible to establish an industry in the country, and on other occasions it is not. For instance, I know that there is a great necessity today for an industry at Port Pirie, and as a matter of fact I have some ideas on something that could assist. However, what I have in mind is still only in the initial stages. I put a proposition to the Commonwealth Government which indirectly could result in big development being contemplated. One industry close to the honourable member's district has resulted from the type of survey I have mentioned. I refer to the salt industry, a little to the north of the honourable member's district. It was established that we could manufacture salt there at world competitive prices, and having established that, and because we could not get sufficient capital in Australia or from overseas connections in Australia to handle it, we approached an American firm direct—a firm of very great promise in this industry. As a result, it was possible to get a 50-50 merger with an Australian company, a big contract for the export of salt, and an agreement for the establishment of a port, which will be paid for by the industry, and in my opinion a flourishing and permanent industry will be established at that site. That was a case of the type I have emphasized, where having found that there was an opening for an industry at that time we then said, "Well, who are the people that could assist most in doing it?" We went to the largest salt manufacturers in the world, and they were prepared to give a contract and to put in the necessary money. Those people have the ships and they have the orders in Japan. That was an instance of where the direct approach was beneficial.

If honourable members examine the position of the State at present and the volume of work that of necessity has to be handled by Ministers, I think they will all agree that two things are necessary, namely, the need to relieve Ministers of some of their heavier duties and, secondly, the need for a re-organization of Government departments to place the departments more logically together. The present number of Ministers was fixed in 1953, prior to which there were only six Ministers, The number of Ministers under the first Constitution Act based on responsible government was five; it was increased to six in 1873, reduced to four in 1901 and again increased to six in 1908. Several abortive attempts were made to change the position until the last alteration in 1953. As I have said, I do not believe any objection will be seen to the increase in the number of Ministers, and I believe that at least six of the nine Ministers should be members of this House. I would, however, refer in perhaps more detail to the provision that one of the Ministers shall bear the title and fill the Ministerial office of Premier.

Mr. Jennings: Whom do you suggest?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am just looking around; if there is a suitable volunteer opposite I might be able to do a deal with him. If there should be a volunteer from the Opposition benches we would be prepared to talk "turkey". I point out that the matter was raised not over here but by a hopeful member opposite.

Section 65 (2) provides that the titles and Ministerial offices to be borne by Ministers of the Crown are such as the Governor from time to time appoints. To this, the Bill adds the proviso in the terms that I have mentioned. It merely means that, whatever other portfolios are arranged, at least one Minister shall be appointed as Premier of the State. Hitherto this title has been unknown, although the expression like the term "Prime Minister" in England over the years has traditionally been used to denote the Leader of Her Majesty's Government. I do not believe that there is much in having the title, except that when dealing with overseas industry the title of Premier has some significance.

Mr. Lawn: Instead of calling the Minister "the Premier" would it not be better to call him "the master"?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I think that would be inappropriate. Perhaps we should say "servant". I have on many occasions indicated the Government's intention to establish a Premier's Department. This the

Government proposes now to do. However, other administrative procedures for the appointment of the staff already exist under the Public Service Act and legislation is not required for this purpose. It has seemed, however, fitting that the office of Premier should receive some statutory recognition. That is the effect of the proviso which this Bill adds to section 65 (2).

If Opposition members delved into the pages of *Hansard* they would find that there is much history in this matter, and I hope it will not be followed in this instance. History shows that matters of this sort have been proposed by Governments from time to time and the Opposition has always opposed them. Sometimes the proposal has come from a Labor Government and been opposed by the Liberals when in Opposition.

Mr. Ryan: That must have been a long time ago.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not saying anything about the enlightened days we are in at present. On one occasion years ago the matter was proposed by a Labor Government. I am not sure whether there was a shadow Cabinet or not, but the man was selected, and then the Opposition became difficult and opposed the legislation.

Mr. Frank Walsh: You are not thinking of the Peake Government and the opposition to the proposal in the Legislative Council?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I think it was, but on this occasion I hope the matter can be looked at apart from the historical background of something being introduced by the Liberals and opposed by Labor, or *vice versa*. I hope it can be looked at from the point of view of whether it will help in the establishment of an effective Administration, and administrative affairs being more adequately maintained. I hope that it will enable greater emphasis to be placed on the attraction of new industries to the State.

Mr. Frank Walsh: You are hopeful.

The Hon Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No. I am frequently disillusioned. With the considerable growth and development of the State, particularly in recent years, the need for a separate Premier's Department has become increasingly clear. The encouragement of and provision of assistance to new industries and undertakings are matters of first-rate importance. A high level of employment does not depend only on public works. The greater part of employment is provided by private industry. This fact is now becoming recognized more fully in every country in the world, and particularly in the other Australian States, and there is today extreme competition between the States in their efforts to gain the immense advantages which flow from new industries. In fact, the high level of industrial expansion in South Australia has in itself provided for the employment almost permanently of large numbers in our constructional industry. I emphasize that point. If employment is to be maintained we must continue to attract new enterprises to South Australia.

The matters to which I have referred cannot be adequately handled within the existing administrative framework. I do not attempt here to spell out in detail the precise functions of the proposed new department, but in general terms would say that every effort will be made by it to secure new and useful industries and to assist those already established to expand and to become more effective. The Government has in mind a small department which would collect information relating to existing, proposed or new industries or undertakings, conduct research work and promote and encourage the establishment, development and expansion of industry in general. One function of the department will be to examine any disabilities that may arise in connection with industries established in the State from time to time. Hitherto these matters have been dealt with by a number of authorities and a considerable amount of the work involved has been done in the Premier's office. However, if further time is to be made available, a re-organization of the departments of State is necessary and some relief should be given to Ministers by making provision for the appointment of an additional Minister.

I should mention that no provision for payment of the additional Minister is made in the present Bill, as the whole question of salaries is at present being examined by the Auditor-General and the Deputy President of the Industrial Court who will no doubt take account of the new provision in any recommendations they may make. I commend the Bill to members.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

OFFENDERS PROBATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed to clarify certain provisions of the principal Act, and to remove certain anomalies and difficulties to which the Government's

attention has been drawn by various magistrates and by the Crown Solicitor and the Commissioner of Police. The main provisions of the Bill concern problems associated with the application of sections 8 and 9 of the principal Act. One of the main objects of the principal Act is to enable a court before which an offender is charged with, and found guilty of, an offence, in appropriate cases to discharge the offender (either without recording, or after recording, a conviction against him), upon his entering into a recognizance to be of good behaviour and to appear before a court, when called upon, for sentence, or for conviction and sentence. When an offender is so discharged, he is referred to in the Act as a probationer, and a court before which a probationer is bound by his recognizance to appear for sentence, or for conviction and sentence, is referred to as a probative court.

Section 8 of the principal Act confers on a probative court power to vary the conditions of, and to discharge, a recognizance, but provides that the conditions can be varied by the court only on the application of the Minister or a person authorized by him, while a probationer himself is given no right to apply for such a variation. On the other hand the section does not say on whose application a recognizance may be discharged by the court. Clause 4 remedies this situation by re-enacting section 8 so as to give a right, not only to the Minister, but also to a probationer, to apply for variation of the conditions of a recognizance, and to give a probationer the right to apply for the discharge of his recognizance. The clause also provides that, in the case of such an application by or on behalf of the Minister, reasonable notice thereof must be given to the probationer, and in the case of such an application by the probationer, reasonable notice thereof must be given to the Minister. In either case, the party entitled to receive the notice is also given the right to appear and make representations at the hearing of the application.

Section 9 of the principal Act sets out the procedure to be followed for bringing a probationer who fails to observe the conditions of his recognizance before a probative court, and empowers the probative court, on being satisfied that such failure has occurred, to sentence or to convict and sentence the probationer for the original offence. The section presents two difficulties, both of which can occur only where the probative court is a court of summary jurisdiction. The first difficulty stems from the view taken by some magistrates that a probationer who has been released on a recognizance by a court of summary jurisdiction and fails to observe the conditions of his recognizance must be brought before and dealt with by a probative court constituted by the same justices or magistrate who constituted the court before which he was charged with the original offence. The view has been generally adopted in practice by courts of summary jurisdiction and, where the justices or the magistrate who constituted the trial court are not available to constitute the probative court, the courts have taken the view that they are without power to deal with such a probationer.

This situation is clearly not in accordance with the intention of the Act, and illustrates the urgent need for clarifying its provisions. Clause 4 (*a*) accordingly inserts in section 4 of the principal Act a new subsection (1a), which provides, in effect, that a probationer who is bound by his recognizance to appear for sentence, or for conviction and sentence, as the case may be, before a probative court that is a court of summary jurisdiction, shall be deemed to be bound thereby to appear before any court of summary jurisdiction, so constituted that such court would have had jurisdiction summarily to hear and determine the charge in respect of the original offence. The second difficulty arises where a probationer who was under the age of 18 years when found guilty by a court of summary jurisdiction is over that age when brought before a probative court upon his failure to observe the conditions of his recognizance.

The justices or the magistrate constituting the trial court could well have assumed jurisdiction in such a case to hear and determine the charge for the original offence, only because the offender was under the age of 18 years and consequently not liable to be sentenced to a term of imprisonment. However, the probationer being over the age of 18 years when brought before the probative court on breach of his recognizance, for sentence or for conviction and sentence for the original offence, committal to an institution at that stage would, in most cases, be inappropriate, and the probative court is in such cases left in a position where it could not make an appropriate order to meet the circumstances. Clause 7 accordingly re-enacts section 9 so as to clarify its existing provisions, and to include a provision to the effect that, where a probationer was under the age of 18 years when tried for an offence by a court of summary jurisdiction, but over the age when brought before

a probative court of summary jurisdiction, the probative court shall, subject to the ordinary limitations on the powers of punishment imposed on courts of summary jurisdiction by section 129 of the Justices Act, sentence him or convict and sentence him, as the case requires, for the original offence, as if he had been over that age when found guilty by the trial court, and as if he had been lawfully found guilty by a court of competent jurisdiction.

It should here be mentioned that the punishment that can ordinarily be inflicted by a court of summary jurisdiction is limited by section 129 of the Justices Act to a maximum of two years' imprisonment or a fine of £100. Clause 3 merely clarifies the definitions of "court" and "probative court" for the purposes of the above amendments. Clause 4 (*b*) is only a grammatical amendment to section 4 (2) of the principal Act. Clause 4 (*c*) raises the maximum sum that could be awarded by a court of summary jurisdiction as compensation from £25, which was fixed in 1913, to £200, which is a more realistic amount having regard to present-day values. Clause 5 is complementary to clause 6.

Section 11 of the principal Act provides that nothing in the Act shall affect the Maintenance Act. Section 113 of the Maintenance Act provides that if a child (being a person under the age of 18 years) is found guilty of any crime or offence punishable by imprisonment, the child shall not be sentenced to imprisonment. As subsection (5) of the new section 9 as re-enacted by clause 7 expressly provides for the case of a probationer who was under the age of 18 years when found guilty of an offence but over that age when brought before a probative court, there would be an inconsistency between that subsection and section 11 of the principal Act unless the subsection is removed from the operation of section 11. Clause 8 accordingly removes that subsection from the operation of that section.

Mr. DUNSTAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 15. Page 531.)

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

BUSINESS AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 15. Page 531.)

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): I support this Bill, too.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

FRUIT FLY (COMPENSATION) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 15. Page 529.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill is to provide for compensation to those persons affected in the most recent outbreak of fruit fly, namely people in the districts of Clovelly Park, Frewville, Beulah Park, Highgate, Marion and North Unley. Two of those suburbs are in my district. I have received the following petition from a number of people in the Clovelly Park area:

We, the undersigned, wish you to use your endeavours to have our fruit and vegetables saved from destruction by the fruit fly inspectors for the following reasons:

(1) That our gardens are all clean—that is, free from fruit fly;
(2) That we have gone to no end of trouble in using the best of sprays to combat any disease at the correct time of spraying;
(3) Our invitation is to any inspector to view our gardens and to see that any old fruit is buried or burnt to stop the accumulation of flies or insects;
(4) Our grapevines are perfectly clean and bearing a heavy crop.

Not only our fruit, but we have various vegetables which we assume are also to be destroyed. Is there any possibility of allowing the fruit and vegetables to ripen, and in the process of ripening should there be any sign of fruit fly we all solemnly agree to advise the authorities immediately. We do not think that the following is an unreasonable request to make, that should our fruit and vegetables be destroyed that we shall be compensated in full. Also the cost of spraying material and fertilizers be paid for.

These people acted in good faith, but I had to write and tell them that there was nothing new in their submissions. The position is embarrassing. It is gratifying that in the past not many commercial areas have been affected by fruit fly, but some people in my district are concerned because of effects on their livelihood. I referred this matter to the Minister of Agriculture last January and wrote to him as follows:

I have had representation made to me by certain commercial glasshouse tomato growers and they are very perturbed at the information they have now received to the effect that they

will not be permitted to plant prior to May 25 and that no pickings are to be made prior to October. Undoubtedly you will appreciate that these growers are able to supply the local demands and have a large surplus for the Victorian market which has proved most beneficial from their point of view. The latter market is largely for early tomatoes, *i.e.*, from September onwards, which means that it is necessary for the growers to commence plantings during the first week in April. The straight-out issue is one concerning which I am unable to offer an explanation and, as put to me by the growers, it is as follows:

> "If we are not permitted to plant as normally from the first week in April, why not offer compensation and no tomatoes will be planted this year."

Whilst I fully realize that it is our desire to not only control but to prevent the spread of fruit fly in this State, would it be practicable to consider the growers' viewpoint and permit planting as from the first week in April?

The glasshouse tomato grower probably takes more precautions in fumigating the soil than any other primary producer I know of. Sometimes it is necessary to humidify the soil as well. After it is fumigated and watered, the growers would not attempt to enter the glasshouses for at least two weeks from when the fumigation was started. Yet it is not sufficient to keep down the fruit fly, which may breed in nearby places. Much of the trouble arises from some people who want to bring in fruit from another State trying to by-pass the road blocks.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: They are doing it all the time.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Of course they are. To use a real Australian expression, they are trying to be "smart Alecs", which is not very complimentary to the State or the taxpayers because this Parliament has resolved to destroy the fruit fly wherever it may occur. It is the people who are not co-operative about parting with some fruit who are mainly responsible for the general spread of the fruit fly.

I am not an authority on tomato-growing but, from my limited knowledge, I know that, as regards our growing of tomatoes for the Victorian market, the Victorians are particular about the type of fruit they will accept, and rightly so. Therefore, to try to iron out some of these points, I entered into correspondence with the Minister. We got on reasonably well. It dealt with matters concerning the livelihood of many people engaged in this industry. The original proposition of the department had to be implemented—no plantings before May. The moment the fruit became discoloured it would be useless for export as first-grade tomatoes to the Victorian market. There are two well-known types of fruit fly, in respect of which it was necessary to take all precautions, but it was discovered that the fly that was the menace on this occasion was not the type that attacked grapes and cucumbers. There was no time for the department to ascertain what species it really was. The desire to combat the spread of fruit fly caused hardship to the growers and the people generally of this State. The growers themselves were pleased with what the department finally decided on. I understand they can forward their tomatoes next month and follow up with export tomatoes from this State until Christmas time.

I have mentioned the seriousness of the fruit fly and its effects upon the commercial growers, but how serious it would be for the commercial growers in the river and other areas were it not for the inspection points set up in this State! Without them we should be in a worse position. I know that this Bill will pass the second reading, and that compensation will be paid to those people affected, but I earnestly appeal to those people coming from another State or travelling from South Australia to another State to be generous enough to hand in any fruit that they had hoped to bring in "on the quiet" for inspection at our established road blocks. I sincerely trust that that appeal will not fall on deaf ears, because this State is trying to do a job in the interest of its people. I support the second reading.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): I desire to address myself briefly to this Bill, which I support. It is similar to Bills passed in years gone by and provides much the same sort of compensation for persons suffering loss of fruit through fruit-stripping operations necessitated by the advent of fruit fly in the metropolitan area. I once again congratulate the Government upon its effective measures in dealing with this problem. The first was the introduction of legislation in 1947 to deal with the fruit fly menace and provide for the payment of compensation to those who had suffered loss as a result of infestations. Indeed, that our measures have proved effective has been made patent by no less an authority than Dr. Steiner, who has a world-wide reputation. As stated by the Minister of Agriculture, it was Dr. Steiner who recently indicated to him that the precautions and measures taken by South Australia had been particularly effective, and the methods were very good.

One point I wish to make (the Leader of the Opposition has already referred to it) concerns the necessity for persons travelling from

another State to South Australia to be certain that they do not bring fruit with them, particularly from Queensland, New South Wales and Western Australia, as the fruit fly is rampant in those States.

Some time ago my attention was drawn to an incident concerning a 14-year old boy from my electorate in the Barossa Valley who was travelling in a bus from Broken Hill to South Australia. He told me (and I should say that he was conscious of what the fruit fly menace could mean to a district like the Barossa Valley) that when the bus approached Cockburn or that area the driver said to the passengers, "If you have any fruit on board I advise you either to eat it or to hide it because we are approaching a fruit fly depot." Subsequently, the bus stopped at the depot and an inspector came on board and I understand he had a conversation with the driver, but no passengers were interrogated. If that laxity is allowed to continue then there is a grave danger of the fruit fly being introduced from other States where it is rampant.

Mr. Casey: Particularly from Broken Hill, where the fruit fly is prevalent.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Yes. The persons or companies who conduct interstate bus tours should be told that an obligation rests upon the driver of a bus to impress on his South Australia-bound passengers the necessity to destroy or hand over fruit at the road block and not merely to say, "Either eat it or hide it." That is the wrong attitude and no doubt some infestation of the fruit fly in the metropolitan area is the result of motor cars or buses coming from other States.

I realize, as I believe all members do, that the losses that can be incurred in South Australia once the fly gets a proper hold and multiplies can be enormous and that expenditure in the past on its destruction or as compensation is well warranted. The loss can be far greater than the expenditure incurred in this way. I remind honourable members that when the original Bill was introduced in 1947 Sir George Jenkins (then Minister of Agriculture) said in his second reading explanation:

> It is a deadly and destructive pest which, if allowed to multiply, would cause loss far greater than the expense incurred in the effort to destroy the fly.

Although we have spent over £1,000,000 since 1947 in compensation and in the campaign to eradicate the fruit fly, there has been no adverse criticism about that expenditure because South Australians realize that many people would lose their livelihood if the fruit fly obtained a permanent hold. On the occasion in 1947 to which I have referred, Mr. Strickland (now Director of Agriculture), reported *inter alia* as follows:

> The alternative to eradication would have been acceptance of the pest as a permanent inhabitant, with many contingent repercussions. If fruit fly were to become established in this State, most people would give up home fruitgrowing in disgust, commercial fruit production would be loaded with heavier costs for reduced production, and some of our export markets would be lost to us because of quarantine barriers.

I emphasize "some of our export markets would be lost to us because of quarantine barriers". This report draws attention to the fact that there might have been considerable loss not envisaged by some persons if action had not been taken in 1947.

I can imagine the destruction that could be caused in the Barossa Valley or in the River Murray districts, which are represented by you, Mr. Speaker, and by the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren), if the fruit fly got into those areas. We should bear in mind that in 1961-62 we had 38,548 acres of orchards producing 5,444,707 bushels of fruit, the gross value of which was £7,462,400, and 57,836 acres of vineyards producing 220,002 tons of grapes at a gross value of £6,062,800. If that is understood then we realize just what financial loss and ruin would be suffered by the viticultural and horticultural areas of South Australia let alone the market garden areas, to which the Leader of the Opposition referred. Also, home fruitgrowing would be out of the question if the fruit fly became firmly established. Without doubt the prompt action taken by the Government in 1947 and since then, whenever the occasion warranted it, has prevented a tragic disaster to the South Australian fruitgrowing industry and, realizing this, I have great pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): I, too, have pleasure in supporting this Bill and I endorse the remarks of my colleague, the member for Angas (Mr. Teusner), about the great importance of keeping at bay the scourge of the fruit fly in South Australia. Looking at the value of the production of the fruit industry it is interesting to note that it is one-fifth of the total value of wool production. The current value of wool production in South Australia is about £35,000,000. The 1960-61 figures for the fruit industry (which are the latest figures I can obtain) disclose a total value of £7,250,000. Since 1947, when the first

fruit fly outbreak occurred, more than £2,000,000 has been expended by the Government to ensure the freedom from this scourge of our orchards, and it is indeed a very necessary insurance to preserve what is, as I have already said, a most important rural industry.

It is worth while, too, to reflect on just what the effects on our industry of fruitgrowing would have been had there not been an alert Government department prepared to do all within its power to see that the fruit fly did not become established here. First, looking at our citrus industry, possibly within three years of 1947 we would have lost the New Zealand citrus market, which is the best outlet we have for our citrus fruit, and, having lost that market, the inundation of our local market with the whole production would have depressed prices to producers and resulted in a serious blow to the stability of citrus-growing in this State.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: It is bad enough without that.

Mr. LAUCKE: Exactly. How much worse would it be to have, in addition to low prices, the inflicting of this terrible fruit fly menace? In the vegetable-growing side of rural production (which, by the way, is worth about £5,000,000 a year) tomatoes play an important part, and these are one of the host fruits to fruit fly. Were we to have had this scourge rampant in South Australia, our tomato-exporting industry to Victoria and also to Tasmania would have been endangered and possibly lost completely or, if not completely lost, the presence of even a few cases of infected fruit would have led to the rejection of a whole consignment. One can easily imagine the total losses which would accrue to the industry were this fly to become established.

Further, if fruit fly had become established here, our fruit-canning industry would have been greatly endangered, because the risk of having any fruit fly maggot in a tin of fruit would be such as to lead to the drying of fruit rather than canning, and the outlet for the production could well be gone. A huge amount of fruit is also produced in the metropolitan area and in the country areas in backyard gardens. We have some 8,000 acres of backyard gardens in South Australia, and with the 38,000 commercial acres we have a total of 46,000 acres. The 8,000 acres produces a huge amount of fruit which we can consume, even while walking down a lane late at night in the dark, without any fear of biting into the effects of fruit fly. I understand that this is impossible in those States where fruit fly is firmly established: the people there have to watch all the while, for that which appears to be sound fruit on the outside can be a very horrible mess inside.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: What is inside can be protein.

Mr. LAUCKE: As the Minister has said, a person has to watch with meticulous care that he does not have protein as well as fruit. I should like to commend the general public for their helpfulness in advising the department of fruit fly strikes. It is the preparedness on the part of the public, I consider, which has been of such great help to the Agriculture Department's getting on to the scene of attack quickly. I compliment the Minister most heartily on his department's work in this fruit fly matter, and I would say again that the £2,000,000 thus far expended has been the finest insurance premium paid for the fruit industry in South Australia in the State's history. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): I support the Bill, and I also commend the officers of the Agriculture Department for their vigilance and for the very good work they have done in preventing any major outbreak of fruit fly in South Australia and particularly in the important producing areas which I represent. The system of road blocks is a very good one. Those blocks on the main entries into South Australia from other States maintain vigilance right throughout the 24 hours of the day.

I should like to mention the practice of bringing secondhand fruit cases into the State, particularly during the summer months. Over the past few years there has developed a trade with Melbourne in Grenache grapes. These grapes are transported in secondhand banana crates, which by regulation must be fumigated before they come into South Australia and stamped to the effect that they have been fumigated. However, it was brought to my notice some time ago at a grape-growers' conference in Loxton that the stamping of those cases is not always genuine. The stamp may be genuine, but the cases have not always been fumigated. One driver had a stamp in the glove box of his vehicle. This is something that is very difficult to police, and I do not know just how the department can deal with the matter. The fruit fly must be kept out of South Australia, and therefore I fully support this Bill and commend it to members of the House.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): While listening to other speakers a thought occurred to me which I felt was worth mentioning. I have noticed when travelling on the West-East train that an inspector boards the train at Pimba and goes along the train before it reaches Port Augusta asking people whether they have any fruit. I believe that the same procedure is followed on other trains. I am sure that a number of people do not declare the fruit they are carrying; I have in mind that probably they retain this fruit because they have paid perhaps two or three shillings for it and intend to eat it later on and therefore do not see why they should declare it. No doubt the same thing occurs with people travelling from other States in their own cars.

I have wondered whether the Minister has considered paying just a little over market price for the fruit that is taken, for I believe that if people knew this would be done probably far more fruit would be declared. This may seem to some people to be a trivial matter, but I am sure this is a factor that influences people not to declare fruit. No doubt quite a quantity of fruit gets through because it is hidden. The passengers know the officer is coming and get used to the procedure. I think there was an outbreak in Port Augusta about three years ago, no doubt because of the fly being brought from Western Australia. I think my suggestion is worth considering. People travelling in motor cars do not always declare the fruit they are carrying. In view of the large sum spent on the eradication of the fruit fly, and the importance of the matter to the industry, every effort should be made to cause people to declare the fruit they are carrying.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I thank members for the attention they have given the Bill. The principal reason why the fly has not taken hold of our fruit industry has been the co-operation of the public in reporting suspicions about the presence of the fly. Every year we have had outbreaks there has been the greatest goodwill and co-operation in the matter. Members of Parliament have been most helpful, too. It is difficult to emphasize the dangers of the pest and helpful to have set out the virtues of the fruit fly campaign. The districts that suffered most this year were those where the outbreak occurred early in the season. Later in the season little fruit was left on the trees and the outbreaks were not so serious. The first outbreak in the St. Marys area was probably the worst.

The public is so helpful in making reports that we have an officer keeping records of them. We have had hundreds of reports of the possible presence of the pest. The department welcomes them, and if the number of false alarms drops the department feels that its publicity is not successful. The problem of people not declaring fruit when they come from other States is a difficult one, but most people are co-operative. Probably the others are not co-operative because their attention has not been drawn to the dangers. Only a few of the travelling public conceal fruit they are carrying, and it is hard to detect the people who do it. The suggestions made in this debate will be considered. I do not want to give a definite reply now, preferring to have the suggestions considered by the departmental officers after I have discussed those suggestions with them.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Compensation."

Mr. FREEBAIRN: In his second reading explanation the Minister spoke of six proclaimed areas and said that the number of outbreaks of fruit fly in the metropolitan area had been disappointing. What amount of compensation was paid in the last financial year?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I will get that information, although I am not sure that any compensation was paid last year. I think the first outbreak this season occurred late in February and the campaign continued through to April and May. It is those outbreaks that I said were disappointing. When there is an outbreak there is no way in which the owners of fruit and vegetables can be compensated immediately. A record is kept of what is taken and the owner is given a receipt with a description of the fruit and vegetables on it. A copy is retained by the department. This Bill provides for compensation for owners who lost fruit and vegetables last summer. Their cases will be considered by a committee after the Bill becomes law.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 27. Page 663.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill has all the appearances of compromise legislation. By the amendments contained in clause 4, among other things, transmission lines, generating plant and transformer stations of the Electricity Trust are to be exempted from local government rating, and in return the trust will shift electricity poles at its own cost if it is requested to do so by the appropriate council. These requests are subject to certification by the Commissioner of Highways, "that in his opinion any such pole, post, cable or wire impedes or obstructs vehicular traffic." This is a wise provision, for it allows for the settlement of any disagreement between the trust and the councils should they occur.

With the extensive road widening that is taking place, heavy expenditure will be involved. For example, at Rakes Road, Enfield, concrete transmission poles stand out four to five feet into the roadway as the result of road widening. This is a comparatively recent transmission line, and considerable expense will be involved in re-aligning it. Similar conditions exist in my district at Marion Road, near Peckham Road, where electricity poles are well out into the road creating traffic hazards, and in Norfolk Road poles have to be shifted. No doubt, all other honourable members can readily recall instances in their districts where electricity poles are creating dangerous situations, brought about by roads being widened to cope with increasing traffic.

If the Town Planner's proposals on freeways are adopted, many other instances of dangerous situations will occur. I understand that a freeway will pass near the Centennial Park Cemetery and many high tension poles will have to be shifted. This is a matter needing much attention if the State is to progress. Apparently, whatever is done, the Government will never be able to cope with all the traffic problems unless there is a different approach, because the widening of roads and the making of freeways are both necessary to assist with the State's progress. Parliament cannot ignore the Town Planning Committee's proposals, which are in the interests of the State's development. Irrespective of how wide the roads are and how many freeways are built, this Government must prevail upon the Railways Commissioner to alter his attitude towards the transportation of the general public. The Railways Commissioner should not be permitted to be a power unto himself. If there is not a different approach to improve public transport, particularly by the Railways Department, many problems will arise. Road transport is not the answer. The railway system could be. It can move large numbers of people from their houses to their places of employment, but at present the department should use its system to better advantage. Instead of having a Minister who is subject to the Railways Commissioner, the Commissioner should be subject to the Minister. In recent years the Government has made available considerable subsidies to the Electricity Trust in the form of straight-out grants and also large areas of land without cost, and therefore the trust should be able to shift its poles at its own expense where necessary. During his second reading explanation the Premier said that the trust had, over the years, made great efforts to extend the electricity supply into the settled areas, and that with the Government subsidy available last year country tariffs were now within 10 per cent of those applying in the metropolitan area. This has not much relevance to the Bill, but as the Government has raised the matter, I should reply to it. In 1961 I moved a motion to equalize electricity tariffs throughout the State to assist the decentralization of industry, and help retain population in country areas. Several Government members agreed with our arguments, but eventually they accepted the directive of the Premier when he said:

> If honourable members opposite—and particularly those representing country districts—wish to curtail the expansion of electricity into their areas, I know of no more certain way to do it than by carrying this motion.

I illustrated how it was financially possible for the trust to put the Labor Party's motion into effect, but the Government was not prepared to endorse our recommendations, because when it came to the final vote all Government members voted in accord with the Government directive I just mentioned. However, within 12 months the Government had second thoughts, and introduced its own half-measure to bring country tariffs within 10 per cent of those operating in the metropolitan area. It is ludicrous that the Government went only portion of the way but now attempts to praise itself for its action.

I know there is another matter on the Notice Paper under which the Government is approaching even more closely to what my Party advocated two years ago, but it

still does not go the full distance. It is still my firm conviction that there should be equalized tariffs throughout South Australia to encourage balanced development. I will say more on this matter later, but in the meantime I support the second reading. I am confident that the trust will pay rates on its properties within the respective council areas. I hope that some real attempt will be made by the trust to remove its poles from the roads to provide for easier traffic movement.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support the Bill. When I first saw this Bill listed on the Notice Paper I was surprised, because in the past there has been much criticism that amending Bills to the Local Government Act are normally left until late in the session. However, I have been assured that further amendments of a real "local government" nature will be introduced later this session. No doubt the local government experts in this Chamber will then have a real "go". This Bill is short, but important. It refers to an important principle in council rating. Members are aware of the controversy between councils and the Commonwealth of Australia about the rating of properties. This Bill is realistic in that it provides for rating of administrative structures and lands occupied by the Electricity Trust, but it exempts from rating transmission lines. I was surprised to learn that some councils—especially country councils—were rating the trust for transmission lines which, in some instances, traversed private property.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Don't forget the Adelaide City Council.

Mr. COUMBE: No-one would suggest that councils should rate the Postmaster-General's Department for its transmission lines, so it is logical that we should exempt the Electricity Trust's transmission lines.

Mr. Millhouse: How do you know that no-one would suggest that?

Mr. COUMBE: They might suggest it, but they would not get away with it. If this Bill is not carried it could result in dearer power. Although the Bill might not reduce power costs, it will prevent them from increasing. Councils will retain the ability to rate land on which converter stations are erected. The trust has a large converter station in Churchill Road, Prospect, in my district, and the land on which it is erected will still be rated for council purposes. I point out that the local council maintains the footpath around the station, provides street cleaning and street lighting.

The question of re-aligning street poles is important. I encountered this problem when I was a member of the Prospect City Council. The council wanted to improve street corners for traffic, but it was faced with the problem that the trust would charge the council for the cost of removing the poles. In one street in Prospect is an extremely large 33,000-volt transmission line, the poles of which are not small. The cost of removing them would be exorbitant and the council would get no revenue from their removal, although it would improve traffic conditions. When road widening has been done, poles have sometimes been left jutting out into roads. Hampstead Road, Broadview, has been widened by 7ft. on either side and the poles that were formerly in the gutter are now encroaching about 3ft. to 4ft. into the roadway. The council would be faced with the problem of removing about 30 poles from that street, and the cost would be considerable. I welcome this Bill, which will assist councils materially in this regard. The Minister of Lands referred to the Adelaide City Council. I point out that the Bill amends section 871g of the principal Act so that the Adelaide City Council can recover the same costs as other councils.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I welcome this Bill. I have had practical association with the effects of council rating of Electricity Trust transmission lines. One council in my district is imposing rates on transmission lines. It did this because neighbouring councils, in the Rocky River district, had already done so. I do not know which council started this practice, but obviously other councils could see increased revenue from the practice and followed suit. They believed that if it were fair for one to impose rates on transmission lines, then it was fair for others. Unless this practice is stopped it will get completely out of hand and every council will eventually apply the rating. The council in my district collects about £600 a year from this rating, and such a sum can be a substantial addition to a small council's revenue. Although that council will miss the revenue, it agrees with the Bill's objects, and realizes that no other council will be able to impose rates on transmission lines.

I believe that some of the Leader's remarks were a little out of place in this debate. I do not think that the question of the equalization of tariffs comes within the scope of this Bill. In fact, I think that while the Leader was promoting the cause of equal tariffs he was also promoting his plan for digging a tunnel under the Adelaide Hills. Which one

has to come first yet remains to be demonstrated. I emphasize that one council in my district that has been imposing rates on the trust is willing to see this legislation passed.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I support the Bill. I do not want to weary the House but I think I am obliged to refer to Rakes Road (not *Rake's Progress*) which I traverse every day on official business. If one gets too close to the side of the road, one is likely to run into an electricity pole. This Bill intends to relieve us of this problem, so I support it.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): I, too, support the Bill and agree with the remarks of the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall). A matter not touched upon is that people living in the country want electricity. Much as the district councils may need the rates, people in the country need electricity more, so much so that already the landholders have agreed that there shall be no rating on the s.w.e.r. lines going to homesteads, possibly through paddocks. They may be a nuisance but, whatever the nuisance, the owners of the paddocks are only too willing to put up with it in order to get the electricity. So I think it is only right, to enable people in the country to get a greater spread of electricity and to make it possible for the trust to supply it at a reasonable price, that the council should not rate it for the poles. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Amendment of principal Act, section 5."

Mr. HALL: Can the Premier tell me how much per annum the trust pays in rates on these poles?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): Most councils have made the rate a nominal one, and some do not even collect any rates on the poles, but one or two have levied very heavy rates. I understand that a valuer who has been valuing for councils has advised them that they are compelled to rate. I cannot give the honourable member the aggregate amount, but I did personally write to about seven or eight councils that had rated the trust very heavily. They answered that they had been advised by a valuer that they should, under the Act, make an assessment, and that was the reason they had done so. One or two councils signified that they would have been pleased not to levy rates. In aggregate, the amount compared with the trust's revenue would not be large, but it was growing rapidly. The idea was catching on.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 and 6) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 29, at 2 p.m.