

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, October 1, 1963.

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

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

**DEATH OF SIR SHIRLEY
JEFFRIES.**

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

That this Council express its deep regret at the death of the Hon. Sir Shirley Jeffries, formerly a Minister of the Crown and member for North Adelaide and Torrens in the House of Assembly, and place on record its appreciation of his public services, and that as a mark of respect the sitting of the Council be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

The late Sir Shirley Jeffries was well known to me and the older members of this Chamber. At the time I entered Parliament he was a Minister of the Crown and when I joined the Cabinet he was Deputy Premier. He represented North Adelaide from 1927 to 1930 and again from 1933 to 1938, during the period of dual electorates. He then represented Torrens after single member electorates were introduced from 1938 to 1944 and from 1947 to 1953, when he retired. Altogether his services in Parliament aggregated about 18 years. He was Attorney-General, Minister of Education and Minister of Industry and Employment from April 18, 1933, to May 6, 1944. He was a very conscientious representative of his district and gave his utmost attention to his Parliamentary duties. I remember during his term as Minister of Education, when he was also Attorney-General, the influence he exerted in education in this State. After his retirement from politics he continued to give public service, particularly in education and social matters. His passing was sudden. I am sure that every member who knew anything of his work desires a proper recognition of the public service he rendered. To his wife and family I express the sympathy of the Council.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I second the motion and with my colleagues express deep regret at the passing of Sir Shirley Jeffries. At times service as a member of Parliament and in other walks of life is forgotten, but I am pleased that on this occasion the services of Sir Shirley, as a member of Parliament, in education, and as a social worker in the community, have not

been forgotten. In the later years of his life he suffered an affliction that no-one would like, but it did not deter him from carrying out his duties for his church, in education and as a social worker. From that angle I feel that the community has lost an able worker, one who was sincere in his thoughts and work in those directions. My colleagues and I join with the Chief Secretary in expressing to his wife and family our sincere regret at his sudden passing.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I desire to associate my colleagues with the motion, which expresses sympathy to Lady Jeffries and to the family. The record of Sir Shirley has been made known by the Chief Secretary. I think we all knew him in many ways. After he left active politics 10 years ago he continued to serve the community. Many men, perhaps lesser men, would not have been able to carry on with the disability under which he laboured for the last 10 years. I think he served outstandingly as a Trustee of the Savings Bank of South Australia, and his experience and wisdom undoubtedly were beneficial to the running of the institution. Sir Shirley is well-remembered for his work in education. He served as Minister of Industry and Employment from 1933 to 1944, a most difficult period in the history of the State. I am sure that each and every one of us expresses deepest sympathy to his relatives at his sudden and somewhat unexpected passing.

The PRESIDENT: I add my tribute to the late Sir Shirley Jeffries. He was always a friend to members of Parliament throughout the State, and often his retirement from politics took an active interest in every election held in South Australia. We regarded his work in Parliament as being associated with his work in the church. All through his career he carried on on a very high plane, as one would expect of a man of Sir Shirley Jeffries' standing, in matters relating to politics and to the church. I associate myself with the expressions of sympathy to Lady Jeffries and her family.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

(Sitting suspended from 2.26 to 2.45 p.m.)

QUESTIONS.**PORT ROAD INTERSECTION.**

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question. Leave granted.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Early this session—in fact, the first time we met—I asked a question about the lights proposed to be installed at the intersection of Clark Terrace, Port Road, and Cheltenham Parade. The Minister of Roads was good enough to get a report on that and on July 23 he gave a written reply about the acquisition of land in that area. He then said:

It is expected that this matter should not take more than another two or three weeks.

I am led to believe that so far no report has been sent to the people concerned. Can the Minister say whether the land acquisition has been completed? If not, will he obtain a report and let me know what progress has been made in that connection?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I am not aware of the latest details but will obtain a report as soon as possible and let the honourable member have it.

CHOWILLA DAM.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question. Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Some doubt has been expressed about the usefulness to South Australia of the Chowilla dam by correspondence in the *Advertiser* from Mr. H. O. Hannaford. He has expressed the opinion that the dam will not serve the purpose that the Government proposes it should, that the water will be saline and that very little benefit will accrue to South Australia from the expenditure of some £13,000,000 to £14,000,000. Has the Chief Secretary any report that will refute that expressed opinion?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Following questions raised during my visit to Renmark at the weekend about whether there was anything in these points, I sought a report, which I have obtained through the Minister of Works, from the Engineer-in-Chief. It reads as follows:

Mr. H. O. Hannaford's letter of September 21 expresses doubts as to the effect and effectiveness of Chowilla dam. Firstly, I would mention that Chowilla will be a costly undertaking of great importance to three States, viz., New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia. These States and the Commonwealth will each bear one-fourth of the capital cost and therefore a heavy responsibility devolved upon the River Murray Commission firstly in investigating the proposal and secondly in recommending its adoption. The Commission is in a position to make use of the expert technical officers employed by the States as well as its own small staff. Every aspect

of the proposal was investigated in detail—in fact this was essential as it was necessary for each of the four parties to the River Murray Waters Agreement to agree that the proposition would be practicable, technically sound and beneficial.

Instead of being viewed as an entirely new project, Chowilla can be regarded as an enlargement of the 40-year old Lake Victoria storage, which will be merged into the larger undertaking. In fact, Lake Victoria can be accepted as a prototype for Chowilla. Chowilla storage will have a capacity equal to approximately nine times the capacity of Lake Victoria and its average depth will be comparable to that of Lake Victoria. Therefore, the proportion of the stored water lost by evaporation will be similar for each storage.

No trouble of any kind has been experienced with a build-up of salinity in Lake Victoria and in fact the water released to make good any deficiencies in river flow has invariably been of better quality than the water flowing in the river. The salinity of the water flowing in the river to South Australia has at times been as high as 430 p.p.m. (30 grains per gallon), but the salinity of the water stored in Lake Victoria has never exceeded 260 p.p.m. (19 grains per gallon). Water released from Chowilla during periods of good natural flow may have a slightly higher salinity than the water entering the storage. However, the really important criterion is the salinity during drought periods and in such periods releases from Chowilla will definitely cause an improvement and not a deterioration in the quality of the water flowing to South Australia.

Mr. Hannaford states that the Snowy works rule out floods in the river. This is not the case as these works will divert water to the Murray system and not away from the system. Actually the amount of water diverted from the Snowy River to the River Murray system will be so insignificant under flood conditions in the River Murray that for all practical purposes it may be said that the Snowy works will have no effect on Murray floods.

The Chowilla storage basin does not consist of limestone caverns but of hundreds of feet in depth of sands, silts and clays laid down by the River Murray over many thousands of years.

Mr. Hannaford's letter concludes with the statement that South Australia will not get one gallon more of water by building Chowilla. This is correct in an overall sense as the total flow to South Australia over a period of years will be slightly less than it would be otherwise, the difference being the water lost by evaporation. However, Chowilla will be a regulating storage—not a contributing storage and its one purpose will be to store water in times of plenty for releasing in times of need. Water will only be stored in Chowilla when the river flow exceeds South Australia's requirements. In other words, this storage will impound water which would otherwise flow to the sea and will augment the flow when water is needed for irrigation and other purposes.

Mr. Hannaford can rest assured that every aspect of the behaviour of Chowilla dam mentioned in his letter and many other aspects have been subjected to close and expert investigation.

I think the honourable member will find from that information the answers to the queries he must have received, which would have been on all fours with the message conveyed to me during the weekend.

HEIGHT ABOVE SEA LEVEL SIGNS.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: Can the Chief Secretary, representing the Premier, intimate whether the Government would be prepared, acting I imagine through Tourist Bureau funds, to erect signs at such places as the top of Willunga hill, and many other points throughout the State, signifying the height above sea level of these positions as an attraction to tourists entering this State?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I realize the interest in such information. I have observed these signs when travelling in other States. I shall pass the honourable member's question on to the Minister of Immigration.

LAKE BUTLER PROJECT.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In the light of opposition from people interested in preserving the Gyp Gyp rock area near Kingston can the Chief Secretary, representing the Minister of Agriculture, say whether the project to construct a channel into Lake Butler will be proceeded with without the construction of a breakwater?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I think that the Lake Butler proposal has been approved, but the stone will not be taken from the Gyp Gyp area but from another deposit which is being used by the Highways Department. I shall confirm that information with the Minister.

FREE RAIL PASSES FOR STUDENTS.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.
Leave granted.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Recently, as a result of a question I directed to the Minister of Education through the Attorney-General, Cabinet approved of the granting to apprentices, studying by correspondence from country districts, free transport by rail to and from Adelaide when desiring to attend two weeks' intensive training in metropolitan trade schools. I am sure this will result in an increase in the number of apprentices who will avail themselves of the opportunity of this additional training and thereby increase the number of tradesmen with higher degrees of skill. The education progress allowance regulations, I believe, provide for the payment of a boarding allowance to every qualified student

who is forced to live away from home in order to attend a course of secondary education of the kind selected by the student and approved by the Director of Education. The extension of this type of allowance to the correspondence course apprentice during the period of his attendance at a metropolitan trades school for two weeks each year would be an added incentive to the apprentices to participate in this intensive training. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Education if he would consider making the boarding allowance now being paid to certain qualified secondary school students also available to apprentices studying by correspondence when they attend for the two weeks' intensive training in the metropolitan trades school?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I shall be pleased to take that matter up with my colleague, the Minister of Education, and will let the honourable member have a reply as soon as possible.

BUCKINGHAM ARMS CORNER.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: My question relates to the intersection of Robe Terrace, Northcote Terrace, Walkerville Terrace, Park Terrace, Gilberton, and Mann Terrace, North Adelaide, commonly known as the Buckingham Arms corner which, as honourable members know, is probably one of the worst bottlenecks, if not the worst, on the perimeter of the city of Adelaide and just outside the city of Adelaide. I have noticed recently an increasing build up at that intersection, which indicates to me that it will get considerably worse in the near future, and also the traffic is commencing to by-pass down Stanley Street, North Adelaide, through two very narrow streets—I think called Marion Street and Gilbert Street—into Walkerville Terrace about half way between the intersection I mentioned and Stephens Terrace. I realize that those roads at present are probably under the control of the Walkerville council, but it seems to me that a by-pass in which the Highways Department might become interested could be made possible by widening the two narrow streets I have mentioned, thus relieving this bad intersection of its increasing traffic. Will the Minister of Roads consider the suggestion—I do not know whether it is practicable or not—that the two narrow streets might be widened for the purpose of making possible a freer traffic flow?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I think the answer to the first part of the honourable member's question is that the traffic lights recently installed at the Buckingham Arms corner would work very satisfactorily for the present density of traffic, given two further provisos. They are that parking should be limited within some distance—I will not state a specific distance—of the intersection, which is very busy. Traffic definitely takes up two lanes of traffic on Northcote Terrace from virtually dawn to dark. The second problem associated with those lights arises from the fourth cycle of the lights, which indicates a specific right turn cycle, on many occasions nobody is turning to the right at all and people sitting in their cars in the front row are annoyed when noticing no movement of traffic for some seconds. That is because people going straight across the intersection are using the right turn lane and this traffic immediately switches the light bar and causes the turning light to operate for its cycle of possibly five or six seconds, which delays sometimes 20 or 30 cars in proceeding up Northcote Terrace and *vice versa*. I believe both of those problems can be looked at by the Road Traffic Board and the situation improved.

With regard to the Stanley Street suggestion, I think that has something to commend it. The honourable member has suggested that the two narrow streets cutting across from Park Terrace on to Walkerville Terrace are very narrow. This matter is entirely under the control of the Walkerville council. Should it feel that it is desirable, I have no doubt that the Highways Department would offer every advice that was available on the matter and even take traffic counts, etc. Whether the Highways Department would be prepared to make any financial advance in the matter would be open to some doubt.

EDITHBURGH FISHING FACILITIES.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Chief Secretary, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a reply to my question of August 20 regarding fishing facilities at Edithburgh?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I have not the answer with me, but I will take up the matter again with the Minister.

WOOL LEVY.

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON (on notice): Will the Chief Secretary state (a) the amount of the wool levy paid for research and promotion and (b) details of any proposed increase in such levy, in New Zealand and South Africa, the other members of the International Wool Secretariat?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The Australian Wool Board reports:

The Australian Wool Bureau, which was absorbed into the framework of the Australian Wool Board on May 1, was financed by a levy imposed by Act of Parliament on the wool-growers of Australia at their own request. The original levy of 6d. a bale for promotion and publicity, imposed in 1936, was increased to 2s. in 1945; 4s. in 1953; 5s. in 1960; 10s. in 1961, and has continued at that rate since then. From 1945 to 1957 the Commonwealth Government provided 2s. a bale for wool research. In 1957, however, the Government increased this contribution to 4s. following the decision of woolgrowers to contribute 2s. a bale for wool research purposes. In short, woolgrowers provide, at the moment 10s. a bale for promotion and 2s. a bale for research. The Federal Government provides 4s. per bale for research.

In its recommendation to the Australian Wool Industry Conference the board sought an income of £11,100,000 to meet its share (64 per cent) of a proposed I.W.S. budget of £16,250,000 and to cover its requirements in Australia, excluding research. Funds required for research purposes, currently administered by the Wool Research Committee but to be taken into the framework of the board at the end of this year, total a little more than £3,000,000 for 1963-64. It is planned to increase research expenditure at the rate of approximately £300,000 per year. Research reserves totalled nearly £8,000,000 and the board believes that these can be progressively reduced, leaving, at the five years, an amount roughly equal to a year's research expenditure. The nett annual requirement for research would thus be £3,000,000. The board's total requirement is, therefore, £14,100,000 annually for all purposes.

The board has not indicated how this money, if provided, should be raised, but has indicated that £2 16s., 2½d. lb., or 3¼ per cent (of gross wool income) would meet the sum covered by its recommendation. It is the responsibility of the Australian Wool Industry Conference to determine (a) whether this sum should be provided, and (b), if so, how it should be provided.

In New Zealand, which contributes 23.7 per cent of International Wool Secretariat funds, the levy at present is 18s. 7½d. a bale, made up of 9s. 3½d. as a direct levy from wool-growers and 9s. 3½d. from interest on the invested funds of the New Zealand Commission.

The Electoral College (the parallel of the Wool Industry Conference) recently agreed that New Zealand should contribute £A2 9s. 8d. a bale as its share of the proposed I.W.S. budget for the next five years. This means that the direct levy on growers will be increased to 18s. 7½d. (Australian) a bale, and 18s. 7½d. (Australian) will come from the Wool Commission's funds. This leaves an amount of 12s. 5d. (Australian) still to be raised and no decision has yet been made on the source of this extra sum.

On September 19 South African woolgrowers agreed to an increase in their levy to finance expanded world wool promotion. The National Woolgrowers Association passed a resolution

agreeing in principle that the present maximum levy for wool promotion be increased by an amount not exceeding 0.5 cents per lb. (½d. per lb. Australian). The Government will be asked to amend the Wool Act accordingly. Present levy is one cent per lb. of wool (1½d. per lb. Australian). The new maximum on the basis of a 300 lb. bale is equivalent to £A2 16s. 3d. a bale.

That deals with the honourable member's question regarding not only what applies here but also what applies in New Zealand and South Africa.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the following final reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

- Government Office Block, Victoria Square, Adelaide,
- Pata Water Supply.

COURT OF DISPUTED RETURNS.

The PRESIDENT: I lay upon the table, pursuant to section 187 of the Electoral Act, 1929-1959, a copy of the minutes of proceedings and evidence of the Court of Disputed Returns in the matter of the petition of Mr. J. G. Gartner against the return of the Hon. R. C. DeGaris as a member for the Southern Electoral District of the Legislative Council and ask the Clerk to read the judgment of the Court.

Report received and read.

The Report.

I have the honour to report that the Court of Disputed Returns has completed its sittings in the matter of the petition of John Godfried Gartner against the return of the Hon. R. C. DeGaris as a member for the Southern Electoral District of the Legislative Council and made the following orders on the dates set out hereunder—

1. On July 24, 1963—ordered that the petition be dismissed.
2. On September 24, 1963—ordered the petitioner to pay the following amounts by way of costs to the persons named hereunder:

	£	s.	d.
Mr. R. C. DeGaris . . .	52	10	0
Mr. J. B. Morrell . . .	24	15	6
Mr. Edmund Burke . . .	22	0	0
Mrs. M. Morris . . .	36	15	0
	£136	0	6

The minutes of proceedings of the Court and a copy of the minutes of evidence are attached hereto.

(Sgd.) DAVID S. HOGARTH, President,
Court of Disputed Returns.

**NURSES REGISTRATION ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.**

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Minister of Health): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its principal object is to provide for the division of the practice of mental nursing into "psychiatric nursing" and "mental deficiency" nursing—the nursing of the intellectually retarded. The Director of Mental Health has drawn attention to the inadequacy of the existing syllabus for mental nursing which permits of some training in psychiatric nursing and some in mental deficiency nursing without dealing sufficiently with either branch of mental nursing. Mental nurses are employed in the hospitals in the nursing of patients in each category and, if duly qualified, they are entitled to undertake private practice in each capacity. However, the two branches are quite different, patients in each category requiring totally different treatment. For this reason it is most desirable that there should be a distinction between the two branches (both in hospitals and in the requirements for private practice). The division of the mental nursing practice for which this Bill provides will enable the syllabus to be reviewed and greatly expanded so as to cover in full the requirements of each branch. The present syllabus for psychiatric nursing is totally inadequate for modern needs; it comprises 12 formal lectures a year for three years and some 10 tutorials in addition.

The new scheme will ensure that psychiatric nursing will be separately supervised by the Nurses Registration Board. The board will be responsible for the standard of training in psychiatric nursing, for the appointment of examiners, and for the conduct of examinations. This will give to psychiatric nursing a status that has hitherto been denied to it. In the same manner, the board will supervise mental deficiency nursing. A similar division in mental nursing operates in New Zealand, by the establishment of psychopaedic nursing (corresponding with mental deficiency nursing), and in the United Kingdom.

Clause 9 amends section 18 of the principal Act by abolishing mental nursing, as such, and providing for nurses who undertake mental training to be trained as psychiatric nurses or as mental deficiency nurses. Owing to the present shortage of hospital accommodation, it is not practicable to provide at present for separate treatment of mental patients in each of the two categories. However, when new

hospitals are built separate wards will be provided for the two types of mental nursing.

Clause 17 (b) provides for regulations to be made requiring existing mental nurses to elect (after the new scheme of nursing comes into force) whether they will change to one or the other of the two new branches. It is intended that, after the inception of the new scheme, the present mental nurses will have 12 months in which to make the election. Clauses 13, 14 and 16 (b) make amendments which are consequential upon the provisions of clause 17 (b). Clauses 4, 6 (c) and (d), 9, 10 (a) and (d), 15, 16 (a), 17 (a) (c) (d) (e) and (f), and 18 and the schedule make amendments consequential upon the new scheme.

Clause 5 amends section 3 of the principal Act consequential on the insertion of two new parts in the principal Act some years ago. The principal Act is inconsistent in its references to training undertaken and examinations taken in other States. In some cases the Act extends to a Territory; in other cases it does not. Clause 6 (b) inserts a definition of "State" in section 4 of the principal Act so as to remove the distinction between nurses trained in a Territory and those trained in other States.

Clauses 6 (a), 7 and 12 make drafting amendments of a revisionary nature. Clauses 8, 10 (b) and (c) and 11 provide for the repeal of obsolete provisions of the principal Act. The Bill has been drawn to provide for the more modern concept of mental care and nursing, and I commend it to the consideration of members.

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

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 3. Page 774.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I support the second reading of the Bill, which was the subject of much consideration in another place. With little opposition practically all aspects of the Bill were agreed to there, so I do not intend to discuss the measure at length. The only criticism I have relates to the time for the enactment of the legislation, which could be somewhat overdue. In the July 1962 issue of *Good Health*, in an article headed "The Air We Breathe" there appeared the following:

The main part of the survey was the work of Inspector D. F. Kelly, whose report we print here.

Mr. Kelly reported:

The mean total fall-out for the period under survey in Adelaide is 15.2 tons to the square mile a month, as compared with a mean result of 21.4 in Sydney for the year 1960. The fall-out rate of total deposited matter recorded in Adelaide in the past 10 months reveals a great variation for all stations ranging from as low as 6.5 tons to the square mile a month to as high as 41.5 tons.

Mr. Kelly went on to say:

Some local boards have already shown great interest in air pollution, and are attempting to eliminate sources in their own areas. We commend their interest and their efforts, but, like the local boards, we are aware that air pollution is one of the many health hazards which show no respect for municipal boundaries. That is why the department believes this wide-spread hazard must be attacked centrally. We believe we can expect the interest and help of every local board.

If members wish to read the article they will find the publication in the Parliamentary Library.

This is a problem necessitating the advice and consideration of people with a technical knowledge, and having studied the proposals regarding the committee I am convinced that the purpose of the Bill is to acquire the services of such people. As I cannot claim to have any knowledge of the ways in which the problem may be remedied, I feel that I would have the support of every member when I say that there is a problem that must be nipped in the bud, otherwise the near future will find us with a health hazard that will be far more costly to remove.

It is a simple Bill, which sets out clearly its intention. It adds two new sections to the principal Act. The first, 94b, sets out the constitution of the committee, and the other, 94c, empowers the Governor to give effect to any regulations which the committee might decide to be necessary. To the average person the size of the committee may appear to be large. It consists of 11 members, but after a close scrutiny of the constitution of the committee I do not think any person concerned could be left off when dealing with this important matter.

Four of the members are to be the Director-General of Public Health, the Principal Medical Officer (Public Health), the Chief Inspector of Boilers and Factories, and the Consulting Engineer, Department of Labour and Industry. These should be the right people for the job. Seven other members are to be appointed by the Governor. One is to be appointed on the nomination of the Trades and Labour Council. I am pleased that the employees are to be

represented, and no exception can be taken to that. One member is to be appointed on the nomination of the South Australian Railways Commissioner. That is essential. One is to be appointed on the nomination of the Electricity Trust. One is to be a professor or teacher of physics or mechanical engineering in the University of Adelaide, nominated by the council of the university. That is a wise move. One is to be appointed on the nomination of the Board of Directors of the South Australian Gas Company. Again, this is a good move. One is to be appointed on the nomination of the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures, which will no doubt secure the right man for the job. We cannot query this appointment. One is to be appointed as a person representative of local government interests. On the face of it, it is rather a large committee, but it has rather a large job to tackle. I do not think any criticisms can be levelled at those appointments. Six of the 11 members form a quorum, so the committee should not be delayed in its business; it will be able to hold meetings without much difficulty in that respect.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: On a committee like that, will it not be largely a matter of opinion?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It may be. The members would have their opinions, but they are the right people to get the right information from someone else if they themselves do not know. They are in a position to secure further information.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: In respect of the whole question?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It appears to be so. I return to the point that Parliament itself in this case will have the last say. The committee can make recommendations to the Governor, who will make regulations and submit them to be dealt with by the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, which will review them. It may recommend that, in its humble opinion, a regulation needs some correcting. Members have the right to move for the disallowance of a regulation and Parliament has to take the responsibility of the regulations being put into operation or otherwise.

I want to say something about the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. It is a hard-working and conscientious committee. I was upset to learn of the Premier in another place criticizing it for doing the job for which it was specifically appointed and which it did to the best of its ability. It brought in a certain recommendation about a

matter now before another place. It ill becomes the leader of a Government to criticize one of its committees which has done its job thoroughly. I read the whole debate in respect of that particular recommendation. It is easy to criticize this committee but, to me, it savoured a little of politics. The committee arrived at a unanimous decision after considerable investigation. It does not add to the prestige of Parliament that one of its committees should be criticized as this one was.

In case anyone thinks this committee has an easy job and does not do much work, I point out that last year it considered 142 papers. Let it be understood, incidentally, that this committee's work is done mainly when Parliament is sitting. It is a committee that must work when Parliament is sitting because the regulations are brought down then. Last year it dealt with 76 regulations under Acts, five proclamations under Acts, 27 by-laws of corporations, 30 by-laws of district councils, one Rule of Court (Supreme Court), and three local Rules of Court, making a total of 142 papers. I am not sure how many meetings of the committee there were, but it meets regularly throughout the session. Therefore, I was disappointed to hear criticism of this committee when it had given so much time to its work. After all, these regulations do not consist of one little item; some of them are important, running into many sections. Yet, having gone to much trouble in this particular case, the committee was criticized and I was astounded to read and learn of the amount of work it had undertaken to reach its decision. Then something was said about its work, which indicated that it was not appreciated.

It is all wrong. One is entitled to differ from the finding of a committee but it is not good for anyone to be critical of the work of a committee appointed by Parliament when it has been charged with the responsibility to do a job and does the job to the best of its ability, taking some pains to complete the job. It is not right that it should be criticized in that way. I wanted to make those comments at this stage because my chances of speaking on that matter were somewhat limited.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: The honourable member ought to know all about that: he dishes it up every day!

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I know the Chief Secretary does not like to have one of his Ministers criticized. I take the democratic right of an elected person in this Chamber to state my views. If a Minister unduly criticizes a committee of this Parliament, I have a right

to put my point of view. All I say is (and I say it most sincerely) that the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation does an excellent job and it ill becomes anyone in this place to criticize it for doing its job and bringing down the decision that it has just brought down.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: I do not object in the least; I am enjoying it, but people in glass houses should not throw stones!

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The Chief Secretary can have a go at me. I can take it and I will give it back. I wanted an opportunity of saying this now because my chances of mentioning criticism of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation are limited. The Bill before us is a good one. No matter how one looks at it, possibly in its initial stages its operation will be more of an experimental nature. All I can say is that I hope it will be successful. If anyone has any doubts about the need for it and he happens to be in a high part near the metropolitan area he should take notice of the haze and air pollution over the city of Adelaide. I hope the committee will be successful. Whatever it can do to rid the air we breathe of the pollution that enters it will be in the best interests of the people of this State.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I rise to support the second reading of this Bill, for various reasons. The explanation that the Minister gave in introducing it should be sufficient for everybody to be seized with the responsibility of Parliament for seeing that something is done about this matter before it gets too far out of hand. In explaining the Bill, the Minister said that this legislation would amend the Health Act. Somebody has to take the responsibility for this. Suggestions have been made from time to time that a new Bill be introduced to deal specifically with this matter.

The Government in its wisdom, after listening to much evidence submitted by various interested parties, considers that the Health Act is the Act that should be amended to deal with this matter. This seems logical and proper. It stands to reason, therefore, that this legislation has been carefully considered. It is not something that has just happened: this has been considered for some time, not only by the Government and its advisers but by outside bodies and individuals who have experienced living in areas where this has already become a nuisance, if not a danger. In a country such as Australia that is developing

industrially at such a rapid rate it is inevitable that some control must be imposed to protect the health of the community from noxious gases and air pollution. I think we are fortunate in having this type of legislation with the benefit of having the experience of practically every industrial city in the world to draw on. It is necessary to enact it before the problem becomes completely out of control as it has in cities such as London, some of the central towns of the United States and to perhaps a lesser degree, but an important degree, in the industrial sections of the larger capital cities of this country.

It seems surprising that man has made such terrific progress in the last few years in shooting rockets to the moon and putting space ships into orbit, but has not been able to cope effectively with air pollution and the disposal of noxious gases and smoke. Under the amendments to the Health Act before us a new section 94b establishes a clean air committee and the Hon. Mr. Shard has mentioned the personnel of this committee, which seems to be very representative: the first four members mentioned will be nominated by the Government and the other seven will be nominated by the various bodies outlined by Mr. Shard. New section 94c empowers the Governor to make regulations on the recommendation of the committee, which seems to be a very wide provision. Somebody has to take the responsibility for this. I think anybody who has read the Bill will agree that the committee is given wide powers. That was probably done purposely to allow it to investigate fully the various items enumerated under the Act.

The committee is authorized to examine various types of fuels, to control the emission of air impurities, to look at the type of incinerators being used, the burning of rubbish and rubbish tips. All these things are extremely important. I think any one of us who has had the misfortune to drive behind dirty diesel trucks from time to time is well aware of the necessity to have at least some experiments into a better method of controlling the fumes from diesel trucks. In a long haul, of, say, three or four miles, if one is unfortunate enough to be driving behind several of those trucks, one is completely inundated with diesel smoke for the whole distance and in these days when most motor cars have a heater of some description the fumes are inducted into the interior of the car and are detrimental to health. I hope that that is one of the matters that the committee will carefully investigate. I read only a few weeks ago

that it is now established that one of the greatest killers on the road is these fumes from the exhausts of vehicles in front of cars, particularly those which have some form of induction heating system.

We know that some of our bigger industrial organizations have spent thousands and thousands of pounds in trying to arrest the smoke nuisance. The Electricity Trust at Port Augusta has made many efforts to make that area a more pleasant place to live in. I do not think anybody could object to this legislation. I think the Chief Secretary said in his speech that this cannot be rigid law: it must be flexible and amended from time to time according to conditions. The regulations that will come forward will be dealt with by the Subordinate Legislation Committee and I assure honourable members that if there is anything of which the committee disapproves it will report to Parliament accordingly. Whether Parliament agrees or not with the committee's recommendations does not worry the committee one iota; provided the committee has done its job and pointed out any frailties in the regulations—

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: You did not like it when I criticized you a year or two ago.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I do not know that the honourable member criticized us on a fair basis. I think his information was not quite correct.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I thought you said you did not mind criticism.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I do not, provided it is fair and accurate.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: The Hon. Mr. Wilson did not like it, either.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: When somebody is misled and receives some wrong information that is how most punters go broke. However, I support the second reading of this Bill because I think it is absolutely necessary and I think it is timely, before we get too big in our industrialization of the State, that we should control these problems. We shall have to wait and see whether the committee will come up with the right answers but this is the first step, and I think it should certainly receive the blessings of this Parliament.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I support the second reading of this Bill and I do not intend to speak at any length because I think that every honourable member would agree that the principle which the Bill seeks to embody in our Statutes is a good one, namely, that we should have some control over the smoke menace and fumes which are given off into the

atmosphere from manufacturing processes and in other ways. Nobody who has been in certain cities in America and in England and has seen some of the worst examples of this problem will for a moment want to delay this legislation. It is true, as the Minister said in the second reading speech, that this problem has not assumed any great proportions yet in South Australia, but with the rapid increase in our population and industrial growth there is no question that in the future there will be a greater menace. I rise merely to make one point, and I hope that honourable members will give some consideration to this before we reach the Committee stage.

Under new section 94c the Governor on the recommendation of the advisory committee may make regulations dealing with the various matters mentioned in this section and no doubt all of these are necessary if the menace is to be dealt with effectively. Under subsection (1) of the new section the Governor, on the recommendation of the clean air committee, may make regulations for or with respect to all or any of the following matters:

- (f) requiring the installation maintenance and operation at any premises of apparatus to prevent limit or control the emission of air impurities;
- (g) requiring the installation maintenance and operation at any premises of apparatus to indicate or record the quantity or quality or nature of any air impurities emitted from any fuel burning equipment thereat including apparatus to indicate or record the amount or percentage of carbon monoxide so emitted; . . .
- (j) prescribing tests to be carried out and records to be maintained by occupiers of premises with respect to the emission of air impurities from and the consumption of fuel on such premises;
- (k) requiring the installation and maintenance of control equipment in or upon any premises and prescribing the types of control equipment to be used in or upon any premises and the manner in which such equipment shall be operated and maintained; . . .
- (n) generally providing for the abatement of nuisance arising from the emission of air impurities from any premises;

As honourable members will see, those powers are very wide, and although it is true that they are to be made by regulation and we all know that those regulations will come before the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, anyone who knows anything about the work of that committee will realize that the action it can take is severely restricted by the rules governing its operations. Unless something was particularly wrong about the regulations put forward, the committee could

do very little to upset them. The important point is that it is not so much the regulations, which on the face of it may look reasonable, but the fact that they leave the individual property owner open to heavy expense. It is obvious to me that regulations will probably be made under the provisions of this section that will impose severe financial obligations upon private property owners. The Bill does not contain any suggestion that the Government will subsidize these persons to help them provide for high-cost equipment or the expensive maintenance of records. No provision exists for appeal to a court or board, or even to the Minister, against the effect of the operation of a particular regulation. It is possible that citizens may be forced to install expensive equipment without the right of appeal as to the absolute necessity of its installation.

I believe members should seriously consider this point in Committee. Some right of appeal should be provided in the Bill for individuals who may be severely affected by the operations of these regulations. I am sure that the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation will give every consideration to the regulations, but it cannot recommend their disallowance because they may cause severe hardship to individuals.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Municipalities have some of these powers already and there have been no difficulties.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: That may be, but an advisory committee is being established and some people may say that on the face of it it appears to be a potentially bureaucratic committee. I am not one of those, but I believe Parliament should consider this point. I do not want it to be thought that I am in any way opposed to the principle of the legislation; I believe it is essential and that all honourable members consider that legislation of this nature is required, particularly because of the future development of the State. However, we must face up to the fact that as a result of these regulations some individuals may have to foot large bills for expensive equipment and the maintenance of records. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill, and would welcome an expression of opinion from other members on the aspects I have raised.

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

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2).

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

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It follows the usual form of Supply Bills and provides for the issue of a further £6,000,000 to enable the Public Service to function during the period in which the Estimates of Expenditure and the Appropriation Bill will be debated by Parliament. Clause 2 provides for the issue and application of £6,000,000. Clause 3 provides for the payment of any increases in salaries or wages that may be authorized by any court or other body empowered to fix or prescribe salaries or wages.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I support this Bill and raise no objection to the manner of its presentation, as it is in accordance with the Budget.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I support the Bill, which covers the expenditure of £6,000,000, and which permits the Public Service to function until the Appropriation Bill is passed. It is entirely in the hands of Parliament how long that Bill will be before us. I do not imagine that in this place there will be a hold-up longer than is necessary, but I do not know that I can say that about the other place. There is no reason why the measure should not pass soon, because the items of expenditure will be considered in due course. In the meantime, people must be paid, so I do not oppose the second reading.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

FRUIT FLY (COMPENSATION) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 3. Page 775.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill, which is similar in form to a measure passed in 1959. Its purpose is to enable the Government to pay compensation for losses sustained by people last year during the campaign for the eradication of the fruit fly. It does not concern my district, but people in other districts are to receive compensation if affected by the work of the Agriculture Department when it has taken fruit or vegetables to prevent the possibility of a fruit fly infestation. Sometimes people criticize the Government for its work in attempting to prevent the spread of the fly, but I feel that the expenditure is worth while. Although we are sorry for the people who lost fruit and vegetables in the areas where the fruit fly was found, it was essential for the fruit and vegetables to be taken in order to eradicate the fly.

I am pleased that the department has agreed this year to permit people in the

banned areas to plant vegetables in order to have a crop next year. This is different from what applied previously, because then people were not permitted to grow anything for a period of 12 months. I am led to believe that the last two outbreaks of the fruit fly were the result of people bringing infected fruit from other States. It is a pity that people do not realize how serious it is to bring such fruit here. I hope it will be a long time before we again have to go through this procedure of fruit fly eradication.

The Hon. C. S. STORY (Midland): I support the second reading, but it does not give me pleasure, because for several years we were able to get through without having to pay compensation. In other words, the fruit fly was eradicated. Mr. Shard said that it was only due to the action of stupid and careless persons in bringing in infected fruit from other States that we had the latest spread of the fly in the metropolitan area. The fact that it was found at Clovelly Park, Frewville, Beulah Park, Highgate, Marion and North Unley shows that the fly moved around a good deal. It is bad enough to have flies left to move around, but much of the trouble is caused by people bringing in infected fruit from other States. Our Government has a remarkable record in the eradication of the fly. No other State has been able to match its work, and no other State has been successful in eradicating the fly. Much of the credit must go to the Agriculture Department. Its first recommendation was that compensation should be paid to people who declared the presence of fruit fly and had fruit taken and the success of the campaign has been based on that recommendation, so it is costing our State a great amount of money—over £2,000,000 since 1947—in compensation. That money could well have been used in other fields of activity in which the Government would, no doubt, like to press on.

I commend the Government for the way in which it has generously come forward with compensation. I commend, too, Parliament for always, with the exception of one or two quibbles, supporting the Fruit Fly (Compensation) Bill. The position in the other States is as bad as ever it was. I was recently in another State. The apathy with which this problem is approached is galling. Only in one spot was I challenged to declare fruit, and that was coming right into an irrigation area. The fruit fly road blocks set up at Yamba are most efficient. They have taken a great amount of fruit from many people, some of whom will always attempt to have a little fruit left in

the boot or the glove-box of a car. I was interested to see that in the Benmark Police Court only last week two justices of the peace took positive action against a person who had brought secondhand cases into South Australia from Victoria. I do not think he was even naturalized. By a subterfuge he had gone to the trouble of cleaning off the brands on secondhand cases and stacking them around a truck so that they appeared to be new cases, whereas most of the load was secondhand cases. They had come through a fruit fly infested area and were placed on a grower's property until the grower himself actually saw them and notified the Department of Agriculture. That man was fined £100 and that, in my opinion, is the proper treatment of irresponsible people who, for their own paltry gain, will jeopardize the whole industry.

I feel strongly on this subject. I compliment the Department of Agriculture on the way in which it has approached this campaign. I thank both the Government and Parliament, on behalf of those people vitally interested in this for a living, for the way in which this legislation has been supported.

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

AMUSEMENTS DUTY (FURTHER SUSPENSION) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from September 3. Page 781.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I rise to support the second reading of this Bill. In my opinion, it is necessary that this tax be not levied. When the amusements tax was in operation, I have clear recollections of the difficulties that various bodies, charitable in their nature, had in this respect. It meant much work for the department and for the Chief Secretary in deciding whether various functions came within the law in respect of exemption. The provisions of this Bill are simple. They merely continue the exemption but still leave the matter on the Statute Book. We cannot do other than agree to this measure, which is small and simple. It comes under the Stamp Duties Act and has only three clauses. However, it will enable the suspension of the amusements duty to be carried on for a further period, until 1967. I do not think it is a matter for great debate. We are glad the Bill is before us, and I shall not delay its passage.

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

BRANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 3. Page 781.)

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES (Southern): I rise briefly to support this Bill. The position has already been covered capably by the Hon. Mr. Dawkins and I do not wish to repeat his arguments on this Bill. Briefly, however, just to get matters into perspective the object of this Bill is to allow cattle to be ear tagged. This is a practice that has been the order of the day in various agricultural areas for some time. There was no reason why people should not put ear tags in cattle if they did not make a hole in the ear through which to attach the tag. Unfortunately, the attachment of an ear tag to a beef animal necessitates some form of hole in the ear. This Bill amends the relevant section of the Act; it legalizes a practice that has been quite common in certain agricultural areas for some time.

With the small amount of research that I have done on this Bill it rather surprises me to notice the difference between tattooing and branding. Branding can be done in six different positions on the carcass of the animal. The interpretation of the word "tattooing" I assume is a piercing of the skin with an ink marking that can be placed in the ear of the animal, on the bare skin around the base of the tail or on the lip. In terms of registered brands the markings must be lodged with the Registrar of Stock and Brands and registered. However, as regards the identity of an animal it is allowable as well as having the registered brand to incorporate the use of numerals as an added means of identity and this in fact is exactly what we anticipate will happen in terms of the marking on the tags themselves. The tag when fixed to the ear of an animal, therefore, can contain the registered brand of the owner; it can also contain various numerals for private identity purposes or for purposes that fall within the province of a breed society that may be controlling the identity of an individual animal from a pure-bred point of view.

In effect, this Bill makes it possible to place on the ear tag a brand approved by the Registrar of Stock and Brands, and it allows numerals to be added for further identification purposes. Secondly—and this is a completely new concept written into the Act—the Bill allows an official of the Artificial Breeding Board to tag animals also. There are fairly wide powers available to officials of that board under this clause of the Bill. The Bill enables a position to occur that can be evolved subject

to the approval of the Registrar of Stock and Brands. The importance of this, I think, is well demonstrated when we consider the problem of identity of animals bred by means of artificial insemination in other countries.

For instance, the early stages of the whole scheme of artificial breeding in England were rather costly to the taxpayer, who indirectly provided the funds, because the identity of certain animals bred by this means was lost. So I cannot but commend the Government for introducing this clause into the Brands Act Amendment Bill because statistical information is wasted when animals—particularly in the case of dairy cattle—are bred by artificial insemination and are identity-lost. Up until now it has been an aspect of operations of the Artificial Breeding Board with which I have not been completely happy. I say this because the board is maintaining the entity of artificially bred animals in herds that are officially tested and herds that are association tested. The latter are the grade herds of the State that are under some form of herd testing for production. Only in those two cases at present is the board maintaining any attempt at establishing the identity of the animal bred by this means.

The second object of this Bill is to empower officials of the board to place tags in the ears of calves bred by the process of artificial insemination. The information that I anticipate will be on these tags will enable both the sire and the dam to be readily identified so that proper production figures can be gained over the years. When a bull is placed under artificial insemination use it usually has a vast series of daughters in different environmental conditions. Because the progeny of this one bull are under different environmental conditions this environmental factor can then be excluded from calculations and a true statistical sampling be made on the productivity of the bull. It is this point that deals with the identity of these cows. In order to prove a case that one bull is better than another, it is of the utmost importance, and it affects the second half of the intention of this Bill.

The Hon. C. R. Story: In what sense do you use the word "environmental"?

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: By this I mean, of course, that one finds dairy cows grazing, perhaps, at Two Wells or Mount Compass under bleak and cold conditions or under lush, sheltered conditions. These conditions constitute different types of environment and affect the production of the animal concerned. Before we can evaluate the series of daughters

by one bull we must cut out the differences and get back to a true measure of the effect of the heredity of the bull on the production of a series of daughters. I hope that satisfies the honourable member on that point.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Are you referring to bull camels as well?

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I have had no experience of spreading semen from that source. The Hon. Mr. Dawkins mentioned in his speech that ear tagging, in his opinion, could never take the place of proper tattooing of cattle for identity purposes. I agree, but I imagine that he probably wished to refer to a grade herd of beef cattle because this Bill only affects cattle. However, there is another side of this problem and that is one of identity of pure-bred stock: for instance pure-bred Jersey cattle receive tattoos in the ear; with Fresian cattle, having black ears, the tattoo is rendered more or less ineffective. Because of this Fresian cattle are usually registered by means of a profile photograph of the animal. The portion of black against the white is so different in each case that proper identity can be obtained by use of photographs. However, this brings up a broader matter and I do not wish to further delay the passage of this Bill.

I congratulate the Government on bringing before this Chamber a Bill which I think is necessary and desirable, particularly within the field of artificial insemination, through its ability from now on to maintain a proper identity of calves bred by that method. I support the Bill.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I rise to support the Bill. In the breeding of stud stock it is essential that correct identification be made and proper records kept. The whole purpose of the Bill is to allow these things to be done. It is most important that our live-stock industry is fostered and that accurate records are kept because Australia is a disease-free country at this stage, although it is surrounded by countries that are not so fortunate. The herds of many countries to our north are riddled with disease and the time may come when those countries will look to our live-stock industry for replacements, and if we have an accurate system of records and our stock is up to the standards required by these countries they will provide a ready made market.

By providing for the ear tagging of cattle and making similar provisions for other live-stock we may be able to build up a worthwhile industry. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

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

THEVENARD TO KEVIN RAILWAY BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 3. Page 786.)

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I support the Bill for several reasons. First, I commend the South Australian Railways and the Government for their progressive move in building this new railway line. It is a business venture that has every indication of being profitable and it will also help companies developing mining leases in the area. The cost of the new line will be £849,640 (as against a cost of renovating the old line of £805,440, plus an additional £20,000 for providing cuttings and banks). The cost of the new line only slightly exceeds that of renovating the old line and the new line will shorten the distance for hauling gypsum from 64 miles to 38 miles. It will provide a grade of one in 120 as against one in 80 on the old line. Because of this more favourable grade a 50 per cent greater load can be carried over the lesser distance of 38 miles and this amounts to an estimated saving of about £50,000 a year, so any difference in cost would be recouped in the first year.

Earlier in the debate a question was asked about royalties paid by companies for the gypsum they mined. I am indebted to the Hon. Mr. Robinson for obtaining these figures. The royalty paid by the companies is 6d. a ton and that is estimated to return to the State £9,500 a year, or £15,750,000 on the estimated extent of the gypsum deposit of 630,000,000 tons. The mines have prospects for quite a long productive life and should make the building of this line profitable and worth while. Also, I am pleased to see this line being built because we often hear lip service paid to the decentralization of industry, but as this area in the vicinity of Thevenard is in one of the more remote areas of the State this is decentralization in the true sense. I was interested in a talk I had recently with a businessman from another State about the success in South Australia of industrial development. I mentioned to him the reasons often given for this development, such as stability, the advantage of our cost structure and other advantages we enjoy, but he considered that one of the most successful things the South Australian Government had done to encourage the decentralization of industry and industry

generally was to provide facilities and services; and this railway is another practical way of encouraging industry in South Australia, particularly in country areas.

The Bill refers to £800 interest to be paid yearly by the Waratah Gypsum Company for the use of portion of this line, on which the South Australian Railways will retain the right to carry goods other than gypsum. Again I feel that this will be to our advantage. In supporting the Bill I hope that sympathetic consideration will be given to making more money available for the roads in the area that will be carrying additional traffic because of the different route to be followed by the railway line.

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

CHURCHES OF CHRIST, SCIENTIST,
INCORPORATION BILL.

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

Ordered that report be printed.

ELDER SMITH & CO. LIMITED
PROVIDENT FUNDS BILL.

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

Ordered that report be printed.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.42 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, October 2, at 2.15 p.m.