LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

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

QUESTIONS

AMOEBIC MENINGITIS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In the last few days there has been considerable publicity concerning amoebic meningitis. I do not intend to direct a number of questions to the Minister but I point out that a report in this morning's press says that a statement from the Minister can be interpreted as suggesting that there are some health dangers involved with swimming pools in South Australia. Can the Minister inform me whether, in his opinion, there is any health danger in properly maintained, chlorinated and filtered swimming pools in South Australia?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Instead of replying to the Leader's question, I wish to make a Ministerial statement that should answer any question on this matter. If it fails to do that, I shall be happy to assist the Leader or any other honourable member further. 1 seek leave to make a Ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The problem of amoebic meningitis has quite rightly been a matter of public concern. By its nature the investigations are most complex, and many avenues can be investigated without finally leading to any positive conclusion. To make almost daily statements on progress, in view of this, could only lead to a state of public confusion. When any firm recommendation came to the Government, it took immediate and positive action and made an appropriate press release. To illustrate and prove this and in the hope that this matter will cease to be a political and press football, I will now describe the chronological sequence of events.

February 23. The first meeting of departmental officers to review the progress of investigations into amoebic meningitis was held in the Department of Health. Present were officers representing the Department of Health, Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science and the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The conference recommended that, although there was no evidence that public water supplies had been responsible for any case of meningitis, the level of chlorine in the water supply to Port Augusta and Port Pirie should be increased to a residual level of 0.5 parts a million as a precautionary measure. On the same day, February 23, the Minister of Works (Mr. Corcoran) directed the Engineering and Water Supply Department to begin work immediately on chlorinating stations at Port Augusta and Port Pirie. Work is proceeding and these stations should all be in operation by the end of the month. The conference also recommended that a press statement be issued.

February 24. The Minister of Works reported to Cabinet on the subject, and said that he had been told that the investigation was at the stage that it could not be proved if the potentially harmful amoebae were in the water, nor could it be proved that they were not.

February 25. A press statement, which had been prepared following the conference's recommendation, was checked with the officers of the departments concerned and it was decided to release it on February 28.

February 28. The following press statement was released by the Minister of Works:

The Minister of Works (Mr. Corcoran) in the absence interstate of the Minister of Health (Mr. Shard), today released further details relating to investigations into amoebic meningitis. He said the Director-General of Public Health, Dr. P. S. Woodruff, had held a conference of senior officers of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and the Department of Public Health, to review the position. The investigation had shown that amoebae of the Naegleria species were widespread throughout the soil and water environment. However, very few were of the harmful variety. None of the harmful variety had been shown to come from the water supply system.

Mr. Corcoran said there were a number of ways in which people could become infected. It was known that forceful entry of water to the nose was an important factor and should be avoided. Salt water (a concentration of 0.7 per cent) destroyed the amoebae, as did effective chlorination. Advice on personal precautions (protection of the nose and addition of salt to pools) had already been given. Mr Corcoran said that although public drinking water supplies had not been shown to be involved in any cases of amoebic meningitis, the conference had considered that action should be taken to positively eliminate water supply from further consideration. It had recommended that during the summer months the level of chlorine in the water supply to Port Augusta and Port Pirie be increased to maintain a residual level of 0.5 parts a million. Mr. Corcoran said he had directed the Engineering and Water Supply Department to carry

out the recommendation. The active programme of research on the many aspects of the problem was being continued.

March 1. At his request, Dr. Bonnin met with the Minister of Works, the Minister of Health being still absent interstate at a Health Ministers' Conference. Dr. Bonnin said he had received many press inquiries and thought another statement should be released.

March 3. The Minister of Works received from Dr. Bonnin a draft press statement, which Dr. Bonnin said he would like to see published, which would prevent the frequent requests for information he had been receiving on the subject: "Is the organism in our various water supplies?" This statement, which follows in detail, is quite different from the facts published in the *Advertiser* of March 6. The statement prepared by Dr. Bonnin was referred to the departments concerned and it was planned to make a statement to the press on March 6. Dr. Bonnin's statement is as follows:

Recently, research workers at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science have developed a serological test that clearly differentiates two types of otherwise indistinguishable amoebae; one is the common harmless variety and the other appears to be the type that causes meningitis. However, this is very recent work and it cannot yet be said to identify the dangerous variety beyond all reasonable doubt. However, it appears that several workers throughout the world have probably found this amoeba in soil and water without recognizing it. It is suspected that it is really quite common and widespread in the soil and in water. Many water supplies in South Australia and throughout the world probably contain this amoeba and have done so for hundreds of years, yet there have been very few cases of amoebic meningitis. It appears that very hot conditions are required for growth of the amoebae to dangerous levels. In other countries, nearly all cases have been associated with heated swimming pools.

At the same time, it also appears that some inflammation inside the nose or some other abnormality is probably necessary before infection will occur, which may explain why one child contracts the disease while hundreds of others do not. Scientific workers will not release their thoughts and ideas as facts until there is reasonable supporting proof, and earlier information given to the Government has not incriminated water supplies because this could not be proven. This information is therefore new. Nevertheless, the Government has taken appropriate preventative action through heavy chlorination of water supplies, particularly those to hot, northern country towns and cities.

So, even if the organism is in the Adelaide water supply (which has probably been the case since the first reservoirs were built), there is little cause for alarm. Temperatures in the reservoirs do not reach dangerous levels and the content will be low. No case of amoebic meningitis has ever been suspected in Adelaide. However, heavy chlorination or salination may be advisable for heated swimming pools everywhere. The precautions against allowing water to flush into the nose in the towns where the disease has occurred is still recommended, and children with a running nose or with a mild inflammation of the nose should probably not swim in fresh water pools at this stage and during very hot weather. Work will continue on the mode of infection and the reasons why certain people are susceptible, and much more will be known about the whole problem by next summer.

March 6. The *Advertiser* published an article on Dr. Anderson's finding. This was the first the Government had heard of Dr. Anderson's discovery. It had not been officially informed. A meeting of officers of the Public Health Department, the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science and the Engineering and Water Supply Department was held to discuss the announcement. A press conference was held later in the afternoon. Let me make it clear that, whatever may have been the manner of Dr. Anderson's findings becoming available to the press, the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science clearly had a duty to ensure that the Government was immediately made aware of the findings of Dr. Anderson, which were published in yesterday morning's newspaper. Unhappily, this did not occur.

Having said this, it is now important to describe the investigations that the institute has carried out and its findings. Following description of the disease and the isolation of the organism by doctors at the Adelaide Children's Hospital, the institute continued research from early 1971. The point has now been reached when amoebae can be found in many locations, and tests devised at the institute permit a speedy decision whether any amoeba is one of the harmful ones or not. The testing of water in various parts of the State has been widespread and is continuing. Harmful amoebae have now been found in rainwater tanks, in piped water supplies in many places including Adelaide and northern towns, in puddles of casual water in districts south of Adelaide, and in paddling pools in addition to a swimming pool in Queensland.

Under hot conditions, the amoebae increase rapidly in numbers and, as a result, amoebic meningitis has occurred only in summer, or in oversea countries, in association with heated swimming pools. The only cases in South Australia have been in Port Augusta, Port Pirie and Kadina, and total 13 since 1961. When conditions favour the amoeba, very small numbers of people have been affected,

while many others who have used the same water have been free. Infection occurs through the nose. Drinking affected water or washing clothes or preparing food with it is completely safe. The amoeba does not get in through eyes, ears, mouth or the skin. It is important to prevent the occurrence of amoebae in water supplies in the affected towns. The Government acted immediately by authorizing additional chlorination of the piped supplies to these areas, but it is possible for amoebae to reach swimming pools from other sources.

Public health authorities have stressed that, to avoid infection, the main precaution that the individual can take is to prevent water, other than salt water, from entering the nose. This precaution is recommended throughout the State, but it is emphasized that no case of the disease has ever occurred in the Adelaide metropolitan area or Whyalla or any town other than the three named, even though the organism has probably always been present. Research continues on many aspects of the problem, and any further preventive action will depend on these investigations. Additional equipment and staff for the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science have been provided and any further assistance needed by the institute will meet with immediate Government action, as will any further remedial action recommended.

Finally, I assure the public of South Australia that the water supply is safe for all normal use subject to the safeguards of chlorination in the affected areas and the general safeguards previously outlined. The present public presentation of the subject is placing the emphasis on water supply as being the source of the problem. This is not established and indeed provides a completely false image, in that the Engineering and Water Supply Department is singled out as the source and controller of a situation that is obviously not more than partly (and it may even be an insignificant part) in its responsibility. No reasonable explanation has yet been forthcoming from the investigation to explain the very particular geographic incidence of amoebic meningitis. Some general conclusions have been drawn that it is associated with temperature of bathing waters, but this alone leads to queries as to its being centred in particular towns and even limited sections of such towns. This special grouping of cases is not confined to South Australia but, on statements from the investigators, is typical in the world occurrence of the disease.

The Government has been, and is, deeply concerned by the reported cases of this disease and by the suffering it has brought to the victims and their families. There remains, despite the best efforts of leading researchers, a number of unanswered, baffling questions about its precise causes. We have undertaken all the precautions recommended to us. I assure the Council that we shall continue to adopt the same urgency if further investigations suggest new preventives or remedies.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: My questions relate to the matter raised just now on which a lengthy Ministerial statement has been given. First, has there been any investigation of water from the Tailem Bend to Keith main, which draws water from the same place as the main that has been mentioned in various press statements? Along the Keith main some very high temperatures are recorded. Secondly, can the Minister give an assurance that the water in the Keith main will receive the same attention in chlorination and general investigation as the water in the other main to see whether the amoebae are present in the Keith main?

The Hon. A. I. SHARD: Off the cuff, I am unable to say whether water in that main has been tested, but I think it would have been tested. However, I will refer the question to the officers concerned and obtain a reply as soon as practicable.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I thank the Leader of the Government and Minister of Health for his long explanation. However, despite the publicity that arose as a result of the press conference yesterday, I consider that the best way the public can be informed of the Government's plans and policies is through the media. Is the Minister now prepared to go before the media and frankly and openly discuss his Government's policies and plans on what it is doing to combat this dreaded amoebic meningitis organism?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: A senior member of Cabinet will appear on television this evening to do exactly that.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary, as Leader of the Government in this Council.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In its policy speech in early 1970 the Hall Government said that it planned to commence as soon as possible the filtration of Adelaide's water supply, that construction of the plant would begin in 1972, that filtered water would be flowing in 1974, and that the cost would be about $35,000,000.

The Labor Party did not make a similar promise. However, on December 4, 1970, a report in the *Advertiser* headed "Adelaide drinking chemical cocktail" said that there had been an increase of 50 per cent in the amount of chlorine in Adelaide's water supply over the previous seven years. On the following day the Minister of Works announced a $35,000,000 plan to clean Adelaide's water by filtration. That was the announcement of the Labor Government's filtration plans. However, last Friday, in what must have been a press release, the Minister of Works stated to the *News* that Adelaide's water supply was almost certain to be filtered. The report in the *News* is as follows:

Mr. Corcoran would give no hint of a possible starting date for the establishment of a filtration system, but it is understood work could start within five years. He emphasized the public would be given the opportunity to say whether or not a filtration system should be established.

The reporter then canvassed the matter as to whether a referendum would be held or whether the Government would raise the matter as an issue prior to the next election. The Minister of Works was further reported as saying:

We will eventually have filtration—it is just a matter of when.

These reports have caused much confusion, especially at present, when there is a very grave threat to the children of this State, especially those in metropolitan Adelaide. Can the Leader of the Government in this Council make a clear statement about the filtration plans of the present Government in regard to metropolitan Adelaide and will he say in that statement whether the Government is considering a referendum or some other form of poll to gauge the feeling of the public on the matter?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am afraid I am not right up to the moment with this, as is the honourable member, so it would be foolish for me to say yea or nay. I will refer the question to the Minister of Works to ascertain the exact position, and bring back a report as soon as possible.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I have been deeply disturbed this afternoon at the note of criticism that has come into the discussion and the statement on amoebic meningitis. It should be acknowledged that the work done so urgently and so quickly on this project is probably unique over the past few years. We owe a tremendous debt to the people who have so ably tracked down this disease and materially presented the people of South Australia with the answer, although until very recently we have barely been aware of its presence. We must keep this matter in perspective. This year two young people have died of amoebic meningitis, and one has been saved by the ability of the group in Adelaide that has been looking after this subject and researching it so deeply. In the whole of the year two children have died. How many children have died when their nightgowns have caught fire or through wearing other flammable clothing? How many have died because their parents have been careless with pills, kerosene around the house, and so on?

The PRESIDENT: Is the honourable member explaining a question or making a statement?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I am sorry if I am out of order. I do not wish to debate this matter. I ask the Minister of Health to try to include in the publicity on this subject, which has unfortunately got right out of hand, the fact that we as a community owe a tremendous debt to these people. I hope that this unfortunate occurrence happened only by chance, and that Dr. Anderson's work will be recognized.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Last night I personally thanked Dr. Anderson and his assistant.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: It didn't stay on for long.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: On behalf of the Government and the people of this State, I thanked Dr. Anderson and his assistant for the able work they had done.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to directing a question to the Minister representing the Minister of Works.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: In his statement, the Minister of Health said that chlorine would be added to the water supplies of the cities of Port Pirie and Port Augusta, and I think he used the words "and at stations near to them". Will additional chlorine be introduced into the main at its source at Morgan so that it will then be able to alleviate the problem where the main serves the consumers in that part of the State? Also, will it be necessary to add more chlorine to the water in the mains on Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's questions to my colleague and bring back replies as soon as possible.

MINING LEASES

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Development and Mines.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I have a letter before me from a miner in the Coober Pedy area in which he outlines the recent action taken by the Commonwealth security forces in that area. It appears that miners were evicted from a field 30 miles south of Coober Pedy. I know the field, which has been worked on odd occasions during the last 20 or 30 years. Recently, some of the miners in that area have been successful and have registered claims with the Mines Department for that field, which was always known as the Penryn field to me, but I believe that it is known to the department as the June field. The point I wish to make to the Minister is that, without any prior warning, these miners were told to shift all their equipment and not return. The field is in an area close to the main road, and the reason given by the security forces was that they were moving them for their own safety. This may be true, but the writer of the letter points out that, hitherto, the authorities had never been concerned for their safety. Indeed, the main road through to Alice Springs passes within two miles of this field. It may be flattering to the miners that the authorities are concerned for their safety, but the miners are not as interested in that as they are in getting their claims back. Will the Minister take up this matter with his colleague with a view to negotiating with the Commonwealth Government on this matter urgently?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will take up this matter with my colleague and obtain a reply as soon as possible.

CAR THEFTS

The Hon. L. R. HART: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: This morning's *Advertiser* contains an article which states that the Victorian Government will seek to change the law so that people who illegally use or steal motor cars can be dealt with more adequately. Under the proposed Victorian legislation, courts will be empowered to order car thieves to pay compensation, and other provisions are expected to be included in the legislation. I notice that the South Australian Attorney-General said that he considered the courts in South Australia had adequate powers to impose severe penalties for the illegal use or stealing of motor cars. However, he said that he would study the legislation. In view of the fact that eight cars a day, on average, are reported stolen in South Australia, will the Government, as a matter of urgency, consider the need for amending our legislation to tighten the laws relating to car stealing?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: As the honourable member has said, this matter comes under the control of the Attorney-General. I will take up the question with him and bring back a reply as soon as practicable.

CITRUS

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I recently noticed a press statement with the heading "C.O.C. retention favoured by most growers". The statement said that, out of a total of 1,450 forms sent out, 674 were returned—much less than 50 per cent. Of the growers who returned forms, a little more than half said that they would like to retain the Citrus Organization Committee as a statutory body. I wonder whether I should regard the press statement as simply a newspaper headline or whether, in fact, the C.O.C. and the Government accept that result as a vote of confidence, as is indicated by the General Manager of the C.O.C. in his statement to the *Murray Pioneer*. Further, does the Government intend to amend the Citrus Industry Organization Act, and has the C.O.C. discussed the matter with the Government?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am unable to comment on the newspaper article to which the honourable member referred, because I have not seen it. Regarding the other matter raised by the honourable member, I can assure him that it is being actively looked at by the Government at present, and we will shortly bring down something concrete that I am sure the honourable member will appreciate.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: On February 29 I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question about citrus, particularly regarding the export

of citrus to Japan, following an announcement by the Premier earlier this year. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The statement made by the Premier after his visit to Japan in July, 1971, referred to negotiations he had with the Ministry of Agriculture in Tokyo concerning the acceptance by the Japanese Government of South Australia as an area free from fruit fly for the export of fresh citrus fruits to Japan. The negotiations succeeded in clarifying that it would be possible for Japan to treat South Australia as a separate entity for the purpose of citrus exports subject to demonstration of effective sterilization of fruit acceptable to the Japanese authorities. Since the return of the Premier, a research project has been designed and is being carried out to determine effective sterilization. A subsequent visit of a prominent Japanese importer of citrus fruits has revealed the interest of importers in importing quality South Australian citrus fruits for the Japanese market when the research project has been completed and proved to the satisfaction of the Japanese Government authorities. As the honourable member is aware, Japan currently imports large quantities of citrus from California, has commenced imports from South Africa, and has a prospective market of considerable dimensions for South Australia. I am very hopeful that we can open up a market in Japan for South Australian citrus. In explaining his question, the honourable member referred to the marked increase of citrus sales from Japan. I point out that he was referring to mandarins and not other citrus, such as grapefruit, oranges and lemons.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Are we sending mandarins to Japan?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: No. Recent information I have received shows that many of the mandarin orchards in Japan are suffering tremendously from pollution, as are other forms of primary produce in that country. I understand that pollution is so bad that it is impossible to grow strawberries in some areas where considerable quantities were grown previously for local consumption. This gives us some idea of the effect of pollution on primary production in Japan.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am indebted to the Minister for his reply and am pleased to see from it that South Australia will probably be considered a clean State from the point of view of Japanese quarantine requirements regarding fruit fly. However, I do not want the Minister to think I accept his answer as being absolutely correct. I refer him to a conference held in Canberra in February, conducted under the auspices of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, which is probably the highest authority in this country, at which the Japanese production figures were stated. The Minister has given the impression that most of Japan's exports are of mandarins. That is true at present, although it will not be true by 1980, when South Australia and Japan will be reaching peak production. Will the Minister study the minutes of the conference held in February this year in order to bring himself fully up to date on the citrus situation?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Yes.

DRIVERS' LICENCES

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The Minister of Roads and Transport recently announced that he intended to introduce legislation to alter the classes of driver's licence in South Australia; I believe he has yet to do that. The alterations would considerably affect many drivers with considerable experience. Class 1 licences will cover drivers of motor cars and vehicles weighing up to 35cwt., whereas class 2 licences will cover drivers of all vehicles except very large semi-trailers. The Minister said that class A licence holders who had passed a driving test since 1961 would convert to class 2 licences; so, those licence holders would be permitted to continue to drive trucks. Further, the Minister said that those who had received class A licences without a driving test before 1961 would convert to class 1 licences; that category would include many experienced drivers. Their conversion to class Iwould stop many experienced truck drivers from driving large trucks. Evidence of experience or practical driving tests would be required by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles if a driver wished to transfer to another class. In view of the very large number of experienced drivers who would come into the category of those who received their class A licences before 1961, will it be the Minister's policy (assuming the legislation is passed) that evidence of experience will be accepted in most cases, rather than

using the cumbersome method of requiring further driving tests in many cases?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I shall be happy to convey the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply as soon as it is available.

ABORIGINAL UNEMPLOYMENT

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The Minister of Lands was reported in the press yesterday as having commented on the Commonwealth Government's attitude towards unemployment reconstruction for Aborigines in the Far North. Will the Minister say what has taken place between himself and the Commonwealth on this matter?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The comment was made in reply to a question asked in another place by the member for Frome concerning the employment of Aborigines under the Commonwealth Rural Unemployment Relief Scheme. The eligibility of a person, whether Aboriginal or otherwise, to participate in this scheme is dependent upon his registering with the Department of Labour and National Service for employment, as distinct from registering for unemployment benefits. It has been difficult for Aboriginal people in the North to register, because there is no departmental office in those areas at which Aborigines can register for employment. To ensure that Aborigines in remote areas of the State have an opportunity to participate in the scheme, I have arranged for self-registration application forms to be forwarded to the various reserves, through the Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs Department, for completion and forwarding to the Department of Labour and National Service for registration.

To become eligible for work under the rural unemployment scheme, a person, prior to being employed, must be registered with the department for employment. I have been able to make arrangements so that they can be registered. I have also arranged for discussions to take place between officers of the Lands Department and of the Aboriginal Affairs Department regarding an application for grant money to provide for employment of Aborigines on reserves. It is expected that a suitable programme of works will be prepared shortly by reserve officials and forwarded to the Lands Department for consideration. I understand that all projects will be centred on the reserves themselves.

ROSEWORTHY COLLEGE

The Hon. L. R. HART: On February 29 I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question regarding the percentage of money contributed by the State Government to the current building programme at Roseworthy Agricultural College. Has he a reply?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Principal, Agricultural College Department, reports that $900,000 has been approved for capital expenditure at the college during the 1970-72 triennium. The Commonwealth States Grants (Advanced Education) Act, 1969-1971, provides for a grant from the Commonwealth of an amount not exceeding the State contribution; in other words, the expenditure on approved capital projects is on a $1 for $1 basis. As at December 31, 1971, grants totalling $295,898 had been received from the Commonwealth, and the State had contributed a like amount. The individual projects at Roseworthy planned for the proposed expenditure of $900,000 during the triennium include the following: Purchase of land, $29,000; planning of 1973-75 triennium, $31,000; erection of residential accommodation, $367,000; kitchen/dining-room additions and alterations, toilet block/sick room, laundry/stores, $286,000; equipment, $75,000; and other works and services (including sewer drainage), $112,000.

MINNIPA RESEARCH CENTRE

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Concern is being expressed in the Far West of the State regarding an intimation that the Minister apparently gave on the possible closure of the Minnipa research centre and the setting up of a similar type of experimental station on Sim's farm at Cleve. I sincerely hope that the latter does become an experimental station, but it would be detrimental to the Far West of the State, which is considerably different from the Cleve area, not to continue to be served by the present station. What is the Minister's intention regarding this research station?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I never cease to be amazed at the press statements attributed to me. I do not think that I have ever made a statement to the press regarding the Minnipa research station. This matter was raised when the committee set up to examine agriculture generally recommended that the station be closed. I have no thoughts at this stage on whether it should be closed. I consider that

it serves a useful purpose in the area. I have received several letters from the farming community in the district asking that the station be retained as it is, if not enlarged, because it serves a useful purpose. Although I have not decided one way or the other at this stage, I have no plans to dispense with it.

FARM VEHICLES

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: My question relates to the difficulty facing farmers who must have third party insurance cover on all their farm implements and vehicles. Many implements on a farm rarely use or cross a road, although it is necessary from time to time for them to do so. It is expensive for farmers to have third party insurance on all their implements. Will the Minister say whether it is necessary for them to have third party insurance on all these vehicles and whether the Government will consider the possibility of the State Government Insurance Office issuing a third party insurance policy for farmers, under which they can pool their machinery rather than having each item covered separately?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: This matter is out of my field. As Leader of the Government in this Chamber, I do not know whether it has been discussed. However, I will refer it to the Minister of Roads and Transport and bring back a report as soon as it is available.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ZONE 5 RENTALS

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Lands): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: My statement relates to zone 5 rentals, which is the reason why I had to be in Canberra last Thursday. I am pleased to announce to the Council that the long outstanding question of rentals for war service blocks in zone 5 in the South-East has been settled. Settlement of this complex matter was reached at a conference between the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry, myself, State and Commonwealth officers and representatives of the settlers in Canberra on Thursday, March 2, 1972. As I previously reported to this Council, the Government acted to endeavour to obtain a settlement of this matter subsequent to the Bright judgment. Our officers carried out a very considerable amount of investigation in depth and ultimately were able to convince the Commonwealth officers that the basis upon which rents were earlier contemplated was not supportable in terms of the arrangements between the Commonwealth and the State. This was, in fact, the most significant factor in gaining the settlement that has now been achieved. Settlers refused to accept a package deal that was submitted to them on a Commonwealth-State basis, and I thereupon offered rents, based upon the findings of the Eastick committee of inquiry, with the full concurrence of Cabinet.

After consideration, the settlers accepted this proposal in principle but submitted six points for further consideration. These were: (1) that Canunda settlers be excluded from zone 5; (2) that costs be accepted in two cases; (3) that provisional rents be modified in six cases; (4) that a meaningful appeal against dry sheep equivalents be permitted; (5) that back rents be not pursued; and (6) that the base standard for later allotments be increased from 1,200 to 1,300 dry sheep equivalents. I gave consideration to these particular matters and the State agreed to accept the second and third provisos and the Canunda settlers subsequently withdrew their request to be excluded from zone 5. I advised the settlers that, as the State had to accept responsibility for the unilateral decision to adopt the Eastick recommendations and for the foregoing provisos, I could not go further without the concurrence of the Commonwealth and, therefore, the last three questions would have to be argued with Commonwealth authorities.

The settlers' representatives readily accepted this position and asked that a conference, which I was able to subsequently arrange, be held to endeavour to settle the three outstanding questions. As I indicated earlier, this conference took place last Thursday, and resulted in a settlement, which the settlers have accepted. The outcome is that rents that on average are about half of those earlier contemplated will apply. This State has agreed to accept its share of the costs involved and this will amount to about $580,000. I propose to have the new leases available for signature by the settlers immediately.

I acknowledge the work that was done on behalf of the settlers by their representatives, and in particular Mr. Matthews and Mr. Snodgrass, who took part in those negotiations with me and were present with another settler, Mr. Cunneen, at the conference that took place in Canberra last week. I say to the members of

this Council that they no doubt will agree with me that this is a matter well settled that has been going on for far too long.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Lands.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Before I direct my question, I should like to congratulate the Minister of Lands on the part he has played in settling the zone 5 dispute. One can go back a considerable time in this matter to the strong advocacy made in this Chamber on behalf of the zone 5 settlers. It took some time to convince the Minister that we were right but, when he was convinced, his advocacy became as strong on behalf of the settlers as was the advocacy in this Chamber. Whilst the zone 5 settlers have now had their differences resolved, there are other matters concerning soldier settlers: for example, on Kangaroo Island, where hardships will continue. Can the Minister report on any progress made in relation to those areas?

The PRESIDENT: I am afraid I must call on the Business of the Day now.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to allow the Minister to reply to the question.

Motion carried.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I want to report here, too, that the previous Minister of Lands, before I became Minister, had written to the appropriate Commonwealth Government Minister asking for a general review of the soldier settler scheme in South Australia, but unfortunately the Commonwealth Minister had not agreed to that. I wrote again to that Minister and supported strongly the previous suggestion made by the Hon. Mr. Brookman, when he was Minister of Lands, and I was successful in getting the Minister to agree to having a review of the whole soldier settler problem. Officers from the Department of Primary Industry have been looking at Kangaroo Island, and I had to remind the Minister for Primary Industry when I was in Canberra last week that he had agreed to look at the whole matter. He agreed with me on that point, and an investigation is taking place. Unfortunately, it is being delayed by the fact that the rural reconstruction scheme and also the scheme dealing with rural unemployment is being handled by his department; that is causing some delay but we will keep pressing for a full review of the whole matter.

SEMAPHORE RAILWAY LINE

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the final report by the Parliamentary Standing Commute on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Glanville to Semaphore Railway Line.

PHARMACY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Minister of Health) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Pharmacy Act, 1935-1971, the Pharmacy Act Amendment Act, 1965, and the Age of Majority (Reduction) Act, 1970-1971. Read a first time.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It arises from a submission from the Pharmacy Board of South Australia and deals with a number of disparate matters that perhaps can best be considered in relation to its specific provisions. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 merely enacts a definition of a 'friendly society' to avoid needless repetition in the body of the Act. Clause 4 is an amendment consequential on a later amendment that provides for a formal practising certificate for pharmaceutical chemists. Clause 5 gives protection from suits or actions in their personal capacity to members of the Pharmacy Board acting in the execution of their functions under this Act and extends the same protection to the Registrar and officers of the board.

Clause 6 repeals and re-enacts section 17 of the principal Act which deals with registration of premises from which the business of a pharmacy is carried on. Previously, this section merely provided that the location of the premises should be registered and did not provide for the control by the board of the type of premises registered. In the board's view this provision is not now adequate and control over the types of premises from which the business of a pharmacy is conducted should be vested in the board. The requirements as to types or kinds of premises will be set out in the regulations which, in the nature of things, will be subject to the scrutiny of this Chamber. Premises registered under the provisions of the present section 17 of the principal Act will continue to be registered premises for the purposes of the proposed provision.

Clauses 7 and 8, again, are consequential on the proposal that there shall be a practising certificate for registered pharmaceutical chemists. Clause 9 repeals and re-enacts the whole of Part IV of the principal Act which

deals with registration of pharmaceutical chemists and enacts the following new sections: Section 21, which continues in force previous registration under the principal Act. Section 22, which sets out in some detail the requirements for registration in this State. Paragraph *(a)* of this section sets out the requirements for a person who has graduated and has been trained in this State. Paragraph (*b*) sets out the requirements for a person who has graduated and been trained in another State or Territory of the Commonwealth. Paragraph (*c*) provides for oversea graduates, and paragraph (*d*) is intended to cover other persons who may be qualified for registration.

Section 23 sets out the formal registration procedure and is, I suggest, self-explanatory. Section 24 provides for a practising certificate. Previously, the registration of a pharmaceutical chemist was, as it were, kept alive by the registered person taking out an annual certificate of registration. It is, in the board's view, desirable that registration as such should be separate and distinct from the right to practise as a pharmaceutical chemist. This view seems to accord with the accepted basis of professional registration. Accordingly, the former certificate of registration will now become a practising certificate.

Clause 10 deals with a matter that has been causing some concern to the board, that is, the ownership of pharmacies by persons who are not registered as pharmaceutical chemists. Honourable members will be aware that pharmaceutical chemists are trained in the handling of drugs and are subject in their work to stringent legal and professional controls. In the board's view, and in the Government's view, it is undesirable that chemists should be subject to the control and direction of persons who are not subject to these legal and professional controls. Accordingly, proposed section 25a provides that, on and from the passage of this amendment, persons other than registered pharmaceutical chemists will be prohibited from owning or taking part in the management of pharmacies. Subsection (2) provides that businesses at present owned by unregistered persons may continue to be so owned so long as there is a registered pharmaceutical chemist in charge of the business. Clause 11 is a drafting amendment consequential on the extended definition of a "friendly society" inserted by clause 3.

Clause 12 provides in some detail for the manner in which the name of the owner of a pharmacy is to be exhibited. Clause 13 is again consequential on clause 3, and clause 14 makes minor drafting amendments to section 26f of the principal Act. Clause 15 makes a consequential amendment to section 15 of the principal Act, following the creation of practising certificate, as does clause 16. Clause 17 sets out a formal regulation-making power relating to the types and construction of premises that may be registered under the Act. Clause 18, in effect, converts the old certificate of registration into a practising certificate. Clauses 19 and 20 repeal a provision of the Pharmacy Act Amendment Act, 1965, and a provision to the Age of Majority (Reduction) Act, 1970-1971, both of which purported to amend section 22a of the principal Act that had in fact been repealed in 1952.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

SWINE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (DISEASES)

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Swine Compensation Act, 1936-1971. Read a first time.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is intended to make an amendment to the principal Act, the Swine Compensation Act, 1936, as amended, as a consequence of the recent amendments to the Foot and Mouth Disease Eradication Fund Act. Honourable members will recall that, following agreement between the States and the Commonwealth, it is proposed that "swine fever" will be included in the diseases in respect of which compensation under that Act will be payable. Accordingly, clause 3 strikes out from the definition of "disease" in the principal Act the disease "swine fever" since in the event of an outbreak of that disease the provisions of the Foot and Mouth Disease Eradication Fund Act will apply and have effect.

Clause 4 recasts section 4a of the principal Act to ensure that specific diseases can by proclamation be added to or deleted from the list of diseases in respect of which compensation is payable. This should ensure that there will be maximum flexibility in the administration of the principal Act, which is desirable in measures of this nature. Clause 5 removes a further redundant reference to "swine fever" in section 8 of the principal Act.

The Hon. C. R. STORY secured the adjournment of the debate.

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (DISEASES)

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Cattle Compensation Act, 1939-1971. Read a first time.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is intended to amend section 4a of the principal Act. This section is, in terms, the same as section 4a of the Swine Compensation Act which is also proposed to be amended. The purpose of the amendment is to ensure that maximum flexibility is obtained in the administration of the principal Act by ensuring that there will be no unnecessary delay in declaring a disease to be a disease in respect of which compensation is payable or in varying the list or description of the diseases to which the Act applies. Honourable members will appreciate the need for this flexibility in legislation of this nature and will recall that the principle was recently affirmed by this Council in the passage of the Foot and Mouth Disease Eradication Fund Amendment Bill last year.

The Hon. C. R. STORY secured the adjournment of the debate.

BIRTHS, DEATHS AND MARRIAGES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Constitution of council."

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I should formally move that the amendment recommended by the Select Committee should be inserted. The amendment appears in the reprint of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: That covers the position.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: The matter is fairly clearly set out in the committee's report. The reasons given there take care of the situation that it was necessary to consider. I am very pleased that we have arrived at a reasonable solution to the problem. I believe that the solution suggested by the committee is acceptable to the university.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): The Government is happy to accept the amendment.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 7) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

PACKAGES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 1. Page 3520.)

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (Southern): Five years ago the principal Act was debated in this Council and in due course it passed through Parliament. That Act made packaging laws uniform as far as possible between the States. The value of modern packaging cannot be stressed too much; it provides convenience of handling and it makes possible standardization of quality and, sometimes, standardization of quantity. There are other advantages of modern packaging that are not so readily realized, especially in connection with food. Modern packaging of food leads to a diminution in the amount of handling and, therefore, a decrease in the risk of infection. I am sure most honourable members will recall that in years gone by when they went into a grocer's shop they often saw the grocer weighing sugar by hand and taking biscuits out of tins and putting them into paper bags and, sometimes, licking his fingers.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Where did that happen—in England or Australia?

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: In Australia. Even worse was the practice of blowing into the bag by the sales person in order to open the bag; if you did not wipe your germs inside you blew them in!

There are, of course, certain disadvantages with modern packing, certain misleading sizes, deceptive labelling (because the goods are wrapped and one must believe what is on the label), confusing claims regarding variations of prices, misleading titles such as "giant", "economy", or "family size", and the use of a packet nearly twice as large as that required to hold the amount of goods actually contained or necessary for holding those goods. As with most measures in life, practical usage reveals flaws of intention and the Bill which five years ago became an Act has in practice revealed certain flaws, hence the introduction of the amending Bill because deficiencies have been revealed which are most obvious when dealing with the interstate movement of goods. Adequate measures exist to deal with packaging defects within the State of South Australia, but so far the packer from another State whose goods come into South Australia cannot be dealt with on the

same footing should the need arise. The interstate packer is very largely at the centre of this Bill to amend the Packages Act.

Clause 3 corrects an error which was obvious from the word "go". It refers to "goods" when it really meant to refer to "foods". Other wordings in that part of the Act are covered by "goods"; "foods" is required to be inserted instead of "goods". The same clause emphasizes the meaning of "pre-packing" by defining it much more clearly as an article packed in advance and ready for resale.

We are changing from Imperial measures to the metric system. Our coinage changed not so long ago and measures of weight and volume have been changing steadily with certain types of commodities. In pharmacy and medicine very little of the old Imperial system of weights and measures is used; metric measures have been uniform in part of pharmacy and medicine for years; and more recently the change has been practically completed.

Clause 5 adds the passage "250 millilitres or 250 grams" after the passage "eight ounces". The measure "250 m*l"* corresponds approximately to 8 fluid ounces and "250 g" corresponds approximately to 8 solid ounces. It is quite clear, since these equivalents are only approximate, that one must be cautious if the package refers to a very accurate standard of requirement. For ordinary food use and bulk articles an approximate measure could have either 8oz. or 250 mg, but both could not be put on the same package without being carefully measured and corrected if one is not to have mistakes with certain types of article.

Clause 6 makes it clear that certain prescribed articles shall have a permissible degree of deficiency, but that there shall be stamped on the goods the net weight when packed and also the date of packing. This is quite important in view of the time lag during which proceedings can be taken. Clause 7 recognizes the relationship betv/een ounces, millilitres and milligrams, and, as the Minister said in his second reading explanation, there is also an intention and purpose not dissimilar to that in clause 5. which deals with packing offences as such. Clause 7 relates also to selling offences, and probably contains the most important part of the Bill, because the wording of this clause places upon the packer of the article acceptance of responsibility for short weight or short measure, as the case may be. It would seem quite reasonable, when one thinks of the vast mass of merchandise manufactured and processed from the prime requirement for making the goods to the packing for disposal and sale, all under one roof, that the packer should take responsibility for his actions.

Many items are delivered directly from the manufacturer to the retailer, who has only to remove the goods from the containers in which they arrive and the smaller packets are then ready for sale. If he receives them in bulk, in one large package, he takes them from that large package and the goods are ready to be sold. Even when the goods pass through the hands of a wholesale delivery agent, no more is involved very often than the opening of the large containers, the removal of the smaller ones, and the dispatch of the smaller packets to the retailer. A product could leave the manufacturer and be quite untouched until it reached the purchasing customer from the retailer. Chocolates, mixed biscuits, sugar, tea and coffee are but a few of the classic examples of goods that go direct from the manufacturer to the purchaser, through the retailer, without being handled at all. It seems reasonable that the responsibility for short weight or short measure should be borne by the packer and not by any intermediate handler or by the final seller.

Until now, the problem has been to bring to court any packer who has carried on his work outside South Australia, but under clause 7 it will be assumed that the packer sold the article at the place where it was found by the Government inspector to be deficient in quantity. In other words, if the inspector in this State finds a deficiency, it will be assumed that the packing was done in this State in the area in which the inspector found the error. This therefore brings the packer within the ambit of the law within this State. Similar provisions are made in the laws of other States, and are found to be satisfactory there.

Clause 8 ensures that items for sale will be sold by net weight or measure, unless special authorization allows the term "gross weight"' to be used. If the latter is used, the article shall be specifically marked, and this marking shall be definitely authorized. New section 42a, inserted by clause 9, allows prosecution under this Act to be commenced within 12 months from the day on which the offence is alleged to have been committed or, alternatively, within six months from the day on which the alleged offence comes to the knowledge of the complainant, whichever period is the later. Hence, the need to have the day of the packing marked on the outside of the container. Apparently, new section 42a

and its predecessor, which dealt with the marking of items with their net or gross weight in specific circumstances, have met with the agreement of the packing industry as being acceptable and necessary.

Clause 11 makes it necessary for items sold through a vending machine to be so packed that the purchaser can see not only the attractive statements that appear on the outside of the package but also the weight and measurements of the product. We live in what might be called a pre-packed society and someone must protect our standard of purchases. Gone almost entirely are those days when the housewife chose her own individual items of food. Instead, such a measure as this Bill offers protection to the masses of pressurized purchasers. I support the Bill.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (EXECUTOR COMPANIES) BILL

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

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

There are four statutory executor companies carrying on business in South Australia:

(*a*) Bagot's Executor and Trustee Company Limited, which operates within the provisions of the Bagot's Executor Company Act, which was passed in 1910;

(*b*) Elder's Trustee and Executor Company Limited, which operates within the provisions of the Elder's Executor Company's Act, 1910, as amended by the Elder's Executor Company's Amendment Act, 1915;

(*c*) Executor Trustee and Agency Company of South Australia Limited, which operates within the provisions of the Executors Company's Act, 1885; the Executors Company's Amendment Act, 1900, and the Executors Company's Amendment Act, 1915; and

(*d*) Farmers' Co-operative Executors and Trustees Limited, which operates within the provisions of the Farmers' Co-operative Executors Act, 1919.

The legislation within which each company operates is in similar terms. It gives each company power *inter alia* to obtain grants of probate and letters of administration in its own name, to hold property in joint tenancy and to charge for their services within the limits prescribed by the legislation. It also requires the company *inter alia* to deposit with the Government investments as security for the performance of its obligations and to comply with stringent audit requirements, and imposes on the directors and managers of the company certain personal obligations. Unfortunately, the legislation, not having been amended for well over 50 years, is in some important respects deficient and out of date and is in need of amendment to enable the companies to operate profitably and at the same time to give adequate service to their clients. The main provisions of this Bill are designed (*a*) to clarify the provisions of each principal Act in relation to the basis upon which an executor company may charge for its services; (*b*) to provide for the establishment and conduct by executor companies of common funds; and (*c*) to facilitate the conduct by executor companies of their day-to-day business without reducing the protection afforded by the legislation to beneficiaries.

At present each company makes a charge, as to capital, of a commission on the value of the assets committed to the company's management and, as to income, of a commission on the income. Each of the companies publishes a scale of charges that is within the limits prescribed by its enabling Act. All the companies, however, are under considerable pressure of increasing costs. This Bill does not increase the limits of charges prescribed by the original enabling Acts but enables the company, in the case of a continuing trust, to charge the rate of commission that would be applicable when the commission became payable rather than a rate that would have applied when the trust became effective. Any charges in excess of the published rates may be made only with the approval of the court.

Another feature of the provisions relating to commission chargeable by an executor company under this Bill is that *(a)* where assets are specifically devised or bequeathed without any intervening life or other intervening interest or condition that would postpone the distribution thereof for over 24 months, or (*b*) where assets are distributed *in specie* within 24 months after they have vested in the beneficiary, the commission would be chargeable on the probate value of those assets, but (c) where assets are devised or bequeathed subject to an intervening life or other intervening interest or condition that postpones the distribution thereof for over 24 months, or (*d*) where assets are distributed *in*

specie after the lapse of 24 months after they have vested in the beneficiary, the commission would be chargeable on the value of those assets as at the date of distribution. It happens that in long trusts prudent administration can result in an increase in the value of assets, and it seems reasonable that the company's remuneration should be related to these values rather than to the values at the date of death. Provision is also included in the Bill for an executor company to be paid, for carrying on a business or undertaking, such remuneration as the court thinks fit.

As to the provisions for the establishment and conduct by executor companies of common funds, the Government considers that beneficiaries should be entitled to expect from professional trustees a better than average investment performance. There are existing provisions for common funds but these are far from being sufficiently extensive for modern conditions and lack certain essential provisions. The best result from investment cannot be achieved without a pooling of the funds of estates and other trusts of similar nature. It would be of particular advantage for small estates with limited funds. A common fund of mortgages, for instance, would open the field for these investments considerably by lending for longer terms than are now convenient at better rates of interest and with a wider spread of risk and greater flexibility from the individual estate's point of view. A common fund of other trustee securities would enable the seizing of investment opportunities that cannot be grasped when one has to make separate investments of separate trust moneys, often in small amounts and in different securities, as occasion permits.

As to the provisions for facilitating the conduct by executor companies of their day-to-day business, some of the provisions of the enabling Acts are archaic. The provision that all affidavits, etc., and appearances required to be made by each company must be made by its manager personally involves a considerable and unnecessary imposition on the manager's time. These responsibilities could well be delegated to and capably carried out by other senior and responsible officers. Additionally, the audit requirements and the returns required from the companies are out of line with modern practices, and these have been brought into line and simplified to meet present-day needs. The Bill also contains a provision which enables an executor company to hold its own shares in a representative capacity. This is now not permissible without affecting the capital structure of the company.

An executor company is also given power to issue certificates under seal as to the fact that administration has been granted in respect of an estate. The new provisions in this Bill do not go beyond provisions already contained in legislation in other States, and the Government is anxious to assist the executor companies to the extent proposed in this Bill. The Government also intends examining the Trustee Act with a view to introducing amendments that could improve the existing legislation governing trusts and trustees generally. I shall deal more particularly with the provisions of the Bill as I explain its clauses.

Part I, which consists of clause 1, is formal. Part II, which consists of clauses 2 to 20, deals with the amendments to Bagot's Executor Company Act. Clauses 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 repeals and re-enacts section 2 of the principal Act, which up-dates the definitions for the purposes of the principal Act. Clause 5 amends section 5 of the principal Act by altering the reference to a person of the age of 21 years to a reference to a person of the age of 18 years. Clause 6 re-enacts section 7 of the principal Act, which empowers the court or the Registrar of Probates to act on an affidavit made by an officer of the company. An officer of the company is defined to be one of the senior executive officers of the company. Under section 7 as it now stands, the court can act on the affidavit of the manager only. Clause 7 makes a drafting amendment to section 12 of the principal Act. Clause 8 makes consequential amendments to section 15 of the principal Act.

Clause 9 repeals section 16 of the principal Act and enacts new sections 16, 16a and 16b in its place. New section 16 deals with commission chargeable by the company. The court is empowered to reduce any excessive rate or amount of commission charged. New section 16a deals with the time when commission becomes payable, and new section 16b deals with additional fees for carrying on a business. Clauses 10 to 13 make statute law revision amendments to the principal Act. Clause 14, enacts new sections 22a and 22b of the principal Act. New section 22a contains the provisions relating to the establishment of common funds by the company, and new section 22b excludes from the application of Division V of Part IV of the Companies Act any existing fund or any existing or future common fund established in the books of the company. A recent amendment to the Western

Australian legislation contains a similar provision. Division V of Part IV of the Companies Act deals with unit trusts, and a common fund referred to in this Bill could well be caught up in that Part of the Companies Act unless it was expressly excluded.

Clause 15 makes a consequential amendment and a decimal currency conversion. Clause 16 makes a decimal currency conversion. Clause 17 clarifies section 26 of the principal Act. Clause 18 alters a reference to the age of 21 years to a reference to the age of 18 years. Clause 19 inserts three new sections in the principal Act. New section 27a enables the company, when acting in a representative capacity, to hold its own shares. New section 27b enables the company to issue certificates under seal as to the granting of probate or administration and the acceptance of such a certificate by the courts, etc. New section 27c provides that the powers conferred by this Bill have retroactive application. Clause 20 repeals the forms contained in the first and second schedules to the principal Act and replaces them with new and more simplified forms, which achieve the same purposes.

Part III, which consists of clauses 21 to 35, deals with the amendments to Elder's Executor Company's Act, 1910. Clauses 21 and 22 are formal. Clause 23 corresponds to clause 4. Clause 24 alters the reference to the age of 21 years to a reference to the age of 18 years. Clause 25 clarifies section 10 of the principal Act. Clause 26 alters the reference to the age of 21 years to a reference to the age of 18 years. Clause 27 corresponds to clause 6. Clause 28 enables a senior executive officer of the company to perform the duties at present cast on the manager of the company. Clause 29 corresponds to clause 9. Clause 30 corresponds to clause 14. Clause 31 makes a consequential amendment and a decimal currency conversion. Clauses 32 and 33 make decimal currency conversions. Clause 34 corresponds to clause 19. Clause 35 corresponds to clause 20.

Part IV, which consists of clauses 36 to 51, deals with the amendments to Executors Company's Act, 1885, and Executors Company's Amendment Act, 1900. Clauses 36 and 37 are formal. Clause 38 corresponds to clause 4. Clause 39 clarifies section 3 of the principal Act. Clause 40 corresponds to clause 6. Clause 41 corresponds to clause 8. Clause 42 corresponds to clause 9. Clause 43 corresponds to clause 14. Clause 44 corresponds to clause 15. Clause 45 makes a decimal currency conversion. Clause 46 corresponds to clause 19. Clause 47 corresponds to clause 20. Clauses 48 and 50 alter the references to the age of 21 years to the age of 18 years. Clause 49 makes a consequential amendment. Clause 51 makes a decimal currency conversion.

Part V, which consists of clauses 52 to 66, deals with amendments to the Farmers Co-operative Executors Act, 1919. Clauses 52 and 53 are formal. Clause 54 corresponds to clause 4. Clauses 55 and 57 alter references to the age of 21 years to the age of 18 years. Clause 56 makes a consequential amendment. Clause 58 corresponds to clause 6. Clause 59 is a consequential amendment. Clause 60 corresponds to clause 9. Clause 61 corresponds to clause 14. Clauses 62 and 63 make decimal currency conversions. Clause 64 corresponds to clause 19. Clause 65 inserts in the principal Act a new section 32, which corresponds to new section 27c inserted in the Bagot's Executor Company Act by clause 19. Clause 66 corresponds to clause 20. The Bill has been considered and approved by a Select Committee in another place.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

RURAL INDUSTRY ASSISTANCE (SPECIAL PROVISIONS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 1. Page 3520.)

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): As honourable members know, Parliament agreed in the last session to all the necessary legislation to assist rural industry. This amending Bill has been introduced of necessity and in the light of experience. A man who must leave rural industry through his financial inability to stay can receive from the rural industry committee $1,000 to help him on his way. I understand that one of the ideas behind this gift of $1,000 was that it would possibly help the man to move his family and furniture from the country to a city, and it might help him to pay a deposit on a house in an area where he could obtain employment.

One of the matters that was overlooked was that the creditors who knocked on this man's door could also claim the $1,000, which was given to him for a specific purpose. So the Bill is designed to spell out that the farmer would be protected in relation to the $1,000 against any debt incurred before the time he received the grant. The Bill is designed to ensure that the rehabilitation loans, payable pursuant to the principal Act to former farmers,

are for economic reasons and are not subject to the claims of creditors.

I have studied the Bill and found nothing about which to be unduly upset. However, it is not unfair to comment on how help to rural industry is proceeding (I do not refer particularly to South Australia). It seems to me that Governments and their representatives are not always the best types of instrumentality for the lending of money to an industry as varied as the rural industry. From reports which many honourable members have received and which have been highlighted in the press on many occasions, the major difficulty appears to be that the man right down on his luck is often the man who is able to obtain assistance from the committee, because the figures he presents to it show that he is not viable. Naturally enough, the assistance goes to him.

Many of the stories we have been hearing concern the efficient farmer who has proved his efficiency during many years. Because he is efficient, he has been unable to obtain relief from the committee and is being forced to use the money he can borrow in the private sector at far higher interest rates and far shorter lending periods. This is creating a problem the committee cannot do anything about, because the Commonwealth Government has spelled things out so rigidly to the State Government that no relief can be given to the person who could well use the money far more wisely than could the person whose creditability is so low; often his creditability is low because of his inefficiency.

My remarks do not point to the committee in this State, nor am I referring to the Minister administering the Act; it is one of the peculiarities the man has learnt to live with. The cry goes up, "The Government should do something for us" but, in trying, the Government is unable to be flexible enough to have its own wishes clearly spelled out. I suppose this is where the private sector of lending has, in the past, always been able to help where the need exists because it is not rigidly tied up with controls and regulations. Perhaps, as the first period passes, the poorest farmer will have received help and, if the rural recession lingers on, perhaps the next man up the ladder will be able to obtain help in the next round.

The hope of the most optimistic person is that the price of wool will rise still more; if it does not rise, then at least that it will maintain its better market, thereby having an effect down the line to that section of the rural industry. One can only hope that quotas for cereal will at least remain as they are and not become more restrictive, so that the farmer who is in need of cereals in relation to his financial affairs will be able to budget on getting a reasonable income from a reasonable acreage. Marketing problems in connection with rural products have caused the recession. Until the world marketing set-up becomes more stable, the difficulties will remain with us. I support the second reading.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Lands): I have listened with interest to the honourable member's comments on the Bill and on the rural reconstruction scheme in general. I appreciate what he has said—that the efficient farmer, who is still able to get some financial assistance from the normal lending institutions, is not being helped by the rural reconstruction scheme; I agree that such a farmer is not being helped in that way. More than a year ago the Prime Minister referred to a scheme of long-term finance for rural industries. Such a scheme would be the answer to the problems raised by the honourable member. Questions were asked of the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry only last week, when I was in Canberra for a review of the rural reconstruction scheme by State Ministers and the Commonwealth Minister concerned with the scheme. We considered a report from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, but no decisions were made, because we had so much to consider. Not much agreement was reached between the States in connection with a reallocation of funds. We will be returning in two or three weeks time for a further conference on the matter, and I hope I shall then be able to report on the review of the rural reconstruction scheme. I thank honourable members for the way they have dealt with the Bill and for allowing it to have a smooth passage. Until this Bill becomes law, interest-free loans will be of little assistance to farmers in need.

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

ADMINISTRATION AND PROBATE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes a number of miscellaneous amendments to the principal Act. Perhaps the most important of these is the validation of certain long-standing practices upon which doubt has recently been cast by legal opinion. The Public

Trustee has, in the past, been accustomed to pay into a common fund all moneys not impressed with a trust for investment in a specific manner. It was assumed that he had power to do this under section 102 of the principal Act. However, a close examination of that provision disclosed that it applied only to moneys that were received under the Administration and Probate Act. Accordingly, moneys that were received by the Public Trustee pursuant to other statutory provisions and certain court orders would not come within the terms of section 102. Under the rules of equity, the present practice of the Public Trustee could technically be said to give rise to a breach of trust. There is, of course, no logical reason why these moneys should not be invested in the same way as moneys that come into the Public Trustee's hands under the Administration and Probate Act. Hence the Bill removes the technical invalidity of the present practice and validates past actions of the Public Trustee in connection with the payment of these moneys into the common fund.

Under section 88a of the principal Act the Supreme Court may, upon giving judgment in any proceedings, make an ancillary direction that money or property subject to the judgment be paid or transferred to the Public Trustee to be held on behalf of the party in whose favour judgment was given. The Bill extends this provision to enable any court exercising jurisdiction within or outside this State to make such a direction. The Bill increases the amount that the Public Trustee is empowered to borrow on the security of the common fund from $200,000 to $1,000,000.

Finally, the Bill provides that the scale of charges to which the Public Trustee is entitled in respect of his services should be fixed by regulation rather than by rules of the Supreme Court. Their Honours the Judges of the Supreme Court have pointed out that the function of fixing these charges is executive rather than judicial and have asked that it be removed from the sphere of their responsibility. The provisions of the Bill are as follows: clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 88a of the principal Act. As has been previously mentioned, this section enables the Supreme Court to order that money or property subject to a judgment be transferred to the Public Trustee, to be held by him on behalf of the judgment creditor. The power is extended by the amendment to other courts exercising jurisdiction within or outside the State.

Clause 4 amends section 102 of the principal Act. The Public Trustee is authorized to invest all moneys received by him (other than moneys impressed with a trust requiring investment in a specified manner) into a common fund. His past action in investing moneys in this manner without statutory authority is validated. Clause 5 empowers the Public Trustee to borrow up to $1,000,000 on the security of the common fund. The increasing volume of the Public Trustee's business makes a more extensive borrowing power desirable. Clauses 6 and 7 provide for the Public Trustee's charges to be fixed by regulation rather than by rules of the Supreme Court.

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

MISREPRESENTATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 1. Page 3518.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): We have been sailing through the Notice Paper today with a good deal of ease, but I think we are now coming to the matters on it that may cause some stronger comment from members in this Chamber. This Bill is another step in the Government's proposals for consumer protection. Although "consumer protection" is another of those emotional catch phrases used by politicians, it is our duty, as a Chamber, to see whether the legislation does interfere too much with the normally accepted trade practices of our community; in other words, that it does not act as a deterrent to normal business transactions. Already legislation has passed this Chamber in this session dealing with used cars and with door-to-door salesmen, and I assure honourable members that a number of quite valid complaints have come from the implementation of that legislation, which is not having a good effect upon normally accepted business transactions.

I must admit that I am looking at this matter through the eyes of a layman. This morning I did quite an amount of research on it, and, although I am a little confused about the measure, it appears to me that it makes misrepresentation, whether innocent or not, an offence; in other words, we are extending the normal civil remedies in relation to this matter and making it a codified law. We are taking only one small section of the total common law in relation to contracts into statute law. I come back to the original point: we must exercise absolute care in imposing such legislation lest the

shackles we place on commerce will not, in the long run, be in the general interest of the consuming public.

About five years ago English law similar to the Bill before us was passed. On examining the English law, one sees that it is contained in two pieces of legislation—the Misrepresentation Act and the Trade Descriptions Act. The Bill before us expands the concept of the English legislation. This is no argument either in favour of or against the measure before us, but nevertheless it is a point that should be made. The Bill goes beyond and expands the English legislation of five years ago which has come under a good deal of criticism in Great Britain from many eminent writers.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: The Government that introduced it did not survive an election.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: They say also that voluntary voting contributed quite a lot to that.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Was it first past the post voting?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: With an excellent House of Review, yes. As a layman, to understand all the ramifications of the common law provisions in relation to the law of contract would be quite impossible. I look forward to hearing some quite erudite speeches before this Bill passes. I intend drawing the attention of members to certain matters and to make certain references for the guidance of those who are interested in looking at the total question.

The matter appears to divide itself into four distinct areas, the first of which is the case of innocent misrepresentation. One could imagine quite easily a person innocently making a misrepresentation in relation to a contract. As I read the Bill, this is an offence in the same way as fraudulent misrepresentation. The second area covers negligent misrepresentation, the third covers fraudulent misrepresentation, and the fourth point is the question of the ability for rescission of the contract. Associated with that, of course, is the question of damages which can be sought against the representor.

I do not know whether the Bill makes any alteration to the accepted law relating to fraud, although I know that in some cases it is not a criminal offence to be guilty of fraudulent misrepresentation. There are offences relating to fraud. One of the most important documents to which I can refer honourable members on this matter is contained in the 10th *Law Report* of 1961-62, pages 177-189. This contains the tenth report of the Law Reform Committee on innocent misrepresentation, presented to Parlament by the Lord High Chancellor by command of Her Majesty in July, 1962. Icommend this volume to the attention of honourable members. At the end of the report there is a full page of recommendations made by that committee and the whole question of innocent misrepresentation is given quite full treatment.

The English legislation provides for no criminal offence in relation to misrepresentation. As I read it, it deals entirely with the question of damages and a rescission or not of the contract, whereas we appear to be taking the extra step of making misrepresentations, irrespective of whether fraudulent or innocent, a criminal offence; indeed, several things could happen in this regard. When an action is taken, the contract can be rescinded, a fine can be imposed, or damages can be awarded, or there can be a combination of those three; for example, damages may be awarded and a fine may be imposed, but the contract could still remain valid. On the other hand, a contract could be rescinded without damages being awarded or a fine being imposed.

Section 2 (1) of the English legislation is closely allied to clause 4 of the Bill. It is, therefore, reasonable for me to refer to statements made by experts in this matter dealing with the English legislation. Section 2 (2) of the English legislation is analogous to clause 8 of the Bill. The gentlemen to whom I refer and who have written on this matter are G. H. Treitel in *The Law of Contract,* third edition, and Chitty in *Chitty on Contracts.* It appears that the onus of proof in clause 4 is on the representor, irrespective of whether the misrepresentation is innocent or otherwise. A defence is provided for in subclause (3). Clause 4 provides, in part, as follows:

> ...the person by whom the representation was made, *or a* person on whose behalf or in whose employment that person was acting, derived any direct or indirect consideration or material advantage, it shall be presumed, in the absence of proof to the contrary, that the representation was made for the purpose of inducing the person to whom it was made to enter into that contract, to pay that pecuniary amount, or to make over or transfer that real or personal property, as the case may require.

That appears to reverse the onus of proof. I have already made the point that this involves innocent misrepresentation. It is a criminal offence under the Bill to misrepresent, and this provision goes much further in its concept

than does the English legislation. Treitel, in *The Law of Contract,* says at page 290, regarding defences available in the English law:

The representor would find it easiest to discharge the burden of proof (that it was not fraudulent misrepresentation) by showing that he was himself the victim of an earlier fraud and that he had innocently repeated a representation previously made to him.

At page 291 he says:

It might, for example, be reasonable to make a large company liable for faulty organization in distributing information to its employees, even though each of them individually can discharge the burden of proof under section 2 . . . There might be liability for negligence at common law in such a case, but this would depend on the existence of a "special relationship", and the burden of proof would be on the plaintiff.

As I see it, this Bill goes a step further than the English legislation. No legislation in this context can be completely satisfactory. This is borne out by English experience. I cannot find a reference to one case in the English law courts regarding innocent misrepresentation. Taking one case out of a large body of common law and applying this concept to it will show that such an approach would be unsatisfactory. As I have another appointment, I ask leave to conclude my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 1. Page 3523.)

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): The principal Companies Act of 1962 consists of 353 pages of a fairly formidable tome. The amending Bill now before honourable members consists of no less than 161 pages. I should therefore like to ask what possible chance a private member has of coping with it. It took me weeks of night work to read the 1962 Act, and I claimed that I was one of the few members of Parliament who read the whole Act. I spent three or four hours a night on it, trying to understand it and to envisage all the practical applications of its various sections in the business world.

I found this practically an impossible task. This amending Bill is considerably worse, as we have not only to consider this Bill, consisting of nearly half the size of the original Act, but also to try to piece in the 161 pages of the amending Bill with the 353 pages of the principal Act and, once more, try to envisage all the applications that would exist in the business world. Whereas previously it took me several weeks, working several hours a night, to read and try to understand the 1962 Act, it would take months of full-time work for anyone properly to understand this legislation. I consider the task impossible for the ordinary private member of Parliament. I have not received any help from any of the professional bodies affected by the legislation.

Some months ago I was invited to attend the meeting of the Institute of Directors, which was addressed by several wellknown authorities on various aspects of the amending Bill. Since then I have not heard from them or anyone else. Perhaps they, too, have given up the unequal struggle. A former very well-known commercial lawyer, who was subsequently a highly-respected judge of the South Australian Supreme Court and who has, unfortunately, since died, said after the passage of the 1962 Act that he considered the 1892 Companies Act, which was a simple, straightforward piece of legislation, to be far better than the 1962 Act. He said it was easily comprehensible; everyone knew what his duties and obligations were. There were legal decisions interpreting what these were, and it was quite practicable to work under it. He felt, as I feel, that the 1934 Act was an understandable piece of legislation, but very much more complicated and very much lengthier. To me, the 1962 Act has always created some confusion. There are several passages in it that lawyers find difficult to interpret and that are beyond the comprehension of the ordinary run of businessman. It is very complicated. It sets forth many onerous duties with the apparent intention of trying to protect the investing public, the shareholders and people dealing with companies. To me, this Bill only makes confusion more confounded.

I assume that the Act will be reprinted, if and when this Bill goes through. It will then consist of over 500 pages, which all company directors and auditors and other management will be expected to conform to and thoroughly understand. I have my own ideas about what they may do in this regard. I believe the Bill arose from a meeting of the anastomosis of Attorneys-General. Perhaps because of incompatible political blood groups or perhaps because they were unprepared to do the job themselves or perhaps even because they might have felt incapable of doing the job themselves, they referred the matter to a committee that they had established called the Company Law Advisory Committee. I have no criticism whatever of that committee, which consists of very eminent men. They go about their job in an industrious way; they are all serious

men and certainly have spent an enormous amount of time on this Bill, which we are expected to deal with in the ordinary course of our duties as members of Parliament.

What I do criticize is that we private members of Parliament are asked blindly to approve their voluminous recommendations, on which they had laboured so hard for so long, for several years, with many lengthy meetings and the calling of much evidence. If I may read the beginning of their report, which consists of no less than 187 closely printed foolscap pages, in small print, it begins thus:

In August 1967, we were appointed by the standing committee with the following terms of reference: "To inquire into and report on the extent of the protection afforded to the investing public by the existing provisions of the Uniform Companies Acts and to recommend what additional provisions (if any) are reasonably necessary to increase that protection.

Paragraph 2 states:

The committee has met on numerous occasions and has reviewed the considerable body of material supplied to it by the standing committee, together with some 74 submissions received in answer to advertisements published by the committee and much other material assembled by the committee itself.

At the end of this first report, before the committee commences the appendices, it says:

We would appreciate an early indication of the views of the standing committee on the following matters:

(1) The proposal contained in Section D of this report for the establishment of a companies commission.

(2) Whether the proposals in this report relating to accounts and audit (Sections B and C) are to be proceeded with, without waiting for a further report from us.

(3) Whether our proposed future programme outlined in Section E of this report is acceptable to the standing committee.

In other words, as I read it, the committee, which had this vague and comprehensive reference, then had to attempt to write out its own detailed terms of reference; and that was the beginning of it all.

This was in 1967, and I think the final report was made in 1970, so that means that on this Bill and the principle involved in it, which we are supposed to understand, this committee spent about four years of fairly intensive work. I suppose it is in our system of Party Government and so on that the private member is supposed to accept recommendations. It is not easy for a private member of a House of Review, because we are supposed to be looking at all this; but all I feel I can do is really to nibble at the edges of the report and do the best I can with the things in it about which I believe I understand something; but I ask: what chance will the ordinary company director or manager have of finding his way through all this stuff? Where, I would also ask, is all this complicated maze of words leading the company world?

It is aimed obviously at the spivs or crooks (whatever one may call them) who try to take people down. I venture to say that that ilk will soon find its way through all this legislation or shoot holes through it while the ordinary common or garden business man trying to do his job and get about his business in a reasonable, speedy and economic way will get all tangled up. One needs to be a technical expert to understand the obligations already in the Act and, when all this goes through, I think one will need to be some sort of genius to be able to comprehend it.

If anyone disagrees with what I am saying, I invite him to read the Eggleston committee report, the Companies Act of 1962 and this amending Bill and tell me whether he can understand them. Ishould like to ask every individual member of this Council a few random questions on the simplest matters contained in these measures, and Iam not denigrating them in any way by saying that I do not think they would pass the examination with flying colours—I would not, either. I think that what we shall need fairly soon is a committee to unravel and simplify the whole of this encyclopaedia of obligations and requirements. It seems to me that more and more the companies legislation is tending to try to make company directors not responsible merely for the policy of the company and seeing that it is properly managed (which is or has been their role as things are) but for managing the companies' affairs themselves and for every detail of the day-to-day management of the company. This is absolutely impossible in the basic set-up of the structure of companies. Indeed, most company managements very properly resent directorial interference in their day-to-day affairs. They say that they are appointed to run the day-to-day business of the company (and they are) and that the director is there to guide them, where he can, and to help them formulate the company's policy; in particular, that he is there to see that the company is properly managed and that the proper personnel are appointed to manage it, etc.

However, this is not the tendency of the legislation now. It seems that many people conceive that the director's role is to run the management of the company and, of course, they are entirely separate and distinct things. In the main, I believe the Bill is a Committee Bill, but I wanted to say what I thought of the generality of the measure. I think I have made it clear that I am not at all enamoured of the Bill, nor do I think that most people in the business world are enamoured of it. It was received from the House of Assembly on November 10, 1971, read a first time, and Standing Orders were suspended to enable the second reading to be given. On November 30, namely, 20 days later, the New South Wales Legislative Council sent a message to the Legislative Assembly with eight pages containing 73 amendments to this so-called uniform Bill which, apparently, had been approved by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General.

In reply, will the Chief Secretary tell honourable members whether the Government is prepared to accept *in toto* the amendments made to the Bill by the New South Wales Parliament, because I understand that the Bill has been passed and the amendments, if not in total, were in the main agreed to? I think they were all agreed to, but I am uncertain of that. If so, will the Chief Secretary instruct the Parliamentary Counsel to prepare the necessary amendments? If not, I should like him when replying to tell honourable members whether the Government considers that more stringent provisions are needed for South Australian companies than are needed for those in New South Wales. I think I could hazard an answer to that, because I can hardly conceive that this would be possible. That is the main burden of my song today. I wish to know whether, as the Act is supposed to be reasonably uniform, and as the New South Wales Parliament has passed these amendments since the Bill was passed by the South Australian House of Assembly—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You want the South Australian Government to accept the law in connection with companies as finally passed by the New South Wales Parliament?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: That is right. The amendments are reasonable and good, but they will need considerable study. I emphasize again that these amendments were passed in New South Wales subsequent to the passage of this Bill by our House of Assembly and to its receipt in this Council. It is very lengthy and complicated legislation. I hope the Government will regard my request as reasonable and take the necessary lengthy and onerous steps to prepare for inserting into our Bill the amendments which have been passed in New South Wales and which will make our Bill reasonably uniform with that State's Bill.

The Hon. L. R. HART secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

PLACES OF PUBLIC ENTERTAINMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.10 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, March 8, at 2.15 p.m.