

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.**

Wednesday, September 18, 1957.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

**METROPOLITAN DRAINAGE WORKS  
(INVESTIGATION) BILL.**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 4. Page 561.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—It is rather extraordinary that a Bill such as this has no clause relating to maintenance. This is a very important thing, and the Minister proposes to move an amendment in reference to this matter. How that was overlooked I fail to understand. I am indebted to the Minister for letting me have a copy of the report submitted by the gentlemen who were appointed as a sub-committee to deal with this question. I recall similar Bills being introduced over a period of years dealing with damage by floodwaters. There was a Bill dealing with the outlet to the sea of the River Torrens waters, a work that was estimated to cost £209,000. The Commonwealth Government made a grant of £100,000 towards the cost of the metropolitan floodwaters scheme.

The Hon. J. L. S. Bice—When was that?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I think it was in 1935. The present Bill refers the matter to the Public Works Standing Committee for them to recommend as it thinks fit. As the Bill is a simple one referring the project to the committee for investigation I do not think anyone could object to it. I merely mention that in the previous recommendation councils within the catchment area were asked to pay 33½ per cent; the corporations and councils whose territory embraced the benefiting areas paid a similar amount, less an amount of £125 to be paid annually by the Municipal Tramways Trust. For the River Sturt, Keswick and Brownhill Creek's scheme an amount of £27,000 was provided through a Commonwealth grant. The estimated cost was £78,740. Clause 3 details the questions to be referred to the Public Works Standing Committee.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—Was there any mention of maintenance in the previous Bill?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Yes. Three men were appointed in April last as a sub-committee to deal with the problem of storm water drainage in the south-western suburbs, and they have submitted a very valuable report, which I hope honourable members

will study. The committee consisted of Mr. D. H. Susman, the city engineer of the Marion Council, Mr. L. F. Lierich, the designing engineer of the Highways and Local Government Department, and Mr. J. S. Gerney, the designing engineer of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The estimated cost of the undertaking is £3,470,000, which is more than the expected cost for the Myponga reservoir. Such a cost could not be met by the councils concerned, except over a long period. The Government has agreed that the matter should be deferred until a thorough investigation is undertaken. The Bill does not propose that the amount to be spent should be £3,470,000.

The work has been divided into two stages. The first stage relates to River Sturt improvements, plus the most urgent of the drains which would benefit a large area by alleviating flooding immediately they were completed. The works comprised in the first stage are estimated to cost £1,774,000. The execution of these works would not commit the Government or the councils to any further expenditure. The committee's opinion is that the second stage will be necessary later, but no further consideration is to be given to that matter at this juncture. I am sure that members will appreciate the great importance of the scheme. I remember on one occasion a scheme was recommended to the committee, and after it had taken evidence it came to the conclusion that the project should not be before the committee. It therefore drew the Crown Solicitor's attention to the position, and the proposal was withdrawn. All the Bill proposes is to refer the matter to the Public Works Committees for investigation, and therefore I support the second reading.

The Hon. J. L. S. BICE secured the adjournment of the debate.

**PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL.**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 17. Page 619.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland)—One could speak on a number of subjects in this debate, but in view of what has been happening to us at the hands of our friends in Canberra I shall confine myself to one or two items. I notice there is an amount of £500,000 on the Estimates for the Lake Victoria storage scheme, to which Sir Frank Perry rightly referred yesterday. This is to provide for further work to be done on that important storage, which supplies water to the

Murray for use in South Australia, including Adelaide. I was pleased to be present yesterday in the House of Assembly and hear reference to the Murray Water Agreement, which links up with the important subject of expenditure on Lake Victoria and the other storage basins on the Murray. It is necessary that South Australia should be given an opportunity to see what will happen to the water to be released from the Snowy River into the tributaries of the Murray and the Murrumbidgee.

I can foresee that in the not too far distant future South Australia will be more and more dependent on its only inland waterway. It is expensive to distribute water through canals or channels because of wastage by evaporation, and therefore the conveying of water through mains is the more economical. This season is the first during the last 10 years that South Australian primary producers have had a dearth of water, and at this early stage we can see signs of panic because of the inadequate storage of fodder, with people throwing sheep and other livestock on the market at depreciated values.

The question arises what can be done to ensure that the average primary producer always has some fodder on his property and his dams full of water, and the only way to do that is to get water from the Murray and pipe it to where it is needed. It does not matter whether it is at Coonalpyn or on the other side of Whyalla, the capital cost will be great; but if we can ensure that a man can be kept in business and that our primary production can be maintained at something like a static level, surely it is worth the effort, to gradually but progressively start to get water to these areas.

I compliment the Government on what it has done to date. When the Whyalla pipeline was first envisaged the idea was to take water only to that township, but look at what has happened on the route. It has been tapped at numerous points to enable people to get at least a tank of water. Some are irrigating pastures and this is all helping to stave off those very deep troughs we experience in our economy from time to time because of droughts and other adversities.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—It will not be long before the main will have to be duplicated.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—And that would not be a bad thing either. If I knew when I was 20 how big I was going to be now, I would have bought a suit to meet my requirements, but we cannot always foresee the

future. However, we should attempt to meet requirements of the foreseeable future. Another route may be decided upon for the new main, and thus many other people will be served. The point that I am coming to is that we cannot miss a trick, but must pursue every avenue to see that we are granted our full share of the water that comes into the Murray. It has cost this State a lot of money to make contributions under the River Murray Agreement but we have not always taken full advantage of it, as we have let too much water go into the sea.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Haven't we missed our advantage now?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—We will have to wait until Thursday to see whether we have. We must watch our interests in this matter. The river has overflowed its banks at times and has cost the State a lot of money, and we have also seen the times when we have had to sandbag the river to keep pumps operating, but perhaps we will not see that again. It has been suggested to me by people who should know better—people who are representing us in Canberra, of both political parties—that we are adopting a dog in the manger attitude with regard to this water—if we do not want it ourselves, we will not let the other States have it. That, in my opinion, is like a person who has quite a lot of money now and has two small sons, but does not need the money for them for the time being, saying to someone else, "You go into business on my behalf and when my boys are big enough you give me my money back." If the man does not choose to do it the father has no legal rights at all, and the same applies to the water from the Murray. If we give Victoria and New South Wales this share of the water, we will not get it back when we need it in 15 or 20 years time because canning, cotton and rice growing industries will grow up in the meantime in those States. The Federal Government says that it only wants to borrow the water until we need it, but how will we get it back? If those industries are set up in the other States, do members think the Commonwealth will say that as South Australia really needs the water those industries must die to let us have it back? That is the position now, and I am pleased to see that both sides of the House of Assembly have taken such a vigorous attitude to see whether we cannot get our rights under the Snowy River Waters Agreement.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—The Labor Party said it was only an electioneering stunt when the Premier raised it 18 months ago.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—I do not want to see politics rear its ugly head in this matter, but I think that when the Leader of the Opposition asked a question on the matter yesterday he had the backing of the South Australian Parliament. The Utah Construction Company has been working for 18 months on opening the intakes to Lake Victoria to speed up the entry of water, thereby allowing us a greater holding capacity in that great lake. I think we should do more of this work in the middle and lower reaches of the river. Without very much effort and without a great expenditure many of our backwaters and lagoons could be utilized as storage basins, which would provide at the same time a supply of water for the country adjacent to those backwaters.

In the Address in Reply debate I mentioned that much of our country that is suitable for horticultural and pastoral purposes is not adjacent to the river, and it therefore entails a great deal of capital outlay on the part of individuals who are prepared to put everything they have into developing the country, whereas the Government should do some logging and place inlet and outlet valves on those areas because, when we analyse it, we have not spent very much on the development there. Except at Berri, Barmera and Waikerie and on the lower Government settlements we have not helped the man who has put his own money into development. I have discussed this matter with the heads of departments, who think it is quite a good idea, and I hope that the Treasurer will see his way clear to provide the money to investigate the matter.

Sir Frank Perry very rightly struck a word of warning with regard to the Electricity Trust. I am very much in favour of that undertaking, which has done a wonderful job for the development of areas all over the State, but it seems to me that earnings of £55,000 with a £65,000,000 asset are very small indeed.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—I think the honourable member is mistaken in his figures.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—The figure of £55,000 is the net profit after interest.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—That is a very small profit. The first duty of any business, if it is to protect itself, is to build up reserves, and to do that it sometimes keeps shareholders very short of dividends.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—The Prices Commissioner does not recognize that that is a proper thing.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—I will come to that too. I do not think that any other business with a capital investment of £65,000,000 would be satisfied to have just a little over £1,000,000 in reserves after 10 years operations. In business you want more than that. It appears to me that perhaps a small increase in the revenue, even of only 1 per cent, would give a handsome gain to the trust. It has been said that one-eighth of a penny increase in the cost of power would provide an extra £1,000,000 a year to the trust. We should not peg such undertakings as the Electricity Trust under price control as it is. I do not think it is going to frighten away one industry from South Australia if we increase the cost of power a little. If I thought it would I would not advocate an increase. We must not get to the position of letting a utility become run down simply because we are saving a fraction of a penny per unit. I feel we should have a good look at the position, because the object of the trust was to reduce surcharges to rural areas.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—And meter rent.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—Oh no. The idea was to reduce surcharges out of the profits of the trust. If the trust is making only a little profit it cannot possibly reduce these surcharges. If we are to develop the areas in zone 5 these surcharges must be reduced. If the trust can get a little more profit by increasing the cost of power by a fraction of a penny per unit, I think we will be able to develop our outlying areas and induce industries into them.

As most members know we have had great difficulty in maintaining communications in the flooded areas. The Paringa Bridge, which is the only one in the upper Murray, has given a lot of concern for some years and particularly in recent months. The Minister recently replied to a question of mine, and quite frankly I was not very pleased with the reply. He has since shown me a document from which it would appear that in the very near future we are to have a concrete decking provided on that bridge. When that is done it will not be one hour before time. The bridge is in a deplorable condition, and I am pleased to see that tenders are to be let forthwith for that work. It is the only connecting link between Victoria and South Australia apart from the bridge at Murray Bridge, which is about 150 miles away.

Mr. Condon in his speech yesterday referred to the question of a bridge over the River

Murray, a subject which is now being investigated by the Public Works Committee. It is most essential that we have some permanent form of communication in the upper Murray between Adelaide and the Victorian border, without being inconvenienced by high rivers. This would cut down the travelling necessitated by having to go around Murray Bridge or using the shuttle services. I point out that as soon as there is the slightest high river the punts are out of commission.

The north of the river road is a very fine one as far as it goes, but there are two sections which are incomplete. The section around Eudunda is now under construction. There is a section of one and a half miles between Renmark and Paringa Bridge which is incomplete, and it will cost a considerable amount of money to link up that section. Before the committee goes seriously into the question of a bridge across the river, and in case it is under the impression that there is an excellent road on the north of the river as many people believe, I point out that there is no connection on the north side of the river and that it will cost a considerable amount of money to make that connection between Renmark and Paringa. If the committee thinks that the north of the river road is an adequate connecting link between Victoria and South Australia, that belief is completely erroneous. The Minister of Roads would probably tell me that it would cost about £150,000 to complete that one and a half miles of road and consequently I would not think that work will be done in the next three or four months. It seems that some people think that as there is an adequate road on the north side of the river it is necessary to locate the bridge at some point between Morgan and Swan Reach.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Where do you think a bridge should be put?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—I have made my position very clear in this matter. Everyone has had an opportunity to give evidence to the Public Works Committee. Mr. Condon has from time to time rather criticized the fact that people have put five, six or seven suggestions forward as to where the bridge should be located. There is nothing wrong in that, because people have even had several different ideas about where the new Port Adelaide Bridge should be. My opinion is that everyone has had a good opportunity to submit evidence to the committee, in whom I have implicit faith to decide, after they have weighed all the evidence, where the new bridge over the Murray should be.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—You think the committee should do its own job and that you should not do it for them.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—Quite so.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Where would you like the bridge located?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—Somewhere between Morgan and Swan Reach. With regard to roads, the Highways Department is doing an excellent job over-all with the funds available. When I spoke last year with regard to taxation of hauliers I said that I thought people should contribute to the roads in proportion to the extent they used them. That is done in the case of petrol tax and the registration of motor vehicles, where the amount payable depends on the weight and capacity of the vehicle. I was very pleased to see that the legislation we passed has met such a very good fate at the hands of the High Court, because it was thought by some members that the Bill was not watertight. I am pleased that we are to get some revenue from this source. I have always thought that people should pay as they go, and that if they did not pay they would not go.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—It is the Victorian legislation on which the High Court has given its decision; we are still waiting on a decision with regard to our legislation.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—That is so, but I am told that we can look forward to a favourable decision. A great deal of money is being spent in the area between Blanchetown and Gawler by the Highways Department in an area which was particularly bad with a very winding road and a steep grade. The complaint the Highways Commissioner had when he submitted evidence to the Public Works Committee in reference to the previous evidence on the Blanchetown Bridge project was that the north of the river road from Eudunda to Greenock was very steep and necessitated considerably more fuel consumption and would not carry the heavy traffic so well. I was pleased indeed to see that the department has widened the road, and at present it is doing a great deal of work in clearing land, straightening out bends and putting in filling. I pay a compliment to the Minister for the way that department is working.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—What increased production has taken place between Truro and Blanchetown since the construction of the Sturt Highway?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—Evidence has been submitted with regard to the increased production and the increase which will occur in

the next few years. "Loans to producers" is the provision under which loans are made to co-operative societies. I notice that the amount this year is £175,000, slightly more than last year. This is a most essential part of the State's finances, and I hope it will continue and perhaps increase because we are getting increased productivity for the money which is invested in this way.

It is also very pleasing to see the sum of £75,000 provided for advances to settlers. In the past the Crown Lands Development Act has dealt mainly with dry land, and in the near future I would like the Government to give consideration to investigating under this Act the further development of irrigation. I am sure that many people with a fair amount of capital are prepared to undertake irrigation projects, particularly for pasture development. If we can maintain that line and increase it to take in irrigation it will be a good thing for the State and repay all concerned handsomely.

The general position in the State at present is very good. From time to time we have very alarming suggestions that we are on the rocks and on the way out, but I do not mind living in South Australia as it is a very good place. The middle-class person in this State finds it an extremely good place in which to live. I do not agree with the great wallings about recessions around the corner because our unemployment rate is up a little. We should not let that be a guide to everything. We have many more people in the State, including quite an influx from Western Australia, where things are apparently not quite as good as they were. Generally, the position here is very stable.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—You must admit that the flour milling industry is in a sad plight.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—I know that the honourable member is very sincere in his references to this industry. As one honourable member representing the largest proportion of flour milling in the State, I support what Mr. Condon has said regarding the difficulties. Those who have gone well away from the seaboard to establish their mills are having a particularly difficult time because the type of wheat they want is not available in their districts, and has to be carried from far distant areas. However, they are keeping people employed, but are not getting the support they deserve. I feel, as Mr. Condon has said, it is an industry which needs a

thorough overhaul. He will have my support in any attempt to assist the industry, and I am sure he will give me his support. I support the Bill.

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

#### MARRIAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 17. Page 623.)

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE (Central No. 2)—In 1955 I spoke briefly when a Marriage Bill was before the House. It will be recollected that it was passed and then went to the House of Assembly, where certain amendments were included, but it was not proceeded with for some time. Then it was reintroduced, and came back to this House under unfortunate circumstances and was defeated. I think we were rushed and did not give sufficient consideration to the rights and duties of parents. Although I voted for the Bill then and moved an amendment, which was defeated, I would not be prepared to support it again in the same form. I see little wrong in one changing his mind to that extent. Much consideration has been given to it in the intervening period.

Mr. Densley made a very good speech reminding us that parents not only have certain rights in this matter, but also certain duties. The debate has clearly drawn our attention to the fact that many parents are not carrying out their duties as they should, and that much of the trouble brought forward by the League of Women Voters in asking the Government to introduce this legislation is because of this position. All the time there is the idea that everything can be left to the Government. As Mr. Densley pointed out, there has been a lack of any kind of approach to members. I have not been approached by anyone to support the Bill, and there is no public demand for it, as far as I am able to gather. I think it is quite clear that the League of Women Voters, which is a comparatively small organization, has persuaded the Government to introduce the legislation. The National Council of Women is the main body of women in this State with, I think, more than 100 affiliated bodies and it has not sponsored this legislation, or shown any immediate desire for it. I mention that because I feel there is little keenness in the community for it, except from a limited quarter and among a limited number of women.

It has been suggested that the ages of common law—14 and 12 years—are barbarous and rather reminiscent of the early Indian age,

as I said when speaking before. Apparently it is desired that we should show that we are sufficiently enlightened to realize that the wish of the legislature is that marriages should not take place at these junior ages, and therefore the Bill suggests that children should not be allowed to marry under 16 and 18 years except with special consent. The ages proposed are interesting. Mr. Wilson vaguely suggested yesterday that he knew of a case where there had been difficulties over sectarian issues. I do not think that in this matter we should hide anything. As far as I know the only church which has come right out into the picture and fixed a marriage age of its own is the Roman Catholic Church. The *Externals of the Catholic Church*, by John F. Sullivan, states that the question of marriage has nothing to do with the State at all, but is a matter for the church. Then the question "Has the State any right to nullify marriages?" is asked and the reply is:—

None whatever. It has the right to regulate them—for instance, to require the obtaining of a licence and the subsequent registration of a marriage—and it can lawfully inflict penalties for the non-observance of these rules; but it has no right and no power to annul a valid marriage.

Then it goes on to give what in the church's opinion are the impediments to marriage. One is extreme youth. The present rule of the church is that boys cannot validly marry until they have completed their sixteenth year and girls their fourteenth year. The old ages they had were the English Common Law ages, which applied in most countries—14 years and 12 years—and they have now altered their rules to make the ages 16 and 14. As far as I know, no other church has any kind of definite rule, or pretends to interfere in the matter. It is interesting to note that the Synod of the Church of England here last week had a resolution before it approving of the marriage age as fixed by the Bill now before us, but it was not carried. They got into such a confusion between the age of consent under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, which is 17 years in this State, and whether a person who married a girl of 15 or 16 should be prosecuted under that Act and after much discussion they decided to go on with the next matter on the paper. That just shows how difficult this question is.

I still feel that the age of 16 is wrong for girls in a climate like that in South Australia. Many girls are so matured at 15 that it would be entirely wrong for us to say that they could not marry legally. In Committee

I propose to move, as I did last year, for the age to be altered from 16 to 15 years and I hope that, having pointed out the feeling of various churches and people, I will get more support than I did before. Otherwise, I propose to support the second reading and also an amendment to be moved by Sir Arthur Rymill to encourage parents to be in the picture and not just wiped off, as proposed in the Bill. I hope the Legislature will indicate what it thinks are the reasonable ages for marriage, and will leave parents to have a share of the responsibility. If the parents will not consent to a certain basis, then there would be an appeal to the Minister. However, I understand an amendment is to be introduced to provide that a decision will be given not by the Minister but by a special magistrate in chambers. That will be a matter for discussion in Committee. I support the second reading.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### MARKETING OF EGGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 17. Page 620.)

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON (Northern)—This amendment merely extends the Marketing of Eggs Act for a term of three years. As has been said during the debate, the original Act was passed in 1941, and it has been extended by this Parliament from time to time. I feel sure that that has been done because the board has performed an excellent job in the collecting, grading and marketing of eggs. The board consists of six members: Mr. C. F. P. Anderson, chairman; Mr. A. S. Hutchinson, producers' representative; Mr. A. A. Osborn, wholesale trade; Mr. A. C. Samuels, retail trade; Mr. E. C. Harris and Mr. R. A. S. MacAlister, producers' representatives. During this debate a member by way of interjection asked why there is no consumers' representative. I presume that Mr. Anderson, who is the Government Poultry Adviser and the Government nominee on the board, and who has a casting vote, coupled with Mr. Samuels of the retail trade, can very well look after the consumers' interests. I am sure that the statistics that I will quote later prove that that is so.

I believe that a continuation of this legislation is of particular importance at present, as our generally accepted market in the United

Kingdom is at a very low ebb owing to the encouragement of production by the payment of subsidies to producers in England and Wales. As Mr. Shard said yesterday, the subsidy is expected to cost £35,000,000 to the taxpayers of Great Britain, and it has resulted in an increase in production of 274,000,000 dozen eggs a year. When travelling in England recently, I was impressed by the number of additional fowl houses that had been erected on properties there. It was evident that the subsidy had encouraged people to increase the number of fowls they keep. Egg production has been increased so much there that Great Britain is now exporting to Western Germany, and believe it or not, I was told by the under Secretary for Commonwealth Relations that eggs are also being exported to Denmark.

Another speaker in this debate said that handling costs in this State are 6d. a dozen. The figure I have is 6½d. a dozen, and that is considerably lower than in other States. The charge includes agent's fees and all costs of receiving, grading, testing and packing eggs, as well as accounting to producers. The costs in other States are—Victoria, 10½d.; South Queensland, 11d.; Western Australia, 1s. 2d.; New South Wales, 1s. 0½d. In New South Wales all grading is done by the Government, and the handling charge there is almost double that in South Australia, which I think indicates the difference between private enterprise and Government control. On the date I obtained these figures the wholesale price in South Australia was 3s. 10d. a dozen, in Victoria, 4s. 3d.; South Queensland, 3s. 3d.; Tasmania, 4s.; Western Australia, 4s. 3d.; and New South Wales, 4s. 5d.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—They get the benefit of home markets compared with South Australia. There is no fixed price in Victoria or New South Wales.

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—Nor is there in South Australia, except by the board, and I take it that in the other States the prices are also fixed by the boards. On the date that I took out my figures, the retail prices were—South Australia, 4s. 4d.; Victoria, 5s. 4d.; Tasmania, 4s. 6d.; Western Australia, 4s. 9d.; and New South Wales, 5s. Members will see that in every instance our charges compare more than favourably with those in other States. In the interests of producers and consumers this orderly marketing should continue, as violent fluctuations in prices are injurious to the industry and consumers. Members can see that if our production increases and the price falls there is a tendency for producers

to go out of the industry, and in the long run the consumer has to pay more. It is interesting to note that in 1955-56 in this State 3,734,730 dozen eggs were graded, and in the following year 4,140,044 dozen, an increase of over 250,000 dozen.

Certain licences are given to producers to sell their eggs in a particular area. In 1955-56 the production sold in that way was 1,406,350 dozen, and the next year it increased to 1,675,935 dozen. That is very satisfactory for the people and the producers concerned, but it takes away a bit from the grading stores and must add to the cost of grading. From the knowledge I have gained I can say that the present price of 6½d. a dozen barely pays for handling costs, and does not allow for the cost of buildings, interest on outlay or depreciation. It is generally recognized that it does not sufficiently recompense graders for their work.

An interesting item that I think will meet with the approval of members is that our Egg Board is selling eggs to other States and disposing of our surplus. In 1955-56 only 72,030 dozen eggs were sold to Victoria, but last year 3,440,400 dozen were sold there. I think from the figures I have quoted members will agree that the board is doing a very good job, and I have very much pleasure in supporting this Bill for the extension of its operations for another three years.

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

#### WATER RATES REMISSION BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 17. Page 621.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—The object of this Bill is to enable the Government to remit, either wholly or in part, the water rates payable under the Irrigation Act. A further object is to give some assistance to a number of settlers who I think are justly entitled to it under the circumstances. I was rather surprised to learn that water rates due and unpaid to June 30 last amounted to £40,092. Of course, that is not for this area alone, but for the State, but it is a big increase on previous figures. From this must be deducted £18,319 refunded to the Broken Hill Proprietary Company for rates overpaid from May 1, 1950, to May 31, 1955.

With regard to irrigation and reclaimed areas, arrears of rates, rents, etc., due at June 30, amounted to £85,000. The total

earnings amounted to only 77 per cent of working expenses, so consequently no contribution was made towards interest. This indicates to me that people are not in a position to pay increased water rates, an argument I have put forward in this House repeatedly. I think the increase in water rates was left too late. When people could afford to pay increased charges they were not asked to do so, but as soon as there was a slight recession the Government increased water rates as well as many charges, which was a great mistake. However, no objection can be taken to this legislation because it is assisting a worthy cause, and I therefore support the second reading.

The Hon. J. L. COWAN (Southern)—I have no hesitation in supporting this Bill which sets out to afford some small measure of relief to a certain section of the people who suffered such considerable losses and hardship as a result of last year's floods on the River Murray. Whilst this flood was at its peak and the swamps on the lower Murray were completely inundated the settlers who had occupied land on the Government-owned swamps had the peculiar experience of receiving notices for water rates, a service which they did not receive and could not receive under the existing conditions. I consider it is only fair and just that these rates should be remitted to the settlers concerned.

Clause 3 gives the Minister discretionary power to remit the whole or any part of the rates payable from July 1, 1956, to June 30, 1957, but only if the settlers are not in any other way indebted to the Government. I point out, however, that this applies only to water rates and not to land rentals which is a further cost that these settlers still have to meet. Water rates are looked upon as a charge usually made for water delivered for irrigation purposes, for domestic or stock purposes, or for other reticulation uses, but in this case that is not so. These rates are a charge for the drainage of that land. The water is drained away in channels to pumping plants and then pumped back into the river in order that these lands may remain highly productive. The water used for irrigation along the reclaimed areas of the Lower Murray is admitted to the swamps by opening sluice gates and allowing the water to flow by gravitation from the river on to the land to be irrigated.

The Bill is a very simple one. It sets out to do nothing more than to remit these rates which one might say were collected in error,

and I support it with the knowledge that it will afford some small measure of relief to those people who suffered such a considerable loss.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland)—The implications of the Bill have been pointed out by the two previous speakers and I wish to add only a little to what they have said. It is a small Bill but it is very important to those people affected by the flood. I wholeheartedly agree with the sentiments expressed by the two previous speakers. Mr. Cowan mentioned the remission of rentals in the areas that were affected. The Renmark Irrigation Trust, which is a private body, has in fact taken some of the people off its assessment lists for a period of three years. I do not know whether the Government will bring this matter up annually if necessary to enable them to continue to receive remission of water rates, but I point out that it may be three to five years before some of them get their irrigation and horticultural properties back into operation. It may be necessary for a continuance of this Bill for at least one or two years. We should give these landholders every opportunity to get back on their feet, because their present financial position is not very good. I think the Government is being very generous in this matter, and I am sure that those I represent would wish me to express my appreciation to the Government for this remission of water rates for the current period. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee; Committee's report adopted.

#### AUDIT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 17. Page 625.)

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE (Central No. 2)—Most Bills which deal with our public service and the administration of affairs in this State require overhauling from time to time. In this Council last year we had a number of legal Bills which were out of date in some respects and which came up for a general overhaul. That applies to this amendment to the Audit Act. If anyone looks at the present Audit Act he will see that although it was amended a number of times in connection with the Auditor-General's salary and in a general way in 1921 and, I think, in 1951, most of the sections are the original sections of the 1882 Act. It is quite obvious that the systems of accounting and auditing have altered considerably since 1882, and it is not



surprising that the Government has introduced a Bill to bring the Act and all the things that it is concerned with up to date.

The Bill, quite naturally, was introduced in the House of Assembly because that is the House which has to deal with the Budget and financial matters, comment on which in this Council is limited under the general practice of the two Houses. It was therefore extremely disappointing to me that this Bill did not get proper notice taken of it in the House of Assembly when it was dealt with there. It was introduced, unfortunately perhaps, in the absence of the Premier and was debated in the absence of the Leader of the Opposition; not one word was said about it by Government members, and it simply passed. That is regrettable, because there is at least one qualified accountant in that House and I think it is the duty of members with professional knowledge to give the benefit of that knowledge to the other lay members in such matters.

Sir Arthur Rymill and I have always tried to give members the benefit of our knowledge in legal matters. However, members in another place received no such explanation. We in this Council are in a much more fortunate position, because yesterday we had a lucid and detailed explanation from Mr. Bardolph and now we know considerably more about it than other people. I am particularly grateful to the honourable member because I did not know how much money under the Public Purposes Loan Bill was being appropriated to the Abattoirs Board, how the board was run, and quite a lot of other things until I had the pleasure of listening to him yesterday. Not having the same capacity to explain such matters myself, and not being an accountant or an auditor, the best I could do was to take the Bill, the Attorney-General's and the honourable member's explanations of it to the accountant that I thought the most reliable and knowledgeable in Adelaide and get him to examine it and tell me what he thought of it.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—You are complaining about nothing being said in one House and too much in another.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—That accountant assured me that he thought this was a very desirable Bill, that the amendments bringing the Audit Act up to date were overdue and that they were therefore worthy of support. I propose to support the Bill without further discussion of the details. We have been extremely fortunate in the persons we have had as Auditors-General in this State. It is not necessary to mention names, but we have

been well served and we are greatly indebted to those brilliant people who have held the position of Auditor-General and stuck to it when probably they could have received much higher remuneration by leaving the State service and going elsewhere. I support the Bill.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General)—It is not necessary for me to say much except to answer one or two points raised yesterday by Mr. Bardolph. I think we all knew that the honourable member had certain qualifications as an architect, but we did not think his qualifications extended to the sphere of auditing. He mentioned what he believed was a discrepancy between the figures shown in the balance-sheet of the Abattoirs Board and those shown in the Auditor-General's statement regarding the balance outstanding by the board to the Government. The explanation is that the financial year for the Abattoirs Board ends on a different day from that of the Government. For some reason, I presume to meet the exigencies of their industry, the Abattoirs Board closes its books on the Tuesday prior to June 30 each year.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—The point I made was that the Auditor-General should lay down a definite accounting policy for all these semi-governmental boards.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I think the point made by the honourable member was that there appeared to be a discrepancy. I was explaining that there was no such discrepancy because the position is that the Abattoirs Board closes its books on the Tuesday before June 30 each year, whereas the State accounts are made up to June 30. It so happened that on June 29, 1955, the Treasurer made a loan of £120,000 to the Abattoirs Board, and that explains the discrepancy in that year. On June 29, 1956, a further loan of £100,000 was made to the board. Those two advances, plus the fact that there is a difference of a few days in the closing of the books, account for the discrepancies which have occurred.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—I said that there may be a satisfactory explanation of it.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—The only other point is, as Mr. Cudmore pointed out, that we have been extremely fortunate in the people who have occupied the position of Auditor-General in this State. I believe the standard of their work is the very highest indeed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Vacating office."

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—This clause comes under the penal section of the Act. Yesterday I asked the Attorney-General whether it would not be more appropriate if a specific clause were included to define more clearly the Auditor-General's leave rights.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General)—I think the matter was adequately covered in the explanation I gave in my second reading. It included the following:—

Clause 4 deals with the Auditor-General's right to leave of absence. The present provision (contained in section 7 (2) (d) of the principal Act) is that the Auditor-General can not take more than a fortnight's annual leave without special approval granted by Executive Council. This provision dates from the time when the annual leave of public servants was only two weeks. It is proposed to alter this to enable the Auditor-General to take the same annual leave as other public servants, without applying for special approval from the Executive Council.

I understand that the purpose of the clause is to bring the matter up to date and ensure that the Auditor-General can take leave equivalent to that of other public servants without making a special request to Executive Council. I can see no objection to it.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 19) and title passed.

Committee's report adopted.

#### LONG SERVICE LEAVE BILL.

Second reading.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

This Bill gives effect to the policy of the Government as regards the granting of long service leave to workers in industry. It is of wide application and applies to all workers in industry, whether primary or secondary, who can comply with the conditions laid down. For this reason it is necessary to have a scheme which is not likely to cause any sudden dislocation of work. At the same time the Government does not favour laws, such as are in force in some States, under which employers are subjected to additional liabilities in respect of work done 20 years ago.

The general policy of the Government is not to propose retrospective laws. If, in special circumstances retrospectivity cannot be avoided, the Government's view is that there should be as little of it as possible. It is, of course, quite obvious that a law which confers on some people benefits based on past events, usually

confers corresponding disabilities on other people. What is given to A is taken from B. The Government believes that in the interests of justice transactions which in the past have been completed by the mutual exchange of services or goods for money, should as far as possible be allowed to rest and not be resurrected years after the event for the purpose of altering the effect of what was done. An attempt has therefore been made in this Bill to devise a scheme with relatively little retrospective effect.

The general principle of the Bill has already been announced. It is that in the eighth and in each subsequent year of a worker's continuous service he becomes entitled by reason of such service to one week's long service leave. Service before the passing of the Bill is to be taken into account for the purpose of determining whether a worker is qualified for leave, but does not give a right to accumulated leave. For all qualified workers the amount of leave is the same, that is to say, one week in each year after the Bill becomes law, but subject to some provisions, which I will explain later, making the Bill retrospective to July 1, 1957.

In working out the details of the scheme the Government has given consideration to the provisions of the Acts of the other States, and has taken a number of them as precedents. There are, however, numerous minor differences between the various Acts and the Government is willing to consider any further suggestions as to the best way of dealing with subsidiary problems arising in connection with the scheme in this Bill.

I will deal with the main features of the Bill in the order in which they appear in the clauses. In Clause 3, which is the interpretation clause, it will be seen that the important definition is that of "worker." A worker is any person employed under a contract of service. So long as the relationship is that of master and servant the Bill will apply, irrespective of the nature of the work. A period of apprenticeship will also count as service if the apprentice is employed by the employer upon completing his time, or within three months thereafter. The definition of "employer" is also in general terms and includes everybody who employs a worker, irrespective of the industry concerned.

Clause 4 deals with the important question of continuity of service. In order to qualify for leave continuity of service is necessary; but it is declared in this clause that a number of events which might normally amount to a break in a man's service will not be regarded

as such. For example, the service of a worker will not be broken by any of the following events:—

- (a) absence for any period by leave of the employer;
- (b) absence for any period on account of illness or injury;
- (c) absence for any period on account of an injury arising out of and in the course of the employment (that is to say, an injury for which workmen's compensation would usually be payable);
- (d) absence arising from an industrial dispute, provided that the worker returned to work in accordance with the terms of settlement of the dispute;
- (e) standing down of the worker on account of slackness of trade if the worker returns to work within 14 days after receiving an offer of re-employment, or a notice to return to work.

Further, it is provided that if the employer should interrupt or terminate a worker's service with the intention of avoiding long service leave obligations, that will not amount to a break in the service, and even a dismissal of a worker will not count as a break if the worker is re-employed by the same employer within three months after the dismissal took effect.

Some of the absences which I have mentioned will not only be consistent with continuous service, but will actually be regarded as service. It will be seen that by reason of subclause (2) of clause 4, a period of absence of the worker from work while on annual or long service leave, or because of an injury for which compensation is payable, as well as absence brought about by the employer to evade long service obligations, will be counted as actual service, irrespective of the length of the absence from work. Leave on account of ordinary sickness up to a maximum of 15 working days in a year will also count as service.

It is also provided in clause 4 that if a business is transferred from one employer to another and a worker accepts service with the transferee, the continuity of the service will not be broken by the transfer and service with the transferee, the continuity of the service will not be broken by the transfer and service with the transferor will count as service with the transferee. Apprenticeship will count as service if the apprentice continues in the employment of his master on the termination of his apprenticeship or is re-engaged within three months thereafter. A period of national ser-

vice training of a worker will also be regarded as service by his usual employer.

Clause 5 provides that the Bill does not apply to Crown employees. The reason for this is that they are already covered by general schemes for long service leave which are as beneficial as that set out in the Bill.

Clause 6 sets out the fundamental principle of the Bill which is that workers are entitled to long service leave amounting to seven consecutive days in the eighth and in each subsequent year of continuous service. This clause also sets out the commencing date of the scheme and explains the effect of past service. It provides that those workers who have completed seven years' service before July 1, 1957, will be entitled to take their first period of leave under the Bill during the current financial year. Workers who complete seven years' service after July 1 of this year will take their first period of leave in the 12 calendar months dating from such completion. In either case the subsequent leave of the worker will depend on the time when he completes additional years of service, that is to say, on the question whether he loses any service by reason of periods of absence from work which are not taken into account as service.

Clause 7 deals with the time for taking leave. Unless leave is postponed, it must be taken at a time agreed upon between the employer and the worker; but if no agreement is reached the employer must fix a time and give the worker at least four weeks' notice of it. By agreement leave may be postponed and accumulated to any extent. However, if the worker does not agree to a postponement the employer will have no right to postpone any leave and must grant it from year to year. By agreement a worker may accept money in lieu of leave.

Clause 9 sets out that the period of long service leave (whether it be seven days or any longer period earned by accumulation) will include Saturdays and Sundays but not statutory public holidays. Thus, a worker going on a week's leave will be entitled to be absent from his work for a full working week plus any holidays occurring in that week.

Clause 10 sets out when the worker is entitled to be paid in respect of his leave. In the absence of any special agreement, he must be paid not later than the day or days when he would have been paid if he had not been on leave; but if there is no pay day occurring during his leave he must be paid before the leave commences.

Clause 11 deals with the case where, as part of the worker's ordinary remuneration, the employer provides board, lodging or the use of premises for the worker or members of his family. In such a case the policy of the Government is to ensure that these benefits will continue to be available for the worker or his family while he is on leave. The Bill therefore makes it an offence if an employer does not continue to make such benefits available to the worker or his family during a period of leave, if the worker asks that the benefits shall continue.

Clause 12 deals with the payment for leave in a case where a worker's employment is terminated or a worker dies before he has taken all the leave due to him. In these cases the worker or his estate, as the case may be, will be entitled to payment for the period of leave not taken. The only exception to this rule is where a worker is dismissed for dishonesty, misconduct or neglect of duty.

Clause 13 provides for exemptions from the scheme. It provides first of all that if a worker has a right to long service leave under an industrial award or industrial agreement he shall not be entitled to long service leave under the Bill. If an industrial tribunal has provided for or approved a scheme for long service leave for workers it is to be assumed that it is a just and reasonable settlement of any claims such workers may have to such leave, and there is, therefore, no need to apply the Bill to such a worker.

Clause 13 also provides that if an employer has a long service leave scheme other than a scheme contained in an industrial award or industrial agreement, and the Public Actuary reports that the employer's scheme is as beneficial as the scheme in the Bill, then the Minister may exempt the employer from the Bill, as regards workers covered by the scheme.

Clause 14 makes it an offence for an employer to fail to grant the leave to which a worker is entitled under the Bill. It also provides that an employer who is being prosecuted for not granting the leave, can be ordered by the Court to pay to the complainant for the benefit of the worker the amount of pay due to the worker for the period of any leave which should have been granted.

Clause 15 provides that any money due to a person by virtue of the Bill may be recovered by action in a court of competent jurisdiction. This will give rights of recovery by legal action to persons who are entitled to the monetary equivalent of leave not taken. Clause 16

forbids any person to contract out of his rights or duties under the Bill. Clause 17 enables inspectors under the Industrial Code to enter premises and make necessary inspections for the due administration and enforcement of the Bill.

Clauses 18, 19 and 20 deal with proceedings for breaches of the Bill. Proceedings will be determined in a summary manner and offences for which no special penalty is prescribed will be punishable by a fine not exceeding £50. A complaint for a breach of the Bill may be laid at any time not later than 12 months after the cause of complaint arose. It is possible that owing to the unusual kinds of duties created by this Bill that there may be a number of cases in which offences will not be discovered in time to lay complaints within the normal period of six months.

Clause 21 provides that prosecutions are only to be instituted with the consent of the Minister. This rule already exists in connection with prosecutions for breaches of the Early Closing Act and it is considered to be a useful safeguard against frivolous or unjustified proceedings.

Clause 22 contains a provision for granting rights in the nature of long service leave to casual workers. There are some groups of workers who because their work is casual or because they divide their working time between different employers will not be able to accumulate the necessary amount of continuous service to qualify for leave in the ordinary way. It is therefore proposed to enable the Governor to make regulations promulgating special schemes for the granting of long service leave to these workers. It will be necessary as regards each group to establish a fund by contributions paid by the employers concerned, and to use this fund for paying the workers who are entitled to long service leave. It will be necessary that the regulations shall prescribe a qualification for leave different from seven years' continuous service with the same employer. The regulations will have to lay down some such rule as that the worker must work for at least seven years continuously in the same industry and in the same locality. The exact nature of the qualification will, of course, vary according to the group of workers concerned and different regulations will be required for different groups.

Clause 23 contains the general regulation-making power which enables the Governor to make any regulations necessary or convenient for the general administration of the Bill,

including regulations as to the keeping of records by employers concerning long service leave.

I think it is agreed that this is a very important measure and one which will confer some far reaching benefits on employees. It has been said at various times that the Government has perhaps not given all the time it should for consideration of measures, but I make it quite clear that in this Bill the Government is quite happy to allow members all the time they wish and will consider carefully any suggestions or amendments. We realize in legislation of this nature that no party can get all he wants and, consequently, the legislation must very largely be the result of compromise. I make it quite clear that if any amendments are moved they will not only receive my personal consideration but that of the Government. I sincerely hope that no member will take any action which will deprive anybody of a right which may not be all that is desired but which still will be advantageous.

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

#### VETERINARY SURGEONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 4. Page 562.)

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1)—This is a short measure which has been introduced to remove one or two anomalies in the present legislation. From time to time it becomes apparent, as the result of the operations of various measures, that anomalies exist, and amending legislation is necessary. The Bill amends section 17 of the principal Act to enable the board to temporarily register a person and issue him with a permit to practice his profession during the period between the time of passing his examination and having his degree conferred on him. The provision is not mandatory and if it becomes obvious during that period that a person should not be registered the board in its discretion may refuse to register him. At present some time elapses between the passing of an examination and the conferring of a degree and a person should not be forced to secure some other form of livelihood until his registration. I recommend this proposal. Similar legislation was introduced in respect of medical practitioners. There is, after all, a similarity between the two professions: one refers to the treatment of humans and the other to the treatment of animals.

The second amendment increases the annual fee from £2 2s. to £3 3s. I am not overjoyed at the prospect, because such increases usually have an impact elsewhere. However, the present fee has been operating since 1935. It is a considerable period since there has been any amending legislation. In 1938 the Act was amended to allow permits to be issued at the discretion of the board to persons it considered competent to treat animals for disease or injury, and that measure also provided for the renewal of such permits. In each case a fee of £1 1s. was payable, and this in actual fact became the annual fee, so a fee of £2 2s. was payable in one instance compared with £1 1s. in another. This legislation increases the fee payable by a person to whom the board had issued a permit from £1 1s. to £2 2s. My only comment is that the person who pays a fee of £1 1s. is entitled to perform the same operations as a properly qualified and registered person with a degree, who has to pay a £2 2s. fee. If circumstances warrant, the board could deregister the qualified man in the same way as it could withdraw a permit, so I do not see why there should be a discrepancy between the fees paid by these men, because they will be in competition with each other for the same class of work. I think that the amending legislation should increase both fees to £3 3s.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—Isn't there some limitation at present?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Yes, there is a limitation on the duration of the permit. It can be issued for five years, after which the man can be registered, when he will be liable to pay a £3 3s. fee, but for the five years the permit is in force he is doing the same work as the other man, so he should pay the same fee.

The Hon. A. J. Melrose—That is not necessarily so. He is doing work within his ability, that is all.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—That might be so, but he is not debarred from doing the same work. He is granted a permit because the board considers he is a competent person, and once it is granted he can do the same class of work as the other man. I agree that he may not have the same knowledge as the person who has had a degree conferred upon him, but he is in competition with him. The qualified man has had to undergo a period of training before receiving his degree, whereas the other person may not have passed his final examination although he may have gone through a similar period of training at the University. The latter can

make application to the board which, if it considers him to be a competent person, grants him a permit to enter into the same field as the registered man, so I think the fee he pays should be the same as that paid by the qualified veterinary surgeon. That is my only criticism of this legislation. I give my full support to the measure, and commend it to members.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE (Midland)—The Bill is so simple and sensible that it can be expected to go through Parliament very rapidly. In fact, it appears to have gone through another place with proverbial rapidity, and I use the expression "gone through" in that sense. The Minister introduced the Bill in a very few words, and with in no sense an explanatory speech. He was followed by a speech from either side of the House, and it could hardly have been possible to use fewer words. In a State like this, which depends so much on primary production, and in which the Party in power uses the word "country" as part of its title, I feel that a little more service should have been given to a Bill of this nature.

We all know that the Bill sets out to do a very sensible thing; it sets out to enable a man who has passed his qualifying examination, but who has not yet got his ticket, to carry out the job for which he has proved himself capable. That is the part that I feel is the very sensible part of the Bill. There is room in this State in the agricultural industries for several times the number of veterinary surgeons that are practising today. The position appears to be something like this: as at January 1, 1954, there were 37 veterinary surgeons registered. In 1955 there were 40, in 1956, 45 and in 1957, 53—an increase in that four-year period of 43 per cent. The numbers employed by the State and Federal Governments in that period were—1954, 17; 1955, 17; 1956, 19; and 1957, 22. These numbers include such people as the leaders of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science and officers of the Department of Agriculture, all men who hold veterinary qualifications in the Government service. The increase over the four-year period has been 30 per cent. The numbers employed in the city have increased from 11 in 1954 to 16 in 1957, and in the country from nine to 15 in that time. The percentage increase in the city has been 45 per cent, whereas in the country it has been 66 per cent.

I have not the latest figures of livestock population, but having a pretty fair knowledge of what the numbers are I would say

that in that time the sheep population has increased by about 25 per cent, and the cattle population by about 5 per cent. On the surface it would appear that the increase in the number of veterinary surgeons has more than kept pace with the increase in livestock population, but it is not quite so. As the livestock population increases, the incidence of disease and the need for veterinary services does not increase mathematically, but rather in geometrical progression. As there are only 15 men practising in the country, I say we have not nearly enough, and any Bill such as this that will enable these young men to come in and start practising before they get their tickets should have our blessing.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—There is a tendency to use veterinary surgeons more.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—There is a great deal more need. During the time in which I have been associated with the pastoral industry pastures that were quite clean and stock that was healthy have become the victims of all sorts of internal and external parasites and diseases, and stock have had to be treated with all sorts of new medicines. Today a man on the land has to have a fair working knowledge of veterinary work. At present there are about 18 practitioners, who I think are the remanet of the men who in the past have been very useful to the man on the land in looking after sick cows, doing a little obstetric work, and who were allowed to become practitioners because that had been their mode of life for so long. There are 11 permit holders as well. Mr. Bevan was not quite right when he said that permit holders do precisely the same work as the qualified men. When I have spoken on veterinary measures before I have said they are among the most valuable men in the community. They do all sorts of objectionable and distasteful jobs that people do not like doing themselves, and many of them do it in almost an honorary capacity. They are honest people, and one does not have to pay them 10 guineas or 20 guineas to get them to come to a place. If a person calls in a qualified veterinary surgeon, a good deal of the cost in saving one life is often used up in travelling expenses.

I take this opportunity to again pay a real tribute to the services that these practitioners and permit holders render to the people of the country. The Bill sets out to do something very sensible. It allows young men, who have proved their capacity and who have passed the necessary examinations and qualified to

become licensed and certificated veterinary surgeons, to start work and earn a living earlier than they would otherwise be able to do. It might be fitting to say that besides giving my blessing to this Bill I think our own university, if possible, should do something to enable the course of veterinary surgery to be taken in Adelaide. These boys have to go to Sydney and because that is so expensive they get some Government assistance. I think I am right in saying that in return for that assistance the Government demands that if it requires them they must enter the Government service.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—I think they are taking more of their training in South Australia now.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—I did not know that. Until recently they had to go to Sydney and had to meet the cost of boarding and being away from home for a long time. I should say that was a very discouraging introduction to a profession. We have an Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science in South Australia; if that institute is doing

something I am pleased to hear it, and if it is not I hope that it soon will do something to enable this State to get more of these qualified men. We know how much we are dependent today on the country in the South-East which was hitherto almost undeveloped but for which we think there is a tremendous future because of the higher and more assured rainfall. We will be even more dependent on the great stock population we will be carrying there. From my own experience I am sure that the people in an area the equivalent of a decent sized estate of a few years ago will be able and will need to employ many qualified veterinary surgeons. A veterinary surgeon could be fully employed in an advisory capacity and would find plenty of veterinary work in every 400 or 500 square miles of country. I wholeheartedly support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee; Committee's report adopted.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.35 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, September 19, at 2.15 p.m.