

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, October 16, 1962.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. L. H. Densley) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.**SITTINGS OF THE COUNCIL.**

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: In view of the contents of the Notice Paper and the invitations issued for an event on November 8, and for the benefit of all members, can the Chief Secretary indicate when the session is likely to conclude, and does the Government intend the Council to sit at night in the near future?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: If members look at the Notice Paper they will see there is much business to deal with. Everything depends on the Council itself. I cannot give any guarantee about the discussions that will take place. Perhaps the honourable member could give as much information as I could on the matter. I thought we would get rid of a couple of Bills the other day, but that did not eventuate. I have no commitment on November 8 and am prepared to carry on as long as is necessary. I shall try to accommodate members in every way, and if they wish to proceed with the business I shall give them every encouragement and assistance. No other action is contemplated.

PIONEERS' CEMETERY.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: There appeared in the *Sunday Mail* of October 13 an article under the caption "Pioneers' Cemetery to be Public Park". It stated that the cemetery is on the Main North Road and under the control of the Enfield City Council. Sixteen graves and headstones are in half an acre of ground. To commemorate the pioneers it is proposed to place a plaque in the grounds. Can the Chief Secretary say whether arrangements will be made for exhuming the remains of the pioneers and placing them in a suitable resting place, especially in view of the fact that some of the pioneers are buried in consecrated ground? I think the Government should act to see that the remains are respected and placed in a suitable resting place.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I saw the article referred to and did not for one moment

feel that any action in regard to this matter would in any way be contrary to a proper recognition of the pioneers.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: That was not stated in the press.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Many things are said in press reports that do not necessarily mean anything, whereas many things unsaid often mean a lot. I should think that the Enfield council would be the last to desecrate in any way an area where people had been buried, or hurt the feelings of the descendants of those people. I know that this has been done elsewhere: I believe it happened in Brisbane where a cemetery was later used as park lands. I take it that the council would honour its obligation in making a change.

MATRICULATION COURSE.

The Hon. A. C. HOOKINGS: As I believe that consideration is being given to separating the matriculation standard from the Leaving examination, giving an extra year's education at high school level, can the Chief Secretary, representing the Minister of Education, say when this is likely to be introduced in South Australia and whether the extra year's matriculation course will apply to all country high schools of reasonable size?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I shall be happy to refer the question to the Minister of Education and get the information.

BANK CHARGES.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my question of October 11 regarding the cashing of pensioners' cheques?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The Australian Bankers' Association has decided that Government social service or pension cheques are free of an encashment fee if cashed by any bank for the payee. Further, when paid into the account of a bank's customer, provided that these cheques are listed separately from other credits to enable the numbers thereof to be determined easily, the association has decided that the collection fee will not be charged to these accounts.

LANDS TITLES OFFICE.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (on notice):

1. What amounts of revenue were received from, and expenditure incurred in, the Lands Titles Office for the years 1960, 1961 and 1962?
2. What were the respective amounts for the Town Planning Section?

3. What was the cost of the mass produced titles machine and the cost of installation?

4. What amount of revenue was received from the machine for the years 1960, 1961 and 1962?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The replies are:

	Revenue. £	Expendi- ture. £
1. Year ended June 30, 1960	196,539	165,114
Year ended June 30, 1961	234,872	186,939
Year ended June 30, 1962	204,821	208,045
2. Year ended June 30, 1960	4,662	29,580
Year ended June 30, 1961	4,481	33,239
Year ended June 30, 1962	2,903	41,548
3. Total cost to the department for the purchase of the Xerox equipment (which included the cost of installation) was £6,233. £		
4. Year ended June 30, 1960		4,160
Year ended June 30, 1961		55,332
Year ended June 30, 1962		34,525

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT.

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the final report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Port Adelaide Bulk Handling System and Port Adelaide Bulk Grain Bin.

MENTAL HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 1).

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

MENTAL HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. President, I call for a division on the third reading.

The PRESIDENT: Unfortunately, there was only one person's voice on the division.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I rise on a point of order. Mr. Shard and I—

The PRESIDENT: Order! It is too late to divide at this stage.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 11. Page 1404.)

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary): I wish to reply to one or two matters that were mentioned late in the debate on this measure. I appreciate the attention given by members to this debate, and as a matter of courtesy I should say something in closing the debate. I think that some reference was made by the Hon. Mr. Bardolph to railways expenditure and that he suggested that the railways should be run on business lines.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: I said it, and I still maintain it. What have you to say about it?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I wished to make sure that the honourable member did not take umbrage at anything I said.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: I will not take umbrage.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: That is why I wished to deal with it. It was stated that the railways should be run on businesslike lines and that they would then be much better off. I thought that, as the Railways Commissioner was not in a position to make his position clear, I should give an explanation, because I know what the position is. We do not charge a ton-mileage tax on people using our highways as is done in most of the Labor-controlled States in Australia. This Government has, in every way, acted most generously to road users for very good reasons. If we were to tax people off the roads and make it impossible for them to use our highways that would rebound on industry and employment generally, because to maintain a healthy employment position we must help industry to function and manufacture and transport goods to its markets in the heavily populated States. Industry has the right to use road transport for the interstate transport of goods, and many people within the State are able to use the roads at a very small charge, which means that they are at a distinct advantage compared with the Railways Commissioner. Therefore, the Commissioner does not start off to do business on business lines, because he has to maintain his own permanent ways and has to observe awards and cannot travel at all hours with his vehicles as some people on the roads do who work on commission or at competitive prices.

The Commissioner has to observe conditions and rates applying for all of his staff,

and therefore he cannot be expected to compete. When talking of competition I think of a situation where everything is open and everyone has the same opportunity. The Railways Commissioner has to maintain the whole railways system, whereas users of road transport do not have to meet such charges. These general observations are fairly obvious to any thinking person, but I will now read what the Railways Commissioner has to report regarding the matters raised by honourable members. He states:

It is not true to say that no effort has been made by the South Australian Railways to compete against road traffic. On the contrary, by the granting of special rates and by improved services, the department is successfully competing against the road, notwithstanding the great advantage in respect of road tax enjoyed by operators of heavy transports in this State. This advantage is one of the reasons why the average freight rate on this system is lower than that on any other State-owned railway in Australia.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Don't get blood pressure, as I have another question.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I am quite happy and comfortable, although the honourable member is turning pale. I would not like him to get as worked up as he did recently and suffer from overstrain when I give him the actual facts.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: I do not like an injustice being perpetrated.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: This State does not have a Labor Government and there are certain conditions to be considered in the States of Australia with a Labor Government. In this State there is a system of freight rates which compares more than favourably with every other State in Australia. The Railways Commissioner's report continues:

From time to time we carry out work at the Islington workshops for State Government departments and others; the extent to which we assist depends on what is required and our capacity to handle the work.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Why send the contracts interstate?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I wish the honourable member would keep his blood pressure under control when I am stating facts. The answer is that we are not the only State in Australia that has diesel locomotives made elsewhere. Can the honourable member name one State in Australia building its own diesel locomotives? This State did produce its locomotives at one stage, but the honourable member knows that they are now built through

other sources. The Railways Commissioner's report further states:

It has never been the policy of this department, and as far as I am aware, of any other Australian railway, to tender in open competition with private industries for work which has no connection with the railways. I have explained on a number of other occasions, the reasons why diesel-electric locomotives have been supplied by Australian manufacturers, under contract.

I hope that answers the honourable member's query. The fact is that the number of diesel locomotives that have to be built in Australia would not warrant several firms engaging in their production. They were built at Islington when funds were difficult to get and when certain equipment had to be imported.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: You must admit that you are on the defensive regarding the railways!

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Other rolling stock is built at Islington, as the honourable member well knows, and his argument does not hold water as far as the economics of the railways is concerned. The Hon. Mr. Kneebone made some references to employment. I cannot remember his exact words but he spoke as though we were experiencing the worst conditions ever and related them to a Liberal Government. My answer is that the worst employment conditions ever experienced in Australia occurred during the regime of a Labor administration. I did not intend to make these comments, but I have heard many extravagant remarks and extreme statements during the course of this debate.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: You are not forgetting yourself, are you?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I have been forced to take up the cudgels instead of listening quietly to all sorts of statements made without foundation, because it has been impossible not to take some cognizance of them. Honourable members are not youthful and are not ignorant of the past. Have they forgotten the Premiers' Plan of the 1930's which was instituted by a Labor Government and not a Liberal administration? We know what happened then. There was an arbitrary 10 per cent cut made in everyone's earnings. That happened in a period of administration by a Labor Government. Did they provide full employment? Of course they did not: many men were on rations and sitting in the gutter. I saw these people, in every little town throughout the State, wanting to get rid of the bread ration to buy cake, and we saw all sorts of

things. We have never had that condition under a Liberal administration, and it is time that memories were carried back a little further before silly accusations are made about the position at the moment, particularly in a State like South Australia.

In this State employment figures are better than in every other State. We hear so much about what a Labor administration would do. Opposition members try to lay all their own mistakes at the feet of the Commonwealth Government. That is a wonderful tune and I hear it at every Ministers' conference. I do not mind having an argument with the Commonwealth Government, but only when circumstances justify it. Labor members seem to have a parrot cry over employment to try to cover the mal-administration of other States governed by the Labor Party. If one considers the employment position there is no justification or foundation for the remarks that have been made.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: That is only your opinion.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The Hon. Mr. Kneebone read laboriously from a report of the Old People's Welfare Council of South Australia and I believe every member has a copy of this report. Like so many other statements, this report completely overlooks what has been done regarding the whole set-up of social services within the State. I asked for some investigation by the Auditor-General on what the Government has done, because I had no record of any moneys being spent by the organization called the Old People's Welfare Council of South Australia. I sought this information because I do not like to make improper comments on the work of anybody.

The people of South Australia can be proud of the efforts that have been made by voluntary social workers and of what has been done. This State has a unique record in that regard. The Government has tried to help the sick people, and I think that is where it can do the greatest amount of good. I think it is appropriate for voluntary organizations and councils to take part in social matters. We must look after the people requiring urgent medical treatment, and in that light I tried to get a picture of the true position of where we had fallen down, if we had done so. I need not quote all the information I have, but the Hon. Mr. Kneebone said that the organization was getting a raw deal from the Government. My information stated:

In its past replies to the Old People's Welfare Council of South Australia Inc. the

Government has expressed the opinion that provision of sums of money to assist elderly people through domiciliary care in the home is more essential than in connection with clubs.

That is something we have been pursuing. The matter has been discussed at various conferences of Ministers of Health and it is practically the unanimous opinion that that is the best way in which help can be given. In supporting Meals on Wheels we are going along the line of giving domiciliary care to people who need it. I think that comes before helping aged people to play chess during an afternoon or helping them in some other way. We should help them, but not neglect other people. My information continued:

In a report in April 1958 the Chairman of the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board quoted that at that stage the State Government had contributed £261,685 for subsidies for homes for the aged. I attach a list of contributions which the Government has made since July 1958, *i.e.*, over four years, towards the welfare of elderly people. This list does not purport to be complete as contributions towards the welfare of aged people are made through grants to many other institutions and societies, such as the District and Bush Nursing Society (£85,000 in four years) and Home for Incurables (£374,000 in four years). It also does not include contributions made through payments for hospital treatment. Contributions which the Government has made directly towards the welfare of aged people over the past four years may be summarized as under. This is, of course, in addition to the £261,000 grants mentioned previously:

	£
Net cost of Magill Home	457,000
Meals on Wheels, including Home Help Scheme	20,242
Rail and bus fares for pensioners attending public hospitals	10,803
Contributions to rail and bus fares for pensioners (three years)	256,500
Other direct grants to old folks' homes	12,846

In addition, during the past four years the Housing Trust has spent more than £500,000 on cottage flats for elderly people, rents being £1 4s. to £1 10s. per week for single persons and £1 5s. to £2 10s. per week for couples. To date the trust has spent more than £1,000,000 on cottage flats. Mention should also be made of the Government's contribution to pensions to its own officers, including police, which during the past four years has totalled £4,677,000.

I could go on and say that the Commonwealth Government has given a £2 for £1 subsidy on capital expenditure for old folks' homes. We think that the first essential is to house the people in decent living conditions. If we went out into the field of amusement I do not know where we could draw the line. Surely it is something that can wait until we have dealt

with essential matters of health, and provided comfortable living conditions for old people. All sorts of extravagant statements have been made about hospital expenditure, and recently I was interested to come across an Ulster commentary, in which appeared the following:

“In 1958-59 the sum of £1 15s. 9d. per head of population was spent on hospital building in Ulster. The figure in England was 9s. 2d. per head. Even with the increase planned by the Government in England and Wales we will not be spending a third of the amount being spent in Northern Ireland.” This comment is contained in an article in the *Daily Herald*, a London daily newspaper, whose correspondent was one of a party of 20 journalists from Great Britain which recently toured hospital establishments in Ulster.

That interested me, because I have seen something of what has been done there. I saw some of the Ulster activity when I was abroad. The Nuffield Research Foundation had built annexes to hospitals, and I inspected them. They were set up to test the most economical way to construct hospitals for the efficient nursing of patients. I was interested in what was being done because I saw being tested exactly what was under construction at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I realized also that Ulster was a progressive country in hospital work. When I read the article I decided to make a study of what was being done here. South Australia is not an old-established country, although it is said that we shall soon have a population of 1,000,000 people. At the time I was abroad we had 800,000 people. When I showed films of what was being constructed here they wanted to know what we used for money, especially when they heard that we had a population of fewer than 1,000,000. I said that the only limit was the capacity to borrow money from the resources of the State. I said that this was a developing State and that it could not live in the past. They had a start of 1,000 years, but we had to provide for the future. We had problems of water reticulation unequalled in practically all parts of the world. I point out that water storages are confined to a small area of land in one corner of the State and are as important a matter in the welfare of the community as health. In view of the interest shown there and the lack of appreciation for anything that we do here, I thought it might be worth while to make some comparisons with other countries. I have already given the figure of £1 15s. 9d. as the cost per capita for hospital construction in Ulster in 1958-59, and in 1956-57 in South Australia it amounted to £4 16s. When I was

speaking at Port Pirie last Friday at the opening of additions to the local hospital—

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: There is an election coming off, isn't there?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The honourable member is always conscious of an election, but even his interjection will not draw me away from the paths of truth. I am giving factual information that can be obtained from the Auditor-General's annual report and the honourable member could get something of interest by reading it. He would be justified in putting on a more cheerful front on matters before the Chamber than he has done in the last few days. He is not usually like that, but he seems to be suffering from an epidemic brought about in the last few days. However, I will not hold that against him. In 1956-57 we spent from Loan and Revenue on hospital construction £4,113,534, or £4 16s. a head. In 1957-58 we spent £4,000,000 on hospital buildings, equal to about £4 a head and in 1960-61 it was still £2 6s. Over the past six years our expenditure in this direction has averaged more than £2 a head. That is something on which we can congratulate ourselves; and it was not done by reckless financing but by prudent administration and at the same time we have been able to maintain other public works of importance equal to the building of hospitals. For instance, without adequate water supplies and reticulation we could not maintain our sewerage system, which caters for almost 100 per cent of houses here, compared with 34 per cent in Brisbane and much below 100 per cent in Sydney. I think that if honourable members opposite, in offering criticism, were to appreciate what is being done they would then come to the conclusion that the more one gets for nothing the less it is appreciated. It naturally follows that what you get for nothing is worth just that.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You do not get hospitalization for nothing from this Government.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I have different ideas from those of the honourable member. I suggest that he should not fall into the easy way of life by irresponsible criticism and requests. Of all the things said regarding the European Common Market, I cannot conclude other than that it will mean greater responsibility for all those in administration. No country that has been in the Common Market has made progress under it by an easier way of life. So, I think it is a good thing to keep a proper perspective

of true values and place first things first, which has always been my Government's policy, a policy that has been in the interests of the people and one that has been outstanding by comparison with that of any other State.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Appropriation of General Revenue."

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): Can the Minister assure me whether the amount of £14,665,387, under "Education" includes provision for the teaching of woodwork in primary schools? Recently I have been told of the possibility of woodwork being removed from the primary school curriculum. I submit the following letter received from the Northfield School Committee:

Attached for your perusal is a copy of a letter which has been sent to the Director of Education by Northfield Primary School Committee. This action was taken after our headmaster had applied for an allocation of hours at the woodwork centre for Grade VI boys and was informed that not only was there little likelihood of this being granted but also that the subject of abolishing woodwork classes completely in primary schools had reached the discussion stage with the Director. This of course means that this move is well in hand within the department and we, the committee at the Northfield school, strongly and urgently request that you pursue this matter at such level and in such manner as you consider necessary to prevent this valuable training being lost by our children.

A copy of a letter that was sent to the Director of Education reads:

It was with consternation that we heard during the headmaster's report to the committee last night that there was a plan to abolish the teaching of woodwork to primary school pupils. It was the unanimous and emphatic opinion of the meeting that we protest as strongly as possible against any such move, and that we should take whatever action we can to prevent the loss of the class.

We were disappointed when the classes were restricted to Grade VII pupils but realized that there were difficulties in obtaining teachers. However, there has been ample time since then to train sufficient teachers to cope with the problem. We are aware that the headmaster had hoped to get Grade VI boys re-admitted to the course and we strongly support his idea. Many of the boys in this school will get only a very limited time at technical school—quite a few leave even before getting there—and the woodwork lessons are a most valuable training for these children.

Perhaps it is our lack of experience that makes us doubtful of the value of some of the handwork taught in schools, but we have

not the slightest doubt about the value of the woodwork class, and we hereby request that you will assure us that these classes will not be curtailed in the foreseeable future at Northfield. We further request that the headmaster be given permission to reserve time for at least some of the Grade VI boys.

That letter was signed by the Secretary and the Chairman of the Northfield School Committee. I can understand the feeling of these people, and I have taken out some figures that I believe to be correct. According to the September, 1962, issue of the *Education Gazette*, at page 239, it appears that nearly 11 per cent of the children who left school last year did not reach secondary schools and a further 14 per cent left during or by the end of their first year. If woodwork were abolished from primary schools 11 per cent of the pupils would receive no education in woodwork and 25 per cent of the children would get one year or less on woodwork.

This matter is too big and important to be dealt with in question time and I therefore pose the questions here. Can the Chief Secretary say whether woodwork will be kept in the curriculum or, if the Education Department intends to abolish the teaching of woodwork in primary schools, will the Minister give me a reply in writing to the following questions:

What handwork course is it intended to substitute for woodwork? What training is to be given (or has been given) to teachers to enable them to cope with craftwork (exclusive of the few evenings that a few teachers gave to various courses a few years ago)? What equipment is to be provided? Will it be adequate?

What special rooms and storage space will be provided? What will these alternative courses cost the parents per annum? What are the comparative educational values of the alternatives when compared with woodwork, which gives such a valuable training in handling tools, working to plan, ability to turn out a good useful finished article, training in the use of hand and eye, a good physical exercise?

How many primary schools have already been deprived of woodwork classes? How many primary schools have already been deprived of domestic arts classes? What special efforts have been made in the past 10 years to train craft teachers? Why is there still a shortage?

I do not wish to deal further with the matter, and I think my questions are clear. I can understand the worries of the parents about handcraft training in the primary school stage, and I thought that if questions were asked they might prove advantageous. I know it is unusual to speak like this in Committee, and

if I had been in possession of the information before I would have asked the questions earlier. I ask the Chief Secretary to bring this matter to the notice of the Minister of Education and give an answer as soon as possible.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary): The honourable member has asked a series of questions, and if he will let me have a copy of them I shall be happy to refer them to the Minister. One question that rather interested me related to children turning out a good useful article. I would not have thought that the primary education standard of woodwork would have led to that. I know that these pupils make certain articles that conform to the elementary rudiments of woodwork. I do not know what discussions have taken place on this question, and it may be that something important has taken place. I will be glad to obtain information for the honourable member.

One matter raised by the Hon. Mr. Shard during the second reading debate that I did not mention was the problem of water pumping. When the Estimates were prepared in September they were accurate, and that was the position at that stage. At that time it was expected that the normal September rains would supply 4,000,000,000 gallons of water to the reservoirs over and above the water taken out. That quantity of water represents approximately £200,000 in electricity charges. Later I received another memorandum to the effect that the rains received in the past five days would supplement the metropolitan reservoirs sufficiently to offset half the additional pumping costs that would otherwise have arisen from the abnormally dry September, and further rains in the next few days would give an even better result. That is why it is provided that by Governor's warrant more money can be used. Weather conditions are unpredictable, but that does not necessarily make the Estimates bad, because we have compared the figures with the previous year's figures, and they could be right, but the position can alter quickly.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I listened to the Chief Secretary replying to criticisms levelled against the railways administration, and that has prompted me to raise one or two queries. The Railways Department underspent by £275,000 the money allocated to it under the Estimates for the last financial year. I refer to railway cottages made available to employees on the West Coast and particularly at Thevenard. They are substantial buildings but

some of the fittings need improving. An enamel basin is supplied by the department as a wash basin but that has to be placed on a box or some similar article. There are no other facilities provided in the bathroom such as towel racks and the ordinary bathroom fittings. Of course, a bath and bath heater are provided. A sink and wooden drainboard are fitted in the kitchen. The drainboards have inaccessible edges which cannot be cleaned and consequently refuse accumulates. All the houses are fitted with a small rainwater tank which holds about one-third of the run-off from the roof. As honourable members know, a supply of rainwater is precious in these country towns.

Upon requests being made for some improvements to these fittings, the railway authorities have answered that although they are sympathetic they cannot do anything until money is available.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: Would you place that request very high on the priority list compared with other things?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I appreciate the fact that the honourable member has all facilities available. People in the outback, however, do not have these facilities and they are entitled to the normal amenities that are available closer to the metropolitan area. The requests would have No. 1 priority with the employees. I draw attention to the fact that the Railways Department underspent by £275,000 yet it did not have enough money to fit these cottages with proper amenities, the cost of which would have been negligible compared with the amount which the department underspent. A case has been drawn to my attention concerning an accident to a driver at Solomontown on October 17, 1961. The driver's name is W. F. Carey. He had his right arm torn off and the department adequately dealt with the matter of compensation. I have no complaints there. When he had recovered, the department offered him a position in the Port Adelaide yards as fireman-shunter, which work he was able to do. Being a young married man with several children he accepted the offer, but it meant a reduction in wages of £6 10s. a week, which is a considerable sum for any worker. He had received £22 15s. as a driver, but his weekly wage was reduced to £16 5s. as a fireman-shunter. It is the policy of the Railways Department when an enginedriver fails in a sight test not to dispense with his services but to provide him with other employment. He receives five-sixths of his previous wage, which is £18 19s.

2d. a week. In the case I have mentioned the consideration was on the basis of the wage paid to a fireman-shunter. I think it should have been on the same basis as the engine-driver, and then the wage would have been reduced to only £18 19s. 2d. a week.

I could make other comments about the reduction in the amount to be spent by the Railways Department this year, but I shall make only one. Recently the Treasurer said, and it was given much prominence in the press, on television and over the radio, that the State would go-it-alone on gauge standardization, and that it would cost £3,000,000 to commence it. Despite this, the Bill provides for a total expenditure this year by the department of £60,000 less than last year. I hope the matters I have mentioned will be considered by the Government.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I was surprised to hear the Chief Secretary's remarks about the Railways Department. He said that in other States there was a special road tonnage rate on goods carted, and I wanted to know whether our department could not put its operations on a proper business basis in competition with road transport. In comparison with other State railway systems, our system lacks something. I realize that we have a recurring debt in connection with interest payments, but in other States they are doing all possible to get more passenger traffic, and are offering special rates for the cartage of goods to and from the country. We have it on the authority of our Railways Commissioner that there is no defined schedule covering rebate rates. He said, however, that when representations are made from time to time for a rebate special consideration is given to the case. Here is one item where there seems to be no intention to put matters on a proper basis.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson: How do the New South Wales railways come out financially?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: All railway systems in the world are non-paying propositions, but many of the losses are recouped by establishing developmental projects. New country is opened up and the produce from it is carried by the Railways Department.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: Are not the private railway companies in America run at a loss?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Yes, but they have an interest in the development of land, and so have two strings to their bow.

The Chief Secretary referred to happenings in this Chamber last week and said that I had high blood pressure. I do not have high blood pressure. It is the Chief Secretary who has it, because he tried to swashbuckle through this Chamber the suspension of Standing Orders, which he should have known, as a Parliamentarian of long standing, would not be permitted. I raised the point and won. I have no qualms about that matter. If any member had high blood pressure it was the Chief Secretary, not I or any of the Opposition members. I have not previously heard so much moaning and groaning by the Liberal and Country League since that happening.

A Bill was introduced a few months ago the object of which was to assist in establishing student hostels and I supported that measure. It provided that as security the State Bank could accept a first or second mortgage on a property. I am interested in one of these independent schools, which applied to the bank for a loan, offering a second mortgage on certain properties, but it was turned down because the security was considered to be insufficient. When independent schools are established there is generally a considerable debt on the property and to extend their activities by providing boarding accommodation it is necessary to seek further finance by second mortgage. In reply to a question the Chief Secretary informed me that £48,000 had been advanced under the Act and that five applications were still under consideration. The Act is not fulfilling the full purpose that was intended. It provides that money may be borrowed from the State Bank and also that a percentage of the students to be housed shall be country students. The measure is not assisting the school authorities to get over their financial difficulties.

I now come to the question of teaching civics in Government schools. Every time I have raised this question in the Chamber I have received an evasive answer. It is a poor commentary on our education curriculum. Whenever there is an election for such bodies as institutes, sports clubs and so on, their members have to be directed how to vote on motions before the chair, and this also applies particularly at Parliamentary elections. Civics is not a very difficult subject to teach. The teaching of this subject would do a service to the community by getting people to take an interest in politics. Many of the things taught in schools are of no value to students. I believe in teaching people how to vote intelligently.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The Hon. Mr. Bevan raised two questions and I think that the answer is that in one case the person had received compensation for an accident, whereas a person failing to pass the medical examination would not receive compensation. I think that that may be the justification in that instance. He also referred to an amount of £275,000 that had not been spent. That can easily occur. These amounts fluctuate from year to year and sometimes a department over-spends its allocation, resulting in the need for a Governor's warrant.

As to the question of housing, I was interested in what the honourable member had to say regarding the position at Thevenard, because that is in my electorate. I should need to know the facts before I could answer him, but I think that the question related to rentals. Other landlords are able to recoup expenditure by applying to the Housing Trust, which has to justify the rents. The Hon. Mr. Bardolph referred to assistance given by the Government for the erection of hostels for private schools. He suggests that probably the Act is not being properly interpreted. I do not think that would be so. The State Bank has a job to do and Ministers are not allowed to go beyond the provisions of the Act. The remarks of members on the Estimates are analysed and I am sure that the Treasurer, if he could go further in these matters, would do so. I know of no-one who would be more willing. I do not know of any curb or restriction being placed on education, and it has always taken first priority and absorbed a large amount of the Budget each year. These questions are examined from time to time and the Leader knows that we have made advances to assist hospitals. I do not think the Government has been ungenerous in its approach to any of these matters.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 to 7) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes a few necessary amendments to the Education Act in relation to long service leave. Subclauses (a) and (b) of clause 3 of the Bill amend section 18a of the principal Act which provides for long service leave. An

officer of the Public Service may, under the Public Service Act, be granted double his long service leave on half salary instead of the ordinary period on full salary, a provision that does not apply to teachers under the Education Act. The amendments will permit teachers to be granted double their entitlement at half salary in the same way as public servants.

Subclauses (c) and (d) of clause 3 will increase the total amount of long service leave for teachers, which is at present limited to 270 days, by an additional nine days for each year of actual teaching service over 35 years—that is, excluding service as a trainee. The ordinary long service leave is limited to 270 days by section 18a(2) of the principal Act, but service as a trainee is counted as part of the length of service. The present amendment will remove the limit in the case of any teacher who has in fact been actually engaged in teaching for more than 35 years; such a person will have an entitlement of nine days long service leave (or 18 days at half salary) for each complete year of his service as a teacher in excess of 35 years.

The other amendment of substance is effected by subclause (d) of clause 4 of the Bill which inserts a new subsection in section 18c of the principal Act. That section makes provision for the carrying over by an officer of the Public Service of his long service leave rights upon his appointment as a teacher. Teachers at the South Australian Institute of Technology not being members of the Public Service, or teachers within the meaning of the Education Act, are not covered under section 18c in its present form. It is not unusual for persons to transfer from the Institute to the Education Department and the amendment will enable them to count service with the institute for the purposes of long service leave under the Education Act.

The remaining subclauses of clause 4 make two amendments that appear to have been overlooked when the Act was amended in 1958. In that year the long service leave provisions were altered to enable teachers after the first 15 years of service to qualify for an additional nine days for each year in excess of 15 instead of having to wait a further 10 years to qualify at all. The corresponding amendment was not made in section 18c in relation to transfers from the Public Service. The anomaly is removed by subclauses (a) and (b) of clause 4.

A further consequential amendment in the same section of the Act is corrected by subclause (c) of clause 4. When the principal Act was amended in 1958 the maximum limit

for persons transferring from the Public Service to the Education Department remained at 365 days, while the maximum under the Public Service Act has been increased to 450 days. Subclause (c) makes the corresponding alteration in relation to transferred officers. As I have said, the Bill is designed to correct anomalies in the long service leave provisions and will, I am sure, have the support of all honourable members.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE secured the adjournment of the debate.

MARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes several amendments to the Marine Act, designed mainly to bring certain of its provisions into line with practice and provisions elsewhere in Australia. The first amendment is made by clauses 3, 4 and 5. Sections 19 and 20 of the Act prescribe the number and class of masters, mates, engineers and other officers to be carried on intrastate ships, section 20 stipulating the qualifications which engineers must have. The Government agrees with the view of the Australian Port Authorities' Association that uniform regulations for Marine Engine Drivers' certificates should be adopted, in order to avoid the necessity for re-examination where drivers move from State to State. The provisions of the Act can be altered only by way of statutory amendment and the adoption of uniform provisions from time to time by way of regulation rather than statutory amendment would enable agreed modifications to be made as and when necessary. Clauses 4 and 5 will accordingly amend sections 19 and 20 by removing the scales therein set out and substituting scales to be prescribed. The first part of clause 3 will enable the making of the necessary regulations from time to time. In connection with these amendments, I mention that Queensland and Tasmania have adopted uniform regulations, New South Wales is seeking the necessary legislative amendment, and Victoria has not yet taken action; no action is necessary in Western Australia.

Clause 7 will repeal the present section 26 of the principal Act which enables the Harbours Board to cancel certificates of masters, mates or engineers on conviction of felony or misdemeanour, but only where the certificates are granted by the board. The new section 26 will extend these provisions by enabling the

board to cancel or suspend certificates of competency issued by other British Commonwealth authorities as well as the board and, further, in cases where the holder has been convicted of an offence in another Commonwealth country or where the board, having regard to the findings of another court in Australia, is satisfied that the holder is incompetent or has been guilty of misconduct. It is considered desirable that there should be full reciprocity within the British Commonwealth on this matter and the new section follows the lines of the corresponding section of the Commonwealth Navigation Act.

Clause 8 inserts a new section in the principal Act, to require the furnishing of stability information before the issue of a certificate of survey, the information to be based on a stability test. The second portion of clause 3 enables the making of regulations for matters affecting stability. The Court of Marine Inquiry recently referred to the fact that there is no power to compel ship owners to have stability tests conducted when a vessel is being built or extensive alterations are being made to it. The court expressed the view, in which the Government concurs, that such a power was necessary. In the interests of safety, the proposed new section 85a is inserted into the principal Act. It follows the lines of the provisions of the Commonwealth Navigation Act.

Clauses 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 concern the constitution of courts of marine inquiry. In this State, a court of marine inquiry is constituted by a magistrate and assessors who have equal authority with the presiding magistrate. The position is similar in Victoria, but in the other four States and under the Commonwealth legislation, assessors do not adjudicate or fix penalties. The clauses which I have mentioned will bring the position in this State into line with that in the Commonwealth and the other States (except Victoria) by providing that assessors shall advise the court but not adjudicate. The qualifications of assessors will also be specified by regulation rather than by the Act as at present. This will enable uniformity in the matter of qualifications and procedure to be achieved by way of regulation from time to time.

Clause 14 amends section 127 of the principal Act. The effect of the amendments is to adopt and adapt to intrastate ships the provisions of the Commonwealth Navigation Act regarding the employment of seamen. Division 7A of that Act, which deals with the engagement of seamen, provides that seamen

shall be engaged only with the approval of a Superintendent appointed under that Act—engagement may, however, be refused a seaman with three “bad” discharges. These Commonwealth provisions do not, of course, apply to seamen on purely intrastate ships and this means that men with “bad” discharges can obtain employment on South Australian vessels and this could lead to seamen engaged in this State being mainly those who could not obtain employment elsewhere. Clause 14 accordingly imports into South Australian law the provisions of the Commonwealth legislation with the necessary modification that a seaman who is refused engagement may appeal to the State Industrial Court: under the Commonwealth Act the right of appeal is to the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. Desirable as it might be in theory to have all appeals to the one tribunal, jurisdiction cannot be conferred upon a Commonwealth body by State law. The Bill accordingly provides for the appeal to be to the State Industrial Court thus giving to seamen a right of appeal from a refusal of engagement. On this matter I understand that Queensland and Western Australia have passed amending legislation, New South Wales is awaiting legislation and Tasmania has deferred action. Victoria has no intrastate seamen under its control. The amendments made by clause 14 will accordingly bring this State into line with others on this matter.

Clause 15 which is to be read with clause 7 is of a formal character. The Act contains, in its first schedule, a code of rules for the prevention of collisions at sea. These rules are now out of date, having been superseded by a set of international rules which have been adopted by the Commonwealth and are, I understand, in fact observed in our own waters, although not formally enacted in this State. The need for uniformity in matters affecting collisions is obvious and I need not dwell upon it. Although the rules in the schedule to our Act can be amended or varied by the Governor, there is clear advantage from a practical point of view of incorporating the new set of rules in the schedule when there is a Bill dealing with other amendments. The ordinary person looking at the Marine Act would normally assume that the first schedule was reasonably up to date. Clause 15 substitutes the new set of rules for those in the present schedule, thus enabling persons interested to find the latest set of rules at the end of the Statute.

The amendment to section 59 made by clause 6 is in the nature of a consequential amend-

ment—the new rules refer to and apply to seaplanes and if we are to adopt the whole code it is desirable to adopt them in their entirety rather than amend them to omit those which might have no practical application. Clause 6 accordingly strikes out the restrictive words of section 59, leaving the international and Commonwealth rules applicable in their entirety to all intrastate vessels. I commend the Bill for the consideration of honourable members.

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

COMPANIES BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 11. Page 1415.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1): This is one of the most important pieces of legislation that have been introduced to this Parliament for some years. The Bill is the result of many conferences of the Commonwealth and the State Attorneys-General. If this measure is passed, it will operate from July 1, 1963. It contains 399 clauses and 10 schedules, a total of 400 pages, and I have no recollection during my sojourn in this Parliament of such a large measure, other than the amended Local Government Act which was passed some years ago.

The purpose of the conferences attended by the Attorneys-General was to prepare a draft of a Companies Bill which would be acceptable throughout Australia and which, if adopted by Parliaments in all States, would result in uniform company law throughout the Commonwealth. In America there is a commission working continually on the uniformity of American laws and this is subsidized by the Rockefeller Institute. In Great Britain the British Board of Trade carries out a similar function including all the powers that are contained in this measure, and it was actually responsible for the report of the Jenkins Committee that inquired into company law.

It has taken the Attorneys-General and their officers two years to agree on the contents of this Bill which is a commendable achievement because similar projects in America take 10 years. In 1959, when this project was started, the Victorian Companies Act was the latest legislation of its type operating in Australia, although Tasmania had already passed almost identical legislation which was not put in operation. The Attorneys-General agreed that the Victorian legislation should be taken as the

basis for future discussion. The Bill before us is the result of long and critical examination of the 1958 Victorian Act, of laws operating in the Commonwealth territories, and of recent overseas developments. Great Britain and America have similar uniform company law.

It is commendable that, due to the efforts of the Attorneys-General and their officers, this legislation has been formulated. In this regard I compliment the Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman (Mr. Ludovici), who attended all the conferences with our Attorney-General, on the erudite manner in which he has compiled the Bill and the explanatory notes on the various clauses. I have no doubt that all members appreciate the clear explanation of the Bill. It is essentially a Committee measure and at the appropriate time the Labor members will determine their action on the various clauses and on the amendments that may be moved. The Opposition will help to pass the Bill expeditiously. The amendment included in another place preserves the interests of the people we represent. Some of our educational institutions, such as the Institute of Technology and the Faculties of Law and Commerce at the Adelaide University, are giving lectures on company law in anticipation of the Bill being passed. Before there was agreement amongst the States on a uniform measure, I believe that Victoria and Tasmania had the most up-to-date company law in Australia, and that in many ways they were ahead of the other States, which had not revised their company law for years.

The Labor Party believes that the Bill is well balanced, and has no Party political significance. It will provide maximum protection to the investing public and a minimum of interference in the affairs of legitimate business. The Parliament of South Australia, like the Parliaments of other States, is a sovereign body, and no person or body outside it can fetter its independence. Accordingly, this measure must be acceptable to the Parliament if it is to become law. I understand that it has been thoroughly examined by every organization interested in the operation of company law, including the Faculty of Law at the Adelaide University. I mention this because some critics outside Parliament say that it is a measure that has been ill-conceived for the purpose of tightening up company legislation, and without organizations and individuals who are conversant with company law and practice being able to place their views before the Attorneys-General. The

representations submitted have been carefully considered by the Attorneys-General, and in some cases adopted, but I am informed that at the Hobart conference, either late last year or early this year, about 1,000 separate representations were made. When they were discussed it was found that many overlapped, and decisions had to be made on about 600 of them. From these submissions the most useful and constructive were fully considered and, in most instances, adopted. The Opposition feels that the best interests of Australia in the field of uniform company law are of paramount importance, and its members will vote for the second reading and assist in expediting the passage of the Bill, without the Attorney-General having to be sure of having a constitutional majority when moving the suspension of the Standing Orders to permit the Bill to pass through its remaining stages without delay.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

BANKS STATUTORY OBLIGATIONS AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 11. Page 1406.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill. Amongst other things, its object is to permit the Savings Bank of South Australia to open cheque accounts for ordinary depositors. Earlier in the year in his policy speech the Leader of the Opposition in another place (Mr. Frank Walsh) said that part of Labor's policy was the opening of cheque accounts for depositors of the Savings Bank. It is necessary to allow the bank to provide this facility because of competition from trading banks. It is a semi-governmental body, because its funds are guaranteed by the Government. The policy of its board of trustees must be commended. It has made loans to the Electricity Trust, the Housing Trust and various local government authorities. It is playing an important part in the development of the State by providing money for public works. It has encouraged thrift amongst schoolchildren and has established 866 agencies in schools. Deposits made in this way represent a considerable sum of money, which has helped in the lending of money by the bank to various authorities. Recently I attended the opening of two new branches of the bank, one at Payneham and the other at Hampstead. Both buildings are a credit to the board of trustees and the

architects concerned. They are spacious and provide the best facilities for the work to be done in them. The branches will be welcome additions to the two districts. I hope the Bill will receive the support of all members and have a speedy passage.

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

EXCHANGE OF LAND (HUNDRED OF TICKERA).

Consideration of the following resolution received from the House of Assembly:

That the proposed exchange of allotments 34 and 68, Town of Alford, as shown on the plan and in the statement laid before Parliament in terms of section 238 of the Crown Lands Act, 1949-1962, be approved.

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

That the House of Assembly's resolution be agreed to.

The existing school reserve at Alford is not large enough to enable adequate playing space to be provided, and a proposal has been put forward to increase the area by the addition of allotments 33, 34, 39 and 40, and an area of closed road. This would enable a satisfactory oval to be provided for football, cricket and other sports, and the Minister of Education has approved of steps being taken with this object in view. Allotment 33 is Crown land, and can readily be made available, and it is anticipated that allotments 39 and 40 will be obtained by way of gift. Allotment 34, which adjoins the existing school reserve, is freehold, but the owner, Mr. William Peters, has agreed to make it available provided he can obtain nearby allotment 68, which is Crown land. The area of each of these allotments is one rood. The proposal has been investigated by the Land Board, which has recommended the exchange of allotments 34 and 68 as the most satisfactory way of achieving the desired result. The board's valuation of each allotment is £10.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I agree with the remarks of the member for Wallaroo in another place regarding this matter, because he is more familiar with the position than I am. I have received a communication from the Bute Progress Association and the District Council of Bute who agree that it is desirable that the school should have the additional area asked for. This is one of the ways whereby Parliament can assist local government and those who are prepared to help themselves. I therefore support the motion.

Resolution agreed to.

TRAVELLING STOCK RESERVE: HUNDRED OF FINNISS.

Consideration of the following resolution received from the House of Assembly:

That the Travelling Stock Reserve (Camping Ground) in the hundred of Finnis, shown on the plan laid before Parliament on July 17, 1962, be resumed in terms of section 136 of the Pastoral Act, 1936-1960, for the purpose of being dealt with as Crown lands.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary) moved:

That the House of Assembly's resolution be agreed to.

The Hon. A. C. HOOKINGS (Southern): In these days many of the old stock routes which were provided to enable drovers to move their mobs of sheep and cattle are not used because stock are largely moved by modern motor transport. Therefore, there is no need to tie up this land. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Resolution agreed to.

LOANS TO PRODUCERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(Second reading debate adjourned on October 9. Page 1307.)

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Enactment of section 3a of principal Act.'

The Hon. C. R. STORY: New section 3a provides:

The bank may borrow moneys for the purposes of this Act under guarantee of the Treasurer in such amounts under such terms and conditions as the Treasurer may from time to time approve.

During the debate on the second reading I raised the point whether Parliament would have the opportunity under the new proposals to know how the moneys were to be disposed of, and how they would be shown, if at all, in the Loan Estimates. It seemed to me on the face of it that perhaps we would not be able to ascertain whether the Treasurer was actually borrowing the money and how he was borrowing it. Another question I raised related to the Commonwealth income tax law as it applied to sections 117 and 120 of the principal Act. I was wondering whether it could be so arranged that co-operatives, which at present get a benefit under the Act, would continue to do so if this money were borrowed other than as set out in the taxation law. Is provision to be made for these co-operatives

to retain the benefit they have always had under the Loans to Producers Act?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary): I asked the Under Treasurer for a report on this question and he stated:

Regarding the suggestion made by Mr. Story that Parliament's opportunity to review the operations of the Loans to Producers Act may be weakened by the proposed new procedure, I do not think that would occur. In the first place the provision on the Loan Estimates, instead of being simply the full provision as hitherto, will show the full provision in the first place, show as a deduction the amount proposed to be borrowed separately, and then the net amount to be provided out of the ordinary Loan Fund. There will not be less information or less control by Parliament. Further, the accounts and reports on operations by both the State Bank and by the Auditor-General will be equally extensive and informative and available to Parliament as formerly.

On the second matter raised by Mr. Story, that of entitlement of co-operatives to count repayment of Government loans as income tax deductions, the Treasurer and the Crown Law authorities believe there is no problem. They believe a loan made out of the proposed new borrowing is equally a Government or Crown loan as a loan made under present powers. However, to be doubly sure, a letter has been addressed by the Under Treasurer to the Commonwealth taxation authorities asking for an assurance on the matter.

In the meantime the Treasurer has instructed that any loans to co-operatives shall for the present be specifically allocated from the funds voted by Parliament and not from those secured by other means. A significant proportion of the loans under this Act are to others than co-operatives, so this procedure is practicable. The procedure, however, would be unwieldy and unsatisfactory to continue, but nevertheless will be undertaken until the necessary assurances are received from the taxation authorities. A restrictive amendment to the Act would be undesirable.

I think that covers the points made by the honourable member and I hope the reply is satisfactory.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am pleased that the Under Treasurer has taken the matter up with the Taxation Department, because it has been a moot point, as far as I can understand, whether "State Bank" means "Government" and whether "Government" means "Parliament" in these things. Anything that would weaken the present system of financing co-operatives would be detrimental, and this is a most laudable provision on the part of the Government to make more finance available for this purpose. If by some small mistake

we should take away the benefits we hoped to give it would be unfortunate.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 to 6) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

EXPLOSIVES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 9. Page 1308.)

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I support this Bill to amend the Explosives Act. The Chief Secretary fully explained its purpose in his introductory speech. The Bill provides for added protection to the public and for the regulation and control of the sale of explosives and deals with the importation and the unlawful use of explosives. The different points have been fully discussed and I do not wish to prolong the debate. Several small questions concerned me but, on inquiry, my anxieties have been relieved. One point related to the storing of rifle club ammunition. We have many rifle clubs operating throughout the country that fulfil the useful purpose of enabling people to enjoy their sport without annoyance to others and that acts as an inducement to young people to stay in their own area. It is not intended, at present, to control sporting ammunition or to place any restriction on the storage of rifle club ammunition.

I understand that fireworks are to be controlled under the provisions of this Bill and that the restrictions are intended to apply to the importation of certain types of fireworks and to their storage. It will also restrict the sale of the more dangerous types. I understand that it is not intended to restrict the sale over the counter of the more harmless types of fireworks. The Bill has been introduced to protect the public. We hear of accidents from using explosives, and such accidents have occurred all over the world from time to time, causing much distress through death, injury and maiming. I commend the Government for introducing this Bill.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.35 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, October 17, at 2.15 p.m.