

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Wednesday, November 4, 1959.

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

WRONGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Wrongs Act, 1936-1958. Read a first time.

MANNINGHAM RECREATION GROUND ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Manningham Recreation Ground Act, 1936. Read a first time.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The object of this Bill is to enable the Council of the Corporation of the City of Enfield to lease portion of the land vested in it by the Manningham Recreation Ground Act, 1936, for the purposes of a bowling green. The principal Act, by section 3, vested in the council certain land which had been left by the late Dr. Bennett for the purposes of development as a children's playground and pleasure recreation grounds upon certain conditions, the material one of which for present purposes is that set forth in section 4 of the principal Act which requires the council "whenever it has money available for the purpose" to improve the land as a children's playground, pleasure and recreation ground for use by the public, adhering as nearly as practicable to a design in the plan described as "Plan No. 2 annexed to the Deed of Trust" made by Dr. Bennett in his lifetime. The design in that plan provided, among other things, for a bowling green. The council is proceeding to give effect to its obligations, playground equipment having been placed on the land and a drinking fountain having been approved for erection in the position directed in the plan.

The council has received a request for a lease to be granted to a bowling club to be established, the proposed club to lay down a bowling green to modern standards for the use of its members and of the general public. The council has been advised by its solicitors that under the existing provisions of the Act it cannot grant a lease of any portion of the grounds nor under any of its general powers under the Local Government Act. As it seems desirable that the wishes of the late Dr. Bennett should

be carried out, the Government has introduced the present Bill, clause 3 of which amends the existing section 4 by inserting a new subsection specifically empowering the council to lease the land to be used as a bowling green in accordance with the design in the plan. The Bill, being a hybrid Bill within the meaning of the Joint Standing Orders, will require reference to a Select Committee. I commend the Bill to the favourable consideration of members.

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

NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

MARKETING OF EGGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to extend the operation of the Marketing of Eggs Act for a further three years from September 30, 1960. Although the operation of the principal Act was extended in 1957 until September, 1960, it is considered desirable, in the interests of the egg industry and stability in general planning, to introduce this amending Bill now rather than wait until the Act has nearly expired before doing so. The principal Act was first passed in 1941 and has been extended from time to time. The marketing scheme created under the Act has become an important part of the egg industry and orderly marketing is important in this State, where periods of surplus production alternate with periods of shortage. Under the marketing scheme created by the principal Act the South Australian Egg Board markets all eggs produced by commercial egg producers. The Board consists of six members, three representing producers, two representing wholesalers and retailers respectively, and the sixth member being the Chief Poultry Adviser in the Department of Agriculture. The sixth member is Chairman of the Board.

The Board is represented on the Australian Egg Board which regulates the overseas export of eggs. As the export market is on a consignment basis there is frequently a gap of some months between the time when the eggs are received by the board and the realizations for the eggs are known. The Australian Egg Board makes an advance payment to the State Egg Board at the time of packing in order to

bridge this gap, final adjustments being made at the end of the season. For the reasons which I have stated earlier the Government believes that the industry should continue to receive the support of this legislation in the marketing of its eggs and considers it desirable that this extension Bill should be enacted into law during this session of Parliament.

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

STOCK DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Stock Diseases Act has as its object the prevention of the introduction or spread of contagious and infectious diseases affecting stock, including animals and birds. It empowers the making of regulations for restricting the movement, and for the inspection, quarantine and treatment of stock, fodder or fittings. It empowers the appointment of inspectors and contains general provisions for preventing the spread of disease in stock. It has been reported by the Chief Inspector of Stock that he is unable to control the sale of eggs from fowls affected with pul-lorum disease, since eggs are not included under the principal Act. Other animal products such as milk, cheese, and the like are also not included. The omissions make it impossible to control the movement of such products in the event of an outbreak of serious disease. It is considered desirable, for obvious reasons, that the omissions should be remedied and this is the object of the present Bill.

Clause 3 will add a new definition to those already contained in section 5 of the principal Act. It will define "animal product" as meaning and including meat, milk, eggs, and the like. At the same time paragraph (c) of clause 3 adds to the definition of "stock" in the principal Act "any animal product." The effect of this will be that the provisions of the Act relating to stock will now be applicable in respect of animal products, as defined in the new provision. At the same time the opportunity is being taken of including in the definition of "carcass" the words "feathers, blood and viscera."

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

FRUIT FLY (COMPENSATION) BILL. Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to enable the Government to pay compensation for losses arising from the campaign for the eradication of fruit fly during the period since the passing of a similar Bill during the 1958 session. Five proclamations relating to areas in the vicinity of Alberton, Alberton Extension, Pennington, Port Augusta and Kent Town were issued during that period to prevent persons from carrying away fruit from the infected areas. Following the practice of other years, the Government proposes that compensation shall be given for loss arising from these measures, and is accordingly introducing this Bill.

The explanation of the clauses of the Bill is as follows:—Clause 3 provides for compensation for loss arising by reason of any act of the officers of the Department of Agriculture on any land within the areas defined by the proclamations and provides also for compensation for loss arising from the prohibition of the removal of fruit from any such land. Clause 4 fixes the time limit within which claims for compensation must be lodged as February 1, 1960. I hope the Leader of the Opposition will be more kindly disposed to this Bill than he was in remarks he made the other day on the fruit fly campaign. This Bill is to provide for compensation for people in proclaimed areas.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 3. Page 1334.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland)—I support the Bill and wish to draw attention to one or two matters in it. It has already been stated that the Government is budgeting for a deficit of £791,000 in this measure and the main reason given for the deficit is the adverse season. The Government is to be commended for such a small deficit when it is realized that this is the worst season on record. It is even worse than 1914, which I do not remember, but which is talked of by old-timers as the most crippling season the State has had. Despite the adverse reports we have received it is still estimated that we shall keep within the deficit budgeted for.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—What do you mean by “old-timers”?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—I was only paying a compliment to those who have been here longer than I. The time is ripe for us to examine the position. The honourable Mr. Condon yesterday pointed out that the first people who will suffer as a result of this dry season are the primary producers. One does not have to be very old to remember that the primary producer is always the first to get it in the neck. It naturally follows that when the neck of the goose is cut it is not long before there are no golden eggs. That applies right through the State and it does not matter whether the person we are speaking of is a primary producer or a manufacturer because the whole State is affected if the primary producer gets it in the neck. The honourable Mr. Condon mentioned that yesterday.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—And the goose will disappear.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—Yes, indeed. The honourable member mentioned a number of matters relating to primary producers and he said that the primary producer would be the first to be affected. He mentioned the amount of wheat that might be reaped in the State this year. He has spoken of 5,500,000 bushels which, I think, is the official figure that the Department of Agriculture has been issuing in recent weeks. That may or may not be the ultimate harvest, but it will be considerably less than 10,000,000 bushels, which is only one-third of last year's wheat crop. The honourable member also made rather great play on the words “one-way traffic,” and said the primary producer was rather a privileged person in this age and in all ages because he received subsidies and everything fell into his lap. He went on to say:—

We subsidize primary products such as butter, eggs and other commodities and the public of South Australia is called upon to pay an increased local price to offset the lower export price, but if anyone suggested that some assistance be given to the manufacturing industry I have just mentioned there would be a hue and cry. It is one-way traffic, and although I have always supported, and hope I always will support, the giving of assistance to primary industries I am afraid that we often neglect those secondary industries.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Secondary industry is protected and has always been protected under the terms of the Tariff Board. I have absolute confidence in the promotion of secondary industry in this State and it is quite unwise and untrue to say

that secondary industry is not being assisted in any way. The primary producer in the main is the last on the stick because he has a perishable commodity. In one industry that I am particularly familiar with—the fruit canning industry—the price of fruit has been reduced by £10 a ton, but in the same period the can maker has taken two rises in the cost of the can. The cost of the can into which the fruit goes for export is now more than the cost of the fruit itself.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Some of the can makers have been carrying the cannery industry for some time.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—I had not noticed it. I should like some proof of that; it would be most interesting. We have to compete on world markets and whether we give subsidies to the primary producers or put up the prices on the local market amounts to the same thing: somebody has to pay for it. As I see it, it is essential that Australia maintains its overseas exports in those commodities that can reasonably come out of the market without showing too much deficit. Yesterday the honourable Mr. Condon made a statement about the price of butter in the United Kingdom. He mentioned a very low price for it yesterday. A cutting from today's *Advertiser* about butter prices seems to indicate fairly clearly that we are not really giving away our primary products on the overseas markets. It states:—

Butter prices, the recent sharp rise which has perturbed British housewives, have risen again in several London stores by between 2d and 4d. Australian and New Zealand butter was already at a record level of about 4s. 8d. lb. before the latest London rise. English butter was 6s. lb. Danish butter exporters yesterday raised the price for the English market to a record 462s. cwt.—an increase of 18s.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—The honourable member knows it was 1s. 6d. for a time.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—The honourable member made a statement yesterday and I am drawing his attention to the newspaper article. I like to keep up-to-date because if one runs along with the times one will not go far wrong, but if one dwells in the past one stagnates. If ever there was a time to run along with the times, it is now.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—Who gets the benefit of that increased price—the producer?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—It does not matter. The spending power of the nation is what really counts when we get down to fundamentals.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—But does not the Australian producer subsidize that overseas price?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—The Australian producer is doing something for Australia in producing the butter in the first place, in sending it to England in the second place, and also in bringing back some credits to Australia which enable secondary industries to function efficiently and the Australian consumer to buy secondary industry products at a much lower price than overseas. That enables Australia to live in rather a luxury category.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Tell us something about the flour milling industry!

The Hon. C. R. STORY—That industry has a representative in this House and I do not intend to get involved now.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—But does not the Australian producer subsidize that credit that you say comes back to Australia?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—I think he does to a large extent, but it keeps our standard of living on a high plane. Our workers are probably paid on the second highest labour market in the world.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—The honourable member had better be careful there!

The Hon. C. R. STORY—They are paid at a very high rate compared with most countries in the world. These bogies brought up from time to time about the primary producer are somewhat mythical when we realize that the world's population is growing rapidly, that in the course of one year another 15,000,000 will be born in China. We have to produce food to maintain our markets, which needs long-term planning so far as the primary producers are concerned.

For instance, the citrus industry has a 10-year programme. If we are going to embark upon greater export production we have to start this year to increase the amount of citrus exportable in 10 years' time; so there is a good deal of hit and miss in this industry and in other primary industries. I do not think the average person minds if there is a little surplus, but I get worried sometimes when I hear untrue statements made about primary producers generally.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—The Labor Party policy in the Federal sphere stabilizes the primary producers' prices.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—It is interesting to hear that it has a policy; I had not noticed it over the years.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—You enjoyed it when the Federal Labor Government was in power.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—Turning now to the Bill, I note the figure of £210,000 shown on the receipts side for motor vehicle registrations and licences, and it is stated that the whole amount will be expended on roads in this State. That is, I think, unique in Australia. I do not think many States can boast that they can spend £210,000—in other words, the full amount—on roads. There is plenty of scope for spending money on roads now. I do not know whether I am alone in this thought: I think it is a good thing to make bad roads good but I am not so sure that it is such a wonderful idea to make good roads better at the expense of outlying areas with no good roads at present. I feel that expansion around the metropolitan area may be a wise plan over the years, but bitumen in some of the outlying areas would be most appreciated by the people there rather than making speedways, so to speak, in areas within 25 to 30 miles of the city. I ask the Minister of Roads to consider bituminizing roads in areas well away from the city that have no decent roads now.

On the expenditure side, I notice "Sheriff, Gaols and Prisons Department, £450,000," an increase of £58,000 over last year, £27,000 of which has been spent in seven months on the Cadell Prison Farm. Those who have had an opportunity of seeing that farm cannot but feel that anybody placed there must be better for having been there because the whole atmosphere is anything but that of a prison. It is surrounded by excellent countryside, low-lying country with good soil that will produce anything if watered. Sixty persons will be moving in in December. If they have any interest in their rehabilitation I cannot think of anywhere better for them to be than New Era, which was the original name of the area now set up as a prison farm. I was a little alarmed to see that provision was made for 60 short-term prisoners from the Murray areas. I did not think that in 10 years there would be 60 people from the Murray areas who would have to go to prison!

The amount provided for the Engineering and Water Supply Department is £3,650,000, an increase of £557,000 on last year. Most of this money will be spent on pumping water from the Murray, mainly to the metropolitan area. Provision is made for an increase in the water pumped from Mannum to Adelaide by the installation of an additional pumping station

along the route, so that instead of 52,000,000 gallons a day being delivered, this will be increased to 55,000,000 gallons. Forty-two bores have been reopened in the metropolitan area with a capacity of 9,000,000 gallons a day. It is most interesting that so much water is being drawn from this source, in view of another Bill now before the Chamber, and we must realize how fortunate we are to have this supply available to augment reservoir supplies. Undoubtedly Adelaide will develop into a city of 1,000,000 people within a fairly short time. I honestly believe that South Australia will not be governed in its development by any factor of greater importance than water. When we compare ourselves with our eastern sisters and realize the opportunities they have for water conservation, our achievement in this direction is colossal. It emphasizes the necessity for more and more conservation, and if necessary the use of a solar system or something else to augment our water supply. We have some water which contains more than 500 grains of salt to the gallon and perhaps this could be used, and even sea water, for industry.

There is need for research by the Department of Agriculture in conjunction with the Waite Agricultural Research Institute into the nematode problem. A nematode is a very small worm, thin like hair, which works underground in attacking the root systems of trees and it is causing substantial losses in areas where fruit trees are grown commercially. Usually the growth of the nematodes is accentuated by the weakening of trees by some out-of-balance procedure during the previous year. In the Upper Murray in 1957 it was the salt water that was applied to trees and weakened them, so enabling the nematode population to grow to alarming proportions. It is almost impossible to control them. Much research is necessary and at present the Waite Research Institute is doing something about it. Fruit-growers are so perturbed that they have levied themselves to provide a fund for the appointment of specialists to deal with this problem. They are called nematologists and there are very few of them in Australia. It is to be hoped that the department will come into the scheme and appoint extension officers to supervise the experiments. This problem is a very real one and if not attacked in its early stages will put out of production an enormous area of horticultural land.

Gummosis and fruit fly have also created problems that have not been solved. Gummosis is a wind-borne spore which is liberated by rain and can be blown from any part of the

State to another part. Unless the prunings and old wood from affected trees, the natural host for this disease, are burned, it will spread and take charge of large areas of orchards. No cure has yet been found, although palliative methods have been devised for its control. Growers have levied themselves to the extent of 1s. a ton on canned deciduous fruits and 8s. a ton on dried deciduous fruits and this should produce enough for the appointment of two or three officers. I ask the department to give serious and sympathetic consideration to their appointment in the near future. I believe that the Bush Fires Research Committee during its very short life has shown that it is active and practical. The clean-up week it has conducted throughout council areas recently has met with the approbation of the people, and has worked well in many areas that I know.

The Commissioner who inquired into the sinking of a ferry at Kingston-on-Murray recommended the installation of a second ferry to enable semi-trailers, especially oil tankers, to be accommodated so that they would not be ferried with ordinary vehicles carrying civilians. In his opinion it is most essential that every opportunity should be taken to protect the lives of people travelling on buses which use the ferries. I think that most people who have used a ferry have at some time or other found themselves alongside a semi-trailer, and unable to open their car door because they have the tray of the trailer on one side, and the side of the ferry on the other. I can imagine no greater death trap to the travelling public than to be forced into that position alongside a semi-trailer. I believe that the Commissioner's recommendations are fair and will go a long way toward protecting the travelling public. I ask the Government to have his findings implemented.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—How long will it be before you ask for another bridge at Kingston?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—I was about to resume my seat, but I was not quick enough. We haven't got one bridge yet at Kingston, nor at Blanchetown, although one is under way there. I am quite sure we all believe, as I said earlier, that "if you sit in the past you stagnate," and when the bridge at Blanchetown is completed I shall be most disappointed if I cannot come forward with a strong body of opinion to say that there should be a bridge at Kingston-on-Murray.

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

LOCAL COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 3. Page 1327.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1)—I support the Bill. As the Minister indicated, it is merely a machinery measure to facilitate the working of the courts and various matters that come before them, particularly with regard to the issuing of summonses from a local court. The Bill provides that summonses shall be issued from the nearest local court to the place of residence or business of the defendant. There has been some doubt as to the definition of distance from a court and this amendment clears up the point by making it conditionally one mile each way, thereby giving the defendant an opportunity to attend the court, and there can be no ambiguity about the processing of the summons. One of the main features is with regard to the issuing of unsatisfied judgment summonses. At present, if a defendant fails to appear in court, and a sentence of imprisonment is ordered, the bailiff has no alternative but to execute the warrant within five days. As the Minister pointed out, there may be occasions when a defendant is unable to appear in court, and on being sought out by the bailiff may not have the money immediately available to meet the judgment, and consequently he must be imprisoned. This amendment, by allowing one month's grace at the discretion of the bailiff, gives some flexibility. It also relieves the Government of any doubt regarding false imprisonment when an order has been made by a court not in close proximity to the residence or business of the alleged offender. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

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

UNDERGROUND WATERS PRESERVATION BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 3. Page 1337.)

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES (Southern)—I congratulate the Government on its courage and far-sighted attitude regarding the main principle of this Bill, *i.e.*, to control the contamination and deterioration of underground water supplies. I find it rather difficult in some ways to talk on the measure because I have come across several contradictions in it. I value my association with a Government that is prepared to put into the Statute Book something that I think very necessary for the safe-

guarding of our supply of water, which is one of the most valued possessions that we have in this State, and we must remember that South Australia is an extraordinarily dry one even by Australian standards. One aspect of importance that has been overlooked so far is that where water supplies are drawn from sources such as the River Murray they are very localized and must be used in the areas to which the water is delivered, and reservoirs, soak-ages and the flooding of river beds supplying those reservoirs are also localized. The importance of this underground reserve of water lies in its diffusion over such a large portion of the State.

I listened intently to Mr. Potter's great effort and although I do not completely agree with all his remarks that is not a point very applicable to the debate at this stage. He referred to Queensland legislation on this subject. I find on making inquiries that although it appears on paper to be a good scheme it is not administered as one would wish a scheme such as this to be administered in a State like South Australia. To Mr. Densley's remarks I must always pay respect, but I think that perhaps he over-emphasized the dangers from an agricultural point of view. I intend to enlarge on that later. The only query I have on Sir Arthur Rymill's contribution to the debate is in relation to his interpretation of the word "permit." This seems to hinge on the Government's intent in this Bill, and I have had a hard job in some cases trying to discover what the intention really is.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—No-one else knows either.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES—Sir Arthur Rymill suggested that clause 7 (1) (d) which states, "a well is used for drainage purposes," is the only permanent fixture or permanently completed well mentioned in that clause under the term "permits." Mr. Story took up the point in relation to clause 10 concerning the duration of the period of permit and suggested a certain alteration there, and Sir Arthur Rymill suggested that the term "permit" was relevant to both clauses 6 and 7. The Chief Secretary, in his second reading speech, said, "Clause 6 requires occupiers of existing wells or wells in course of construction to notify the Minister of their existence and clause 7 provides that wells may not be sunk or deepened or used for drainage purposes without a permit." Mr. Story is interested in an amendment in relation to permits, but I

think it is rather consequential on what happens in respect of another amendment that he wishes to make in relation to the definition of a "well," in which he hopes to exclude septic tanks, or possibly put a limitation of depth into it.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—You could not call a septic tank a well.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES—If you examine the definition I think you could, because clause 7 (1) (d) says "a well used for drainage purposes," dug after the proclamation of the Act. In other words paragraph (d) sets out, with the three preceding paragraphs, something that takes place after proclamation of the Act and puts the four things into line. Whereas clause 6 deals entirely with wells already dug and "notification" is the essence of the contract, in clause 7 the essence is "permit." I am in complete agreement with Mr. Story's suggestion regarding proclamation by regulation as it makes the Bill functional, whereas I do not think it could be in its present form. It puts the responsibility on the proper footing. I have read Sir Collier Cudmore's remarks in 1948 on the Prices Act and the importance of proclamation by regulation and the proper responsibility of the Government to revoke such proclamation if necessary. I subscribe to his point of view as it affects this Bill.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—What about the time when Parliament is in recess?

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES—I take it that is largely a matter for the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. Under regulation it can be brought before Parliament as a whole if necessary for discussion or to make new regulations. The amendment suggested to clause 10 by Mr. Story becomes unnecessary when the doubt about notification and permits under clauses 6 and 7 is cleared up. In other words, the two-year period mentioned is for permits that are given for putting down new wells and bores. No period is mentioned for the termination of the permit and I think that shows what is the intention of the Government. If that is so I have no complaint at all about that clause because it is only right that the permit should carry on until revoked. The honourable Mr. Story has suggested an amendment to clause 14 relating to the issue of a fresh permit on application after refusal, but I do not agree with his suggestion. He feels that on a resale of a property the new owner should be entitled to apply for a permit, if necessary, under new conditions. I do not think the Bill reads in the way he imagines it to read. The wording is:—

If an applicant has been refused a permit under this Part . . .

There is nothing that I can see in that wording which prevents a new owner from applying afresh before a period of two years. I am not in favour of the honourable member's suggestion.

The Hon. C. R. Story—You should read clause 12, "Transfer and variation of permits."

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES—I shall not read it at present but I may in Committee reply to it. That is the point I make about some of the suggested alterations. I hope I have not taken too much of the House's time by discussing matters that should be discussed in Committee but I think the matter is relevant because if some of the questions on notification and permits could be cleared up I think I could get the Bill in better perspective.

I am principally concerned with country people and I think that the use of the words "proclamation by regulation" will not cause them very great hardship. No notification clause exists in this Bill about wells already put down in areas not proclaimed. I would not be in favour of the Bill if I did not believe that it would be policed in this fashion in the future. I cannot think of anything I disapprove of more, pertaining to primary producers, than a lot of red tape and further bureaucratic interference in their lives. I believe the only successful farmers on a one-man unit basis are the ones who rarely have any time to put into book work. On bigger farms the reverse applies and very often a great deal of book work and thought is necessary. I would hate to see this measure applied needlessly to people who work for their livelihood on the land. It would not be a fair crack of the whip at all if it were applied in that way.

The Bill mentions deterioration of supplies in areas in the proximity of Government bores. That must be looked at very carefully. The consumption per capita per day in 1948-49 was 70 gallons, but the consumption per capita per day in 1959 had risen to 108 gallons. In other words, there has been an increase of over 50 per cent per person in the use of water in 10 years. When great numbers of school children leave school and marry and require houses in the not distant future obviously the consumption of water will be much greater again. Under the heading of deterioration of supplies we also have the example mentioned by at least one other speaker of farms being sold in various parts of the metropolitan area. Bore levels have gone down in isolated areas

from ground level to 120ft. in a matter of a very few years. It is right that the Government should take some responsibility in this matter and try to make sure that pollution of pure supplies and deterioration of actual supplies are kept well under control. Looking at the question in that way I can see the purpose of the Bill in requiring statistical information on samples of soil at certain depths and also samples of water. I question whether the Bill will work in terms of some qualifications to it because "to err is human," particularly when one is busy, and I question whether this measure can be policed if bores can be put down privately instead of by licensed borers.

The honourable Mr. Condon quoted Mr. Campbell as being an expert on the deterioration of water supplies. There must obviously be expert opinion of that type which can be brought to bear on the deterioration of water supplies.

I do not think anyone would doubt the need to guard against industrial effluent contaminating underground waters. In the country even dairy factories create some difficulty regarding the disposal problem, let alone the secondary industries which become a real problem. We have an example at Mount Gambier of contamination. I do not know what is the attitude of the people there to the Bill, and that is one reason why I admire the Government for its courage in introducing the measure. I believe the Government is acting in good faith. Many members know how water is disposed of in Mount Gambier. I admit that the earth there presents a very good filter system, but this method of drainage is a dangerous one in this area and it is one that could break down at any tick of the clock.

Several opinions have been expressed in this House regarding contamination from septic tanks. If septic tanks are removed from the definition of "well" we get a lot of conflicting views. I believe that Clare has a number of septic tanks within the town limit and that there is a local government provision prohibiting the use of underground waters for domestic purposes in that locality. On the other hand at Murray Bridge and its environs septic tank outlets are put down to a very great depth to effect disposal, and obviously the effluent must get into underground waters and possibly pollute the supply. No doubt we shall need this legislation to ensure a safe source of good quality water, which is essential for this State and for future generations. It is essential that we leave them a legacy of good water. I am completely in favour of the principle of the Bill, but I do not know what attitude

to take on some clauses in it. I have already indicated my support for some, but on others I am in some doubt. I hope that the problems I have raised may be resolved when the Bill is discussed in Committee because I do believe that the principle of the Bill is a very right and proper one.

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

BIRTHS AND DEATHS REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 3. Page 1326.)

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1)—The principal Act has not always been known by its present title, and before 1937 there were six Acts, including amending Acts, dealing with this subject. They were the Registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1874, and the Legitimation Act of 1898. The first Act was amended in 1900 and the second in 1902. Then there were the Births, Marriages and Deaths Registration Act, 1907, and the 1915 Registration of Deaths in War Act. All these Acts were repealed in 1936 by the present Act, which in turn was amended in 1940, 1942 and 1947.

On examining this Bill I found all the sections proposed to be amended excepting sections 29, 32, 32a and 33 were in the amending legislation of 1947. The amending legislation of 1940 and 1942 dealt with different matters from those contained in the present Bill, so I suggest that the time has arrived when this legislation should be consolidated. The original Act of 1936 had 63 sections, many of which have been amended. This supports my view that, assuming the present Bill is passed, this legislation should all be embodied in the one Act, for it is difficult to search through four or five volumes to find the meaning of one particular section. At the beginning of his second reading speech the Chief Secretary said:—

It is designed to effect a change in procedure relating to the registration of births and deaths so as to make it possible to relieve, as far as practicable, members of the police force of duties as assistant district registrars under the Births and Deaths Registration Act and to effect an overall saving in the administrative expenses of the registration branch of the Statistical Department. The Bill also seeks to simplify and clarify the procedure relating to the registration of births and deaths.

On the question of relieving members of the police force of duties as assistant district registrars, the Bill uses the same phraseology as was used in the original and amending Acts, so it will not achieve its desired purpose in that

respect. In the principal Act "district registrar" is defined as "a district registrar of births and deaths appointed for a district," and "assistant district registrar" is defined as "a person appointed to act as assistant district registrar in any district." The same wording was used in the amending legislation. I am doubtful about the interpretation of "assistant district registrar," for it is open to two meanings. "In any district" could mean any district at all, and that the person who would be appointed as an assistant district registrar would operate in any district. I do not think that is the intended meaning, which is that in any district where the services of an assistant district registrar were required a person could be appointed to that office. The same remarks apply to the interpretation of "district registrar." The Bill does not say what the intention is.

I turn now to the amendment to section 15 of the principal Act, subsection (2) of which is contained in the amending Act of 1947. It states:—

The particulars to be furnished for the registration of a birth shall be furnished in an information statement in the prescribed form. The person by whom the particulars are furnished shall record or cause to be recorded the particulars in the information statement in the presence of the district registrar or an assistant district registrar of the district in which the child was born and shall certify that the particulars so recorded are correct to the best of his knowledge and belief.

It is now proposed to delete the words "in the presence of the district registrar or an assistant district registrar of the district in which the child was born." This will mean that an information statement will be prepared and, as long as it is duly certified to be true and correct to the best of the informant's knowledge and belief, it will not have to be prepared in the presence of a district registrar or an assistant district registrar: it can be done at home and forwarded to the district registrar or assistant district registrar, who will record the fact as correct from the certified statement. This will save much time, assuming there was a local police officer to act as the district registrar or assistant district registrar, who at present has to take the statement in the presence of the person desirous of making the registration. The elimination of the words suggested would be an advantage.

As now proposed to be amended, subsection (3) of section 15 of the principal Act will read as follows:—

The district registrar or assistant district registrar who receives the information statement shall from the particulars furnished in

the information statement register the birth in accordance with the form in the second schedule and shall within seven days forward the information statement to the principal registrar.

The words "information statement" occur there three times. I suggest that "said statement" be used instead of "information statement" the second time it occurs: that would improve the subsection. A similar amendment to section 28 of the principal Act where the words "information statement" occur several times would improve that section.

Clause 9 amends section 29 by inserting after the words "date of the death" the words "by the principal registrar or by a district registrar." In section 28 and in other sections the phrase "the Principal Registrar, the district registrar or the assistant district registrar" is used, but in this clause it is provided that the Principal Registrar or a district registrar may register a death, though the latter may do so only on the instruction of the Principal Registrar. Therefore, only those two persons are authorized to register a death under the circumstances. However, elsewhere the assistant district registrar has authority to register births and deaths. The position is rather perplexing. Is it intended that only the Principal Registrar or a district registrar shall register? If that is so, delay may be caused in country districts, where I understand the district registrar is usually the police officer in charge, with one of his constables as assistant district registrar. The officer in charge could be miles away attending to official duties, or absent for a period owing to illness, and therefore not available to register a death.

Clause 9, which deals with the late registration of deaths, amends section 29 of the principal Act, and authorizes the registration of a death within six months of the date of death by the Principal Registrar or a district registrar upon the direction of the Principal Registrar, whereas elsewhere an assistant district registrar has authority to register deaths. I am unable to determine whether the clause is confined to the Principal Registrar and a district registrar, or whether an assistant district registrar also has authority to register a death. I hope that in Committee the Minister will give me an explanation of the position. I support the second reading.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.47 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, November 5, at 2.15 p.m.