LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, August 24, 1954.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTION.

REMOVAL OF TRAMWAY TRACKS.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (on notice)—

1. At what rate is the contractor being paid by the Tramways Trust for the removal of tramway rails?

2. Is the contractor responsible for the reinstatement of roads from which rails have been removed? If so, at what rate is payment being made?

3. Who becomes the owner of the secondhand rails and sleepers?

4. What price is being charged for the sale of the secondhand rails and sleepers?

5. Is it intended to remove eventually the whole of the tramway rails in the metropolitan area?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—The General Manager of the Municipal Tramways Trust reports:—

1. The rate varies between £62 2s. 8d. and £64 16s. 8d. a chain of single track for the removal of rails and sleepers, and the reinstatement of the roadway.

2. Yes.

3. The Municipal Tramways Trust.

4. Secondhand rails unfit for further use by the trust are sold at 5s. per foot. Curved and badly corroded rails are sold at lower prices. Scrap sleepers unfit for further service are sold from 1s. 6d. to 6s. each, according to condition.

5. No final decision has been made as to whether the abandonment and removal of rails shall embrace all routes, including Glenelg.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 18. Page 411.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—Although this Bill gives members an opportunity to discuss a number of important matters, I will content myself with supporting the second reading. It provides in clause 2 for the issue and application of moneys not exceeding £6,000,000 for the Public Service for the financial year ending June 30 next. We passed a similar Bill earlier in the session for a similar amount. Clause 3 provides that payments are not to exceed last year's Estimates except in certain respects. It is pleasing to note that although wages are pegged provision has been made in this measure to improve conditions of public servants, who will be able to meet the increased cost of tea, bread and many other commodities that the ordinary worker will not be able to meet. I am pleased that decisions have been given in the courts to increase the wages of public servants; they are quite worthy of them.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE (Central No. 2)—I support the Bill. At the beginning of the session we passed a Supply Bill for £6,000,000, and the present Bill provides for a further £6,000,000 to carry on the work of the Public Service until the Budget is presented and an Appropriation Bill passed. The Bill is in no way different from the usual Supply Bill; it merely enables salaries of the Public Service to be paid and public works to be carried out.

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

WHEAT PRICE STABILIZATION SCHEME BALLOT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It was provided by the Wheat Price Stabilization Scheme Ballot Act of last year that if a wheat price stabilization scheme should be agreed to by the Governments of the Commonwealth and of all the States, the Minister of Agriculture was to direct that a poll of wheatgrowers should be held. The object of the poll would be to ascertain whether the growers favoured the scheme. As members know, there has been some delay in securing the necessary agreement of all the Governments to the stabilization proposals, but agreement has now been reached and it is necessary to hold a poll. Since last year's Act was passed, however, another wheat harvest has been delivered to the Wheat Board and another wheat crop has been sown. This, of course, will bring additional persons into the category of wheatgrowers. Accordingly, it has now been decided that in addition to the wheatgrowers specified in last year's Act, namely, those who delivered wheat to the board in 1951-52 and 1952-53, any wheatgrower who delivered wheat in 1953-54, or who has planted 50 acres or more to wheat for the 1954-55 season should also be granted the right to vote at the poll. To carry this decision into effect it is necessary to amend last year's Act, and the present Bill has been introduced for that purpose.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—In supporting this Bill I take the opportunity to point out a few things that have been done for the farming community for some

considerable time which have been denied to other industries. This is a Socialistic measure; if any have doubts about that let them look at the Bill, yet it will be supported by every member of this Council. Why should we provide for a referendum when we know that there will not be a dissenting voice in this place? Why shouldn't we take the responsibility of saying that the Bill shall become law without a a ballot? I am prepared to vote this afternoon in acceptance of the proposals agreed upon at the conference. I propose to give a little history regarding previous ballots and what the public of South Australia has subscribed to in this one-way traffic. In 1953 we passed two Acts of Parliament. Firstly we amended the Wheat Industry Stabilization Act, 1948-1951. That was followed by the Wheat Prices Stabilization Scheme Ballot Act, 1953, which provided for the holding of a ballot. This Bill was passed in a few minutes and contained a provision for compulsory voting. Not one member here opposed compulsory voting in that case, although when it does not suit them, on matters of far greater importance, they will not agree to it; members know what I have in mind.

The Bill before us will be generally accepted and I will reserve some of the remarks I had proposed to make on it, because there will be another Bill later which we will not have a chance of amending, but on which we may speak. As I have said before, we are merely figureheads; a conference at Canberra agrees on a certain course of action and we are not asked to amend it or even discuss it, but merely to support it. Parliament is supposed to be an authoritative body, yet by this Bill we are handing over to a section of the public the right to say whether or not they will agree to the proposal. Moreover, who will meet the expenses of the referendum? It will certainly not be the farmers. Section 3 of the 1953 Act provided that:—

> The money required to meet the expenses of holding the ballot under this Act shall be paid out of the general revenue of the State and the necessary amount of that revenue is hereby appropriated for that purpose.

This proves clearly that the general taxpayer will pay for the cost of the ballot, which is a foregone conclusion. The Government has power to make regulations, including provision for compulsory voting at the ballot, and prescribe penalties, recoverable summarily not exceeding a fine of £15 for any breach of the regulations. Were the compulsory voting provisions enforced under the last Act and does the Government propose to use compulsion under this Bill? Under Clause 3 dairymen and other primary producers could be included in the ballot, provided they had sown 50 acres or more of wheat. This is another instance of where the old age pensioner will contribute £2 5s. a year, because he has to pay an additional 1½d. a loaf for his bread, as he is to guarantee to a section of the public 14s. a bushel for wheat for home consumption. I do not know of any other section, compared with farmers, who have retired in such big numbers, and yet the poor old pensioner will be compelled, out of his miserable pittance of £3 10s. a week, to finance the farmers to the extent of £2 5s. a year.

The PRESIDENT—I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that he must tie up his remarks with the question of the taking of a ballot. The Bill deals only with that question. The question of the wheat agreement cannot be brought under that heading.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Behind this proposal is the payment of a minimum of 14s. a bushel for wheat. The conference agreed that this should continue for a period of five years. The ballot relates to the maintenance of a home consumption price of 14s. for that period, and I therefore suggest I am in order.

The PRESIDENT—It is a one-clause Bill, which relates to the holding of a ballot. It has nothing to do with whether 14s. a bushel is guaranteed, and the agreement is not part of the question before the House, but who shall participate in the ballot.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I bow to your ruling, as I do not feel like dissenting from it at this stage. When the price of wheat fell below 2s. a bushel in 1930 the position of wheatgrowers was difficult, and the Commonwealth Government then assisted growers in the form of a bounty, which amounted to £3,400,000 in 1931/32. In the following year £2,000,000 was distributed, £3,000,000 in 1933/34, £4,000,000 in 1934/35 and £2,000,000 in 1935/36. As the price improved, Commonwealth assistance was discontinued, but when the price again fell in 1938/39—

The PRESIDENT—Order! I am afraid I will have to stop the honourable member. The Bill does not deal with those figures, but, as I have pointed out, deals only with the question of the ballot to be taken and who shall vote. The whole subject of the wheat scheme is not before the Council, and I therefore rule that it cannot be discussed on general lines.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—With great respect, I was allowed to speak on these lines on the last occasion a similar Bill was before

the Council. The Minister in charge invited discussion on the Bill, on which a number of members spoke on many subjects.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson—I think that clause 2 would give you the right to do it.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—The President having ruled against me, I have nothing further to say.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS secured the adjournment of the debate.

FOOD AND DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 18. Page 411.)

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE (Central No. 2)—This is a short Bill, but one by no means without interest. The limited amount of Greek I was ever able to absorb has rusted, and so I had to consult my friend Murray as to exactly what "therapeutic" might mean. Broadly speaking, it means the whole science and art of healing. To me this is a very interesting Bill because of the extraordinary discoveries in medicine and the changes in the art of healing wrought thereby. I refer to the discovery of the sulpha drugs, penicillin, aureomycin and other drugs. The scientists are still continuing their discoveries, and I hope they will produce some others as I have had my issue of the existing medicines. These great discoveries have had a profound effect on the practice of the medical profession. I hope I will not be offending anyone in that profession when I say that I notice a considerable difference in their practice. In the old days one had a general practitioner who knew what one had been doing when he was a naughty boy, knew the family history and treated you as an individual, giving you some old-fashioned remedy which probably put you right. Now the position seems to be quite different. If you call in a doctor he says, "I will have you X-rayed all over and then we will have a blood test," and having done that and taken no notice of anything you might have said about what had happened to you he adds, "I will take this bottle off the shelf and give you some of its contents and see how it goes." As an expert, he is, of course, the best authority to say which of these wonderful new drugs you shall have. That is the position that has arisen and it has changed very greatly the technique of the medical profession.

Another matter that has brought about the necessity for this legislation is the rapid growth of free medicine schemes here and in other parts of the world; Australia, England and New Zealand are outstanding examples. These new drugs are made by the millions, as it were, and people take them on the advice of medical practitioners in extraordinary quantities for all sorts of complaints. Whether it is known what their effect will be on the human body in the future I do not know, but I have some doubts. Sometimes the cure knocks the patient about as much as the disease. However, these matters must be faced up to because with the new discoveries and techniques, whether we like it or not, their control is necessary. As other members have pointed out, a conference was held on this matter and the Commonwealth is doing its best to control the quality of these goods, whether imported or locally made; this measure will enable this State to come into line and assist. It is interesting to see the new definition of "drug", and I do not dispute its correctness. However, why should we issue a proclamation as to what are considered to be therapeutic substances within the meaning of the Act; why should they not all be controlled?

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—They are controlled by regulation under the Health Act. This is a new provision.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—This is the Food and Drugs Act and the definition of "drug" has been struck out and a new definition inserted.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—This definition is all-embracing.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—I admit that. Clause 4 provides that the Governor may by proclamation from time to time declare that any drug specified in the proclamation shall be a controlled therapeutic substance within the meaning of the Act. I cannot understand why all drugs are not controlled instead of providing that certain drugs may be proclaimed, and I will raise this matter in Committee. Apart from this the Bill is commonsense. Poisons and controlled substances should be under the control of the Central Board of Health. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—Can the Minister temporarily in charge of this Bill state why it is necessary after the definition of "Central Board of Health" in section 5 of the principal Act to add:—

"controlled therapeutic substance" means a drug which, pursuant to any proclamation in force under this Act, is for the time being a controlled therapeutic substance.

Can he inform me why all such substances are not controlled?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government)—In view of the honourable member's remarks I move that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

WILD DOGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In 1951 section 6a of the Wild Dogs Act was enacted to provide that the Minister could, in each of the calendar years 1952, 1953 and 1954, expend up to £2,000 in the carrying out of aerial baiting for wild dogs. This amount is to be provided out of the rates levied under the Act. The section provides that the Minister may seek the advice of the Dog Fence Board as to the best means of carrying out this aerial baiting. The board has reported that due to nomadic habits of dingoes and the varying seasons which cause fluctuations in the number of tails and scalps from baited areas presented for bonus payments it is somewhat difficult to assess the true value of aerial baiting. However, results in Queensland and Western Australia, where aerial baiting has been conducted over a longer period, indicate that reduced numbers of tails and scalps have been received from treated areas. A similar reduction has occurred in South Australia. The board accordingly recommends that aerial baiting be carried out in future years and accordingly it is proposed to repeal the time limitation now included in section 6a. The effect will be that aerial baiting may be carried on in any year subject to the limitation that up to £2,000 only may be expended for this purpose in any year.

Although section 6a authorizes the Minister to expend money for the purposes of aerial baiting the point has been raised whether his powers are sufficiently wide to authorize him to cause this aerial baiting to be carried out. The Crown Solicitor has advised that section 138 of the Pastoral Act would probably be construed as giving the Minister the requisite power but has suggested that, in order to remove any doubts on the matter, it would be advisable to amend the law and to provide specific power for the purpose. Paragraph (*b*) of clause 2 accordingly expressly authorizes the Minister to cause this aerial baiting to be carried out. The effect of the clause is that this baiting may be carried out on pastoral lands, Crown lands, and reserved lands. The clause also provides that section 38 of the Vermin Act is not to apply to these operations. This section provides that where the Minister lays poison baits, notice must be displayed on the land. Obviously this provision did not contemplate aerial baiting and should not apply to it. As has been pointed out by the Crown Solicitor, a general power of this kind would not be construed to extend to the performance of acts dangerous to humans or stock, and, as a consequence, it is incumbent on the Minister, in carrying out aerial baiting, to see that care is used in selecting the places where the baits are dropped.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC FINANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes some amendments to the Act consequential on recent legislation of the Commonwealth Parliament respecting the Commonwealth Bank. By the Commonwealth Bank Act, 1953, a new institution called the Commonwealth Trading Bank of Australia was formed to take over the general banking functions of the Commonwealth Bank. The new institution was in law a separate corporation, distinct from the Commonwealth Bank. In the Public Finance Act of South Australia there are two provisions in which the Commonwealth Bank is mentioned. One is section 7, which states that the Treasurer may make agreements with the Commonwealth Bank or any other bank in London respecting the issue and conversion of stock, and allied matters.

The other provision is section 34 which provides for the payment through the Commonwealth Bank, Adelaide, of orders drawn on trust funds held by the Treasurer. As a result of the Commonwealth legislation it is now doubtful whether these provisions apply to the Commonwealth Bank or to the Commonwealth Trading Bank; and it is necessary that the position should be clarified without delay. The Government is advised that it is desirable that it should be empowered, in transactions under sections 7 and 34 of the Public Finance Act, to deal both with the Commonwealth Bank and the Commonwealth Trading Bank. It is therefore proposed by this Bill to amend both these sections so that they will apply to both the Commonwealth Bank and the Commonwealth Trading Bank.

The Hon. F. J. Condon secured the adjournment of the debate.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Minister of Health)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to enable doctors employed by the Commonwealth or the Flying Doctor Service to be registered by the Medical Board of South Australia without payment of fees. In September last a conference of representatives of State medical boards discussed some of the difficulties arising from the fact that medical practitioners registered in one State cannot practise in other States without securing registration in those States also. This is particularly inconvenient for practitioners employed by the Commonwealth who may be called upon to work in any State. The conference took the view that such barriers to the practice of medicine should be broken down as far as possible, and expressed the view that it was desirable that State medical boards should be enabled to register without fee doctors employed by the Commonwealth who are already registered in another State. The resolution was submitted to the Government by the Medical Board with a request that the Medical Practitioners Act should be amended. The Government has accepted the proposal, and is accordingly introducing this Bill.

The Medical Board at the same time asked that the privilege should be extended to medical officers of the Flying Doctor Service of Australia (S.A. Section). Officers of the Northern Territory Medical Service of the Flying Doctor Service are occasionally called upon in their duties to go into South Australia, where they are not registered. At present, if such an officer holds himself out to be a doctor or prescribes certain controlled drugs in South Australia he will, strictly speaking, be breaking the law. In 1952 the Medical Board was approached by the Flying Doctor Service of Australia (S.A. Section) with a request that such officers should be registered without payment of a fee. The board was unable to grant the request as the Medical Practitioners Act did not permit registration without fee in such a case, and subsequently decided that the matter should be referred to the Government. The Government takes the view that it is desirable that the work of the Flying Doctor Service should be facilitated in this way, and the matter is accordingly dealt with in this Bill.

Clause 3 permits a person to be registered without fee who is registered as a medical practitioner in any other State or in any Territory of the Commonwealth, and who is employed as a full-time medical officer by the Commonwealth or is employed or holds an appointment as a flying medical officer of the Flying Doctor Service of Australia (S.A. Section). Clauses 4 and 5 make consequential amendments.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH secured the adjournment of the debate.

PLACES OF PUBLIC ENTERTAINMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 17. Page 380.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—This Bill is in two parts. The first relates to drive-in theatres, several of which are projected in various parts of the State. I understand that negotiations have been going on in respect of one in the eastern part of the city, but owing to acquisition of the land it will not be proceeded with. Several of this type of theatre are proposed to be erected at our beach resorts and I think the Government should be very careful to take every precaution to protect the public, particularly nowadays when a fair amount of crime is prevalent. If these theatres are estabilshed at beach resorts people can come out of the water practically in the nude, and precautions will be needed to preserve morality and decency. Drive-in theatres are built to accommodate a given number of vehicles irrespective of the number of persons occupying those vehicles. Clause 4 provides that the licence shall stipulate the number of vehicles which may be admitted, and in computing the number of persons it shall be assumed that each vehicle contains three persons. Precautions should be taken to prevent over-crowding and fire, and I trust that the same strict supervision will be enforced in respect of this measure as is the case under the principal Act.

Clause 6 deals with the restriction on Sunday entertainments. Under the present law the consent of the Chief Secretary must be obtained for the holding of such entertainment and the penalty for any breach of the regulation may be a fine not exceeding £100, and the licence may be cancelled absolutely or suspended for such time as the magistrate or justice thinks fit. Cancellation is a serious thing and a fine of £100 very severe, although I realize that that is the maximum. I simply

draw attention to these things. Doubt has arisen as to whether the Act applies to private entertainments; this legislation makes it clear that it is to include both private and public. I understand the purpose is to meet the position which has recently arisen in Adelaide with the opening of cabarets. Clause 7 defines a cabaret as premises in which meals or refreshments are sold to and consumed by members of the public and in which, after 6 p.m., facilities are provided for dancing or entertainment in the form of music, singing, recitations, dancing or other exhibitions of personal skill. The Bill ensures that there shall be adequate provision for the safety and convenience of customers. Before granting registration the Minister must be satisfied that equipment is provided for the prevention and extinguishing of fires and amenities to ensure the safety, health and convenience of patrons. I support the second reading.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY (Central No. 2)—I commend the Chief Secretary and the officer administering this Act on their prevision. This is legislation designed to lock the stable door before the horse escapes, whereas frequently we are called upon to deal with legislation after the damage has been done and when difficulty occurs because of the vested interests which have arisen. Here the Chief Secretary and his officers have foreseen the trend of events. We have no such thing in South Australia as a drive-in theatre. I believe there are a few in Victoria and there may be some in other States. I look upon them as a good thing in a climate such as ours which permits entertainment of the people out of doors nearly all the year round. These drive-in theatres will provide for many people who today may not be able to go to picture shows; old people, for instance, who cannot go out much, but who could go to these entertainments in cars of their relatives; also the family man who, after coming home from work, often does not feel inclined to change; he could put his family in the car and go to the picture show without changing.

The second part of the Bill deals with the necessity to furnish plans to the Chief Secretary before places of entertainment are built. This also is a wise provision. Lots of places are set up in buildings not suitable for public or even private entertainment. They lack sanitary facilities or proper accommodation and they are carrying on in a way that is not convenient or comfortable for the public. The Bill will also control cabarets. Again, this is something with which we are not very familiar, although in older countries the night club, which is only another name for cabaret, is very common. Indeed, most of the people of Continental countries are to be found in the night clubs in the evening, and excellent programmes they provide, too. We are getting considerable numbers of people from European countries who are accustomed to taking their pleasures in the evening. They find the position here rather grim because there is nothing much to do in the evenings. The cabaret is a very popular form of entertainment, but careful supervision is required. The Bill provides for this, and it should prevent any unseemly and undesirable conduct cropping up. It is an attempt by the Chief Secretary to forestall that position. The Bill will be welcomed by the public and I commend it.

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

GAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to make better provision for the supervision of the gas supply at Mount Gambier and at other country centres (if any) where a gas supply may be instituted in future. At present by far the greater part of the gas used in South Australia is supplied by the S.A. Gas Company. This company, however, does not operate at Mount Gambier, where the supply is undertaken by the Mount Gambier Gas Company Limited. This company has about 1,200 consumers and supplies about 27 million cubic feet of gas per annum. Under the existing law the supervision of the Mount Gambier gas supply is a function of the local councils. The law governing this matter is contained in the Meters and Gas Act, 1881, which empowers and requires the councils to test and stamp gas meters, and to test gas for illuminating power and purity. The councils concerned, however, have neither the technical staff nor the equipment required for this work and are not in a position to investigate or remedy any complaints which may be made by consumers. They have recently approached the Government with a request that more suitable legislative provision should be made on this subject. The request has been investigated and reported on by the Director of Chemistry and the Public Service Commissioner. It is clear from the reports that the difficulty at Mount Gambier can be simply and cheaply solved by making the Director of

Chemistry responsible for supervision of the gas supply in that area and by the introduction of legislation to declare that the provisions of the Gas Act, 1924-1950, relating to quality and pressure of gas, and testing of meters shall apply to the Mount Gambier Gas Company. The Gas Act of 1924, as amended in 1950, is considered to prescribe reasonable standards for gas having regard to modern requirements. The Government has accordingly decided to introduce this Bill for the purposes mentioned.

The Bill repeals the Meter and Gas Act, 1881, which is unsatisfactory in two respects. The first, as I have mentioned—is that it has to be administered by district and municipal councils which are not equipped to do the work. The second is that the gas standards prescribed by the Act are based on illuminating power. This is no longer a satisfactory standard and the more modern legislation of 1924 prescribes standards based on calorific value. This is the important thing now that gas is used mainly for heating purposes. If the Bill is passed it will completely supersede the Act of 1881 and there will be no point in retaining that Act on the Statute Book.

Clauses 4 to 9 and the amendments made by the schedule are all directed to the same purpose, namely to extend the application of the Gas Act, 1924-1950, to companies other than the S.A. Gas Company. Clause 5 declares that the Governor may by proclamation declare that any other company or person shall be a gas supplier within the meaning of the Act. When a company is so declared it will become subject to the provisions of the principal Act respecting the testing of meters and the calorific value, purity, and pressure of gas.

The Bill also provides that the Mount Gambier Gas Company, when proclaimed under the Bill, will have to bear its share of the costs of administering the principal Act. These costs will not be heavy. The administration of the Act at Mount Gambier will be carried out by existing officers of the Government without any further appointments, and the initial outlay by the company for testing equipment will be a fairly small amount.

The Hon. J. L. COWAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 17. Page 381).

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—The second schedule of the Bill sets out a list of infectious diseases and this can be altered from time to time by proclamation. Section 127 of the Act deals with the reporting of infectious diseases. Outside a public or licensed hospital it is usually left to the head of the family, or on his default to the nearest relative of the inmate present in the building, and on his default the occupier or owner of the building, and in any case the medical practitioner attending him. Section 131 of the Act deals with the disinfection of buildings and articles. An officer of health or any legally qualified practitioner must certify in writing to the local board of health what is to be done. In this case any expense incurred by the board can be recovered from the owner or the occupier, but I do not know whether this is usually insisted upon. When I was a councillor a number of cases were reported to me of people who were never asked to pay because of their financial position. The Bill provides for the notification of infectious diseases in order to prevent their spread.

There are two schedules, one giving a list of infectious diseases and the other of notifiable diseases. The Central Board of Health has expressed the opinion that it is desirable to have uniformity between the States as to infectious and notifiable diseases. The second schedule of the Act contains a list of 37 infectious diseases. There have been eight amending Health Acts since 1898. Clauses 7 and 8 provide that the existing sections of the Act relating to the notification of disease will apply to notifiable diseases in the same manner as they now apply to infectious diseases. The provisions of the Act relating to preventive measures will not apply to notifiable diseases, but will of course continue to apply to infectious diseases. Clause 9 repeals the second schedule of the Act containing the list of infectious diseases, and with clause 12 enacts two new schedules.

Section 101 of the Act provides that no person in charge of a slaughterhouse shall keep or permit to be kept in or about the slaughterhouse any swine unless intended for immediate slaughter, or any dog unless constantly chained when not in use. A penalty of not less than £10 is provided if a dog is fed on any blood, offal, manure or filth from a slaughterhouse. The Bill will remove a number of dangers, as at present there is a strong likelihood of a dog becoming infected and communicating a disease to human beings. During 1952 four complaints were laid against persons for permitting dogs not used for yarding purposes to be loose in slaughterhouses.

This Bill does not apply if dogs are assisting in the yarding of sheep, but if not, proprietors of slaughterhouses are liable to a severe penalty.

Good health is something that most people are anxious to get and keep; for that reason public co-operation in well-planned health projects is generally forthcoming. The long sought after diphtheria immunization was achieved and in 1952 there were no deaths from this disease. This was the first clear year in the history of the State. Diphtheria has been a notifiable infectious disease for over 50 years, and for 20 years voluntary immunization has been carried out. This legislation protects the public; firstly, it compels people to notify certain infectious diseases and, secondly, it deals with dogs roaming about slaughterhouses. I can see no objection to the Bill and support the second reading.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland)—It seems that quite frequently it is necessary to amend the Health Act which, of course, governs most matters relating to health in the city and country. It was amended in 1947, 1950, 1951, 1952 and 1953, and this Bill goes a little further than previous amendments. The Act contains one schedule of diseases to cover what are commonly known as infectious and notifiable diseases. The distinction between the two is that an infectious disease not only must be notified but certain treatment must be prescribed to prevent its spread, whereas with a notifiable disease all that is necessary is achieved when notification has been given to the proper authorities. This aspect was considered by the Central Board of Health which recommended that instead of one schedule there should be two—one to cover infectious diseases for which various remedial measures are to be taken and the other to cover only notifiable diseases. This appears to me to be a necessary and desirable division. I have examined the proposed two schedules. I have no adequate knowledge of the diseases they contain but no doubt the officers of the Central Board of Health are quite satisfied that it is in order to transfer certain diseases from the infectious list to the notifiable list. This seems to be a move in the right direction, and I have pleasure in supporting it.

It is interesting to note that the definition of metropolitan local boards includes the municipalities of Campbelltown, Enfield, Marion, Mitcham, Payneham, Walkerville and West Torrens as municipal councils, whereas previously they came under the list of district councils. These bodies apparently have been raised in status since the Act was last before the House.

Clause 5 dealing with dogs at slaughterhouses relates to section 101 of the Health Act. This is a very well known section to anyone having any experience of local government, particularly in country areas, because we all realize that dogs are used in slaughterhouses for yarding sheep and other animals, and that their use is necessary. Experience shows that quite frequently they are allowed to roam while slaughtering is in progress and quite frequently eat offal and other such substances. We all know the danger to human beings that can follow. When prosecutions have been launched it has been found that the owner of the slaughterhouse or the person in charge has been able to avoid conviction by stating that he was unaware that the dog was there. Clause 5 tightens up the provision by providing that the owner is liable unless he satisfies the Court that the dog was being used for yarding purposes and when not so used was chained or that it was in or about the slaughterhouse without his knowledge and that he could not reasonably have had knowledge of its presence. This amendment will not place an undue responsibility on persons in charge of or owning slaughterhouses and is a wise move. Frequently, we are meticulous and careful in providing that meat shall be wrapped in certain types of paper and properly handled in shops, yet anything might happen before it reaches the shops. If this Bill becomes law I hope some steps will be taken to acquaint slaughterhouse proprietors with the amendement. If a butcher in the country is prosecuted under any section of the Health Act his business is affected adversely, so he should be made aware of his increased responsibilities under this measure. I think any member of this House who has been associated with local government in the country and has seen reports from health officers knows a great number of matters call for attention after an inspection is made, and anything that can be done to improve conditions should have our whole hearted support. This Bill is a move in the right direction and I have much pleasure in supporting it.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.25 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, August 25, at 2 p.m.