LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Wednesday, October 1, 1958.

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

MURRAY BRIDGE CORPORATION BY-LAW: POULTRY KEEPING.

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. E. Anthoney—

That by-law No. 40 of the corporation of the town of Murray Bridge for preventing the keeping of poultry so as to be a nuisance and injurious to health, made on July 22, 1957, and laid on the table of this Council on June 17, 1958, be disallowed.

(Continued from August 27. Page 535.)

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2)—The Subordinate Legislation Committee has recommended that particular by-laws be disallowed on the ground, substantially, that they rely upon the councils' administrative and not on their judicial powers. The fact that we have not followed the committee's recommendations in, I think, four other cases, does not, of course, mean that that is not a satisfactory ground for disallowance of by-laws. It may well be that there are by-laws which should be disallowed on that ground. I wanted to make it clear that because the committee has recommended in particular cases that by-laws be disallowed on that particular ground it does not mean that we should lightly refuse to disallow them on that ground. Every by-law must be considered on its own merits.

The question before us is whether or not we should disallow a by-law of the corporation of the town of Murray Bridge relating to the keeping of poultry. I believe that the reason given why we should disallow it is that it gives the council too wide a power, and that the by-law could be more definite and relate to specific areas of the town. We know that the Murray Bridge corporation, as distinct from the district council of Mobilong, has dominion over the affairs of the town of Murray Bridge, which is a very large town comprising 1,899 acres, which is about the size of Adelaide's area without parklands, etc. Naturally a country town of that size is not built completely over; there are still many broad acres in it, and the question we have to decide is whether the corporation should have power to differentiate between its various areas in relation to the keeping of poultry so that the thickly populated parts should be subject to the provisions of this by-law—in other words, controlled in relation to where poultry should be kept, how close to main roads and under what conditions—or whether the council should have latitude to say that in parts where there are fewer houses poultry keeping need not be subject to this by-law.

The argument advanced as to why we should disallow the by-law is that the council could be more definite in its definition of areas and say, "This is part of the built-up area and this by-law should apply there," or, "This part is not a built-up area but is broad acres, and this by-law should not apply there.

Murray Bridge, as everyone who has been there recently must have observed, is expanding very quickly. It is one of the towns in this State that is ideal for expansion. It has everything—a main straight railway line, a broad highway, good farming lands and every facility that there possibly could be. There is nothing to stop Murray Bridge expanding as it is noticeably doing at this moment. The question is whether we should prohibit the council of an expanding town from having the wide-spread powers that it is asking for by saying, "You should nominate the areas in which this can be done," or whether we should say, "Your town is expanding quickly and if we make you define the limited areas in which poultry keeping may be undertaken you will have to amend your by-law next year and probably each succeeding year. I have said previously that I trust local government. Councils are elected by the people, but if they are not trustworthy the people have the say each year in relation to half of the council, and if the ratepayers feel that they cannot be trusted with the powers delegated to them no doubt they will swiftly change the council.

All in all, having given this a good deal of consideration, I think this by-law should be allowed. I do not think we should put the council in a position of having to amend its regulation to define new areas as new houses are built. We should trust the council to administer this by-law sensibly, and I again draw the distinction that has been mentioned before in this Legislative Council, that it is the council and not the town clerk that has this power of differentiation. There is one other point to which I wish to draw attention and it is general rather than particular. Mention has been made of the general powers of Parliament to disallow by-laws, and one or two members have expressed the view that the House should have power to disallow part of a by-law rather than having to disallow the whole of it, but I do not agree with that view. If we disallowed part of a by-law we could well alter the whole tenor of it, and I instance

this particular one as a comparatively minor example of that. I have no doubt that the Murray Bridge Corporation in drafting this by-law specially asked for this power of dispensation so that it could distinguish between its closely settled areas and its unbuilt on land. If we took this power away from the corporation by disallowing that part of the by-law to which the Subordinate Legislation Committee has taken exception, and allowed the rest of it, we would be forcing that council to impose every detail of this by-law on every square foot of its area, which has never been its intention.

I think that is a good example of why we should not have power to disallow part of a by-law, but rather why we should be entitled to disallow the whole of the by-law and let the council recast it. By disallowing part of it we could upset the whole framework of the by-law and oblige the council to do something it did not wish to do. I oppose the motion, and I propose to vote, in effect, in favour of the council's by-law.

Motion negatived.

PROSPECT CORPORATION BY-LAW: STREET ALIGNMENT BUILDING LINE.

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. E. Anthoney—

That By-Law No. 31 of the Corporation of the City of Prospect for fixing the building line with reference to street alignment, made on August 19, 1957, and laid on the table of this Council on June 17, 1958, be disallowed.

(Continued from August 20. Page 449.)

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General)—The by-law sets out certain provisions with regard to street alignments in the Prospect corporation area and provides that in certain cases the council may approve of a different alignment from what is generally required. For the reasons I mentioned when speaking on a similar matter last week, it seems to me that the objection taken by the Subordinate Legislation Committee cannot be well-founded, and in the circumstances I think we might very well give to the corporation the powers it seeks.

Motion negatived.

SALISBURY COUNCIL BY-LAW: POULTRY KEEPING.

Adjourned motion of the Hon. E. Anthoney—

That By-law No. 42 of the District Council of Salisbury in respect of poultry, made on October 28, 1957, and laid on the table of this Council on June 17, 1958, be disallowed.

(Continued from August 20. Page 449.)

Motion negatived.

WEST TORRENS CORPORATION BY-LAW: CARTING OF HEAVY MATERIALS.

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. E. Anthoney—

That by-law No. 54 of the corporation of the city of West Torrens to regulate and control the carting of heavy materials, made on February 25, 1958, and laid on the table of this council on June 17, 1958, be disallowed.

(Continued from August 20. Page 448.)

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON (Northern)—The Subordinate Legislation Committee has over the years run across some instances which guided them to a very great extent in taking the attitude that a council should set out in its by-law what it intends to do. I believe that if the trouble were taken that could be done. We have had two very striking instances where this power of a council to give a dispensation was abused. I refer to the corporations of Burnside and West Torrens. The Burnside corporation provided in a by-law that the council should have the overriding power of deciding what should be done, and in one case it was prepared to grant a permit for a drive-in theatre in the Magill ward. The local progress association discovered that this was contrary to the wishes of the people of that locality; its representatives gave evidence to the Subordinate Legislation Committee, and the by-law was disallowed.

The by-law with which we are now dealing is by-law No. 54 of the corporation of West Torrens to control the carting of heavy material. The by-law sets out the definition of a vehicle and the definition of a road. It reads as follows:—

No person shall except with the previous consent of the council or of the town clerk given in writing drive or conduct or permit to be driven or conducted in or along any of the roads . . . except the roads described in the schedule hereto, any vehicle the weight of which including the weight of any load which may be thereon, exceeds three tons.

I support the disallowance of this by-law on the grounds that it gives power to the clerk to make exceptions. In addition, the weight of three tons, whether laden or unladen, seems absurd. Many unladen trucks weighing over three tons go along roads without causing damage. I think the by-law is too extreme.

The West Torrens corporation, in a letter forwarded to the committee, set out the reasons

for the introduction of this by-law, and pointed out that legal action would be taken against any person who infringed it. Yet the by-law grants permission to the clerk to vary it, and a loaded vehicle might be taken over these roads which are set out in the by-law as being capable of carrying only three tons. The motion for disallowance was moved on the ground that the by-law gives too much power to the clerk and, in addition, I consider the weight allowed is too light altogether. I support the motion.

The Hon. Sir COLLIER CUDMORE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SHEARERS ACCOMMODATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Council divided on the third reading:—

Ayes (13).—The Hons. E. Anthoney, K. E. J. Bardolph, S. C. Bevan, J. L. S. Bice, J. L. Cowan, L. H. Densley, E. H. Edmonds, N. L. Jude, W. W. Robinson, C. D. Rowe (teller), Sir Arthur Rymill, A. J. Shard, and C. R. Story.

Noes (3).—The Hons. Sir Collier Cudmore, A. J. Melrose (teller), and Sir Frank Perry.

Majority of 10 for the Ayes.

Bill read a third time and passed.

COUNTRY HOUSING BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

ROAD CHARGES (REFUNDS) BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 30. Page 949.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1)—I support the Bill, which amends Section 8 of the principal Act by deleting the words that limit new standards to multiples or aliquot parts of existing standards, and enables new standards to be prescribed when they are needed. Whilst we are dealing with weights and measures, there should be a complete review. The local government authorities are responsible for carrying out the full provisions of the Weights and Measures Act and do laudable work. Those associated with local government do this work on a purely voluntary basis. Enforcing the provisions of the Act rests with these local government authorities, whose chief inspectors are responsible for checking the selling of articles to see that the Act is complied with.

Section 32(2) of the principal Act provides that all packages offered for sale, wrapped or otherwise, shall bear the net weight of the contents. I shall not mention any specific manufacturer now, but it is well-known that some cake manufacturers sell cake wrapped in conformity with this Act, but with no net weight of the contents of the package displayed on the outside. In many cases articles weighed have been found to be short-weight, sometimes by as much as 1oz. or 1½oz. in a 1 lb. or 2 lb. weight.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—Do they purport to sell them as weighing 1 lb. or 2 lb.?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—They are in packages and wrapped; I presume 1 lb. in weight is charged for. I have purchased some of these things and have never seen them placed upon the scales. I have simply been told, "That costs half-a-crown or 2s. 9d.," as the case may be. Some overall control should compel those responsible for giving effect to the Act to see that the correct weight is displayed on the outside of the package.

In the case of biscuit manufacturers, for example, the full provisions of the Act are observed because the public can read upon the package the net weight of the contents. If it is necessary to compel biscuit manufacturers to do that, the Act should be reviewed so that those selling other things should be bound in the same way.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—They would have to be accurate to comply with this Bill.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—If the biscuit manufacturers can do it, why cannot others? It is equally necessary for those who sell cake to do so. They do not indicate the contents of their packages. Some blocks of cake instead of weighing a full 16oz. weigh only 15oz. and it does not require a mathematician to prove that if 1,000 blocks are sold 1oz. underweight there is a gain of 1,000oz., for which the public pays.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—That is a police court matter.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—No. While the honourable member was serving on a council how many cases came under his notice of police court action being taken in such circumstances? It is our responsibility to see that it does not happen. Now is the time we should mention these things so that full effect may be given to the Act. I support the second reading.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY (Southern)—I do not know whether the selling of cake is relevant to this Bill. I have often bought cake in a shop and if it weighed a little below or a

little above the amount required I was charged accordingly.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—You would not apply that to the sale of your wool.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY—We have to do it. When our wool is taken into store it may weigh 300 lb. a bale, but when it is sold it may weigh only 290 lb. I would be sorry to think that we introduced a line of thought in the marketing of cake that it should be sliced to bring it to the exact weight and the scraps wasted. I support the Bill.

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

NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 25. Page 915.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1)—The two main provisions relate to the payment of fees to members of the Nurses Registration Board and the registration of nurses from another State who are under the age of 21 years but already qualified. Previously members of the board gave their services voluntarily, but it is proposed that two guineas a sitting will be paid and that there will be 11 sittings a year. Members will thus receive 22 guineas a year. I suggest that this is too parsimonious. I am not suggesting that the professional people desire more, but it is belittling that members of professional boards should receive only two guineas a sitting. In attending board meetings members may suffer a fair amount of dislocation in their business, and in addition they have to meet incidental expenses. Instead of there being a minimum fee, I suggest that it should be between two guineas and 10 guineas. This would give recognition to people doing this work.

Clause 4 deals with the registration of nurses who are trained in another State. Often nurses desire to go to another State to undertake another branch of nursing, but they cannot be registered here until they reach 21 years, despite the fact that they may already have their certificate for midwifery or obstetrics. Under the Bill, however, if they are qualified in another State they may be registered here if under 21 years. Accordingly, this Bill will facilitate the working of the Act on the lines originally intended for the training of nurses.

Before resuming my seat I want to pay a tribute to the noble work carried out by the nursing profession. Every member here will agree when I say that it is one of the noblest professions we have. The work is of a self-sacrificing nature and very laborious at times. We are fortunate in this State in having the type of people who take up nursing on behalf of the sick and needy of the community; it is really a vocation, and if it were not we would have hardly anyone in the ranks of the trained nurses in Australia. It is a profession which we all hold in great respect.

I compliment the Hospitals Department on the manner in which it has dealt with housing the nursing staff of our respective hospitals. Not many years ago those who took up the profession of nursing were quartered under very poor conditions, often in the back yards of hospitals, but in the last few years the department has made a determined effort and has succeeded to a great extent in providing proper surroundings for nurses, both for their study and in their living quarters, and this augurs well for the future of the profession in South Australia. I support the second reading.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2)—This appears to be a brief but virtuous Bill and, as Mr. Bardolph said, it can be divided into two parts, the first dealing with payment of members of the board and the second with the registration of nurses. In his second reading speech Sir Lyell McEwin said, "The Government sees no reason why the payment of fees should not apply to the Nurses Board." Neither do I, and I imagine that other members do not. The fee, as Mr. Bardolph pointed out, is modest enough and one cannot take exception to this aspect of the Bill. The second part relates to the provisional registration of nurses at the age of 20 instead of 21. The Chief Secretary in his second reading speech pointed out that this State is suffering some disability because our Act does not permit the registration of nurses under the age of 21 whereas the Acts of other States do, and this causes a falling off in the number of midwifery trainees from other States. Sir Lyell said, "The clause (4) will enable such persons to be provisionally registered for the specific purpose of undergoing midwifery training, but it will prevent them from otherwise practising as registered nurses."

This is a guarded approach when there is in the other States, as mentioned by the Minister, apparently an absolute registration of these

people. I have not noticed the same guarded approach in recent legislation when the Government has been seeking further powers for itself, and I commend this approach as I would have commended it in the Mining Act Amendment Bill that we recently discussed. This appears to be the minimum to achieve the purpose, which I believe is always laudable, and I hope that the Government will adopt the same approach in other Bills when it is considering widening the powers of administration. The only query I have is in relation to clause 4. Proposed new section 21(5) says:—

Any person registered provisionally under subsection (3) of this section may, on reaching 21 years of age, apply for registration as a nurse, mental nurse, or midwife.

I take it that the draftsmanship of that clause is to make it clear that provisional registration does not preclude complete registration when the person registered attains the age of 21, but it seems possible to construe it to mean that a nurse may apply for registration, having been provisionally registered, whether she passes her exams or serves her term of apprenticeship or not between the ages of 20 and 21. I hope the Minister will consider the wording of that clause because the word "may" can be positive as it can be interpreted as "shall," and it can also be permissive. I make this comment at this stage so that the Minister may further look at that aspect before the Bill reaches the Committee stage. I support the second reading.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

INTER-STATE DESTITUTE PERSONS RELIEF ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 30. Page 943.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland)—This Bill has been discussed fairly fully and Mr. Shard gave us a dissertation on it yesterday, so that I do not propose to debate it at length. However, it has rather far-reaching effects. Its main purpose is to enable a person who has had an order for maintenance made against him in another State to apply to the court in this State to vary the amount of maintenance. This seems very just because a person may have been in particularly good circumstances in one State but, on leaving it, may fall into unemployment or have his income substantially reduced by other circumstances. If he has not sufficient money to go back to his own State to defend his case there is no alternative but to send him to gaol for failing to comply with the order taken out against him. I see no reason why the amendment should not be made. It is a good provision, and I think we can rely on the Judiciary to see that the only persons who benefit under this amendment are genuine cases. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

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

METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 30. Page 947.)

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY (Southern)—In supporting this measure I would say that it provides for a modest portion of what has been requested over the years, so that people slaughtering meat for export should be able to sell their reject meat in the metropolitan area. I have occasionally approached the Minister with regard to providing for the Noarlunga Meat Company to sell its reject meat on the metropolitan market, but the Government has hitherto not been prepared to agree to this. What has happened in the meantime is common knowledge and we are pleased that the Government has now seen fit to amend the regulations governing the Metropolitan Abattoirs.

The abattoirs have been a fairly satisfactory medium for selling cattle, sheep and lambs for a number of years. Members will appreciate that it is a heaven-sent opportunity for workers who want to strike to do so at the period when a strike can be most expensive to the producers, and consequently over the years there have been petty strikes and some larger ones at periods when many lambs were awaiting slaughter at the abattoirs. For that reason the producers have been anxious that another export abattoirs should be established and to sell their reject meat on the metropolitan market.

We have heard much talk regarding the weakening of the metropolitan abattoirs by this legislation, but I cannot see any foundation for that. The population of South Australia is growing so rapidly that the very small amount of meat that will be available for the people of Adelaide from any exporter who may set up would have a negligible effect. I have no very great hope that we will get further export abattoirs in the metropolitan area. Much money is required to set them up and consequently I very much question whether there will be any great rush to do so. It is possible, however, that within fairly heavily populated country areas

we may ultimately get some people who are interested enough, from the point of view not only of the local market but of the export market, to go into the abattoirs question. That is one of the things country people look forward to and hope will come into effect as times goes on.

I cannot say that I feel the Government has been at all generous in this matter, now or previously, but it is giving way a little on the principle formerly adopted. I hope that principle may be broadened as time goes on, and provide an effective contribution for those people desirous of setting up export meat works.

Before meat can be exported it has to be inspected by a Commonwealth inspector. After that inspector has set certain carcasses aside as rejects certain of those rejects may be sold for consumption within the metropolitan area, after further inspection by the State inspectors. As I understand it, that inspection is entirely under the control of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board. If an export abattoirs were set up in the metropolitan area the inspection would be a simple matter, but if it is in a country area that particular requirement of the Bill might be made so onerous that it would be most difficult for any country export works to function. I think that it is being made rather difficult to set up an export works. For instance, it would be most difficult for a firm to set up at Naracoorte, Bordertown or Murray Bridge, because if it wanted to sell meat in the metropolitan area it would have to take the meat to the Metropolitan Abattoirs for inspection and then back to the shops, and the extra expense involved would probably make the whole business unprofitable.

However, I am pleased that this step has been taken by the Government as a start towards the encouragement of additional export abattoirs, and I hope the trend may grow as time proceeds. The Bill provides that 10 per cent of the total of the meat killed for export may be sold on the home market, and the Government has gone to great pains to make sure that that amount will not be exceeded. First, the meat must be slaughtered for export, inspected by a Commonwealth inspector, and rejected, and then inspected by the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board before even that 10 per cent may be sold in the metropolitan area.

If there is any doubt about any firm trying to sell more on the metropolitan market than it is entitled to sell, I point out that the Bill provides that records of meat exported and meat sold in the metropolitan area must be kept and must be available to inspectors of the department at all times. The Minister, therefore, from time to time through his inspectors knows whether an export abattoirs is tending to exceed its quota of sales on the metropolitan market, and under those conditions he is enabled under the Bill to restrict or reduce the quota that firm is entitled to sell on the home market.

The Government has taken great precautions to see that no more meat than the 10 per cent will be sold on the metropolitan market. I feel, however, that 10 per cent would meet the position of a firm that does business on the local market, but it would be almost impossible for any firm which had no local business to carry on. However, it is a step in the right direction, and consequently I support it. With our growing population the amount of 10 per cent of meat killed for export would be so small as to amount to no more than one dinner a month for the people in the metropolitan area, and I can see no reason why it should adversely affect the Metropolitan Abattoirs; it should be a fillip to it to do as well as it can and build up its own organization nearer to perfection than it is at present, because, although it does a very good job, it could do better. We have heard criticism concerning the number of members on the board. If I remember correctly, we had a report of a Committee on the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board some time ago, and I believe on the recommendation of that committee another member was added to the board as an employees' representative, which indicates that the committee was satisfied the board was not too big.

Around the abattoirs has grown up a system that provides not only for those people who buy meat for human consumption within the metropolitan area and those who buy the carcasses for export, but for dealers and feeders—people who are prepared, at a time of glut or when stock are not quite fat enough to meet the market, to buy the lambs and hold them until a more favourable time. I point out that those people to a large extent fatten on the glut that may be caused from time to time when too many lambs come in or when the demand within the metropolitan area is not so great. Consequently, those dealers can buy, hold the stock and sell again at a substantial profit.

The fact that gluts and strikes occur plays into the hands of those people who buy as dealers, and we must be careful not to be advised by those people whether the abattoirs

is being efficiently managed. I am pleased that we have made a start on providing export abattoirs, other than the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, with the chance to sell some of their reject mutton and lamb within the metropolitan area. I support the Bill.

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

FRUIT FLY COMPENSATION BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 30. Page 947.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland)—The Bill before us is similar to certain Bills that have been brought into this Parliament since 1947, when the first outbreak of fruit fly was located in the metropolitan area. Since that time about £1,000,000 has been spent in eradication measures and £400,000 in compensation, which is a lot of money in anybody's language. People sometimes appear apprehensive and wonder whether they have received full value for their money. The activities of the Department of Agriculture in the eradication campaign fall into four main categories, namely, spraying, spray baiting, road check-points, and compensation.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Would the same eradication methods apply to the various types of fruit fly?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—Yes, the same treatments have been used up to date.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Are the growers themselves taking any necessary precaution?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—The growers are aware of the problem, and have done everything in their power, through their representatives, to urge the Government in this matter and to see that the fruit fly is kept in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—Had it been observed before 1947?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—Not in South Australia.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—There were rumours to the contrary.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—That is so, but I never believe anything that is not authoritative because it gets one into trouble. In 1947 when the first outbreak of Mediterranean fruit fly was located at Wayville we followed the same procedure as that being used in California and Florida, which was to proclaim an area of a mile radius. Nobody knew, and I do not think anybody knows now, whether a mile is the exact radius that we should take, but it proved successful in South Australia because only once has fruit fly been located in an area treated the year before, and that was in the 1947 outbreak at Wayville.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—What is your authority for saying that?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—The highest and best authority in the State, which is the Department of Agriculture. Following on the eradication of the Mediterranean fly in 1948 that fly did not reappear in South Australia until the recent infestation at Port Augusta, where the fly came from Western Australia. That clearly proves the point that we have been able to eradicate the Mediterranean fly in the metropolitan area, because it has not reappeared except where it was imported into Port Augusta last year.

The Hon. A. J. Shard—I am informed that in one area it has appeared three years in succession.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—That is not so. The Queensland fruit fly has proved a hardier specimen, and is the most persistent. Until last year the same methods had been used since 1947—the ordinary tartar bait sprays. In this present eradication period malathion has been used, and as an insecticide it should have a good effect because it has had a great effect on codlin moth and things of that nature in the commercial areas. It is to be hoped that it has had an effect on last year's outbreak. I do not think we can say that to all intents and purposes we have eradicated fruit fly in South Australia. We have no fruit fly at present, but until the summer months and the right conditions come again we will not know whether we have eradicated it. The position would not be the same in New South Wales because they know that all the year around they have fruit fly maggots in the various fruits as they ripen, and in Western Australia it is the same. We are not sure whether fruit fly over-winters or is re-introduced from outside. That is the present position.

Both here and in another place reference has been made to damage resulting from spraying. An assurance has been given by the Department of Agriculture that, if the formula is properly applied, no damage should be sustained by trees sprayed with either the tartar bait original or this malathion spray. I do not say that damage has not been sustained—I know it has—but, had the formula laid down by the department been adhered to, I do not think it would have occurred.

The Hon. A. J. Shard—Is it the department's business to see that the formula is applied?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—Human nature comes into it, I am afraid. A gang goes out on a job and is given a certain amount of malathion to use. If the gang does not work hard during the day and has a good deal of this stuff left over, it is my guess that the strength of the solution gets stronger as the day goes on because malathion has to be used up. I can see no other reason why these sprays, which are used successfully in commercial orchards, should not be safe. No burn is sustained unless something is wrong with the mixing—that could be the reason. I agree that a closer check should be kept on the mixing of these sprays. There is nothing wrong with the department's formula: the fault lies in its application.

The biological or parasitic method of control of this particular fruit fly has been mentioned. In Hawaii success has been achieved with parasites that have attacked the oriental type of fruit fly that abounds in that area. It is also interesting to know that two years ago the Commonwealth Government made available a certain sum for sending an officer to Hawaii to study the parasitic control of the fruit fly. He brought back two species of parasite, which have been liberated in the Coff's Harbour district of New South Wales where the fruit fly abounds. The result has not manifested itself yet, but I am hoping that something good will come out of it because, if the fruit fly can be cleaned up in the other States, it is as good as our doing it here because, the less they have there, the less they can send across to us.

The two types of parasites liberated are known as the opius ōōphilus and the longicaudatis. The result of that experiment will be known in perhaps two or three years' time when we see how things go. The Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization is working all the time on various methods of trying to find better means of eradicating the fruit fly than we have at present.

The fruit fly road blocks are working successfully in South Australia. They have justified their existence on many occasions, and have detected infested fruit at both the Western Australian road block and the Yamba road block on the South Australian border on the upper Murray. Pressure has been put on the department for some time to do something about the Duke's Highway at a point somewhere between Meningie and Murray Bridge. Certain legal difficulties are involved in taking fruit from people as far inside our borders as at Murray Bridge, but the buffer zones set up between South Australia and the infested areas of Victoria and New South Wales must help. Both the Victorian and New South Wales Governments have road blocks in their areas where the fruit fly is at its worst. However, they do not police them nearly as well as we do ours: nobody is ever searched; a man is asked whether he is carrying fruit and, if he says "No," he can more or less go through. It is an "honour" system; but in South Australia cars are frequently searched. I have always thought that more prosecutions should be made where people will not declare fruit and where, on inspection, custard apples, pineapples, fruit from Queensland and tomatoes are found to be absolutely full of maggots, in which case had that fruit got into our commercial areas our present problem would have been aggravated.

South Australia still supplies most of the export market for citrus, for the very reason that the other States have all been prohibited from exporting to the New Zealand and Singapore markets. It is essential that we keep the South Australian citrus industry going and see that the fruit fly does not appear in our fruit-growing areas because, once it does, the 50-mile radius would cut out the whole of the upper Murray if the fly appeared in any one of those districts. It is important for our export trade and our citrus industry generally that everything possible is done to ensure that we do not run into this difficulty.

Suggestions were made by Mr. Shard and Mr. Anthoney that persons be notified when strippers or sprayers are going to their property. I do not think it would do any harm at all. A squad of men should not be unduly disorganized by having to wait until the lady of the house is found and, if she is not at home, having to by-pass her. The men could knock on the door as an act of courtesy and say, "We are from the fruit fly squad and are here on official business." The department is doing all it can in this respect. It is keeping abreast of the latest scientific knowledge available in Australia and from overseas and, providing we all play our part in assisting to eradicate the fruit fly, I think that South Australia has a good chance of beating it.

The Hon. J. L. BICE (Southern)—Over the years we have heard many practical speeches on

the control of the fruit fly. Today, we have been fortunate to hear an excellent speech by Mr. Story, who has tried to approach this problem from the point of view of the fruitgrower. I support this effort made by the Government to encourage people to report the fly when it appears in their backyards. It is impossible to imagine what a calamity it would be if we were ever deprived of our fruit carts and fruit shops. We are blessed in that we have always been able to purchase fruit reasonably cheaply. It is important for us, for it obviates the necessity of doctors being called in so often. If we had the misfortune to experience the trouble suffered by New South Wales, Western Australia and Queensland, it would be bad for us. We should do everything we can to encourage the backyard vegetable grower to report any infestation that may occur in his locality. The effort that the Government and the departmental officers have made in policing the road blocks reflects a practical approach to ending this trouble.

During my recent visit to the Eastern States, I was interested to see those who collected the fruit and was struck by the difficulty of freight travelling by air. Sometimes in that way people have been responsible unintentionally for bringing fruit flies here. I support the measure and compliment the Government on its action in trying to control the fruit fly.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General)—Honourable members have listened carefully, and also to their great advantage, to the speech made by Mr. Story. One of the biggest difficulties here is that people do not realize the consequences if this matter gets out of hand. Also, they do not know the facts relating to the treatment of the problem. If adequate publicity could be given to the factual statement made by Mr. Story, it would be to the advantage of everyone concerned, and there would be less criticism. I rise only to draw attention to the excellent speech we have just heard and to commend Mr. Story for the work he has done in bringing the matter before us.

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

FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 30. Page 948.)

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1)—The object of the Bill is to increase the amount the South Australian Fire Brigades Board may borrow, from £25,000 to £100,000. The former figure has operated since 1913, and, in view of the decrease in the value of money since, I am rather surprised that this amendment was not introduced earlier. As a comparison, in 1936, when the Act was consolidated, the basic wage was about £3 5s. a week, but has been increased almost four times to £12 16s. The functions of the board in 1936 were not nearly as onerous as they are today and it is therefore surprising that the amount it could borrow has remained stationary since 1913.

In 1936 many emergency fire services were manned by volunteers, but these services have been taken over by the board and consequently its costs have been considerably increased. These include alterations to buildings, the cost of which today is very high, and therefore this legislation is necessary. Both industrialization and population have increased, and thus greater responsibility is placed on the board to provide protection against fires. Its equipment must be modern to satisfy present day requirements, especially in the metropolitan area. The public would not have much confidence in the ability of the board to handle an emergency if its stations were not properly staffed and equipped, and to meet this position much capital is necessary.

Yesterday, Sir Collier Cudmore drew members' attention to section 26 of the principal Act, which permits the board to raise a loan with or without security, and he was somewhat critical of the phraseology of this section. Apart from the State Government's making a loan, the board would have to raise funds from financial institutions or even by private subscription, if that were possible. I believe the board would have great difficulty in raising £100,000 without security. I cannot imagine any institution lending money under those terms, but if anyone were prepared to do so, that would be his business. If it were considered that the clause should provide for the raising of funds on security, it could be amended, but I do not think it should. If anyone demands security from the board and it agrees to provide the security, that meets the requirements of the lender. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Borrowing powers."

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General)—Yesterday Sir Collier Cudmore referred to the question of the board's raising a loan without security and for his information I have obtained the following report from the Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman:—

Section 26 is virtually in the same form (apart from the limit of borrowing) as it was when enacted in 1890 and the words "without security" have been re-enacted in the law since that time. By so providing, the Fire Brigades Board is given the alternative of borrowing on the security of its real estate assets or by such means as by overdraft. However, if the board desires finance over a period of years, it would in all probability be necessary for the board to give security in order to meet the requirements of the lending institution. It would, of course, be possible for the board to obtain different advances under the section, some with security and some on overdraft, provided that the total borrowing does not exceed that permitted by the section. In all cases the consent of the Minister is necessary to the borrowing.

That makes it quite clear that the provision facilitates the operations of the board. It has worked satisfactorily and I think it will continue to do so.

The Hon. Sir COLLIER CUDMORE—I thank the Minister for his explanation. If the board requires small amounts on overdraft the section gives it the power to borrow without security, but when £100,000 is involved, there should be security. It seems absurd that public bodies should be authorized to borrow big sums without proper provision. Curiously enough, section 27 of the Act enables the board to borrow on debenture, but apparently this has not been of much use to it. The fact that the board has refrained from getting into heavy debt and that its indebtedness is only about £9,000 under the present legislation giving it the right to borrow £25,000, shows that its affairs have been carefully managed and I do not think we run any risk by increasing the amount.

Clause passed.

Title passed; Bill reported without amendment.

Committee's report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.55 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, October 7, at 2.15 p.m.