LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Wednesday, November 16, 1955.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 3 p.m. and read prayers.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL).

Second reading.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill comes to us from the House of Assembly, where it was thoroughly debated in Committee before being passed unanimously in its present form. It is a short Bill, containing only two provisions, and I feel confident that no objection can be taken to either of them.

Clause 3 proposes to amend part of the proviso in paragraph (*a*) of section 167 of the Code. The relevant part of this proviso, as it now stands, is to the effect that an industrial board cannot make a determination for the payment of wages in excess of £20 a week. It is proposed to raise this maximum to £25 a week. The maximum prescribed in section 167 has been varied from time to time in accordance with changes in the value of money. For many years it was £10 a week. In 1948 it was raised to £15, and in 1951 it was raised to £20. Since that time, however, the level of wages has risen considerably, so that the proposed new maximum is justified on that score alone. There is no great virtue in fixing any particular amount as a maximum in this legislation except for the purpose of ensuring that industrial boards shall not be impeded in making their determinations. The maximum should be high enough to be safe in that respect. The proposed new maximum would, I believe, remove any doubt as to the scope of industrial boards in this connection, following on the relatively large marginal increases resulting from the Federal Arbitration Court's decision last year. The maximum prescribed in the Code is not intended—and has never been intended—to be a direction to any board to fix a wage as high as that maximum; and, of course, the great majority of wage rates fixed by industrial boards are considerably below the proposed maximum. There are some, however, which, with the present £20 maximum, have become borderline cases as a result of the increases referred to.

The other provision is contained in clause 4, which seeks to amend section 186 (1) of the Code. This subsection lays down that the determination of a board must be forwarded to the Minister of Industry, to be gazetted by him, and that it cannot come into force until 14 days after such gazettal. There can be delays in gazettal. In one instance, I understand, owing to the failure to gazette a determination promptly and the occurrence of the Christmas holidays, a delay of some weeks was occasioned. The amendment seeks to prevent delays of that kind. However, it goes further than that. The Industrial Court may, within the limits prescribed in section 21 (1) (*t*), make an award retrospective, and it is proposed to give industrial boards the same power, that is, to make their determinations retrospective.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—What has the honourable member got to say about retrospectivity now?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—My honourable friend has forgotten what he said a few years ago on that question. If it is fair and reasonable to accept retrospective legislation that concerns the farming community and others he represents why shouldn't we pass similar legislation in the interests of the workers? I thank my honourable friend for the interjection which gave me the opportunity to express my views. Where a board takes an unusually long time in coming to a determination, it should have power to date such determination back to any date (not before the commencement of the hearing) that it considers equitable. This is provided in the amendment in clause 4. After an application is lodged in the court it may be a delay of three months or six months before it is heard and this legislation does not provide for retrospectivity to the date of application, but only from the date of hearing, and I think that is fair enough.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—From the start of the hearing?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Yes.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Cases are often adjourned.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—That may be so, but why should the workers have to wait and suffer in the meantime? When it concerns people whom the honourable member represents he does not think of retrospectivity, and quite a number of other members will accept it when it suits them. There is nothing unfair or unreasonable in this request. Suppose a

union has a dispute with an employer but does not go on strike and refers it to the court. The court may not hear that case for a week, a fortnight or a month, so why should not the award be made retrospective to the date of the commencement of the hearing? Wages boards and courts may be called together to hear a case and be adjourned for a month and why should the men have to wait because some objection may have been lodged by the employers' representatives.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—Does not this clause refer to the powers of wages board and not the courts?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—The Minister must know of quite a number of cases of that description in the Arbitration Court and this comes in the same category. If we believe in arbitration and conciliation we should make it as easy as possible for both sides to approach the court and for a friendly feeling to be established between the parties, but delays of weeks or months causes discontent. In my own experience cases have been delayed for 12 months or even two years and it is that sort of thing that causes discontent among the workers. Therefore, I say make arbitration as easy as possible.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—The Arbitration Court has power to make retrospective awards so why should not wages boards?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Exactly, that is the whole point and that is why our present legislation has driven people from the State Industrial Court to the Federal Arbitration Court. Disputes have been created in this State because the same principles do not apply in our court as in those in the other States.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—The court has the right to make pay retrospective under certain conditions.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Exactly. If an application is made to the court on November 1 and it does not feel disposed to hear it until December 1, there is an adjournment for a month. The Bill would enable the court to make any decision retrospective to the first day of hearing. What is wrong with that?

The Hon. Sir Wallace Sandford—Quite a lot.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—If an employer looks for trouble or denies the men a reasonable claim, let him put up with it. Members know that I favour conciliation and arbitration, but if the employer wants to take advantage of little points, as he has done over a number of years, it will be found that I am behind the men. The object of the legislation is to encourage peace in industry. It is all very well for those who have little to do with industry, except through their organization, to combat such legislation. At least they should give a little credit to the men in industry whose chief object is the achievement of peace.

In addition, clause 4 provides that where a superior court has made an award on which a board bases its determination—such as in a margins case in which a principle laid down by the Arbitration Court is followed—a board may fix the date of commencement of its determination at any time back to the date of the commencement of the award. Subsection (1) of section 186, if amended as proposed, would read:—

> The determination of a board made after the passing of this Act shall—
>
> (*a*) be signed by the chairman and forwarded by him to the Minister;
>
> (*b*) be forthwith published by the Minister in the *Gazette*;
>
> (*c*) subject to the provisions of section 187, come into force unless otherwise provided by this Act on or as from any day which, not being prior to the day on which the board commenced the hearing of the matter in question, the board may consider equitable, having regard to the length of time involved in the hearing; provided that where the determination is based on an award made by the Industrial Court or Arbitration Court, the board may order that the determination shall come into force on the day on which the award came into force or some other subsequent day fixed by the board.

This provision would not, of course, be a direction to boards to make their determinations retrospective. Sufficient safeguards have been provided to prevent abuse and to ensure that, in the case of a protracted hearing, the date fixed by a board for the commencement of its determination shall be equitable. When the Bill was introduced in the House of Assembly it was in a different form. Amendments have been included at the suggestion of the Government and accepted by the Opposition. Members might consider whether the people or only a few individuals who represent certain interests are to be supreme. When dealing with legislation, members should not be one-sided and think only of individual interests. Our object is peace in industry, therefore I ask members to support the second reading.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE secured the adjournment of the debate.

PLACES OF PUBLIC ENTERTAINMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary) obtained leave to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Places of Public Entertainment Act, 1913-1954.

SEWERAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

LAND SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides that the present members of the Land Settlement Committee shall be entitled to remain in office until the end of 1956, provided, of course, that they retain their seats in Parliament at the next election. The Government has given careful consideration to the period of this extension. It has been the practice to extend the term of the committee for periods of three years. At present, however, although land development and settlement is proceeding steadily, it does not appear that there will be much work for the committee in the near future. In view of the uncertainty of the position, the Government considers that it is desirable at this juncture to extend the committee's term for one year only. The position can then be reviewed next year. The proposed extension is provided for in clause 3.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—I think the Government should have set out its reasons for extending the life of the committee. Although it has done good work, I do not know what work it has ahead, and it might be necessary to extend it for a further 12 months or two years. If the Government thinks it is wise to extend its term, why not make it three years as in the past? I shall leave my remarks about committees until we are discussing the Appropriation Bill later today, because the Public Works Standing Committee has been criticized by members of the Land Settlement Committee.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE (Central No. 2)—I support the second reading of this very short Bill, which should not take up much of the time of this Chamber at this stage of the session. I had something to do with this committee when it started. The point now is whether the Government is justified in recommending to Parliament that the committee should continue in existence. It was formed as a soldier settlement committee, and whether it is desirable that there should always be a Land Settlement Committee, apart from the settlement of soldiers, is an open question. I do not think it is. I think it is the duty of people to settle themselves and not have the Government do it for them. I approve of the suggestion that the committee should be carried on for another year, and at the end of that time we will be able to see whether it is desirable that it should continue. There seems to me to be no possibility of opposition to this Bill in its present form; we are simply saying that the committee has certain work before it and that it is desirable that it should be carried on for another year. I therefore support the second reading.

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

HIGHWAYS 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 provide for the transfer of certain money from the Highways Fund to Consolidated Revenue, and for re-imbursing the Highways Fund from the Loan Fund. The events which have led up to this Bill are the following:—In 1953 the sum of £620,000 was transferred from general revenue into the Highways Fund, pursuant to a special appropriation by Parliament. At that time the Government took the view, which it still holds, that this was a proper and reasonable provision to meet the costs of road construction and maintenance. When the money was voted there were prospects of a surplus in the Revenue Account, but the decision to vote the money was not based on the fact that revenue was buoyant, but on the needs of the Highways Department. Whatever the position of the Revenue Account may have been, the same amount would have been required. However, in assessing the grant for the year 1955-1956 the Commonwealth Grants Commission has made a "correction"—that is to say a reduction in the amount which would have been recommended of £620,000. The substantial reason for this reduction is that in the Commission's view the payment of £620,000 to the Highways Fund in 1953 was the disposal of a prospective surplus of revenue which would otherwise have been available to assist the State in meeting its commitments in a subsequent year. The Grants

Commission rejected the State's submission that the transfer of money to the Highways Fund was a proper and reasonable appropriation for road purposes which would have had to be made whatever the state of the revenue was at the time. The Government, of course, accepts the Commission's decision on this particular appropriation, and intends, accordingly, to transfer the sum of £620,000 back to revenue. It is, however, desirable that the Highways Fund should not be deprived of this amount, and the Government therefore proposes that, in order to reimburse the Highways Fund, authority should be given for the making of advances from the Loan Fund to the Highways Fund up to the sum of £620,000. The money so advanced will be repaid from the Highways Fund to the Loan Fund at convenient times to be decided in future by the Treasury. Clause 3 gives authority for these transactions. In addition to the loan moneys, the Government also proposes to pay from Consolidated Revenue a contribution to the Highways Fund of £250,000 to be applied towards the cost of developmental roads in country areas and the maintenance of country roads. This appropriation is being dealt with in the Budget. The Government believes that the Grants Commission will be prepared to consider these various appropriations on their merits and has no reason to think that they will lead to any disadvantage to the State.

Another alteration of the Highways Fund is made by clause 3. At present the Government, before transferring the motor revenue to the Highways Fund, is required to deduct from it and set aside a special sinking fund payment of 1¼ per cent of the balance of the Road Purposes Loan Account. This special sinking fund is in addition to the various contributions made by the State to the National Debt Sinking Fund. It was first inaugurated in 1926 before the National Debt Sinking Fund came into existence and has been carried on ever since. No doubt an argument in favour of maintaining the special sinking fund was that the life of a road was less than 53 years—the period in which loans are amortized by contributions to the National Debt Sinking Fund. However, in view of the new methods of road construction and maintenance this argument has lost much of its force. In addition, the Financial Agreement now contains provisions for special sinking fund contributions for loans used for wasting assets of relatively short life. These provisions, if necessary, can be applied to loans for road purposes. The Government, after reviewing the position, has come to the conclusion that the special sinking fund contributions are no longer necessary and should be abolished. It is therefore proposed by clause 3 to repeal the provisions in the Highways Act which provides for these contributions. I commend the necessity for this Bill to honourable members, and trust that I shall receive their support.

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

METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 10. Page 1523.)

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON (Northern)—Many amendments have been made in recent years to the principal Act. A few years ago a Select Committee was appointed to inquire into the disabilities under which we were labouring with regard to the slaughtering of stock at the Metropolitan Abattoirs. These works were established in 1913 as a municipal undertaking for the killing and processing of meat for local consumption in the metropolitan area. At that time we also had export treatment works at Port Adelaide run by the Government Produce Department. Another committee of inquiry was appointed in 1933 and on its recommendation the business of slaughtering livestock for export at Port Adelaide was amalgamated with the metropolitan works and the management placed in the hands of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board. The board closed the Port Adelaide works and brought the work of killing and processing under one roof at Gepps Cross. I am mentioning this brief history to show that abattoirs were primarily muincipal works which gathered a certain atmosphere that they were for the metropolitan supply and that the export side of it was more or less a secondary thing.

The amalgamation was acclaimed as being in the best interests of all those who required such services and time has shown that each section has helped the other to attain greater efficiency. The combined business has been carried on much more successfully financially, and the charges to both sections were, in the earlier days, progressively reduced. The board was fortunate in securing the services of Mr. Rainee as works manager, and he placed the Abattoirs on a very sound and efficient basis. The works were well designed except, perhaps, with one exception. Had those who planned

them visualized the expansion that would take place they would undoubtedly have built the railway line around instead of through the works, thereby dividing it into two parts. However, the business of processing meat has grown very considerably indeed. In 1947 additional plant was installed to cope with the growing export trade and it increased the killing capacity to about 70,000 lambs a week for export. This work cost £100,000. In that year the combined killings for export and local consumption totalled 976,000 and the figures have progressively increased, as the following figures show:

1948	1,078,000
1949	1,371,000
1950	1,513,000
1951	1,149,000
1952	931,000

Since then, with the advent of better seasons, the numbers have grown still further and in 1953 were 1,451,000 and in 1954, 1,709,000. Although the report for this year has not been published I have secured the figures from the secretary of the board and the total was 1,813,000. This indicates that we have practically reached the limit of the slaughtering capacity of the works. To show how local consumption has grown I will give the combined figures in that respect. In 1947, 247,000 sheep and 395,000 lambs were killed, whereas last year the numbers respectively were 538,000 sheep and 477,000 lambs. Thus home consumption has encroached upon the export capacity by about 400,000. Today, instead of slaughtering 70,000 lambs in a week as we set out to do in 1947, we are slaughtering in a five-day week only about 40,000 for export. With week-end overtime, however, an additional 25,000 are killed but, of course, at a higher cost. The point I am trying to make is that the growth of population will in time absorb the greater percentage of output.

This Bill proposes to amend the provisions relating to the bringing of meat and carcasses from the Port Lincoln branch of the Government Produce Depot into the metropolitan area and the selling of such in this area. The Port Lincoln works have done much to establish the sheep industry, and particularly the production of fat lambs in that part of the State and we have in that area today men such as Messrs. Sims, Smith, McFarlane, and Trestrail, who have over the last few years, with the one exception of last year, won the prize not only for that area but for the State for fat lambs for export. These men have devoted a lot of time and money to the breeding of export lambs and they have not only won the State Championship, but also the Australian Championship in England. We appreciate what has been done there and we believe that the amendment to enable them to bring meat to the metropolitan area will add materially to the success of the works.

The Bill also provides for the granting of quotas for any works killing stock for export which is situated more than 50 miles from the Gepps Cross Abattoirs. That, it is hoped, will be the means, if properly interpreted and administered, of enabling works to be established somewhere on the mainland. We have only to recall that of recent date it was expected that works would be established at Kadina by a local firm, and that if it had a sufficient quota it would have been a success. However, I really take exception to a quota being fixed for I feel that the disability of being some 50 miles, or in the case of Kadina 80 miles, away from the city, should be sufficient to prohibit its becoming a competitor with the Metropolitan Abattoirs. I believe, too, that unrestricted competition would be a good thing and would also enable the competitor to bring meat into the metropolitan area at a cheaper rate. Someone has said that we must safeguard the money invested in the Metropolitan Abattoirs, but I believe that they are so well established that competition from works at Kadina would not in any way jeopardize them.

It is of interest to note what is done in the other States in the matter of slaughtering facilities. New South Wales, with a sheep population of about 60,000,000, has 16 killing works. Queensland, with 23,000,000 sheep, has 14, Victoria, with 22,000,000 sheep, has 11, Western Australia with 13,000,000 sheep, has 3, South Australia, with 12,400,000, has two, and Tasmania, with only 2,200,000 sheep, has three works. In South Australian figures I have included Port Lincoln, but that is very restricted in its operations and capacity. We also have an outlet at Portland in Victoria, where quite a percentage of our stock from the southern part of the State is treated. In New Zealand, where about 17,500,000 sheep are treated annually, there are 29 works. This represents an average of 550,000 sheep each, whereas our works have almost reached the 2,000,000 mark.

With the drop in wheat values I believe that there will be a greater preponderance of our land devoted to fat lamb raising, which is a very profitable industry. I think it was the Leader of the Opposition who said yesterday that farmers "want the lot." That is

not my view. I regard this as a national industry, an industry in which all the people of the State are vitally concerned. The production of over 1,000,000 lambs for export will return between £3,000,000 and £4,000,000 to the coffers of the State, which is of great importance to our economy. Anything we do to encourage the industry will be for the benefit of all concerned. The producer, by hand feeding during periods of shortage and by growing improved pastures, endeavours to produce an animal that is a credit to himself and to the State, and yet when his animals are kept at the abattoirs for three or four days awaiting slaughter they deteriorate considerably in condition. The stock for the metropolitan supply is killed on Thursday prior to the killing of export lambs being undertaken. The consequent delay at the works reduces the weight and quality considerably. It is quality which we should encourage because we have to compete with the rest of the world. Lambs produced on the Canterbury Plains in New Zealand have gained world-wide renown. These plains are 100 miles long and 75 miles wide and there are four treatment works for the killing of lambs straight from the pastures. Until we can approach somewhat similar conditions—

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Are they Government works?

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—No, private works. We have the opportunity in this State to have private works established in a certain country area which is crying out for an industry if we give the company concerned sufficient encouragement. I would not limit it to a small quota, but allow the fullest possible quota to encourage the establishment of the works. During the debate the question of breaking strikes at the abattoirs was mentioned, but that should be far from our minds. Our main objective should be to see that the interests of producers are not jeopardized by ensuring that his lambs are treated when they are ready. Mr. Bevan went to considerable trouble to give the history of the recent abattoirs strike, but I do not intend to answer that. We believe in arbitration. When an award is made employers obey it. Mr. Bevan said:—

I could not get the disputes committee together on Saturday morning nor could I do anything before the men assembled on Monday morning at 10 o'clock. However, wise counsel prevailed and a disputes committee meeting was held at 10 o'clock on the Monday and it was decided to approach the Premier. We did and eventually an independent arbitrator, acceptable to both parties, was appointed and it was agreed that his decision would be accepted. It is interesting to note that he increased the men's wages. In my opinion the strike—if it can be so called—for increased wage rates was justified in view of the independent arbitrator's decision.

An arbitrator should have decided the point in the first place instead of stock being held back for five weeks for slaughtering. The question could have been settled amicably and a loss to the State of at least £250,000 avoided.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—The strike would have been settled but for the attitude of the Abattoirs Board.

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—I believe the Bill will result in improvements for the slaughtering of our stock and therefore I support it, although I feel it does not go far enough. I think the time will come when we will have more private works to treat the numbers of stock available.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE (Midland)—We are indebted to Mr. Robinson and other speakers for the technical information they have submitted about the industry. It would appear that the time has arrived when the legislature should consider the question rather from the point of view of the abattoirs not being a State monopoly, and whether in the interests of South Australia, and indirectly of producers, we should not consider the time ripe to bring this monopoly to an end and allow the business to stand or fall on its own merits. I think we agree that any such industry having been established under protection should, within a reasonable time, justify that protection by so organizing and managing its business affairs that it can stand on its own merits. Apparently this monopoly at the abattoirs has been protected for about 40 years. I am of opinion that it would be better if we forgot that the State had so much money involved in these works. Rather we should look at the question from the point of view of producers as a whole, bearing in mind that their prosperity is a matter of vital interest to the finances of the State.

There is no doubt that the establishment of big abattoirs is right to deal with the supply of edible meats in the more congested areas. I know for a fact, and it is perfectly obvious, that where there are no abattoirs and the individual butcher operates competition for the producers' livestock is keener. Each individual butcher concentrates on providing his customers with meat of the highest quality. His sound practice is to buy his meat at the abattoirs if necessary, but if he does so he knows it will be travel stained. If he could give the animals

a week or a fortnight's rest before their slaughtering, the freshness of the meat would be restored. With monopolistic abattoirs operating, one finds that some of the meat sold is just like jarrah.

Any country district that is persuaded to establish local abattoirs is badly advised. One must bear in mind that all meat is thoroughly sterilized before it is eaten, and whether the conditions under which it is slaughtered are ideal or not, in my opinion it does not matter very much. When it comes to the question of the protection of milk, I have different views. I believe that the regulation and control of this article cannot be too rigid. When it comes to meat, it is thoroughly sterilized before being eaten, and nothing can be held against the small individual butcher if he does not comply with the highest standards of hygiene. Another point is the purposes of abattoirs. Their prime purpose is to supply the metropolitan area with meat, but the abattoirs has become involved in and dominates the matter of our exports. The export lamb business is highly seasonal. There is a terrific influx at only one period in the year, and I cannot help feeling that every export lamb season is entered into by the growers with a great deal of apprehension. There is no doubt that such a tempo offers a great opportunity for organized labour to make its demands against people who have not the advantage of time and who are almost in a hopeless position when the argument starts. I therefore believe that it would be in the best interests of not only the primary producers, but eventually of the Government as a whole, that the protection of this monopoly should be wiped out and we should allow anybody who has faith enough in us, and in their own business capacity to establish export abattoirs here. The restrictions are, to my mind, completely absurd, because after all the establishment of these works must bear some relation to export facilities. It must be perfectly obvious that an export port would be almost a *sine qua non*. Wallaroo, which offered the opportunity a little while ago, was frustrated by official interference, although it seemed to me to be an ideal place because it is in lamb producing country.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Was it not because they could not get any quota for the Adelaide market? I think that keeps them going.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—It was because of official interference. I have tried to say that they should not be dependent on these quotas. Private enterprise should be given a free hand. The Abattoirs have had a long time to pay initial costs and establish goodwill, and surely the time has now come to give private enterprise a go. The fat lamb business is very delicate and highly seasonal. When the lambs are ready, they face the drying off of their feed over a very short period and the onset of hot weather. They are a very delicate crop and should be harvested when ready. From the Government's point of view, if anyone is willing to come into this State and lend a hand to market this crop, we should give them every opportunity.

We are apt to talk today about this year's crop, the rate of slaughtering, and so on, but the State is growing so fast, not only industrially, but agriculturally, that what we are saying today will be almost out of date tomorrow. Parts of the State with better rainfall are increasing production enormously. People now talk in figures that may appear a little over-optimistic, but even if they are discounted by 50 per cent, the higher rainfall areas are now producing two or three times as much as they produced 25 years ago. However, we are only on the threshold of this development. We know that in the South-East, in the higher rainfall areas, the ultimate production is anybody's guess, although we all know that it will be very great. I am also certain that in the middle rainfall areas the advance of scientific knowledge will make production greater still. I cannot explain exactly why I believe that, but I do believe it. I do not think anything can be done in the lower rainfall areas, but with the advance of scientific agriculture and that type of knowledge I am sure there will be greater improvements in agricultural production in the other areas. That really means that when we are talking today about what we will do with the abattoirs we should not confine ourselves entirely to what is going on today, but we should think and act in the belief that in a very short time the demands of such a business that will find its ultimate destiny in the abattoirs, production of stock of all sorts, fat lambs in particular, needs a wider view than one that miserably and meagrely grants trivial rights to some people to start up over 50 miles away from Adelaide.

I realize that in individual lives and in Parliamentary moves it is wiser to take half a loaf rather than nothing because, if one sticks out for the whole loaf, one will probably get nothing. I do not believe that this Bill is a sensible answer to the problem. The State should forget the money it has wrapped up in the Abattoirs and say to it, "You have had

a good start. You have a lot of things in your favour. Now stand on your own feet.'' If I were the Government I would say, from the point of view of the people as a whole, that we should allow the establishment of as many export abattoirs as care to take on the job at their own risk.

Mr. Robinson's figures relating to the number of export abattoirs in other States were extremely illuminating. I think we should bear in mind that we have one and a half abattoirs, because Port Lincoln is not a fully fledged abattoirs. It is restricted to a small number of consumers, to the area it serves, and other things. We have 12,000,000 sheep in this State and one abattoirs. It cannot deal with our present production and it will be well behind with increased production. The wheatgrowers are getting into more and more trouble and I do not doubt that anyone who can get out of growing wheat will do so. With a second string to our bow—the export meat market—we should not do anything to make people wish they could get out of that industry. I believe that the time has come for us to forget about the money we have invested in the Abattoirs. We put that money in there because we had to establish it, but now if someone else comes along and wants to help us in the industry, we should allow them to do so. I support the second reading only because I believe half a loaf is better than no bread.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—''Permits as to carcasses and meat from country abattoirs.''

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—Futile as it may be, I feel that I cannot conscientiously let this clause pass without saying something in view of what I said during the second reading. I would like to feel that the Government and the Minister were giving some consideration to the strangulation of an industry by the imposition of this 50-mile limit. We have within 50 miles of Adelaide a small abattoirs that is willing to do a bit of exporting, and surely if it is able to comply with the regulations and general restrictions applying to the export of lambs it should be allowed to do so. I feel that this 50 miles restriction puts the official signature of approval to this unending Government monopoly. The word ''monopoly'' stirs up feelings. While some of us may be opposed to big industrial monopolies others may be in favour of limited monopolies.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Are you speaking on behalf of the Noarlunga Company?

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—Yes.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Why don't some of the Southern members say something?

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—I am not interested in whether it is south, north, east, or west, but in the principle. I would not quarrel with a monopoly if it were necessary for the establishment of a concern, but after a certain time it should be asked to stand on its own feet. I think if the Minister would redraft this clause and eliminate the 50 miles restriction at least there would be one member of this Committee who would retire tonight very much happier.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—I assure the honourable member that I have noted his remarks and appreciate the point he is endeavouring to make, but there is nothing abnormal about this clause. Any body interested in the establishment of abattoirs in the country would desire that it should have the same protection as is applied to the metropolitan abattoirs. It is not confined to abattoirs. Only a few days ago I was approached by an industry to take certain steps to see that competition did not destroy its opportunities to make profits. The idea of protecting capital is not something which applies only to the metropolitan abattoirs for it applies to the whole system of industry throughout Australia; in fact, the fiscal policy of Australia is based upon it. Those associated with lamb raising know that it is only a seasonal industry as our climate does not permit all the year round production, and in that respect it is different from any other industry. This provision goes quite a long way to provide what is sought by private enterprise to permit the establishment of works outside the metropolitan area.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—I would consider supporting any amendment to increase the distance of 50 miles but as the members who represent the district in which the company concerned in the court case is situated have not seen fit to submit any amendment I do not intend to move one. Had such a thing happened in my district, however, I should certainly have protested. I think that the Port Noarlunga people had a perfect right to put up a case and I am very disappointed that the members who represent that district have had nothing to say on the matter.

Clause passed.

Title.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—I move—

To delete "relevant to the foregoing amendments" and to insert "respecting the sale of meat within the said area."

The amendment is necessary in view of amendments made to the Bill in the House of Assembly. These were within the scope of the Bill but not covered by the long title.

Amendment carried; title as amended passed.

Bill reported with an amendment and Committee's report adopted.

PORT WAKEFIELD HOSPITAL (TRANSFER OF ASSETS) BILL.

(Continued from October 12. Page 1050.)

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Received and read. Ordered that report be printed.

On the motion of the Hon. C. D. ROWE for return of deeds and other documents to witnesses,

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—I oppose the motion. The Bill will be referred to a Committee of the Whole tomorrow, so what right have we to return any papers until the Council has decided the issue? I think the Attorney-General's motion is entirely out of order.

The PRESIDENT—Will the Attorney-General explain the position?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—The certificates of title, pass book and other documents referred to were produced to the Select Committee by witnesses. I have been requested by one member of the local committee who submitted the documents that they be returned to him so that he may be able to take them back for the purpose of a meeting of the Hospital Board tomorrow. I do not see that they can be of any value to the Council.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—My point is that the local committee could adjourn its meeting meeting for another week until this Council has decided the matter. The Bill was introduced for the purposes of giving permission for the transfer of assets and we appointed a Select Committee to report on it. The Committee's report has been brought up but it has not yet been discussed and therefore we have no right to return any documents until the fate of the Bill has been decided, because there is a difference of opinion in the district. In the first place certain people asked a solicitor, Mr. Zelling, to give them an opinion as to what they could do. He did so, and without any authority except that of one or two individuals, the Bill was introduced. Since then the local people have awakened to the situation. The district council called a meeting which was attended by over 100 people who voted 100 to nine against what is proposed in the Bill. Although the hospital has been used as flats for five years the people want to retain it as a hospital and they object to the money in hand being passed over to any other body. I should say, therefore, that we would be doing the wrong thing if we agreed to the motion until the Council had decided the question. I ask members to uphold the privileges of the Council and not allow the matter to be taken out of its hands until it makes a decision.

The PRESIDENT—The position is that the Attorney-General has moved that the Council take certain steps and it is perfectly within the rights of any member to object. He can vote for or against the motion as he thinks fit.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1)—I oppose the motion. The Select Committee appointed to inquire into the hospital's ramifications has concluded its inquiry and the report will be debated tomorrow. Much finance is involved, taking into account the assets of the hospital board and its bank balance. I understand that the official documents are in the hands of the Clerk of the Council, but we are asked to agree to a motion instructing the Clerk to return these documents. During the course of the debate tomorrow it may be necessary to have them available for information. Therefore, I feel they should not be returned until we have had the opportunity to debate the Select Committee's report.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY (Central No. 2)—The matter was submitted to a Select Committee, a completely impartial body, and it made a recommendation. We should stand behind the Committee.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—How do you know that the Committee's recommendation will be adopted?

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY—We do not know. I cannot see much in Mr. Condon's arguments about the documents. We should accept or reject the committee's recommendation.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE (Central No. 2)—I do not profess to be *au fait* with procedure concerning reports of Select Committees when

they come back to this Chamber, but I am surprised at what has happened this afternoon. We do not appear to be in Committee on this question and yet the Attorney-General and Mr. Condon have already each made two speeches. I am bewildered at the position at which we have arrived. As far as I know, we cannot discuss on this motion what is in the Committee's report. I was a member of the Committee and know what is in it, and cannot understand why it was not submitted and dealt with this afternoon. I can see no objection to the return of the documents. The Committee has dealt with them and submitted a report, and yet we have decided to discuss the report tomorrow instead of today. Whatever we decide tomorrow, I do not see it will make any difference if the documents which were supplied to the Committee are returned. They will be returned to those who produced them; Parliament cannot give them to someone else. I see no objection to the motion and support it.

The Council divided on the motion.

Ayes (13).—The Hons. E. Anthoney, J. L. S. Bice, J. L. Cowan, C. R. Cudmore, E. H. Edmonds, N. L. Jude, Sir Lyell McEwin, A. J. Melrose, W. W. Robinson, C. D. Rowe (teller), Sir Wallace Sandford, C. R. Story and R. R. Wilson.

Noes (4).—The Hons. S. C. Bevan, F. J. Condon (teller), A. A. Hoare and Sir Frank Perry.

Majority of 9 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL (PENSIONS).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 15. Page 1554.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—The object of the Bill is to increase the pensions payable to the President and Deputy President of the Industrial Court. This morning members of Parliament visited the new town outside the metropolitan area and we are delighted to know that it has been named Elizabeth. We were told that there would be 30,000 inhabitants there within a few years. Therefore, why should we not extend to this area the provision of the Industrial Code. Today it applies only within a certain radius of the General Post Office, Adelaide. If we have any respect for the good and worthy name of Elizabeth, let us extend the provisions of the Code to that town. The Premier has been asked to do this, and include other areas, but has refused. We should not be narrow-minded and say that only a few people around the metropolitan area should be entitled to rights under the Industrial Code.

A pension scheme to apply to the President and Deputy President of the Industrial Court was introduced eight years ago. Parliament has been very generous, and rightly so, in increasing the pensions of the judiciary. Pension payments available to public servants have also been increased. The full pension will not be available to the President or Deputy President of the court unless he serves at least 15 years. The retiring age is 65 years. There is no provision now for a pension to be paid to the widow of the President or Deputy President of the Industrial Court in the event of his death. The President now receives £3,250 a year, and I think the Deputy President receives £2,750, and each will be entitled to a pension equal to half of his salary. Compare that with the Parliamentary superannuation scheme. This Council is called upon from time to time to deal with other people's pensions, but when it comes to our own for which we have to pay we are treated worse than anyone else.

If either the President or Deputy President dies before retirement, his widow will receive a pension equal to one quarter of his salary at the time of death, but how is the widow of the Parliamentarian treated in comparison with widows of members of the judiciary and the public service? It may not be popular to refer to these things, but I am doing so to point out the injustice that even wealthy members of this House have to put up with. It is true that contributions will be increased to a very slight extent under this Bill, but these men have the right to choose between this scheme and the South Australian Superannuation Fund, although naturally they will accept the best offering.

I support the Bill because these men hold very important positions and must have the confidence of both employer and employee. It is not what they do in court but what they achieve in public confidence that counts, and only if we have men who have the confidence of both sides will we get anywhere with arbitration. It is not very satisfactory to have one man making a decision today and another tomorrow. During my life in Parliament, on numerous occasions it has been decided to increase pensions for police and public servants, but we have not been so generous or even fair in relation to our own pensions.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Isn't that our own fault?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Unfortunately, there are men in Parliament who have to live on their Parliamentary salaries and who devote the whole of their time to their Parliamentary duties. There are others who look upon their salaries as pin money, and they have no consideration for the man who is battling, so unconsciously they take a very narrow view of the matter. No member wants anything for nothing. We are quite prepared to pay increased contributions in accordance with what is fair and reasonable and with what other people pay. Many men have sacrificed their lives for their Parliamentary work and surely they are entitled to the same consideration as anyone else. I have known men who had to work as lavatory attendants or labourers when they left Parliament. If they are prepared to pay for a pension scheme why should they not have some consideration?

Although I support the second reading, I point out we are prepared to consider everyone but ourselves. The Labor Party objects to the statements made by the Premier about our superannuation fund. The other day I was told that I should read *Hansard* if I wanted information about this matter, yet if I referred to anything in *Hansard* I would be out of order. Earlier this session, when I wanted to refer to something that took place in the House of Assembly, I was stopped, yet the Chief Secretary, the Leader of the Government in this Chamber, referred me to what happened in that House. The Premier wants to increase our contributions to about £150 a year—

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—On a point of order, Mr. Acting President, I would like to ask whether the honourable member is discussing this Bill or some hypothetical case of Parliamentary pensions.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. A. J. Melrose)—I ask the honourable member to confine himself to the Bill.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—When I asked a question I was told to refer to *Hansard* for a reply, so surely I am quite within my rights in referring to the pensions scheme. Why should a full pension be paid to any man who is receiving £3,250, and a half pension to his widow, when we receive only £12 a week after paying contributions of over £150 a year? Although we are generous in extending privileges to the officers mentioned in this Bill, it is about time that we extended our generosity in another way. The Labor Party objects to the iniquitous suggestion of the Premier. Parliament is prepared to give consideration to everyone else, yet it only provides a pension of £12 a week for a member who retires after giving many years of service to the community. I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE (Central No. 2)—We have listened to an interesting dissertation on the Industrial Code, how the President and Deputy President of the Industrial Court should deport themselves, and on the Parliamentary pensions scheme in general, but we have heard practically nothing about this Bill, which I support and to which I shall confine myself. As the Attorney-General and the Leader of the Opposition have both said, in 1947 pensions were provided for the President and Deputy President of the Industrial Court by an amendment to the Industrial Code, and the pensions were put on more or less the same basis as the pensions of the judges of the Supreme Court. Since then we have dealt with the judges' pensions, making them more liberal, and this Bill does the reasonable and proper thing by bringing the position of the President and Deputy President of the Industrial Court into line with what has been done in relation to judges' pensions. The Bill simply says that if they elect to come under this scheme they have to contribute five per cent of their salary at a certain age, and later eight per cent and on retirement at 65 they will receive a pension of half salary. In the event of their death their widows will receive as pension quarter of the salary, and if they die before retirement their personal representatives will receive back the contributions they have made. It seems to be quite a reasonable and proper thing that I should support the Bill.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY (Central No. 2)—I also support the Bill, and rise with the object of saying a few words regarding the importance of our industrial Court Judges. Their judgments have a great effect on the economy of the country and to bring them into line with the Supreme Court Judges in the matter of pensions is only right. It is true that they retire a little earlier, but to give them the same rate of pension as the Supreme Court Judges is, I think, quite equitable in view of the responsibility and worry they must have in making their determinations. I commend the Government for introducing the measure.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1)—I support the measure, and like other members realize that it is for the purpose of bringing the pensions of the presiding officers of the

Industrial Court into line with present monetary values. There are one or two interesting provisions in the Bill. For instance, should a public servant who is already contributing to the South Australian Superannuation Fund be appointed as President or Deputy President of the Industrial Court he may elect to continue to contribute to that fund. However, I cannot imagine his desiring to do so because even if the President, for instance, were contributing for the maximum number of units permissible he would be entitled to a retiring allowance at 65 of only £1,183, whereas half of his salary is approximately £1,625. If he withdrew from the South Australian Superannuation Fund he would be entitled to a refund of his contributions and would then be entitled to come under the provisions of this Bill.

New section 12ea confers considerable benefits on the personal representative of a President or Deputy President in the event of his death which I do not think is given under any other pension scheme. I have in mind our own Parliamentary scheme. I can see nothing in that which confers a similar benefit upon my personal representative, and I cannot see why the same principle should not apply in all Acts of this description. Although there appears to be considerable objection to legislating on the same lines in other instances, if the principle laid down in this Bill is correct surely it should be applied in other respects, and what Mr. Condon said was perfectly correct. There have been attempts to influence the Premier to do something in regard to Parliamentary pensions, and we know the reply given by the Chief Secretary to Mr. Condon yesterday, namely, "Look in *Hansard* and you will find the answer." I found it without looking in *Hansard,* for the Premier was reported in the *Advertiser* as stating that he would consider increasing Parliamentary pensions to £12 a week conditionally upon members agreeing to increase their contributions by 100 per cent. The Government has considered various suggestions and I hope that it will consider the one I am now putting forward at a very early date. The Bill removes certain anomalies and brings the retiring allowances of the presiding officers of the Industrial Court into line with present-day values in accordance with the principle that should be applied in respect of other superannuation schemes, and I therefore support the second reading.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General)—I do not think any matters have been raised that call for a reply, but if any are raised in Committee I shall be pleased to deal with them.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 15. Page 1563.)

The Hon. R. R. WILSON (Northern)—The total amount involved in the Bill is more than £45,000,000. I pay a tribute to those who prepare the financial statements and also to the Treasurer, who has now entered upon his eighteenth year as Premier of this State. South Australia has enjoyed a period of prosperity under his leadership. He is recognized as one of the great satesmen in the history of the Commonwealth. His one objective has been to obtain the best for South Australia and in doing so he has done the best for his country. Whatever he can be accused of, he is certainly honest. There is a saying that they are only truly great who are truly good, and I think that aptly applies to him.

Last weekend, in company with the Minister of Agriculture, I visited Minnipa and found the country in excellent condition. Crops were promising, and just as well because prices are falling. Farmers are fully aware that they must modify their spending accordingly. I was interested to see press reports concerning the failure of some of the crops due, it was stated, either to atom dust or to frost. I saw no sign of damage by either. On one farm visited the wheat yield was more than 30 bushels to the acre, and that on a 13in. rainfall. There were many crops yielding an equal return, and even better. Many who have harvested their barley have complained that it is only feed quality. The return will not be anything like equal to that for malting barley. I examined the grain and also came to the conclusion that it was of feed quality. Something had happend during the ripening period, the grain being very hard and covered with a thick skin. Good quality barley is thin skinned with plenty of wrinkle to allow for the expansion of the grain on the malting floor. Feed quality barley is of a hard, steel colour and there is no white in the grain when broken open. If farmers grow barley in dry country or where there is excess nitrogen they must expect grain of inferior quality. That happens to many barley growers and they do not appear to realize the importance of growing quality grain.

The Minister and I were interested to study the damage which had been done by grasshoppers. None was seen this side of Port Augusta, but there were plenty at Iron Knob, and between that town and Kimba we had considerable trouble with the car over-heating although the radiator was protected with gauze. The grasshoppers kept on blocking the air from getting through. The Kimba Council has already been debited for an amount of £6,176 for expenses associated with fighting the grasshoppers, and I feel that some relief should be afforded this and other councils which are involved in countering this menace. The Government has set aside £100,000 to fight grasshoppers, and one would be safe in saying that where thousands of pounds are being spent, millions of pounds are being saved. I pay a tribute to those young men who are driving Army jeeps in the fight against grasshoppers. It was stated in the press that some of them were receiving very poor treatment from station properties on which they had been operating. Those we interviewed gave a different story, and said they were treated with the utmost kindness and indicated that when they got the opportunity they would be happy to return to the stations for a holiday. The Minister was unable to find any person who could confirm the adverse stories. The Army, which is supplying the jeeps and the drivers, is doing an excellent job, and it is to be hoped that the Commonwealth Government will bear this part of the expense.

There has been considerable spraying of poisons at Kimba, and we saw a black mass of dead grasshoppers around the outskirts of the town, and yet millions were still advancing. The spray is effective for about 36 hours and then the area has to be resprayed. The Agricultural Department and its officers have done an excellent job in fighting the scourge, and we can be thankful that the councils and others have made such a valiant effort. Grasshoppers are known to travel long distances in a day and they have been found at a height of more than 5,000ft. The Kimba district is practically devoid of green growth.

An amount of £6,000,000 has been allocated for education. Admittedly, it is a huge sum, but no doubt it will be worthily spent. Area schools are performing a particularly good service. The transport provided for children attending these schools absorbs quite a large amount, but as a result the children get a better education, a better appreciation of social life and a better foundation in life.

Our hospitals are also doing a wonderful job, and local councils are worthily supporting their efforts and contributing considerable sums. In practically every case the Minister of Health has seen fit to subsidize pound for pound the moneys raised for hospitals. This gives great encouragement to the local people.

The enormous amount of £15,000,000 is allocated to the railways. One wonders where it will all be spent, but no doubt each item has been carefully scrutinized. I believe the railways could get more revenue as a result of this extra expenditure by improving services. An amount of more than £19,000 is provided for the Transport Control Board, but I wonder how long the State will retain this board. I am of opinion that its operations do not add in any way to the revenue of the railways, especially those on Eyre Peninsula, although I would have thought that the railways would be benefited as a result of the restrictions on other transport. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

TOWN PLANNING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 15. Page 1567.)

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE (Central No. 2)—This matter has been somewhat contentious in this Parliament for the last 12 months, and the Bill has now arrived before us for discussion. So far it has received rather a mixed reception. Mr. Condon, leader of the Labor Party in this place, had, I should think, at the most 1s. 6d. each way on it, but that is all. He did not give it any blessings, nor did he say anything against it. Mr. Anthoney was very lukewarm about it, but he said one thing that should be qualified. He said we were justified in rejecting the legislation last year, but I do not think we did reject it; we said that it came to us too late for discussion, and we did not discuss it. The only matter we debated was whether we should deal with it or not. Now we have had ample opportunity, as we have known for months what is in the Bill, so there is no possibility of our saying we have not had time to consider it. This Bill sat in the Committee stage, as it did last year, on the Notice Paper of the House of Assembly for a long time. It was

then brought up to the top, certain amendments were made, it was put through that House and then came to us. If there were any real teeth in it at this time last year, which I doubt, there are none in it now, and if people want this plan to be drawn up for a Greater Adelaide, or whatever it is to be, I have no objection. I do not propose to speak at great length on this or any other Bill that has to be dealt with in Committee this session, because time is getting on, so that is all I will have to say about this measure, which has my blessing.

I notice that the Attorney-General has some amendments on the files, the exect meaning of which I am not clear about at the moment. His amendments are very small, but the last may be of considerable moment. No doubt when we get into Committee we will know what it is all about. With those few remarks, I indicate my support of the second reading of the Bill, which is after all, a Bill to amend the existing town planning scheme that is run by one town planner, whereas this bigger scheme is to be drawn up by the committee set up under the Bill.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General)—There is very little I need say in reply. I have a note prepared by the Parliamentary Draftsman that indicates that all the amendments are drafting amendments only, and have become necessary consequent upon certain amendments made in the House of Assembly. However, I shall deal with them as we come to them. With regard to the point raised yesterday by Mr. Condon about land at St. Peters, it is quite clear that if that land is compulsorily acquired the owners will be entitled to full compensation.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Approval to subdivisions, etc.''

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General)—I move—

In new subsection (2) of section 11 to delete ''shall not approve of'' and to insert ''may withhold approval to.''

As introduced in the House of Assembly clause 7 provided that the Committee was to withhold approval to a plan of subdivision if it did not comply with certain requirements. The Bill was amended by substituting ''may'' for ''shall'' and thus giving the Committee a discretion in the matter. Paragraph (*d*) of clause 5 provides that any plan of subdivision which has been approved before the passing of the Bill but not deposited within two months after the passing of the Bill is to be again submitted for approval to the Committee which is to withhold approval if the plan does not comply with clause 7. Obviously, the Committee should have the same discretion under clause 5 as is now provided in clause 7, and the amendment provides accordingly.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 6 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—''Power to enter land.''

The Hon. J. L. S. BICE—Will the Minister state where the provision relating to compensation on compulsory acquisition is in the Bill?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—It is not included in the Bill, but there are provisions in other Acts that cover the matter.

Clause 10—''Duty of committee to prepare plan for metropolitan area.''

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I move—

In subsection (1) of new section 27 to delete ''for approval.''

New section 27 provides that when the Committee has prepared its plan for Adelaide the plan is to be submitted to Parliament for approval. As introduced into another place, the Bill provided machinery whereby the approval of Parliament could be obtained to the plan when it was to be known as the developmental plan for the metropolitan area of Adelaide and to have the force of law. These provisions were struck out in another place and the effect of the Bill is now that the plan is to be laid before Parliament and, if the plan meets with the approval of Parliament it will require further legislation to approve of the plan and to give it legal force. Thus the words ''for approval'' are now redundant and the amendment strikes them out.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I move—

To delete new section 29.

New section 29 provides that every metropolitan council is to secure a copy of the developmental plan. As drafted, the term ''developmental plan'' was applied to the plan when approved by Parliament and the intention of new section 29 was to secure that the plan as so approved would be available for inspection by persons interested. With the amendments previously referred to, new section 29 becomes redundant, particularly as new section 28 provides that every metropolitan council is to be supplied with a copy of the plan as laid before Parliament. The new section is therefore struck out by this amendment.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I move—

To delete subsection (5) of new section 30.

New section 30 provides that a proclamation may be made on the application of the owner of any land, declaring that the land shall not be subdivided into allotments. New subsection (5) provides that any such proclamation is not to be made after the developmental plan has the force of law and is to continue in force after that time. As the provisions of the Bill relating to the developmental plan having the force of law have been struck out this subsection now has no meaning. New subsection (3) gives power to revoke or vary any proclamation made under the new section 30. The amendment therefore strikes out new subsection (5).

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendments and Committee's report adopted.

[*Sitting suspended from* 5.47 *to* 7.45 *p.m.*]

BRANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 10. Page 1518.)

The Hon. R. R. WILSON (Northern)—This is a most important Bill that will be appreciated by growers, buyers and manufacturers of wool. In the past metal tags have always been used for branding stud sheep, but clause 2 permits plastic tags to be used as well. Male animals are to be branded on the near side and females on the off side. Clauses 4 and 5 deal with the branding of racehorses and exempt those which are registered in the Stud Book. Clauses 5, 6, and 7 are the most important clauses in the Bill and they deal with sheep branding fluids. In the past oil paints have been commonly used, but a number of back yard manufacturers sprang up who used all sorts of material, such as sump oil and black jack in combination with tar. In the early days, when tar alone was used for branding, wool buyers and wool manufacturers were deeply concerned about the bad effect on fleeces. In 1950 the C.S.I.R.O. released a formula which was washable, but it would not stand up to wet weather soon after branding. The formula was improved in 1952 when what we know as L.B.E.—lanoline based emulsion—was introduced, but the black colour was hard to distinguish from the black insoluble fluids which this Bill deals with. It was also found that raddle, commonly used in marking sheep, contains fast dyes and growers are asked to refrain from using it extensively because of its insoluble ingredients. A conference of wool-growers, buyers, manufacturers and all other parties concerned decided to ask for legislation to prohibit the use of black fluid because of the cost to the wool industry. In 1953 a German wool buyer visited Australia and furnished a report about the Australian wool clip. He asserted that 2 per cent of the clip was lost through the use of black fluid or tar. In that year the price of wool was £100 a bale and therefore 2 per cent meant a loss of £2 a bale, or a total loss of £7,000,000 to £8,000,000 on the year's wool clip.

The tar brands have exercised the minds of the trade for a long time. The branding of sheep is easily the most successful means of identification, but the careless use of branding fluids reacts against growers. On many occasions I have taken the branded piece out of the fleece when it was thrown on to the table. That is an excellent way of preventing tar from penetrating through the wool, but if the branded pieces are not put into separate sacks and are merely thrown amongst the bellies and locks they do just as much damage as if they were left in the fleece; indeed, wool buyers say they would prefer it were left in the fleece if it is not to be separated from the other wool. The formula introduced by the C.S.I.R.O. has now proved to be satisfactory and consequently they are not satisfied with the continued use of black because it cannot be distinguished from oil paint. The only remedy, therefore, is to prohibit the use of black. At present we have four colours—black, red, green, and blue and the last mentioned three are quite good. The department is experimenting with brown and yellow branding colours and it will be interesting to get the reports from the experimental station. One cannot imagine yellow being particularly good, yet it is a fairly strong colour to the eye and it may prove quite successful. I think it wise, however, to wait until that colour has been proved before registering it.

As the proclamation will not be made until July 1, 1957, there is ample time for manufacturers and distributors to readjust any stocks on hand. It will also be a big undertaking for the Stock and Brands Department to reregister all brands now in black. I was pleased that the Chief Secretary introduced an amendment to deal with something that has been exercising the minds of stock firms in regard to stock mortgages, because brands are used on bales as well as on sheep. However, I am sure the amendment will overcome

that difficulty. The time of the changeover must be advertised in three leading newspapers so growers will have ample time to realize that as from July 1, 1957, they can no longer use the black colour. I support the Bill.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS (Northern)—As my colleague pointed out, this Bill consists of three amendments. The first two are not of great consequence. One makes a minor alteration consistent with altered conditions that have evolved over the years. The Act provides that stud sheep in particular shall be tagged with metal tags and the amendment simply enables plastic tags to be used as well. The second amendment relates to the branding of registered racehorses. It has been the practice for years for breeders of blood stock to have their own distinctive brands and it is provided that they shall have the right to put their brands on particular places which are not within the ordinary sequence of stock brands. The proposed alteration has been approved by the breeders so there can be no objection to that.

The main point of the Bill is in relation to the colour of the branding fluid that may be used for branding sheep. For about as long as I have had any active interest in stock handling there has been objection on the part of wool manufacturers to the Australian habit of branding fleece wool and sheep with insoluble fluids because it cannot be scoured out of the fleece and therefore in many ways it appears in their products. I have been informed that one of the disadvantages is that if there is an insoluble brand in the wool that the tops maker or the spinner is using it not only affects the material that he is manufacturing but it fouls his machinery and thereby may affect clean wool subsequently put through it. It has always been a source of wonderment to me that, because of a peculiar trait of human nature, people must be forced to do something that is in their own interests, and that seems to be the case in the matter of branding sheep.

This Bill is an endeavour to make it an offence to use black branding fluid. The C.S.I.R.O. has experimented with some success, but not complete success in as much as it has not yet found a satisfactory black branding fluid. Yellow, green, red and blue colours have been evolved but, although they may be soluble, sheep men have some objections to their use. Undoubtedly black is the most satisfactory colour. With the other colours in the drier areas it is not long after the new brand has been applied that there is difficulty to distinguish it. It would appear that it will be for the C.S.I.R.O. to evolve a soluble fluid in black. The new colours evolved cannot be introduced except by proclamation and that may be 12 months or even two years. The idea is to give the C.S.I.R.O. and others interested an opportunity to experiment further. Institutions and people who take mortgages over stock as a security rely on brands for the identification of their securities. I presume that in any legal document relating to that security the colour of the brand would be declared. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition—I am very interested in this Bill because it was my pleasure in 1925 to be chairman of a Royal Commission which was appointed to consider this question, particularly in its application to the leather trade. The other members of that Commission were Messrs. T. Gluyas, W. Morrow, E. Anthoney, W. Harvey, E. C. Vardon and S. R. Whitford. We were told in evidence that owing to faulty branding more than £1,000,000 annually was lost to the Commonwealth. The committee recommended that instead of stock being branded on the rump, the brand should be near the head. The commission's report included the following:—

The commission has been impressed by evidence of the enormous loss to the Commonwealth owing to the unsatisfactory branding and the tar marking and faulty flaying of hides, amounting to approximately £1,000,000 p.a. While unsatisfactory branding is practised in South Australia, many hides damaged in the manner indicated which find their way from the local market to tanneries here and in other States are those of cattle introduced from Queensland and elsewhere, but the fact that they are so badly branded is prejudicial to the reputation of South Australian hides. The commission considers that an early conference of the branding authorities of the different States to deal with the whole question of branding legislation is most advisable, with a view to restricting the size and nature of brands, and determining those portions of the hide upon which brands may be legally placed.

Although this subject has been considered for more than 30 years, very little alteration has been made in the meantime. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

The Hon. J. L. COWAN (Southern)—I support the Bill. There is no industry in Australia, either primary or secondary, which has lost so much income from bad management and neglect as the wool industry. It

has been suggested that more than 50 per cent of the brands used for sheep are in black. When a brand is registered the owner is allocated a colour, design and position on the sheep for the brand, and most of the sheep brands have been registered in black. Tar has been used on many occasions because it is black and a fast colour, not easily obliterated by grease or dust and is distinguishable until the next shearing. When the wool is sent to the mills to be scoured ready for manufacture into textiles the tar cannot be removed, and this had led to millions of pounds of loss to the Australian woollen industry. The Bill proposes to define a substitute colour or colours for black, to be proclaimed not later than July 1, 1957. It will all depend on the success of experiments whether a substitute colour for black can be found. Great difficulty may be met in this regard. We already have red, blue and green, which are quite satisfactory. For many years the C.S.I.R.O. has given attention to branding fluids and has met with considerable success and now has a formula for the three colours last mentioned. When manufactured according to the formula it is called the "Si-Ro-Mark." A licence is issued to the various branding fluid manufacturers who use this formula and on the container appears the name "Si-Ro-Mark," indicating that it is according to the formula of the C.S.I.R.O. The proposed use of plastic tags instead of metal tags is only in keeping with the times, because plastic is taking the place of metal for many uses. It is quite durable and more easily applied, and I think it will be a good substitute for metal ear tags and perhaps more comfortable to the beast.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—Metal tags can still be used.

The Hon. J. L. COWAN—That is so. This Bill gives permission to use plastic tags, and I think they will be used to a very great extent. Its provisions relating to the branding of thoroughbred horses are very sensible. Those animals have thin skins and it is desirable that their appearance be not marred by unsightly fire brands.

The Hon. A. J. Melrose—Why not every type of horse; why these particular horses?

The Hon. J. L. COWAN—There are not very many other horses that require to be branded or are in existence to be branded.

The Hon. A. J. Melrose—The few that we have are very valuable.

The Hon. J. L. COWAN—That may be so, and the same could be applied to them if they were registered. As thoroughbreds are registered, it will be an easy matter to do away with these extra brands. I believe this Bill is a move in the right direction, and that it is very long overdue. I think that the matter of obtaining a substitute colour for black will be successfully arrived at, and that the whole industry will benefit considerably by this measure.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE (Central No. 2)—I support this measure. Mr. Cowan said it was long overdue, but I wonder whether we are not precipitate, and whether we should not have carried out the experiments first and then decided to introduce this legislation. I think the key to this was in the Chief Secretary's second reading speech, when he said:—

The Australian Wool Bureau has made representations that the use of branding fluids not conforming to the C.S.I.R.O. formula should be prohibited.

We have been asked by the Federal body to come into line to help the general situation in regard to the sale of wool. I understand that, but I still feel that perhaps it would have been better to have carried out the experiments first and then to have brought in the prohibition. However, the prohibition is not to come in except by proclamation, when regulations may be made. I was perturbed when I compared the Bill with the conditions in the ordinary stock mortgage as to the effect of regulations, but the Minister has an amendment on file that I think will cover this point. It would be extremely difficult if, as new regulations were promulgated providing for brands of a different colour, the stock mortgage providing for a black brand would not be available.

I was pleased to hear Mr. Edmonds say that, even with brown or yellow, there would probably be enough of the brand remaining to identify the sheep subject to the stock mortgage. However, I think that the Minister's proposed amendment will make it clear that existing stock mortgages will still be good, and they will follow the regulations made altering the colours of brands to be used.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Transitional provisions."

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—I move to insert the following new subclause:—

If the colour of any paint brand is altered as aforesaid and if in any stock mortgage or preferable lien on wool within the meaning

of the Stock Mortgages and Wool Liens Act, 1924-1935, or in any bill of sale within the meaning of The Bills of Sale Act, 1886-1940, or in any other instrument whatsoever any reference is made to the paint brand which is so altered, the stock mortgage or preferable lien on wool, or bill of sale or instrument, as the case may be, shall be construed as if the reference therein to the paint brand were a reference to the paint brand as altered as aforesaid.

This amendment has been drafted to clear up any misapprehension by members and will put the matter beyond doubt.

New subclause inserted; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with an amendment, and Committee's report adopted.

NOXIOUS TRADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 15. Page 1553.)

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1)—This Bill is apparently to clarify the intentions of the principal Act, as it is now apparent that there has been considerable misunderstanding of the actual intentions of two or three sections. The sections that are amended by this measure are sections 9 and 10, and in addition new section 12a is to be inserted. Clause 2 provides:—

Section 9 of the principal Act is amended by adding at the end of subsection (2) thereof the words "or of any other premises erected on the land occupied with the premises in which the noxious trade is carried on at the time aforesaid.

Subsection 2 of section 9 provides:—

If at the time this Act is applied to any part of the State any person is carrying on a noxious trade in that part of the State, and if the noxious trade is not carried on in a noxious trades area or if the noxious trade is carried on in a noxious trade area but the noxious trade has not been specified by regulation as a noxious trade which may be carried on in that area, the local board, if satisfied as to the matters referred to in paragraphs (*b*) and (*c*) of subsection (1) shall grant a licence to that person to carry on the noxious trade, but any such licence shall be granted only in respect of those premises in which the noxious trade is carried on at the time aforesaid.

Clause 2 defines the intention of that subsection in relation to the time in which the trade will be licensed in those premises, and is apparently to clear up whether land that could be used for extension to the trade is within the purposes of the specific licence.

Section 10 permits the Minister in his discretion to revoke a licence after a period of five years has elapsed from the time the Act was first applied to the part of the State in which the premises are situated, but in such event the licensee has the right to apply to the Supreme Court for an order directing the Minister to pay to him such proportion, if any, of the expenses of removing the noxious trade to another premises as the court may direct. Clause 3 enacts new subsection 3 to section 10, and provides:—

In making an order for the payment of the said expenses, the Supreme Court shall not have regard to any building or other structure erected after the time this Act is applied to the part of the State in which the building or structure is erected.

With this provision embodied in the Act the position will be clarified. Section 12 of the principal Act contains only two small provisions relating to the right of appeal by an applicant whose licence has been refused. As the Minister pointed out, there is some confusion relating to the refusal of a licence or to the renewal of a licence and the appellant's licence is to be regarded as operative until the appeal has been determined. Time must elapse between the lodging of an appeal and its determination. From my experience of appeals against decisions, during the period prior to the determination of the appeal, the *status quo* remains. The Bill provides that if the Central Board is satisfied that the premises do not comply with the regulations, but if they did comply they should be licensed, and if it considers the applicant will do what is necessary to make the premises comply, the premises shall be deemed to be licensed. This Bill was introduced because of the doubt about the intentions of the original Act and will clarify the position. I support the second reading.

The Hon. Sir WALLACE SANDFORD (Central No. 2)—This Bill has been introduced because the present law has apparently been unsatisfactory, firstly because there is no uniformity in the law or some of the regulations issued under it. Although some trades have apparently been operating contrary to some of the provisions of the Act this Bill has not been introduced with any ill motive. It is merely designed to put the various sections in order. The 1943 Act is fairly lengthy and reads more like a local government statute. This Bill will have the effect of causing the law to be interpreted as it was originally designed to be construed. Sections 9 and 10 of the Act relate to the licensing of premises and to compensation to be paid

if premises are directed to be removed to another area. Clause 4 deals with the processes of appeal and while an appeal is before the court some degree of immunity is conceded to the trader. In explaining the Bill the Chief Secretary emphasized that it is a fair measure and will provide a greater degree of satisfaction than the present Act. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY (Central No. 2)—When the Noxious Trades Act was introduced in 1943 much discussion and argument took place and there was a degree of unpleasantness in the debate. However, since that time it has apparently operated satisfactorily, particularly as it has applied in the post-war period when building activity has increased. If a person extends his trade in a non-noxious area he does so at his own risk and if called upon to transfer his premises he cannot claim compensation for buildings erected after the time the provision is applied to the part of the State in which the building or structure is erected. That is a fair provision. Clause 4 provides for appeals and there are the necessary safeguards. It enables disagreements to be settled by negotiation. Although we all desire to see noxious trades transferred to appropriate areas we must consider the viewpoint of traders. I support the second reading.

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

POLICE REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 15. Page 1553.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—This short Bill provides for the appointment of a Deputy Commissioner of Police, something I have advocated for a considerable time. At present when the Commissioner is absent through illness or on duty in another State an acting Commissioner performs his duties. When Brigadier Leane was Commissioner of Police a Bill was introduced to extend his term of office by five years. He was then within three years of the normal retiring age of 60 and it was proposed to extend that term to 65. I took strong exception to it because I thought that the right time to pass legislation of this nature was just prior to his retirement. If members examine the duties of the police force today compared with the duties at that time they will observe that its members have to go through a much stricter course of instruction, examination and preparation.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—All to the good.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Yes, but as a consequence we should not put too much responsibility on one man. The first part of this Bill deals with the appointment of a Deputy Commissioner. I understand every other State has one and there is no reason why South Australia should not follow that precedent. The second portion of the Bill provides for the term of Deputy Commissioner to be the same as that of the Commissioner, namely that he shall retire at 65 instead of 60, and I am in favour of that. There is however, one omission. Throughout the police force all members but commissioned officers have the right of appeal, and I think Parliament might well consider extending that privilege to commissioned officers. I knew the present Commissioner when he was a clerk in the Local Court and he has proved himself to be a very efficient officer. He is entitled to an assistant to take his place during his absence, and therefore I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE (Central No. 2)—I not only support the Bill but support the idea that there should be a permanent second in command as it were. I take the opportunity of paying another tribute to the work of the police, particularly that of the Commissioner, during the past few years. After the visit of Her Majesty the Queen I complimented the police on the work they had done on that occasion, and I think everybody who comes here from overseas or from other States and has an opportunity to see the work of our police appreciates the fact that they are a splendid force. As I have said before, when one goes aboard a ship one knows as soon as one is received at the head of the gangway what sort of control there is on that ship. The Chief Secretary is, of course, the head of the department but the Police Commissioner has to carry out the work, and I think we have been very fortunate, in as much as the relationship between the police and the public has improved immensely during the tenure of office of the present Commissioner. It is highly desirable that he should have a permanent No. 2 with status and authority to carry on his work while he is absent for any reason. Therefore I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

In Committee.

(Continued from November 15. Page 1568.)

Clause 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Basis of fixing rent."

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I oppose this clause, the purpose of which is to raise the 27½ per cent permissible increase on 1939 rentals to 33⅓ per cent. I remember vividly the great promise made in 1949 about putting value back into the pound. Since then we have had the stabilizing of prices and the pegging of wages. When the Arbitration Court eliminated quarterly cost of living adjustments it said that it expected that there would be no increase in prices and that the stability that everyone desired would be brought about. We know that, despite the discontinuance of quarterly adjustments, the cost of living has increased. The Government claims that its policy is to prevent prices from rising, but by its own act it is now increasing the cost of living, throwing a further burden upon the worker who will have to pay increased rents in addition to other increases in prices, and we know that already there is a lag of 13s. between the actual cost of living and the basic wage.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—I am particularly pleased to support this clause. The simple answer to the honourable member is that in 1939 the basic wage was less than £4 and today it is a little over £11 11s., a rise of nearly 200 per cent. Therefore, by comparison the proposed increase of rent by 33⅓ per cent is small indeed. I think there is considerable misunderstanding of what has been done to landlords. They still feel they have been badly used and I have spoken for them on many occasions. This time I speak with some pleasure because at last we are doing them a little more justice. Under section 21 of the principal Act which we are now amending the trust has to take certain things into account. It provides that additional rent may be allowed for any expenditure reasonably incurred by the lessor for rates, taxes, insurance and other costs in respect of the premises beyond the expenditure which would have been reasonably incurred for that purpose immediately prior to September 3, 1939. Parliament has already agreed to an increase of 27½ per cent above the rent operating in 1939 and it is now proposed to make it 33⅓ per cent. We are gradually improving the position of the landlord a little and I therefore have much pleasure in supporting the clause.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY—I am not a landlord, but I have sympathy for landlords. I do not think that any fair-minded man would object to a small increase as suggested. One only has to see the state of neglect of some of these properties to realize that the landlord is unable to keep the premises in order because of the small rent received. That is not a condition anyone would like to continue. Many of those concerned are widows, and some are having a bad time. It is the people on the fixed incomes who are feeling the pinch and not the workers. As Mr. Cudmore said, there have been considerable increases in wages since 1939. I hope that members will support this very modest increase.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I am in duty bound to support my colleague in his objections to this clause. I have much sympathy for landlords. I have them coming to me almost daily concerning their position. It is idle for members to plead for landlords and at the same time agree to a pegged basic wage. Rents have been increased since the basic wage was pegged. I would not object to an increase in rent up to 40 per cent if the law provided for the added cost to be included in the basic wage. It is all very well for some members to plead for only one section. Landlords are entitled to consideration, but I shall not be a party to increasing rents while the basic wage is pegged. With any increase in rent, wages should be increased proportionately.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—I thank the honourable member for his remarks because I was rather fearing there would be opposition to the clause on the ground that it was unjust. I suppose that an average dwelling of five rooms in 1939 could be rented for 30s. or 32s. 6d. a week and on that basis, with the amendment included, it would now be worth about 10s. more, amounting to £26 a year. That would not pay for the kalsomining of one room. It seems to me rather a poor reward considering the increased value of investments. My conscience is much more at ease since the honourable member has spoken. I think the clause is more than reasonable and I am glad to have the assurance of members that that is so.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Recovery of possession of premises in certain cases."

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—My objection is to the provision that the notice to quit given to the lessee shall be for a period of not less than six months. We know that the minimum becomes the maximum. I feel that such a notice is too short in view of the acute shortage of houses. Some further consideration should be given to the tenants, because hardships are created for them in obtaining alternative accommodation. We all know it is difficult to obtain even a temporary home at short notice. The Housing Trust is doing a wonderful job in providing accommodation but the demand is so great, and is increasing because of the greater population, that a period of six months is too short. Once the lessor proves that he desires premises for specific purposes, the court cannot take anything further into consideration and has to issue an order to quit, so such a short period creates a hardship. I feel that the period should be 12 months, which would permit the tenant to obtain alternative accomodation.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (7 to 9) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment, and Committee's report adopted.

SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 15. Page 1573.)

The Hon. Sir WALLACE SANDFORD (Central No. 2)—Members will doubtless remember that a Bill was introduced in 1952 to amend the Succession Duties Act. Its purpose was an increase in revenue that had been prompted by the Commonwealth Grants Commission having made an adverse adjustment of about £240,000 in the grant to South Australia. The 1954 Bill covered other amendments to the Act and, as well, there were created four classes of beneficiaries instead of three. Also exemptions were raised for widows and children under 21, and increases were made in the rates on larger estates. The new scale, allowing also for the increasing value of real estate, increased the amount collected so that expressions of disapproval were heard in some directions. The opinion was then expressed that this type of duty is a form of wealth levy and in consequence not a desirable way of raising money. However, the amending Act of 1952 made a number of alterations to the principal Act, both to clauses and consequential amendments. It also struck out the second and third schedules that were printed into the Bill. The 1954 Act was a very short one, and affected only sections 3 and 4. When addressing myself to these clauses and sections, it presumes that members are conversant with the set-up of the Act. From earlier speeches, I gather that there will probably be amendments in Committee—indeed, there is one already on the files—so I shall content myself with supporting the second reading.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE (Midland)—I feel that I should not let this opportunity pass without voicing my thorough disapproval of the succession duties levy. While one is living one should readily subject oneself to taxation and pay one's footing through life, but it seems to me to be a very short-sighted policy to levy these iniquitous taxes on the estate of any person who has died. I am certain that if any State were to wipe out succession and estate duties it would have an influx of capital that would help it in very many ways, and that it would vastly gain by the exchange. There are some industries, perhaps particularly the one with which I am associated, in which the habit is not to spend every pound that is acquired, but to adopt the prudent policy of ploughing back most of the capital derived from it.

It has been proved through all civilization that when the land is robbed of everything it can produce it deteriorates rapidly, as proof of which we have such disasters as the Sahara and other great deserts throughout the world. The benefits of ploughing back into the soil the profits made out of it evidences itself very quickly in the improvement of the soil. The world-wide problem today, and the thing exercising the world's mind, is how food production can keep pace with population increases. It is not going to do it by denuding the soil, so I say that anything such as succession and death duties, and anything that hinders the ploughing back into the primary industries the profits that have been made out of them, militates against the future. Although I am a voice crying in the wilderness, and I might be accused of self-interest, I have always been closely associated with the land and with the policy of ploughing profits back into it, with the sure knowledge that eventually I would make more out of it than I would need. My own view of these matters is that if one gets three meals a day and £1 to spare one is wealthy, and if one has £100 to spare one is

very wealthy. I am wealthy, because I get three meals a day and have £1 to spare.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—Where did you get the pound from?

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—From accumulated reserves. Any land with which I have been associated has been the better for that association, because I have always followed the policy of ploughing back into it most of what it gave me. I am old enough to realize that provision has to be made for these iniquitous taxes, but nevertheless it only reminds me that if I want to say anything against them, however futile it may be, I should say it. As I said on a measure on which I was speaking earlier today, half a loaf is better than no bread. This measure is a very little step in the right direction, and I think in all earnestness that any State that would give away its profits from death and succession duties would shortly find itself better off for it. I support the second reading in so far as it will do some good, but I welcome this opportunity to say how iniquitous I think this type of taxation is.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Relief from duty on successive deaths."

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—In my speech on the second reading I asked two questions which I hoped would be explained in Committee. The first was the question of a quick double death and the duty being paid or not being paid. The other was whether it is necessary to have another definition of "net present value." Has the Chief Secretary any explanation to offer?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—I have not noted the first question, but as to the second I am advised that the wording is the same as in the principal Act and is applied in the same way.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—"Payments under policies of assurance."

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—I move to insert the following paragraphs:—

(*a*1) by adding after the word "pounds" in the fourth line the words "or if the total surrender value of a policy or policies on the life of another person and owned by the deceased does not exceed five hundred pounds at the date of the death of such owner;"

(*a*2) by inserting after the word "policy" in the fifth line the words "or policies or may allow dealings with the policy or policies."

(*b*1) by inserting after the word "policy" in the thirteenth line the words "or policies."

When speaking on the second reading I pointed out that in other places there have been amendments to the death duties legislation providing that if people who hold policies on the lives of other people die their representatives may collect the surrender value of the policy on the lives of people still living under the same exemptions as to the production of probate as in the case of the death of individuals. For the amendment to be understood clearly it must be read in conjunction with section 63a (6) of the principal Act which this clause amends. This reads:—

If the amount payable in respect of a policy of assurance on the life of a deceased person who was at the date of his death domiciled in South Australia does not exceed two hundred pounds, a corporation, company, or society, may pay the amount payable in respect of the policy without production of such certificate as aforesaid or such consent as aforesaid if the corporation, company, or society is satisfied by a declaration of some person that:—

(*a*) the gross value of the whole of the estate of the deceased person does not exceed five hundred pounds;

This clause amends that in two ways in accordance with the fall in the value of money The £200 is raised to £500 and the £500 to £1,500. That is to say, the amendment will operate if the succession is not more than £500 and the total value of the estate is not more than £1,500. My amendment brings on to exactly the same basis the person who holds a policy on the life of somebody else and dies. His personal representative will be able to collect the surrender value of the policy if the whole estate is not of the value of more than £1,500 and the surrender value is not more than £500 in the same way as we are enabling assurance companies to pay out on ordinary life policies.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—The amendment has been clearly explained by the mover. The Government considers the amendment a fair extension of the Act and I accept it.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—I support the amendment, but I take the opportunity to draw the Government's attention to what might be called the most meagre justice being meted out under this Bill in respect of estates of the value of a humble home. On today's

values. I would say it would be a very humble home indeed that a man would leave to his widow and family worth only £2,000. At £1,500 a widow might not be able to keep a roof over her head. We are following the good South Australian tradition of being too parsimonious. Individually, there has never been any question about the generosity of South Australian families, but when it comes to a public gesture they hold up their hands in horror and say, "Mon, it costs too much." The least we can do in times of inflation is to allow a widow to have a roof over her head, and I ask the Minister to consider increasing the amount to at least the value of a very humble home.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendment and Committees report adopted.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Introduced by the Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary) and read a first time.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The main proposal contained in this Bill is that every person registered after June 30, 1958, as a medical practitioner, will be required to serve as a resident medical officer for at least 12 months before he commences practice. The Bill has been prepared pursuant to a request which was made by the Faculty of Medicine of the Adelaide University, with the support of the University Council and the Medical Board of South Australia. The proposal is similar to a scheme in New South Wales which was provided for some time ago by legislation in that State and was brought into operation in November of last year. New Zealand and the United Kingdom also have legislation for the same purpose, although the form of it differs somewhat from both the New South Wales Act and this Bill. This Bill requires the medical practitioner to have hospital experience after he is registered, but before he commences private practice. New Zealand and the United Kingdom require hospital experience after graduation but before registration.

The Government is credibly informed that because the English medical authorities now require compulsory hospital experience, they no longer recognize South Australian qualifications as being sufficient to entitle a South Australian practitioner to registration in the United Kingdom. The proposal in this Bill has for a long while been generally regarded by medical authorities as being desirable; but it could not be introduced until there were sufficient positions for resident medical officers in hospitals to enable all medical graduates to obtain the required 12 months' experience. Clause 4 contains the provisions necessary for the proposed scheme.

There is a certain amount of flexibility in the clause. The compulsory experience which is required can be got in any public hospital within the meaning of the Hospitals Act or any other institution which is proclaimed as an approved institution for the purposes of the Bill. The Medical Board is given power to grant exemptions from the obligation to serve in a hospital. Such a power is necessary because there will no doubt be applications in future, as there have been in the past, from experienced persons from other countries to be registered in South Australia and there will be no reason for requiring all of these people to serve as resident medical officers. There is also a power to suspend the operation of the provisions in cases of emergency or other circumstances if it is desirable in the public interests to do so.

Clause 3 deals with a different problem, namely, reciprocity between South Australia and other countries in the matter of registration. This question has created some difficulties and may again do so. The introduction of this Bill affords an opportunity to put the law on a more satisfactory basis. The amendments proposed are in the provisions dealing with the registration in this State of persons who are registered or entitled to be registered in the United Kingdom. Under the principal Act a person is entitled as of right to registration if he is registered in the United Kingdom or possesses qualifications entitling him to be registered in the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom grants registration to persons holding qualifications granted in a number of other countries, as well as to persons holding qualifications granted by Universities and other institutions in the United Kingdom. This Bill does not affect the right to registration of a person who has qualifications obtained in a University or Medical School of the United Kingdom. It is, however, anomalous that South Australia should be obliged—as it is at present—to recognize qualifications obtained in other countries irrespective of whether those countries recognize South Australian degrees and registrations. By this

Bill conditions of medical practice in this State are being made more stringent, and it would be inconsistent if the Medical Board were still obliged to recognize a qualification obtained in a country whose standards may be lower than our own, and which grants no reciprocal registration to our own graduates.

For these reasons it is proposed to amend the paragraph dealing with the registration of United Kingdom practitioners so that registration as of right will be granted only to United Kingdom practitioners who have obtained their qualifications in the United Kingdom. This does not mean, however, that a person registered in the United Kingdom by virtue of qualifications obtained elsewhere will in no circumstances be able to secure registration in South Australia. He will, however, have to apply under provisions of the Act different from those applicable to practitioners from the United Kingdom and will have to satisfy the board that he has passed through a course of medical study of not less than five years' duration and which is recognized by the board as not lower in standard than that required in this State. In addition, his qualification will not be recognized unless the country which granted it recognizes qualifications obtained in South Australia. The amendments made by clause 3 are therefore for the purpose of establishing these two principles, namely:—

(*a*) that in future a United Kingdom practitioner will only be granted registration in this State as of right by virtue of qualifications obtained in the United Kingdom:

(*b*) that a person whether registered in the United Kingdom or not whose qualifications were obtained in a country outside Australia, New Zealand or the United Kingdom will not be entitled to registration unless that country grants reciprocal registration to South Australian practitioners, and the qualifications relied on are of a standard not lower than those of this State.

The Bill will not affect any existing registration.

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

NATIONAL PARK ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This is one of the two Bills which have been introduced as a result of discussions between the Government and representatives of the citizens who are interested in the formation of a National Trust. Those who have in recent years taken an interest in the movement for the formation of a National Trust have been actuated by diverse motives. Some are desirous of preserving sites, buildings and chattels which are of interest from the point of view of the history of South Australia. Others desire that lands should be set aside because of their natural beauty or because they contain relics of aboriginal art and other activities. Others again desire that various tracts of country should be protected so that their natural vegetation and bird and animal life will be maintained in perpetuity in the interests of science. The Commissioners of the National Park have advocated the formation of a National Trust mainly because of their interest in the plant and animal life of the State from the scientific point of view. They have also been influenced by the idea that in the interests of the health of future generations it is desirable that adequate areas of land should be maintained in a natural condition within a reasonable distance of the main centres of population.

These various points of view have all been considered by the Government and, after discussion with representatives of the interested groups, the Government agreed that in addition to a Bill for the formation of a National Trust, a measure would also be introduced extending the powers of the Commissioners of the National Park so that they could take over the control and management of other areas and maintain them in their natural condition as wild-life reserves. The National Park Commissioners already possess an organization which is well adapted to look after wild-life reserves. Among the commissioners are representatives of leading learned societies of South Australia, and of the State Forests, the Botanic Gardens, the Royal Zoological Society and the Government. They have had long experience in this kind of work. The provisions of the Bill, therefore, are all directed to the one object, namely the extension of the powers of the commissioners in the direction I have indicated.

Clauses 3 and 4 alter the long title and preamble of the principal Act, so as to make it

clear that the Act will apply to wild-life reserves. Clause 5 alters the title of the commissioners for a similar purpose. It also provides that, in addition to the Minister of Lands, an officer of the Department of Lands nominated by the Minister will be one of the commissioners. It is not always possible for the Minister to attend meetings and for this reason and because of the possibility that further Crown lands may be placed under the control of the commissioners it is desirable that the department should have another representative. Clause 6 provides that the Governor may by proclamation declare that land vested in the commissioners, or of which the commissioners are lessees, or which is under the care, control and management of the commissioners, shall be a wild-life reserve within the meaning of the Act. It is contemplated that any land which is to be established as a wild-life reserve will be dedicated and placed under the care, control and management of the commissioners by appropriate action under the Crown Lands Act, and thereafter dealt with under the National Park and Wild-Life Reserves Act.

Clauses 7 to 12 are all consequential amendments. Clause 13 extends the powers of the commissioner to accept grants and gifts of land and personal property and exempts them from stamp duty and succession duty on such gifts. Clause 14 provides that wild-life reserves or other lands under the control and management of the commissioners will be exempt from rates and taxes, as the National Park now is. Clause 15 makes it clear that wild-life reserves cannot be mortgaged or made security for debts of the commissioners and clause 16 enables the commissioners to expend their revenue on wild-life reserves as well as the National Park.

The Hon. Sir WALLACE SANDFORD secured the adjournment of the debate.

AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS BILL.

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to regulate the sale of agricultural chemicals. At present the sale of fertilizers is regulated by the Fertilizer Act, and the sale of fungicides, insecticides and vermin destroyers by the Pest Destroyers Act. These are no longer adequate for present day requirements.

First, the number of agricultural chemicals on the market multiplies almost daily and the present legislation does not apply to many of the new products. Thus, the present legislation does not apply to trace elements, plant hormones or weedkillers. In the interests of the public it is desirable that the sale of these substances should be regulated. Trace elements are used for the purpose of correcting soil deficiencies and their importance is well known. The plant hormones are used principally for the prevention of fruit drop and for the promotion of fruit setting and are of increasing importance. Weedkillers are becoming very widely used in agriculture. Crop spraying in particular is becoming a common practice. It is important for both farmers and the general public that these agricultural chemicals should be of proper quality and efficacious for the purposes for which it is claimed they can be used. For example, it is desirable that trace elements should be properly mixed with the substances with which they are to be spread. The Government's attention has been drawn to the fact that trace elements are in instances not properly compounded with the substances with which they are sold. Also it is doubtful whether the Fertilizers Act applies to foliar fertilizers. It is desirable that foliar fertilizers should be under the same control as other fertilizers, and that doubt about the matter should be removed.

Second, the present Acts do not make adequate provision to prevent the sale of substances under misleading names, or false, misleading or indefinite descriptions. The Fertilizers Act provides for the licensing of fertilizers, and the Pest Destroyers Act for the registration of pest destroyers. The procedure in both cases which, for convenience, I will refer to as registration, is automatic. On the making of an application in due form registration cannot be refused. This means that an application may be made for the registration of a substance under a name which indicates that it contains specified ingredients, when, in fact, it does not contain them. Thus, substance which are not bordeaux powder are registered as "Bordo" and "Bordacide," and substances which are not copper carbonate are registered as "Copper Carbonate." A substance was also at one time registered as "Derridust" which did not, in fact, contain any derris. ("Derridust" now in fact contains derris.) Similarly, if a false description of the composition of a substance is given on an application for registration, registration

must still be granted. It is true that a person who sold the substance could be prosecuted for giving a false description of the substance if he repeated the description on a label under which he sold the substance, but it is unsatisfactory that registration should be granted in the first place. A further difficulty arises under the Pest Destroyers Act. While under the Fertilizers Act particulars of the quantities of the chemicals specifically mentioned in the Act must be furnished, the Pest Destroyers Act merely requires percentages of the substances which are claimed to be active constituents to be set out. The manner in which the active constituents must be stated is not regulated. This means that there is no way of preventing indefinite descriptions which have no specific chemical meaning from being supplied and used. Thus the expressions "chlorinated benzene," "hydrocarbon oils" and "essential oils" are expressions in use which have no specific meaning. Descriptions may also be inadequate. Thus there is no necessity to disclose the isomer content of B.H.C. or D.D.T. The isomer content is relevant to the effectiveness of those chemicals.

Third, there is no method under the present Acts of preventing the marketing of substances the use of which might cause injury to health, or substances which are not really effective for the uses to which it is claimed they can be put. The many new developments in agricultural chemicals make it necessary that measures should be taken for the protection of public health and to prevent substantially useless substances being passed off on the public.

Fourthly, there is no power under existing legislation to cancel the registration of any substance. The whole subject has been carefully investigated by a departmenal committee which has recommended that the existing Acts be repealed and replaced by a single Act.

This would have two advantages. First, it would simplify the administration of the legislation, and second, it would avoid the necessity of registering a substance under more than one Act. There are a number of substances which serve more than one purpose and at present have to be registered under both Acts. The Government has decided, after giving the matter full consideration, to adopt the recommendation of the Committee that the existing legislation should be repealed and replaced by a single Act under which the sale of all types of agricultural chemicals would be controlled. The Government is accordingly introducing this Bill.

The Bill provides for the registration of labels to be used on packages containing agricultural chemicals. The registration of labels is made the responsibility of the Minister of Agriculture, who is empowered to refuse registration on various grounds set out in the Bill, namely, that the substance intended to be sold under the label is substantially ineffective for any purposes for which it is claimed it can be used. Power is given to the Minister to cancel the registration of a label in certain circumstances. As a general rule, the label must state particulars of the substances which are claimed to be active constituents of the agricultural chemical. A detailed description of the composition is not required to be given on the label. However, a detailed description is required to be furnished with the application as "additional particulars." In certain cases, particulars of active constituents may be furnished as additional particulars. The Bill provides that where an applicant can establish that a secret process or formula might be disclosed if he were required to state any active constituents of a substance in a label, he may register the particulars of the active constituents as additional particulars.

The Bill makes it an offence to sell an agricultural chemical except in a package with a copy of a registered label affixed to it, and also makes it an offence to sell a substance in a package with a copy of a registered label affixed to it, if the substance does not comply in every respect with the particulars stated in the copy and the registered additional particulars. Both the Fertilizers Act and the Pest Destroyers Act contain provisions affecting civil rights arising out of the sale of fertilizers and pest destroyers. Thus there are provisions creating warranties and enabling purchasers to refuse delivery. This Bill omits these provisions altogether. It is considered that it is better to leave these matters to be decided by the ordinary law of contract.

The details of the Bill are as follow:—Clause 2 provides for the Bill to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 repeals the Fertilizers Act and the Pest Destroyers Act. Clause 4 is an interpretation clause. The only definitions which call for comment are those of "active constituent" and "agricultural chemical." The Bill defines agricultural chemical as a substance commonly used, or represented by the seller as capable of being used, for any of four purposes. These purposes are as follows: for preventing, regulating or promot-

ing the growth of any vegetation; for improving the fertility or structures of soil in any way; for protecting vegetation or fruit or other products of any vegetation from attack by insects, animal fungi, parasitic plants, bacteria or virus and for destroying vermin.

The Bill also provides that the Governor may declare a substance to be an agricultural chemical by proclamation.. This definition is wide enough to include all forms of fertilizers, plant hormones and weedkillers. Provision is made for substances to be excluded from the operation of the Act by proclamation. It is at present proposed to exempt certain natural products which have some value as fertilizers, for example, farmyard manure, crude night soil, crude offal and seaweed, and also substances which can be used both for agricultural purposes and for other purposes when they are sold for use for such other purposes, namely copper sulphate, sulphur, lime and zinc oxide. This matter is left to be dealt with by proclamation because it is considered that to attempt to deal with it in the Bill would lead to too great rigidity. It is almost certain that the list of exemptions will from time to time require amendments and additions, and these can be made readily by proclamation. The Bill defines "active constituent" to mean a constituent substance which is effective for any of the purposes mentioned in the definition of "agricultural chemical" or which materially influences the effectiveness for any of those purposes of any constituent substance.

Clause 5 provides for the appointment of inspectors and analysts for the purpose of the legislation. Clause 6 provides, in effect, that a label attached to a package containing an agricultural chemical need not be a fascimile of the registered label, although it must contain particulars identical in all material respects with those stated in the registered label. It is unnecessary to insist on the use of exact copies of registered labels.

Clause 7 sets out the circumstances under which a substance shall for the purposes of the Bill be deemed not to comply with the particulars shown in the label and the additional particulars. A substance will be deemed not to comply with such particulars only where the quantity of any claimed active constituent is greater or less than the quantity indicated in the particulars by more than the prescribed tolerance, or where the constituent substances are not properly mixed or where the substance is deemed not to comply with the particulars by virtue of the regulations. It is desirable that the circumstances in which a substance will be regarded as not complying with particulars of composition should be limited, but that at the same time it is neither practicable or desirable to set out all the circumstances in the Bill. Hence the Bill provides for the matter to be dealt with for the most part by regulation.

Clause 9 makes it an offence to sell, offer for sale, expose for sale, or have in possession for the purpose of sale a substance in a package with a registered label affixed to it unless the substance complies with the particulars shown in the label and the registered additional particulars. It is a defence to a charge under clause 9 if the defendant obtained the substance already packed and labelled and that the defendant believed on reasonable grounds that the substance complied with the particulars. Thus a person who manufactures and packs an agricultural chemical will be placed under a strict liability for any deficiency in the product marketed by him, while a dealer who purchases an agricultural chemical manufactured and packed by another will not be responsible for any deficiency in the agricultural chemical so long as he can show that he had reasonable grounds to believe that the agricultural chemical complied with the particulars.

Clause 10 makes it an offence for a person who sells an agricultural chemical in the course of his business to make any false or misleading claim in respect of the agricultural chemical. This clause is principally designed to prevent false or misleading advertising, examples of which have come to the notice of the Government. It will also prevent the inclusion of false or misleading matter in a label other than a registered label attached to a package containing an agricultural chemical.

Clause 11 makes it an offence to sell, offer for sale, expose for sale or have in possession for the purpose of sale any agricultural chemical which does not comply with the prescribed standard. A defence to a charge of this offence somewhat similar to the defence provided for the offence created by clause 9 is provided. The Pest Destroyers Act provides for the fixing of standards. Only one standard has in fact been fixed, namely a standard for copper carbonate. This standard will be enforced by clause 11. It is proposed that, if possible, other standards should be fixed in the future, as standards are regarded as a valuable means of regulating the sale of agricultural chemicals. However, there will be some delay

before any further standards are fixed. Work recently done on the subject has revealed that the fixing of standards is a complex matter.

Clause 12 deals with applications for registration of labels and additional particulars. The clause sets out the particulars which are to be included in a label, and provides for the use of abbreviations and symbols. Particulars of the composition of a substance must be given in compliance with the regulations and any directions given by the Minister. This provision will ensure that the particulars given have a definite chemical meaning. Clause 12 provides for the payment of a registration fee of 5s.

Clause 13 enables an application to be made for the registration of a label which does not disclose the active constituents of the substance intended to be sold under the label. The clause provides that on such an application particulars of the active constituent of the substance must be supplied as additional particulars. The clause provides that the Minister shall not deal with the application unless he is satisfied that the disclosure of the particulars might lead to the disclosure of a secret process or formula and that some person might thereby suffer loss. Provision is made elsewhere in the Bill to prevent as far as possible the disclosure of particulars supplied to the Minister under this clause.

Clause 14 sets out the grounds on which the Minister may refuse the registration of a label. They are as follows:

(*a*) that the substance intended to be sold under the label is substantially ineffective for any purpose mentioned therein or in additional particulars as a purpose for which the applicant claims or intends the substance may be used;

(*b*) that if the substance is used for any such purpose, there may be a substantial risk of injury to health of members of the public;

(*c*) that the distinctive name of the substance is misleading;

(*d*) that any statement in the application or in the label is false or misleading in a material particular;

(*e*) that in any respect the substance does not comply with the particulars stated in the label or the additional particulars;

(*f*) that a standard having been prescribed which applies to the substance, the substance does not comply with that standard; or

(*g*) that a constituent substance which is not claimed as an active constituent of the substance ought to be so claimed.

The clause provides that the Minister must not register a label unless he is satisfied that the substance if sold under the label would not be sold in contravention of the Poison Regulations. An application for registration must otherwise be granted as of right unless the Minister is satisfied that a ground exists for the refusal of registration.

Clause 15 enables one label to be registered for a number of packages containing different quantities of the same substance. Clauses 16 to 22 enact various machinery provisions. Among other things they deal with such matters as the annual renewal of registration, the alteration of a registered label or registered additional particulars and the keeping of a register of labels and additional particulars. Clause 21 enables the Minister to refer any matter arising out of an application to the Central Board of Health for the report of the Board.

Clause 23 provides for the cancellation of registration. Two grounds of cancellation are provided, namely, that the person who obtained the registration has sold, offered for sale, exposed for sale or had in his possession for the purpose of sale, any substance in a package with a copy of a registered label affixed to it and the substance has not complied with the particulars contained in the copy and the registered additional particulars or the person has been convicted of an offence against the Bill. The first of the grounds mentioned in this clause is included mainly in order to facilitate the enforcement of the provisions of the Bill against interstate manufacturers. Many agricultural chemicals are manufactured and packed in other States and it is expected that difficulty would be experienced in prosecuting such persons for offences against the Bill.

Clauses 24 to 28 provide for the taking of samples by inspectors and by private purchasers, for the analysis of such samples, for the publication of the result of an analysis, and other matters incidental to the taking of samples and the analysis of samples. Clause 29 enables a court, on convicting a person of an offence against the Act by means of evidence of an analysis to order the person to pay the costs of the analysis. Clause 30 makes it an offence to obstruct the Minister or any inspector or analyst in the execution of his powers and duties under the Bill. The provisions of clauses 24 to 30 are substantially similar to provisions contained in the Fertilizers Act and the Pest Destroyers Act.

Clause 31 requires the Minister to take all reasonable steps to ensure that information supplied to him under the Act concerning the composition of substances is not unnecessarily

disclosed to the public. Clause 32 provides for the making of regulations. The clause provides, in particular, for the making of regulations for the taking of grab samples. The purpose of this provision is to enable samples to be taken by which the proper mixing of an agricultural chemical can be determined. In order to obviate any injustice arising from the method of taking samples provision is made that different tolerances may be prescribed to apply where grab samples are taken. The clause also enables regulations to be made requiring packages containing agricultural chemicals to be labelled with a brand where ordinary labels are not suitable for use.

Clauses 33, 34, and 35 deal with legal procedure. Clause 34 enables a complaint for an offence against the Bill to be laid within 12 months of the matter of the complaint arising. Normally, by virtue of the Justices Act, a complaint must be laid within six months. The object of clause 34 is to facilitate the prosecution of the person who originally packs and labels an agricultural chemical in contravention of the Bill, by giving more time for the offence to be discovered.

Clause 36 is a transitional provision in effect providing for the continuance of a registration under the Fertilizers Act or the Pest Destroyers Act until the normal expiry date. The clause enables any substance not registered under either of those Acts to be packed in packages not labelled with a label registered under this Bill for three months after the commencement of the Bill. Clause 37 amends the Stock Medicines Act. The effect of clause 37 is to bring within the scope of that Act substances used for preventing insects or other pests from attacking stock. The sale of such substances is at present controlled by the Pest Destroyers Act. Clause 37 also provides that the Stock Medicines Act shall not apply to any agricultural chemical within the meaning of the Bill. Clause 37 is designed to make a convenient division of work in the Department of Agriculture.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.20 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, November 17, at 2 p.m.