LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Wednesday, October 2, 1963.

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

QUESTIONS.

HACKHAM CROSSING.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Having travelled on the South Road to Victor Harbour on a number of occasions recently I am concerned about the Hackham crossing. Without going into detail, the improvement on the South Road, as far as it has progressed, is good, and when it is completed the road will be equal to any in the State. I have heard a lot about the Hackham crossing and I stopped there to make observations about its disabilities or otherwise. I understand only two trains a week use the line. I do not want it to be understood that I advocate that the line be not used, because possibly we might want more than two trains a week. Has the Minister, in his capacities as Minister of Railways and Minister of Roads, considered widening the road and the possibility of putting a bridge over the Hackham railway line, thus doing away with the extravagant roundabout that is necessary to get over the railway line? If not, will he take up the matter with the Railways Commissioner and the Commissioner of Highways to see if it is possible, because I believe there is no engineering difficulty whatever in connection with it?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: As Minister of Roads I have consulted with the Minister of Railways and I can assure the honourable member that this matter has given me very considerable cause for thought during the last two or three years. He pointed out that there are only one or two trains a week, but unfortunately there are too many accidents there, some fatal. It is a most objectionable crossing. There were fatalities there 20 years ago, and fatalities involving more than one person. I inform the honourable member that the Highways Department has in mind—and, naturally, with modern progress—taking an overpass directly over the railway line going down the hill, but it involves great difficulty in landing at the bottom end because of the grades and the running into the little village of Hackham. I am aware that, generally speaking, it is undesirable to close a railway. I am also aware that it is desirable to increase public transport in that southern area, probably down to Noarlunga or Port Noarlunga, but I am closely considering, with my colleague the Minister of Roads or the Minister of Railways, whichever he is, whether it may be desirable to recommend to the Government that the railway line south of the Onkaparinga River be closed in view of the paucity of the traffic upon it. I am at present awaiting reports regarding the actual annual losses on that Willunga line, compared with the fantastic cost that would come on to the Highways Department for producing overways, not only at Hackham but down at Pedler's Creek and so on down to Willunga.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Arising out of that question, I ask the Minister whether, as there are only two trains a week, he does not consider that the road could go straight through, and whether it would be desirable that those two trains a week should stop just before reaching the crossing, on either side, with suitable signals, which would mean merely four stops for two trains a week, thus solving the difficulties of the thousands of motorists who use that crossing every day?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I have given personal thought to that matter but, as honourable members are aware, the Railways Commissioner in his authority, supported by Parliament, has the power over that. I feel that as a railway man he would not be prepared to support the idea of trains stopping at the crossing. Probably my former suggestion is the better one.

SECOND CREEK, BURNSIDE.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: Has the Minister of Mines a reply to my question of September 3 about Second Creek, Burnside?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: On behalf of my colleague, the Minister of Mines, I have to advise that this matter was investigated by officers of the Mines Department, who report as follows:

It was found that sand and gravel from a quarry had washed down Second Creek, Burnside, and had spread over a piece of flat ground several properties lower down stream, rendering it unusable. An extension of the bared quarry area, plus greater clearing of upstream properties inducing greater run-off, coupled with the unusually wet winter, have caused this situation. Remedial measures will be undertaken by the quarry proprietor, including removal of sand and gravel from the flat land, clearing out of the creek bed, and provision of a retaining wall on the creek bed.

These measures should prevent any recurrence of this situation.

EDITHBURGH FISHING FACILITIES.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to a question I asked yesterday about fishing facilities at Edithburgh?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Following suggestions by the fishermen of the locality, estimates of the amended plans have been prepared. The Director of Fisheries and Game (Mr. A. C. Bogg) has arranged to visit Edithburgh next Monday in company with officers of the South Australian Harbors Board. The proposals will be discussed with fishermen.

FESTIVAL HALL.

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: In the press this week there appeared an article in regard to the demolition of the Exhibition Building and the new Napier Building. In that article it was mentioned that the design of this building had been selected on a competitive basis from a panel of architects. In view of that procedure can the Minister representing the Minister of Education ascertain whether the Government will consider similar action when the Festival Hall is selected and constructed?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I shall be pleased to refer the matter to my colleague, the Minister of Education. The only thing I add to that is that I do not know whether any firm decision has been made with regard to a Festival Hall or whether it will be the responsibility of the Government if and when that time arrives.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT.

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended June 30, 1963.

MOUNT GAMBIER BY-LAW: TRAFFIC.

Order of the day No. 3: the Hon. C. R. Story to move:

That By-law No. 7 of the Corporation of the City of Mount Gambier in respect of traffic, made on September 27, 1962, and laid on the table of this Council on June 12, 1963, be disallowed.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland) moved:

That this Order of the Day be discharged.

Order of the Day discharged.

FOOD AND DRUGS REGULATION: MEAT AND MEAT PRODUCTS.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I move:

That Regulation No. 15 (amending the principal Regulation No. 40) relating to meat and meat products, made under the Food and Drugs Act, 1908-1962, on April 11, 1963, and laid on the table of this Council on June 12, 1963, be disallowed.

I point out that this matter has been the subject of debate in another place and I understand it is still unresolved. I bring this matter before the Chamber today because the Subordinate Legislation Committee, of which I am a member, has recommended to the Council that this portion of a vast number of regulations be disallowed. It is only a section of the regulation brought down under the provisions of the Act. The reason why the committee wished at least to alert the Council—and I think it is very important from the committee's point of view that the Council is informed of anything which the committee thinks should be examined—

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Wasn't this discussed in another place?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The matter is probably before that other place at the present time.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Why bring it before this place at the same time?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: We have the right to do it, and it is one of our great rights.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: It is not to save the face of the Premier?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No. I think the Premier has proved over many years that he is very well able to look after his own face and stand on his own two feet, and therefore it would be impudent for me to suggest that I was saving anybody's face, including one like the Premier's.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: He can stand on his feet politically with the aid of the Speaker in another place.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: He can stand on his own feet in any company. I think the honourable member probably agrees with me to a large degree on that. Regulation No. 15 has been brought down in this Parliament and laid on the table, as I pointed out, under the Food and Drugs Act. The committee made a close study of all the regulations brought down and I must say that out of the 22 amending regulations to the Act the only one with which the committee found fault was No. 40. It deals specifically with meat in various forms, such as minced meat, sausage meat, ground meat

and tripe. After close examination and calling witnesses the committee thought Parliament would agree to most of this amending legislation but it could not agree to the regulation dealing specifically with tripe. The provisions dealing with tripe were completely wrong in my opinion and it is wrong that a regulation should ever be brought into Parliament which cannot be complied with. This regulation cannot be complied with under any circumstances.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You ascertained that after expert inquiries?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes; we got the best people we thought we could get.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: Did you get any housewives?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No, we were after experts. We went right to the core of the matter and got the opinions of people who produce the tripe and make it into a palatable substance, particularly the Metropolitan Abattoirs, which supplies the majority of the tripe consumed in this State. The abattoirs were able to come up with the answer that they could not comply with the regulations as laid down. We took evidence from Master Butchers Ltd. and individual butchers and each one in turn, particularly the abattoirs, said that the regulation could not be complied with. I must point out that this committee has no power whatever to disallow portions of a regulation. We can and do make suggestions to district councils sometimes if there is a drafting error. We try hard to save people inconvenience by suggesting to them that if they alter the regulation we will report to the House their intention to alter it. We then move for the disallowance and, when the matter has been finalized, as in the case of Mount Gambier which I dealt with today, and when the new regulation is brought down, we give an assurance, which we include in *Hansard,* to the effect that we will not obstruct them in their work. This is a far more important type of regulation than we have dealt with before, although the taxi-cab regulations may be comparable. The committee has not the power to select one portion of a regulation and amend it. It has been said that the committee did not take any action to try to allow this particular regulation to continue. It is a group of ordinary lay people who represent a large cross section of the community and includes representatives of the Labor Party and the Liberal Party—people from both metropolitan and country areas.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is well balanced.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes. The committee thoroughly studied this matter and came to the conclusion that this was a highly hypothetical approach to the subject of meat. It was an endeavour to make South Australians eat exactly the same preparation of meat as was eaten in Queensland, New South Wales and Western Australia. I believe, and women in particular would agree with me, that the very essence of living is to be able to obtain different recipes and have different food. Nobody wants to be moulded into one type of eating. This concerns sausage meat. The idea was to endeavour to foist on the people of South Australia that they must have similar sausages to those produced in New South Wales. Recently I visited that State and I could almost be considered a connoisseur of sausages, as I am very fond of them. It may be that some people would say that I look like a sausage! Sausages in New South Wales contain 75 per cent of meat. If a housewife is keen on protein values this type of sausage would probably appeal to her, but for a palatable sausage give me one with 66 per cent of meat. An attempt is being made to bring down a formula for the whole of Australia for all kinds of meat and preservatives. The matter has been discussed at one or two conferences and those who attended decided that it would be nice to have uniform regulations throughout Australia. The committee agreed entirely with the findings of Dr. Woodruff and his colleagues regarding smoke essences, and considered they would be against the public health, but its members cannot see why the same method of making sausages should apply throughout Australia. It is a matter of opinion. No evidence has been produced that practical experiments have been carried out on this matter. A bio-chemist worked on a certain formula.

For 50 or 60 years the people of South Australia have been eating minced meat prepared by butchers who have added some SO_2 to act as a preservative. SO_2 is used as a preservative in many commodities we consume. People who drink soft drinks consume immense quantities of SO_2. It is obvious that soft drinks contain this preservative because that fact is stated on the label. SO_2 is also added to minced meat and has been for many years. Under the regulation it is to be cut out completely and no additive is to be included. The committee investigated this matter closely and some practical people were called to give evidence about SO_2. The paragraph relating to minced or chopped meat is as follows:

Chopped or minced meat is meat which has been minced either by chopping or cutting.

One of the difficulties when dealing with meat is that when it is minced by a butcher in large quantities it is necessary to keep the cutters of the machine very cool otherwise the meat is damaged or bruised and that causes it to darken. The additive stops this darkening.

The paragraph states that the meat is minced or chopped. This includes rissole steak, hamburger steak, pie meats and other meats sold under a specific name. There is nothing wrong with this. The matter that has been raised in various quarters relates to the additive SO_2. The committee took evidence from Mr. Lindsay Mase, who is a well-known producer of smallgoods and I think one could say that he is in business in rather a big way in Adelaide. He attended a meeting of the committee at its request and brought various samples of meat he had prepared for the committee's inspection 24 hours beforehand. He brought two samples that had not been treated with an additive and two that had been. The committee requested the housekeeper at Parliament House, Miss Bottomley, to put that meat under refrigeration immediately so that members could observe what happened to it. Mr. Mase predicted that the meat would discolour and that after a few days it would have a sour smell. Both these things occurred as predicted. The meat treated with SO_2 still retained its bright colour and was edible up to seven or eight days later.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: It was a sort of technical analysis?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The committee felt it was necessary for someone to do something practical.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: You said that the members of the committee were laymen. Where did they get their technical knowledge?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Technical knowledge is a remarkable thing. We need people to experiment with various things. My experience with experiments in Australia, particularly in the agricultural field, shows that the suggestions have been worked on to see whether they are good or not. In this case a person's nose enabled him to tell whether the meat was off or not, and his eyes could tell him whether the meat appealed in appearance or not. In this case the meat was not good, but the meat containing the additive was good. Mr. Mase gave useful information to the committee regarding the addition of a small amount of starch in sausage meat. This has been a practice for a long while. The regulations do not cut out the starch, but permit it. There is a specific formula setting out how much starch can be used at present. The committee does not object to that. It felt that it was necessary to get the best knowledge it could on the matter. The next point on which Mr. Mase was questioned, and evidence was also given by Mr. Beck, the Secretary of Master Butchers Ltd., concerned tripe. Whatever people think about minced meat, it is only incidental to tripe, and this is an important matter. A person buying tripe from the Metropolitan Abattoirs could get into serious bother if the regulations were allowed to remain as drafted. I understand that at present the regulations are not being enforced, pending a decision by Parliament. If they were carried out a person buying tripe from the abattoirs for sale in his shop would be guilty of an offence. I always believe that regulations should be capable of being policed and put into force properly, but that cannot be done with present regulations.

We also had evidence from the General Manager of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs concerning the pH requirements in tripe. The pH is merely the measurement upon which they work. The neutral figure is seven, whereas the regulations require eight. Because of the water available in South Australia it is impossible to comply with the regulations. A scientific approach has been given to the matter and some research has taken place. The abattoirs people say that it is impossible to get the alkalinity in the water down to the required standard in order to enable tripe to be sold in accordance with the regulations. It is futile for us to have regulations when it is known that they cannot be complied with. The committee feels that it has a responsibility to the people of the State to see that they are not exposed to unnecessary prosecution. To put in the necessary plant to enable the regulations to be complied with would cost a considerable sum of money, far more than the value of the tripe produced at the abattoirs. We were told in evidence that there is nothing detrimental to health in the pH figure obtainable at present. It seems to me that the committee is justified in alerting members to this matter, and also in connection with minced meat. The committee feels that it might be all right for the big butcher in Adelaide who can make minced meat every day and sell it over the counter for the housewife to take home in her handbag for use that night, but in the country areas, where there is only killing twice a week, and where residents pick up meat

in Adelaide and take it many miles before putting it in the refrigerator, there will be complaints and loss. There will also be some danger from food poisoning, which is an important matter. When a person buys minced meat without any preservative in it, puts it on the back seat of a motor car, where I have often seen it, and leaves the sun to work on it for a few hours before it gets into the refrigerator, there is great danger, particularly for country people.

Most of us seem to have lived for 50 or 60 years with the SO_2 being added to the meat. It is remarkable how long our grandparents and parents have lived with this meat, so why at this stage do we have to stop putting SO_2 in the meat? We allow children to drink lemonade, lemon squash and other drinks that contain SO_2. We take no action to prevent that; therefore, it cannot be such a terrible thing to put it in meat. The committee feels that there would be certain hardships on the public if the regulations were adopted, and that some people would be liable to prosecution in the sale of tripe. I do not like a sausage with 75 per cent meat in it. I prefer the sausage with 66 per cent of meat in it, which we have had for many years. I do not like being asked to conform completely to what happens in other States, just because those other States have it and South Australia does not have it.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2): I compliment the Hon. Mr. Story on his delightful speech, but I do not think that this is a motion to be treated lightly. I believe that the health of the community is of far more importance than the convenience of the wholesale butchering trade in South Australia. Not all butchers favour the disallowance of the regulations. Competent butchers whom I have interviewed in both the metropolitan area and country areas where I have been travelling recently have told me that they still keep to the practice of mincing meat every day. We differ from what happened in the days of our grandparents 50 or 60 years ago. In those days butchers took a pride in their work and minced meat every day. I realize that it suits the big butchering businesses to be able to mince meat once a week, add preservatives, and then send it out pre-packaged, but the continual eating of chemicals is against all I believe in pure and natural foods. We are all endangering our health.

My greatest objection is that the general public is at the mercy of the individual butcher, in many instances. There can be no strict policing of the amount of preservative used. To my continual and searching inquiries (I have done this for six weeks) I have found the most interesting and varying, not to say vague, answers. I differ again from Mr. Story in his remarks about lemonade. Anybody who has anything to do with factories making soft drinks will know that there is very strict policing. It is not a matter of a handful here and a drop there: it is most scientifically done.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: Very interesting!

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: Certainly. There is also the possibility of mistake. We can all remember the tragedy that occurred in this very State when the wrong preservative was added. No reason was given why the wrong preservative was so near at hand. As for the so-called experiment, far from scientific experiments in another place which were mentioned today, I can only say that the results are quaint. The conclusion reached was that meat with preservative added was preserved, and meat without preservative added was not preserved. To me, it was still the same old meat. The skilled housewife buys her steak—

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: Do you add salt when cooking meat?

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: —and minces it herself. That is what grandmothers did. Some chefs recommend no salt, Mr. Minister. Today, when most modern kitchens have electric mixers with mincing attachments as part of their equipment, the mincing is a matter of only a moment. I am sorry that my name was used in another place when the motion for disallowance came up. I dissociate myself entirely from the statment made. My opinion was never sought, but I have inquired of Miss Bottomley and I have news for honourable members. She has given me permission to say that she has never bought minced meat in her life and she assures me that she would not in any circumstances serve it to the delicate honourable members of these two Chambers! She always buys beef and minces it herself. Both she and I take a keen and tender interest in the health of those for whom we cater.

Remember, we all have only one life. Remember, too, that allowing preservative to be added to minced meat will not increase the sale of beef or any other meat, for the following reasons. First, stale meat, even preserved from objectionable deterioration and flavours, will not sell and will reduce the market for beef. Secondly, beef that has not sold should rightfully be regarded as trade wastage and not be foisted upon the public with

preservative as an additive instead of fresh meat. So, to my mind, the use of preservative in minced meat will not make beef more popular. In fact, it tends to reduce the total usage of beef.

Finally, I would say that the public health authorities who have available the best medical advice had this legislation introduced. The public health authorities in the larger States have refused so far to allow this type of preservative for this meat. I consider that we should be well advised to follow expert opinion and not be stampeded by a few wholesale butchers, who wish to peddle stale meat all over the State, into disallowing what I believe is a first-class piece of legislation.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I listened with much interest to the honourable member who has just resumed her seat. One important thing appearing from her remarks was that she was really against any minced meat: that is to say, any minced meat that was prepared and sold in a butcher's shop the day on which it was sold. It may be that the honourable member follows the practice of her mother and grandmother and, in fact, minces her own meat, but I cannot believe that that is typical of what occurs today in the average home, in spite of the fact that there may be electric mixmasters with mincing attachments. The average housewife does not buy her meat and mince it herself. I say that most housewives go to the butcher's and buy minced meat.

This question was looked at carefully by the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. It took evidence from four or five witnesses— not all butchers. It took evidence from Dr. Woodruff himself on this matter and from the Metropolitan Abattoirs Board.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Did it make any culinary tests?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: No culinary tests, but I was not surprised at the result of a little experiment that the committee made because I did not expect that the result would be any different from what it was. I agree to some extent with what Mrs. Cooper says, that there was nothing very significant about this experiment, because any intelligent person would have been able to predict what happened; but there are some important points about this. If we accept the fact that housewives do require to buy minced meat (and I think that the fact that they do is beyond any question), then we have to ask ourselves whether it is wrong or not wrong to make this small addition of sulphur dioxide to the meat. I remember this because I asked the question in the committee of Dr. Woodruff himself— "We have been eating meat with this small content of sulphur dioxide for donkey's years." He said "Yes." I asked him specifically: "Can you tell us whether any harm has resulted from this practice?" His answer was, "Not that I know of."

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Had he carried out any experiments?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: That was quite unequivocal on his part. I have never heard of any complaint or difficulties arising from the use of sulphur dioxide. It is true that Dr. Woodruff went on and said, "Well, you know that sulphur dioxide is an irritant" but, when I pointed out to him that it goes into soft drinks and other commodities, he had to agree that this was so.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Only a decimal point.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I want to assure Mrs. Cooper and other honourable members that one cannot take stale meat and make it into fresh meat by putting sulphur dioxide into it. This is just not done and is not possible. Dr. Woodruff himself agrees that this is so. One cannot turn stale meat into apparently fresh meat by this process. So you must have fresh meat to start off with, but in the processing of minced meat it goes through a series of mincers which grow progressively smaller, the smallest being to produce what has now become known as hamburger mince which I believe is sold prolifically in shops today. This processing generates heat, which causes the discolouration—indeed immediate discolouration—of the minced meat. It also causes a quick deterioration in the meat if it is not immediately placed under refrigeration, and even if it is immediately placed in a refrigerator it will not last more than three or four days at the outside.

When this point was put to the committee by a witness we asked Dr. Woodruff whether he agreed and his answer was, "Yes, I do agree but you can get over this difficulty by putting some crushed ice in the mincer." Mr. Mase who gave evidence and brought the specimens pointed out to the committee that crushed ice was used in his mincers and always had been, but it still did not produce the effect that Dr. Woodruff speculated it would produce, namely, to stop discolouration of the meat. It became plain, I think, to members of the committee that this was an attempt to introduce, rightly or wrongly, uniform health

regulations throughout the whole of Australia. It was pointed out that adding sulphur dioxide had occurred in South Australia and in Tasmania.

The Hon. C. R. Story: And in Victoria.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Yes, and since they have cut it out in Victoria there have been innumerable prosecutions for failure to comply with the regulations, that is, failure to sell unpreservatized minced meat. In other words, the temptation in Victoria is too great to go back to the old practice and add some preservative.

These regulations came into force in South Australia in about March this year. The committee did not investigate them until August and September, so for a period of about four or five months the regulations, on the assumption that they would be allowed by this Chamber, have been in operation throughout South Australia, including the metropolitan area. Butchers have ceased during that period to add this small quantity of sulphur dioxide to minced meat. The evidence before the committee was that during that period, which was winter in South Australia, there were innumerable protests from customers who had previously preferred to have the old, slightly preservatized meat. They wanted to know what was wrong with the minced meat, why it was brown, and protested that it was going bad and smelt.

This was during our winter months—it was a very severe winter—so we can imagine what the situation will be in the summer. All in all, I think that the committee, looking at this problem as representatives of this Chamber and another place and representing a fair cross section of opinion of the community, examined this problem seriously. It did not want to disallow this regulation because there were other things in it which were unobjectionable. The committee has no power to dissect a regulation and only disallow parts of it. I consider it took a realistic and practical view on this matter which is in keeping with its responsibilties.

On the other question, I think all authorities, including Dr. Woodruff, are in agreement as far as the regulations on tripe are concerned. They simply cannot be complied with at present in South Australia. Although scientists are working on the problem they have not yet found a solution in order to make South Australian water supplied to the abattoirs sufficiently alkaline to produce the results that the regulations require. I say that it is wrong in principle to have regulations introduced which carry a monetary penalty when, even on the admission of the department which introduces them, they cannot be complied with. It may be that this is only one small factor, but even so, in my opinion, that would justify a disallowance for the time being. Therefore I have much pleasure in supporting the motion moved by the Hon. Mr. Story.

Motion carried.

FRUIT FLY (COMPENSATION) BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

AMUSEMENTS DUTY (FURTHER SUSPENSION) BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

BRANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

THEVENARD TO KEVIN RAILWAY BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

SCAFFOLDING INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 3. Page 782.)

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1): This Bill is designed to extend the powers vested in the scaffolding inspectors and to further extend the control of power-driven tools and equipment and hoisting appliances. Building activity today has extended at an enormous rate and the emphasis is upon multi-storey buildings, which have revolutionized the building industry. Modern methods used in the construction of these buildings are a great step forward compared with those we knew a few years ago. Steel and other metals play a very important part in the constructional work and architects today are required not only to design and supervise the erection of buildings under modern trends but to be capable of estimating the stresses and loads in relation to the construction of those buildings because of the enormous amount of steel used in constructional work today. Because of these up-to-date methods we find that new tools have had to be introduced; hence the introduction of power tools, power-driven equipment and power hoists.

Power tools have proved to be very dangerous in their use and many accidents have occurred to workmen using them. Therefore, I think proper tuition should be given to a person before he is called upon to use these tools. Irrespective of the manner power tools

and equipment have been defined in the past there has been room for improvement and I believe that this Bill has overcome the difficulty in defining them. The proposed amendment will afford greater safety in the industry. Scaffolding inspectors will have increased authority in ensuring that scaffolding is safe at all times. If this power is exercised it will go a long way to prevent accidents, some of which in the past have been fatal.

I believe that the amendment would enable inspectors to prevent some types of accidents that have occurred previously. If inspectors had had this power before, in all probability the recent fatal accident at the Port Adelaide silos would not have happened. I understand that since then safety measures have been taken to prevent any such repetition. I believe there is room for considerable improvement in the present legislation for the safety of workmen on building constructions. The amendment would enable inspectors to order certain safeguards to be implemented. If these precautions were not taken the inspector could refuse permission for the scaffolding to be used.

These amendments are an immense improvement on the present legislation, but the Bill does not go far enough. Great expansion is taking place in building activity in South Australia, particularly in house building. This expansion is progressing into areas that were recently open country and, in addition to that, many country districts have been expanded and often the Act did not apply to these areas. Modern methods of building are used in these areas, similar to those in the metropolitan area. I suggest that workers employed on these buildings are entitled to protection also. I know that it can be argued that the Act can be extended by regulation if it is considered necessary. However, this is a cumbersome procedure and the time has arrived when the operation of this Act should be State-wide. I have on the files an amendment to clause 3 that provides for the addition of certain new areas because, owing to increases in population, some district councils have now become municipalities. I know that the principal Act gives power by regulation to extend the Act. This has been done on numerous occasions—recently at Noarlunga in respect of the building of the oil refinery at Port Stanvac. Another instance occurred at the Myponga reservoir.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: There were quite a few exemptions at Port Stanvac.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: That is so. By regulation the Act can be extended to cover certain projects. The report of the Housing Trust shows considerable activity in the building of houses in country districts. We have reached the stage where what was comparatively open space can be occupied by numerous houses in the period of a month.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: Not much scaffolding is used in house building surely?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: There is. The Scaffolding Act was introduced to protect workers building private houses. Methods of scaffolding have improved from the old system of pole and planks. Little of that goes on today, and tubular steel is used instead. The tendency in cities today is towards multi-storey buildings for office accommodation. This is apparent in Adelaide, where the skyline has been altered considerably. Because of the increase in building activity, I believe this Act should apply over the whole State, and it should not be necessary to have regulations promulgated from time to time to extend its application. In Committee I intend to move for the deletion of section 3, subsection (2) of which states:

> The Governor may from time to time make regulations for the purposes of this section, and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, may by regulation—
>
> (*a*) declare that this Act shall apply to any portion of the State to which this Act does not for the time being apply;
>
> (*b*) revoke or vary any regulation so made;
>
> (*c*) declare that this Act shall cease to apply—
>
> (i) to any municipality or district council district mentioned in paragraph (*d*) of subsection (1) of this section; or
>
> (ii) to any portion of the State referred to in paragraph (*d*a) of that subsection.

Purely and simply that applies to regulations under the section, and has no relation to other provisions that say the Governor may make regulations from time to time determining penalties and so on. The deletion of the section would make the measure operate throughout the State. The time has arrived when it should be State-wide legislation and in Committee I will move for the deletion of section 3 from the principal Act. I support the second reading.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY (Central No. 2): The Bill seeks to extend the operations of the principal Act over a wider area and to control certain equipment used in building operations. Buildings now being erected are higher than buildings erected previously, and different uses are being made of materials.

Consequently, from time to time it is necessary for the principal Act to be reviewed. Now the Government is extending the area in which the Act will operate and the department is given control over the use of hoists and other equipment. I have no objection to the Bill, if it will in any way prevent accidents. It provides for a compulsion on the employer, and there is some responsibility on the employee to become better acquainted with the equipment used. The Hon. Mr. Bevan finds no fault with the Bill, but his Party wants to extend the operation of the Act to all parts of the State. I can see no reason why the legislation should not apply at specific places like Port Augusta or Port MacDonnell, but there is no reason for it to apply to all parts of the State, because it would not be possible to police the Act properly. I do not think it is necessary for all scaffolding to be examined by inspectors. For many years we have built two-storey houses without scaffolding and inspectors. I agree that, where necessary, buildings should be higher. I understand that the people who will have to work under the legislation are satisfied with it, and I commend it to members. I can see no reason why it should apply State-wide, but it could be extended to particular areas when considered necessary.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Central No. 1): I support the Bill. I did not intend to say much about it, but I now feel I must enter the debate because of what has been said by some members. The Hon. Sir Frank Perry said that our Party advocates the extension of the legislation to all parts of the State. I can see nothing wrong with that, and I am pleased that the Party believes that industrial legislation, designed to protect the worker, should be extended in that way. I agree with the Hon. Mr. Bevan that the Bill does not go far enough, and that it should cover all the State. Some people will say that can be done under the regulations. I have a pamphlet, issued by the Department of Labour and Industry, indicating the areas where this measure will apply. Including those already mentioned in the Act, we will have 29 areas. In most instances a radius of five miles from a post office is mentioned, but I have travelled extensively throughout the State and, differently from some members, have found that outside the five-mile radius substantial buildings are being erected. Don't tell me that people who live on farms and dairies all live in single-storey structures, because I have called on places of two storeys and noted that even the dairies in some places were of a considerable size. Building techniques today are different. Years ago the builder's labourer himself carried all the bricks, hods of mortar and so forth up on the scaffolding to those working higher up on the building. Today, because of the improvement in techniques within the building industry, on even the smaller structures there are cranes and power-driven equipment to lift wheelbarrows full of mortar up to the higher levels. I can remember when those scaffoldings were made solely of timber; in many instances they were stood in a 44-gallon drum with a few bricks to hold them, and tied together with a rope, with no inspection as to whether they were in good order or not. Things are different today. There are other types of structure. If this inspection of scaffolding did not cover the whole country, we could revert to the old practice of using bits of timber and ropes on scaffolding to hold power-driven lifts or hoists, which would almost certainly lead to serious accidents in the country.

We find, too, that most builders who erect structures in the country either come from the metropolitan area or work and reside in a bigger country town that is probably covered by the Scaffolding Act anyway. When their employees are working within a five-mile radius of the post office, they are covered by the provisions of the Scaffolding Act; if they happen to be half a mile or a quarter of a mile outside the five-mile radius, they are not covered. That is a crazy situation, one that should be righted by making the Scaffolding Act cover the whole State. That goes for all other industrial legislation designed to protect the lives and limbs of the workers.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Which are the areas?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: There are 29 of them. I do not wish to read them and I know it would be foolish of me to ask for them to be included in *Hansard* without my reading them. The metropolitan area is covered. Angaston, Barmera, Berri and so forth are covered but, in the majority of instances where they are not included in the Act, the five-mile radius provision applies, and that is foolish. The Act should cover the whole State. We can see, from some of the regulations coming before us to be laid on the table, that the application of the Act to certain areas has been revoked. Why that is so I do not know. Why it should not extend, and stay extended, I cannot understand. This applies to most of our industrial Acts where provision is made for the protection of people.

I know of safety provisions either under this Act or under another Act. For instance, with asbestos roofing, it is provided that there should be wire mesh between the asbestos roofing and the rafters underneath. Building extensions have been made and, because some places are not covered by the Act, this provision has not been observed.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Is not this provided for in the Building Act?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: It is contained in one of the Acts, but that Act should cover the whole State, as this one should. That is the most dangerous type of roofing we know of. If honourable members look at the reports of the Department of Labour and Industry of last year and of the year before, they will find that there were several cases where people went through asbestos roofs because the provision that there should be a safety mesh had not been observed.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: But that is nothing to do with this Act.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: No, but this is in the same category as the Building Act, which does not cover the whole State. This Act does not cover it either. For that reason, workers' lives are in jeopardy. There have been exceptions, I know, but they were not covered by the Act. In some cases the wire mesh was not put in, and one fellow went through an asbestos roof to the floor. Such an accident can result in very serious injury or death.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: Somebody nearly went through this roof recently.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I think I have said enough to indicate that I support the proposal put forward by my colleague, Mr. Bevan. The Act at present does not go far enough.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Amendment of principal Act, section 3 (1)."

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I move:

That section 3 of the principal Act be struck out.

I have already intimated this afternoon that the deletion of section 3 of the principal Act has the effect of making this Act State-wide in its application. There has been only one objection to this, but there are many country districts where this Act could apply and where at present it does not. For instance, silos are being extended today. They are not all built inside a country town; they could be built outside the area already referred to by Mr Kneebone. Unless someone realizes that the Scaffolding Act does not cover such an area, no proclamation is made. Nobody on the job would know whether or not the Act applied. All employees on building projects are not conversant with Acts of Parliament. There is no reason why employees working on these projects which are not covered at present and which probably would not be covered by proclamation should not have the same protection as an employee who is covered. It is foolhardy and is an example of closing the door after the horse has escaped. That has happened in many instances where fatal accidents on building projects that are covered by the Act have occurred.

It has been said that if the Act had State-wide effect it could not be policed. There are other Acts that I submit have State-wide effect that are not, in fact, policed until something happens and a report has to be made. The onus would not be on the authority but on a particular contractor to see that he complied with the Act. If he did not comply with it and something occurred he would be responsible. I consider that every employee working on a project that could be covered by this Act but is not is definitely entitled to have protection and I hope honourable members will give due consideration to extending the operation of the Act by supporting the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out that to achieve this it will be necessary first of all to move to strike out "subsection (1) of" and then after "is" all the rest of the words of the clause.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Very well. I withdraw my previous motion and now move:

To strike out "Subsection (1) of" at the beginning of the clause and all words after "Act is" and insert "repealed" after "Act is".

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I have listened with great respect to the matters that have been mentioned by Messrs. Bevan and Kneebone with regard to the extension of the provisions of the Scaffolding Inspection Act to the whole of the State. In the first instance, before dealing in detail with that matter, I point out that I have taken a particular interest in safety matters as far as workmen are concerned in regard to not only scaffolding, but other matters, too. I have always considered that education has achieved very much better results than compulsion in this matter. One has only to look at statistics, whether relating to industrial accidents or scaffolding accidents, to see that our record in this State compares more than

favourably with that in any other State. This is not something in which I have taken merely an academic interest, but a very real interest because I realize the importance of seeing that accidents are avoided, if possible.

We have concentrated very largely on that matter; my Secretary for Labour and Industry, Mr. Bowes, has taken a keen interest in these matters and only yesterday and today has arranged a conference of all inspectors of that department who are concerned with policing the Acts and regulations so that they will be conversant with the requirements of their Acts, some of which we have amended in recent years, and will be competent to carry out their responsibilities and see that safety precautions are brought up to the highest possible standard. I think Mr. Kneebone said that in some parts of the State this Act had created a problem and that subsequently the proclamation had been revoked. That is true, and one instance of where that happened is in connection with the construction of the reservoir at Myponga.

We proclaimed that part of the State, for obvious reasons, whilst construction was in progress, but when construction was completed we revoked the proclamation, which seemed to be a sensible approach to the whole matter. Mr. Bevan mentioned the building of silos in various parts of this State by South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd., or contractors employed by that company. We investigated the matter and we realize that it is a type of construction presenting certain hazards and is unusual in country areas. To avoid the necessity of having to proclaim the Act in all areas where silos are constructed we have come to an arrangement with the company which is honoured in every case.

Every contract into which South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. enters includes a clause providing that the contractor must comply in all respects with the provisions of the Scaffolding Inspection Act, so that he is bound to comply with the provisions of this Act irrespective of whether it is proclaimed in the area or not. Therefore, we have looked after the situation as far as that type of construction is concerned. We do not believe that it is wise or desirable to have the Act operating in areas where it cannot be adequately policed and where there is no type of construction that would require its implementation. We have never been slow to extend the Act where we feel it is necessary in the interests of workmen, and that will continue to be our policy.

From time to time we have extended the Act to various areas and that practice will be continued. I cannot see at present that we would achieve any good purpose by extending it throughout the whole State. I think we would be much wiser to limit it to areas where it served a useful purpose and see that it was properly policed within those areas. In view of the explanations I have made I ask the Committee to accept the Bill as it has been submitted.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I support the amendment and I agree with what the Minister has said about the interest he has taken in regard to the prevention of accidents. Nobody can question that, but I disagree with him that it is not necessary to extend the Act to every part of the State. The life of an employee in a country area is just as valuable as the life of an employee in the metropolitan area.

If it is State-wide in operation this Scaffolding Inspection Act will not penalize anyone, but it will obviate the gazettal of proclamations from time to time. The Minister mentioned silos; but I recall that if the relevant provision had been complied with an accident at Port Adelaide would not have happened. There was a strike and workers refused to complete a project until a safety measure was installed. In the interests of the safety of employees the operation of the Act should not be confined to the metropolitan area or certain parts of the State. If the Act is not needed in certain parts of the State its application will do no harm, but it will save the issuing of a proclamation to other areas which often comes too late to prevent an accident. The Labor Party does not doubt the good already being achieved by education. It is essential to educate those on the job, but if something happens because the area has not been proclaimed, what can be done? The Hon. Mr. Story asks what the union representative is doing on the job. A union representative is not in a position to know the ramifications of the Act, but if the area is proclaimed it puts the responsibility on the employer to see that safety precautions are taken before the work is started, and not after the proclamation. This may save a life and prevent what happened at Port Adelaide recently. This is a reasonable and urgent request.

At the recent Stirling by-election I told Liberal electors that the regulation should apply throughout the State and that there should be no differentiation between country

workers and those who worked in the metropolitan area and they agreed. This is not a matter of politics. Country workers should have the same rights as those in the metropolitan area. The Labor Party asks that the Act be extended to cover the whole of the State. This would obviate the need to issue proclamations. There should not be exemptions as applied at Port Stanvac. If an Act applies to one employer it should apply to all; no employers should be exempted. Surely the Act should apply equally to people in the country and the metropolitan area. I hope the Committee will accept the amendment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (4).—The Hons. K. E. J. Bardolph, S. C. Bevan (teller), A. F. Kneebone and A. J. Shard.

Noes (11).—The Hons. Jessie M. Cooper, R. C. DeGaris, G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, N. L. Jude, Sir Frank Perry, F. J. Potter, C. D. Rowe (teller), Sir Arthur Rymill, C. R. Story and R. R. Wilson.

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 to 9) and title passed.

Clause 3—"Amendment of principal Act, section 3 (1)"—reconsidered.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I move:

To insert in paragraph (b) the words "and Elizabeth" after "Salisbury".

The District Council of Salisbury is now known as the District Council of Salisbury and Elizabeth.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Has the change of name been gazetted?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I am instructed that it has been done.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Bill reported with an amendment. Committee's report adopted.

BUSINESS AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 3. Page 775.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Southern): I support the second reading. This Bill amends the Business Agents Act 1938-1954, and has two major purposes. The first is to increase the value of the fidelity bond lodged with the local court, or increase the amount of security lodged with the Treasurer, the receipt for which is sighted by the local court in the issue of a business agent's licence. The other purpose is to separate the business agent from the land agent in this matter. At present the one fidelity bond covers the bond for the land agent and the business agent. There is a reduction in the fee for the business agent if he also has a licence as a land agent. Under the principal Act the value of the fidelity bond to be lodged with the local court is £500. This has been the amount since 1938, and at present, by comparison, it is unrealistic. In the event of a default by a business agent £500 is not a reasonable protection for the public. Clause 4 amends section 19 of the principal Act and makes the amount £2,000, which on present money values is more commensurate with the position.

Clause 4 also repeals subsection (6) of section 19, which allows a single bond to cover the activities of both the land agent and the business agent. At present, instead of lodging a fidelity bond with the local court, securities to the value of £600 can be lodged with the Treasurer. Clause 5 amends section 22 by making the amount £2,250. Clause 5 also repeals subsection (6) of section 22, in the same way as the other subsection (6) in relation to the business agent and the land agent. It means that if a person wishes to operate both as a land agent and a business agent he or she must lodge with the local court a fidelity bond to the value of £4,000, or securities with the Treasurer to the face value of £4,500.

Clause 3 provides for a single licence, at a cost of £3, being issued to a business agent. In other words, a separate licence must be taken out as a business agent and another as a land agent. In the interests of providing reasonable protection for the public there will be an extra burden on the man who wishes to operate both as a land agent and as a business agent. I look at this matter from the viewpoint of the small country business where one person may be carrying on as a land agent, a business agent and possibly an auctioneer. The extra cost involved for such a man in taking out a fidelity bond would be £12 10s. a year for an amount of £2,000. This would permit him to have a fidelity bond covering his activities as a business agent and as a land agent, and the extra licence cost involved would be £2 a year. That would mean a total cost of £14 10s. in order to give an added protection to the public. I feel that this is reasonable for the added protection in the possible default of a land agent or a business agent. If a person defaults in one activity it is more than likely that he will default in both. I can see no machinery in the legislation for having the present bond of a land agent for £2,000

being related to the activities of a business agent. The measure amends this and gives a protection for any default as a business agent or as a land agent. I support the Bill.

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

METROPOLITAN TAXI-CAB ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 3. Page 787.)

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): This Bill really contains two parts. One part is to bring the legislation up to date in view of the consolidation of other Acts; the other part is to bring in the District Council of Noarlunga as a constituent council under the Act. In one sense this is one of the most peculiar Acts on the Statute Book, for a reason that I shall elaborate because it is of some interest. Under section 2 of the Act "constituent council" means a council mentioned in the schedule. Section 3 enables a proclamation to be made to add other councils to the schedule, and the schedule then sets forth the constituent councils; but nowhere in the whole of the Act is anything said about what happens to constituent councils, what a constituent council is for, or anything else. They are not mentioned in the Act except that they are established as constituent councils—and that is a most curious feature of the Act.

However, the regulations have taken advantage of this situation. I do not know whether the original purpose was to prescribe that the owner of a registered taxi-cab must be a resident of one of the constituent councils, but the main part of this Bill is to alter the schedule by adding the District Council of Noarlunga to the constituent councils, no doubt for the sole purpose of qualifying residents of the District Council of Noarlunga as holders of taxi-cab licences. I really think it must be one of the most peculiar Acts on the Statute Book and I cannot help thinking that something was originally intended to be said about district councils.

When I went through the Act to see how the amendments applied, I was surprised to find that constituent councils were solemnly nominated and seemed to have no role, so I checked with the Parliamentary Draftsman (who was not the Parliamentary Draftsman at the time the Act was drawn) and he said he had looked through the Act and found the same thing, and he could not explain why it was. However, the question is academic because use has been made of the constituent councils as they are comprised in the schedule for the purposes I have mentioned. I see no objection to this Bill. It is a comparatively minor matter except for the question of qualifying drivers in the rapidly growing district of Noarlunga. The other parts of the Bill are purely for tidying up various matters. Consequently, I support it.

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

CHURCHES OF CHRIST, SCIENTIST, INCORPORATION BILL.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Incorporation of First Church of Christ, Scientist, Adelaide."

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

In subclause (1) to insert after "shall" first occurring "upon compliance with the provisions of subsection (5) of this section".

If honourable members will look at clause 2 (1) they will see the words proposed to be inserted in a different type of printing. If they will look at subclause (5) they will see it is a new subclause requiring the First Church of Christ Scientist Adelaide Incorporated to file in the office of the Registrar of Companies a copy of its by-laws and rules within one month after the commencement of this Act. So the purpose of the inclusion of these words in clause 2 (1) is to certify that the incorporation shall become effective upon the compliance with that condition. This matter has been looked at carefully by the Select Committee.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I move to insert the following new subclause:

(5) Within one month after the commencement of this Act First Church of Christ Scientist Adelaide Incorporated shall file in the office of the Registrar of Companies a copy of its by-laws and rules as the same are in force at such commencement verified by a statutory declaration made by the Clerk and the Treasurer of First Church of Christ Scientist Adelaide Incorporated.

The reason for this amendment is that the Select Committee thought that this provision should be inserted so that an up-to-date copy of the by-laws and rules of the church would be available.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: May I ask why this is to be filed with the Registrar of Companies rather than under the Associations Incorporation Act?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: The purpose is to incorporate the First Church of Christ Scientist pursuant to the terms of this Bill. Similar legislation was passed in other States and it was requested that it be done here. If the church were incorporated under the Associations Incorporation Act, the person with whom it would have to be filed would be the Registrar of Companies and that would be the office to which people would go who wanted to know what the rules were.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I should like to point out that the title under which this church has been incorporated is "First Church of Christ Scientist Adelaide Incorporated". "Incorporated" is the normal ending word for a body incorporated under the Associations Incorporation Act, whereas if it is incorporated under the Companies Act the normal ending word is "Limited". It seems a little confusing that these by-laws and rules should be filed with the Registrar of Companies when, on the face of it, it appears to be an incorporated association. However, I do not propose to raise any objection.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I point out that the Registrar of Companies is also the Registrar as far as the Associations Incorporation Act is concerned. It is a different register, but I think the Bill as it stands adequately meets the position.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I move to insert the following new subclause:

(6) Within one month after the making of any addition to or alteration of any of such by-laws or rules First Church shall file in the office of the said Registrar a copy of every such addition or alteration (as the case may be) verified as aforesaid.

The purpose of a new subclause (6) is to provide, if at any time in the future there is any additional alteration to any of the by-laws of the church, that within one month of that alteration being made a copy of it will be filed with the Registrar to ensure that his records are kept up to date.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 3 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Conditions."

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I move:

In subclause (1) (*e*) to insert after "trust" second occurring "and accompanied by a copy of the by-laws and rules of such body or association".

Clause 6 provides that further Churches of Christ, Scientist, may be incorporated in this State in addition to the first church. If that is done then pursuant to clause 7 (1) (*e*) they must also file a copy of their by-laws and rules with the Registrar of Companies. The amendment is to ensure that that will be done.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 8—"Vesting of property."

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I move:

After "association" second occurring in subclause (1) to strike out "referred to in the documents filed in the office of the Registrar of Companies under paragraph (*e*) of subsection (1) of that section".

These words become unnecessary because of the amendments made earlier. As I said previously, this has also been looked at by the Select Committee and I ask the Committee to agree to the deletion of those words.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE moved:

After "incorporated" in subclause (1) to strike out "(or on whose behalf the documents were filed)".

Amendment carried.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE moved:

After "other" in subclause (1) to strike out "assurances" and insert "assurance".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (9 and 10) passed.

First and Second Schedules passed.

Preamble and title passed.

Bill reported with amendments. Committee's report adopted.

ELDER SMITH & CO. LIMITED PROVIDENT FUNDS BILL.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed.

Preamble.

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

In line 5, page 4, to strike out "by reason thereof".

I ask the Committee to accept my assurance that this is a drafting amendment.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I move:

In line 6, page 4, to insert "save in the case of any woman who at the date of transfer has completed 15 years' service with the company and is aged 55 years or upwards".

These words were included at the request of Mr. Astley, Q.C., to meet a particular case. The Select Committee considered the matter and decided that the words should be included.

Amendment carried; preamble as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendments. Committee's report adopted.

NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 1. Page 868.)

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Central No. 1): I support the Bill because I believe its provisions will bring about an improvement in the training of nurses in the field of mental health. I pay a tribute to nurses generally. They are a band of dedicated people. It never fails to amaze me when I see the cheerful and efficient manner in which they carry out their duties, often under difficult circumstances. The nursing staffs of our mental hospitals are deserving of special praise. Here they are faced with conditions more difficult and less glamorous than those experienced in any general hospital. For this reason it has been traditionally difficult to maintain adequate staff in this type of hospital.

I have been told that the nurse-patient ratio in mental hospitals in South Australia compares unfavourably with other Australian States and overseas countries. There are more patients per nurse here than in these other places. Adding to the difficulties experienced by these nurses is the overcrowding of these hospitals. Shortage of nursing staff and overcrowding of patients are recognized in medical circles as major obstacles to the recovery rate of mentally-ill patients. The high recovery rate obtained by the medical and nursing staff at the Parkside Mental Hospital and other mental hospitals is in itself a tribute to them in view of the difficulties I have mentioned. The Director of Mental Health (Dr. Cramond) has recommended the action proposed by this Bill. Since his appointment Dr. Cramond has shown that he is well aware of the need to improve our mental health services in this State and he is to be commended for his action in recommending the matters contained in this Bill and for his efforts to improve our mental health services.

The main purpose of the Bill is to provide for the separation of the two types of mental training of nurses as psychiatric or mental deficiency nurses. This will result in more adequately trained personnel in both branches of mental nursing. It will also add status to this type of nursing and could result in more people entering this branch of the nursing profession. The Chief Secretary said yesterday in his speech on the second reading that owing to the shortage of hospital accommodation it is not practicable at present to provide for separate treatment of mental patients in each of the two categories. I maintain that to get the greatest benefit from the Bill sufficient accommodation must be provided to enable the two types of patient to be treated separately. I urge the Government to provide such accommodation as soon as possible. For the reason that the Bill proposes an improvement in the training of mental nurses I have pleasure in supporting the measure.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER secured the adjournment of the debate.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 1. Page 872.)

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): I commence my remarks by quoting the following statement by the Minister of Health when explaining the Bill:

> Although the problem of air pollution has not in this State assumed very great proportions, the Government believes that there is a need for some form of clean air legislation to enable preventive measures to be taken before it is too late.

I agree wholeheartedly with the statement, which is why I support the Bill. It is a true statement, but in my opinion, and I say it from personal observation, air pollution in the metropolitan area of Adelaide is growing rapidly, and almost daily. I come up from a near-southern part of the State often on Monday mornings when one would expect the air over Adelaide to be probably at its cleanest, because at that time most of the factories are starting up after having been closed down over the weekend. However, when a chimney starts up again after a weekend probably it gives off more smoke than if it has been going for a while. I have noticed in the five or six years that I have been making this journey on the Monday morning a tremendous increase in the minor smog over the metropolitan area, so much so that it had been my intention to make representations to the Government for the introduction of a Bill of this nature. I commend the Government for bringing down the measure. Prevention is better than cure, so an old platitude says. The time has definitely arrived for the prevention of the things dealt with in the measure.

It is a rather unusual type of Bill, because I regard it as a Bill for an Act to make an Act by regulation. In other words, it is not an Act in itself. It does not enact anything of substance. It sets up a committee to investigate matters and then provides for that committee to make recommendations, and then

regulations can be made relating to the various matters set forth in new section 94c. The Hon. Mr. Potter commented on this and expressed some fears as to whether the rights of individuals might not be unduly trespassed upon. That is a phrase that we have heard often in the last couple of days. The Hon. Mr. Potter is a member of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, yet he doubts whether that committee has power to deal with a matter where the rights of individuals may be interfered with. I feel that it is difficult to cope with the matter in any other way than as the Bill sets out, although I have every sympathy with the idea expressed by Mr. Potter. He said, as I understand it, that there should be an appeal from any such trespass to a court, another body or a person.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: It is not so much the trespass as the heavy cost involved.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Perhaps that expresses adequately what the honourable member said. I was paraphrasing and using my own words, but that is what I intended to convey. I have every sympathy with the idea, but I cannot see how it can be done, because if a tribunal of that nature is set up as an appeal body over regulations not yet made a third legislative authority comes into the picture. We have Parliament being asked to pass the Bill to enable regulations to be made by another group of people, and Mr. Potter suggests that the regulations be considered by another tribunal. All in all, and using my judgment of the totality of the matter, the Bill is as good an attempt to cope with the situation as can be devised. The substance of the Act will be included in the regulations, and not proclamations, which matter has often been raised by members previously.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: And soundly, too.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Yes. Parliament would be given the opportunity to say whether or not the regulations should be promulgated. In turn, it would give Parliament a say in the making of the law, and probably that is as good a way of dealing with the matter as one can devise at this stage. It seems that Mr. Potter's objection could be dealt with by the disallowance of the regulations, if necessary. He expressed doubts as to whether the Joint Committee could consider the rights of particular individuals. I am not as familiar with the work of the committee as he is, but if the committee could not take into account that matter it could be dealt with by individual members of Parliament, such as the members for Central No. 2, who are custodians of liberty and the rights of the property owners they represent.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Very well spoken.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: In saying that I do not exclude other members, because in their hearts, if not in other ways, they think similarly to the members for Central No. 2.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: They may not have such wisdom as the members for Central No. 2.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I would not be so presumptuous as to make such a statement. I think the honourable member is in a jocular mood, because he does not suffer from an inferiority complex. I support the second reading of the Bill. I have covered all the points I wanted to mention, except new section 94b, which deals with the persons to be appointed to the committee. Whether the choice is wise in all respects I fear I have insufficient knowledge to appreciate but, on the face of it, it is a satisfactory committee. It could be said that some interests were better represented than others, that the importance of some interests might be over-represented while other interests of more abundant importance might be under-represented. However, I think that all in all it should be a good committee and that its members will take into account not only the interests of the people they represent but also the interests of the people as a whole. I conclude as I started, by saying that I feel that this is a very important and essential matter and should be tackled at once. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.59 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, October 15, at 2.15 p.m.