

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, September 18, 1951.

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. Sir Robert Nicholls) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PURCHASE OF PLANT AND EQUIPMENT FROM U.S.A.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Premier any information to give the House as to what success attended his mission to the United States of America, particularly in regard to securing supplies of urgently needed steel, copper cable, and heavy equipment from that country?

The **Hon. T. PLAYFORD**—I found that, provided the right contacts can be made, materials and equipment are fairly readily available in the United States, and I was able to place orders for a large amount of transmission cable and steel, particularly heavy section steel necessary for the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline. However, there are two matters that have yet to be adjusted. Firstly, consent has to be obtained from the Australian authorities for the necessary dollars, and permission to import is required. I have been led to believe that there will be no difficulty in getting that. Secondly, an allocation has to be made by the National Production Authority in America. An application has been made to it. It is well sponsored and I hope it will be successful. The price of steel in the United States is very much lower than the price we would have to pay for it in Europe at present and the saving on the 25,000 tons ordered, compared with the European price, would be about £1,000,000. Generally speaking, I believe there is an opportunity to get a large quantity of plant and equipment, particularly specialized plant and equipment that we so badly need in this country, from the United States, and I was able to place orders for all the items supplied to me by my departments, except for heavy tractors. I was informed at Canberra before I left that heavy tractors have to be dealt with on a national basis and that it would be of no advantage to place individual orders. This State will get its share of the total allocation for Australia. I received full co-operation from the Commonwealth authorities in the United States and found that our representation there was extremely good and effective.

LANDLORD AND TENANT INQUIRY COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

Mr. DUNKS—Has the committee appointed to consider whether the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act should continue in its present form finished its deliberations and, if so, when will its report be available?

The **Hon. T. PLAYFORD**—The committee has completed its deliberations and its report has been forwarded to me as the head of the Government. The report makes a number of suggestions for amendments to existing legislation and at present is in the hands of the Parliamentary Draftsman, who has been instructed to draft a Bill embodying the proposed amendments preparatory to its introduction in the House. The report will be available when the Bill is submitted and there will be ample time to study it before the Bill is proceeded with.

TRANSPORT OF WOODSIDE CAMP TRAINEES.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Several people have asked me if they are permitted to bring home trainees other than their own sons from the Woodside military training camp. It appears from reports that a number of trainees take their own cars to Woodside, and a number of parents go to Woodside with their cars, buckboards or lorries to bring home their own sons. These people have offered other trainees a ride home and the Transport Control Board has communicated with such people on the matter as a result of which they are now of the opinion that they are not permitted to bring home neighbour trainees, even if they transport them free of charge. Can the Minister of Railways clarify the position?

The **Hon. M. McINTOSH**—Speaking generally, the ordinary ancillary vehicle—that is, the privately-owned car—is not controlled. The owner may transport people as long as it is done without fee or reward, but I am afraid the position at Woodside is not exactly that. It is not the number of people who are taking friends in their own cars that has caused any issue with the Transport Control Board, but those operating in a commercial way wanting to do that work outside their own sphere. Having heard of the question raised by the honourable member, I asked the chairman of the Transport Control Board to let me have a report. It is as follows:—

The board was approached prior to the opening of the camp at Woodside *re* a bus service for transport of personnel Woodside-Adelaide and Adelaide-Woodside. The board held the

view that it was a railway job and referred the matter to the railways suggesting that the military authorities be approached as to their requirements; this was done and the railways agreed to give the military authorities a train service running to the times decided upon by the military authorities. The service was commenced on Saturday, August 11. The up service runs Friday, Saturday, and Sunday; the down service Saturday and Sunday. To date 16 up trips transporting 2,562 troops; and 12 down trips transporting 2,892 troops—a movement of 5,454. Had taxis catered for a third of this movement and buses two-thirds, it would have meant 361 taxi trips and 122 bus trips as against 28 train trips. The wastage of manpower is obvious 483 on the road as against train staff of 84. The rail fare, River-view (the entraining point) to Adelaide is 6s. return, 4s. 7d. single. It was reported to the board that certain truck owners and taxi drivers were touting for fares to the extent of inducing troops to leave the train and use their service. As this was a distinct breach of the Act, the board's inspectors were instructed to police the road. It was established that trucks and taxis were operating, they were advised of the position and their case is being considered by the board.

I have heard no suggestion that ordinary citizens going to see their friends may not give neighbours a ride home. If they were so informed it was done under a misapprehension; it might have been on suspicion that it was being done commercially.

SLOGANS ON FENCES.

Mr. PATTINSON—During the period of the last Commonwealth election campaign the properties of several householders at Glenelg were disfigured by unauthorized persons painting "No conscription" and other similar slogans on fences. Some of the alleged perpetrators were apprehended by the police, but no prosecutions were launched because of some alleged difficulty in the law. Some of those fences are still in a disfigured state and can be seen by anybody motoring along Anzac Highway. I have been informed, but have not investigated the position, that during the last week or so similar signs and slogans have been painted on people's property in my district by unauthorized persons. Will the Premier obtain a report from the Chief Secretary, as head of the Police Department, or from the Attorney-General, through the Crown Solicitor, as to whether there is any weakness in the law which prevents prosecutions from being launched and damages obtained from such persons?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will have the matter investigated.

SUPERANNUATION FUND PAYMENTS.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—On August 30 I asked the Minister of Lands, representing the Premier, to see whether it was possible to help public servants obtain increased benefits under the South Australian Superannuation Fund. The Minister promised to take up the matter. Has the Premier any information to give?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Governor's Speech at the opening of Parliament stated that the Government proposed to introduce legislation dealing with superannuation payments to civil servants and ex-civil servants. As a matter of fact, in a few moments I will give notice of my intention to introduce the Bill.

CONDENSED MILK SUPPLIES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Will the Government ascertain whether any condensed milk is being retained in stock by manufacturers? I have received reports recently from people who use condensed milk, particularly for children, that during the last couple of weeks they have been unable to obtain their requirements, and I believe that the demand is far greater than the supply. It would appear that this has been brought about since the last increase in the retail price of butter. Can the Premier do anything to see that supplies of condensed milk are made available for people who require it?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will have the position investigated. I point out that condensed milk and, in fact, all milk products have been in short supply for a considerable time, even before the recent butter price rise. Several members have asked questions on the subject. I take it that the honourable member is interested not only in condensed milk, but in tinned milk products generally.

LOAN WORKS.

Mr. CHRISTIAN—Has the Minister of Works the information I sought about certain items when the Loan Estimates were under discussion?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—As promised, I have brought along an epitome of the expenditure of the various departments, showing the amounts voted and the amounts unexpended or over-expended. The statement is lengthy and I ask leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without reading it.

Leave granted.

The statement is as set out on the following pages.

SUMMARY OF LOAN WORKS, 1950-51—PROVISION AND EXPENDITURE.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN RAILWAYS.

Total provision	£1,700,000
Total expended	£1,910,000
Over-expended	£210,000

Description of projects.	Voted. £	Un- expended. £	Over- expended. £	Remarks.
Way and works—				
1. Broadening gauge, South-East	275,000	21,000	—	Progress was slower than anticipated on account of shortages of materials and labour.
2. Ballasting, buildings, platforms and stock yards improvements to station yards, signalling and safety devices, strengthening main lines, bridges, and purchase of plant, etc.	204,000	—	23,500	This work is made up of many small projects and the excess expenditure reflects rising costs.
3. New cottages	150,000	—	95,000	Owing to the urgency to provide cottages for staff, much better progress was made than anticipated. Approval obtained for additional expenditure. During the year 156 cottages were completed.
4. Diesel loco. depot at Mile End	—	—	6,000	This item was not included in the Loan Estimates, but was approved after investigation by the Public Works Committee.
5. Goodwood to Marino duplication	20,000	—	11,500	The amount allowed was underestimated.
Rolling stock—				
6. Eight steel passenger cars, 5ft. 3in. gauge	130,000	126,000	—	Owing to more urgent work and the shortage of material progress on this project could not be made during 1950-51.
7. Ten Class 600 locos., 5ft. 3in. gauge—Equipping with auto stokers	30,000	29,000	—	The locomotives are being fitted with automatic stokers when they go into the Islington Workshops for major overhaul.
8. Eight joint stock passenger cars (S.A. proportion approximately two-fifths). Four roomette and four two-berth sleepers	40,000	—	20,000	An effort was made to have these cars completed by June 30, 1951, and the completion was achieved.
9. Twenty side-loading cars to end-loading passenger cars, 5ft. 3in. gauge	36,000	—	2,500	Good progress was made with this work.
10. Twenty-one rail cars, model 75, 5ft. 3in. gauge, conversion to diesel engines, etc.	50,000	—	1,400	Good progress was made in obtaining engines and other gear from overseas. Work proceeding in 1951-52.

11. Three hundred four-wheel open waggons, 5ft. 3in. gauge	130,000	—	20,400	The estimated cost of the 300 waggons is £251,562. The amount of £130,000 shown for 1950-51 represents the estimated expenditure for that year. However, better progress was made than anticipated, and £150,400 was expended. Up to June 30, 1951, 200 cars were complete and others partly complete. Up to date 250 cars have been issued to traffic.
12. Ten diesel-electric locos, 5ft. 3in. gauge	240,000	—	196,000	The progress payments made to the English Electric Co. for the equipment being supplied under contract were greater than anticipated.
13. One hundred four-wheel cattle vans, 5ft. 3in. gauge	50,000	50,000	—	A contract for portions of these vans was let to Perry Engineering Co., but owing to the shortage of steel, no expenditure was incurred in 1950-51.
14. One hundred four-wheel sheep vans, 5ft. 3in. gauge	70,000	69,600	—	These vans are being made at Islington and are now under construction, but owing to the difficulty in obtaining steel, no expenditure was incurred in 1950-51.
15. Three hundred four-wheel louvre cars, 5ft. 3in. gauge	40,000	37,240	—	See 14.
16. Six joint stock coach cars (S.A. proportion approximately two-fifths), two first class and four second class	60,000	40,800	—	The progress was less than anticipated, but it is expected that all six cars will be issued to traffic before Easter, 1952.
17. Fifteen diesel rail cars, 5ft. 3in. gauge, fitted with pan-cake type engines	100,000	100,000	—	Awaiting receipt of engines, etc., from overseas. Progress now reported, some engines expected shortly.
18. Purchase of 10 Class "N" locos. from Victorian Railways	—	—	300,000	Opportunity was taken, with Government approval, to purchase these new locomotives from the Victorian Railways. They were urgently needed to cater for expanding railway business and are giving excellent service.
19. Sundry other small items, including plant and machinery	75,000	—	7,340	
	£1,700,000	£473,640	683,640 473,640	
Total over-expended for year			£210,000	

SUMMARY OF LOAN WORKS, 1950-51—PROVISION AND EXPENDITURE—continued.

HARBORS BOARD DEPARTMENT.

Total provision	£587,000
Total expended	£488,000
Total net unexpended	£99,000

Item.	Voted. £	Expendi- ture. £	Un- expended. £	Over- expended. £	Remarks.
Port Adelaide—Inner and outer harbors—					
Reconstruction of berths 1, 6, 8, and 9	201,000	153,000	48,000	—	Insufficient labour and material, particularly cement.
Housing for employees	33,000	—	33,000	—	Awaiting delivery of prefabricated houses.
Purchase of properties	20,000	72,000	—	52,000	Programme advanced.
Deepening and improving channels	50,000	49,300	700	—	
Improvements to dockyard, extension of Currie Street cargo shed, etc.	64,500	27,000	37,500	—	Delays in delivery and shortages of material. Delays in letting of contracts.
Coal handling plant—Amenities for employees	10,000	17,700	—	7,700	Due to increase in labour costs and materials over extended periods because of inability to obtain contractor and work had to be carried out by petty contracts.
Plant and equipment—Purchase and construction of vehicular cargo handling, dredging, and floating plant, etc.	155,000	116,800	38,200	—	Delays in delivery of machines and equipment from overseas.
Outport wharves and jetties—					
Floodlighting at Port Pirie and Port Lincoln, jetty additions at Edithburgh and Minlacowie, etc.	16,370	6,500	9,870	—	Shortage of labour and material.
Construction of fishing havens, etc.	25,000	2,400	22,600	—	Insufficient technical staff available to complete designs.
Other miscellaneous works	12,130	43,300	—	31,170	Special requirements of the ports and increases in costs generally.
Total	£587,000	£488,000	£99,000	(net)	

SUMMARY OF LOAN WORKS, 1950-51—PROVISION AND EXPENDITURE—*continued.*

ENGINEERING AND WATER SUPPLY DEPARTMENT.

Total provision £4,045,000
 Total expended £3,516,000

Total net unexpended £529,500

Undertaking.	Voted. £	Un- expended. £	Over- expended. £	Remarks.
Morgan-Whyalla water main	3,000	300	—	
Adelaide Water District— Mannum-Adelaide pipeline	950,000	433,000	—	Decreased expenditure due to impossibility of obtaining Australian steel for this work, and the suspension by the U.K. Government of export orders for steel plate (totalling 20,000 tons for this project).
South Para reservoir	250,000	54,000	—	Decreased expenditure due mainly to extremely wet winter hampering operations. The project is at the stage where practically all work is in the bed of the stream.
Other works	300,000	—	87,200	
Adelaide sewers— Treatment works extensions, Port Adelaide	60,000	—	700	
Pumping stations—Actil, Glenelg, Queensbury, Port Adelaide, Woodville Gardens North	36,500	34,700	—	Actil and Woodville Gardens North pumping stations not to be proceeded with. A larger gravitational scheme for Woodville North and Wingfield has been developed which dispenses with the necessity for these pumping stations. Contracts let for Glenelg, Queensbury, and Port Adelaide Stations, but shortage of manpower and materials forced contractors to delay the work.
Other works	336,000	14,600	—	
Country water districts— Southern	175,400	82,000	—	Shortage of manpower and essential materials.
Northern— Clare water supply	22,900	—	16,600	
Jamestown-Caltowie	107,000	102,800	—	The first pipes for this project are being manufactured at the present time, as supplies of Australian steel were not available earlier.
Other works	42,200	17,700	—	
Western	2,500	2,100	—	

SUMMARY OF LOAN WORKS, 1950-51—PROVISION AND EXPENDITURE—*continued.*
ENGINEERING AND WATER SUPPLY DEPARTMENT—*continued.*

Undertaking.	Voted. £	Un- expended. £	Over- expended. £	Remarks.
Barossa Water District—				
South Para reservoir	50,000	27,600	—	See remarks under Loan Works, Adelaide Water District, for this project.
Other works	30,000	18,800	—	
Beetaloo Water District—				
Service reservoirs and tanks—Keilli, Birds Hill, Caltowie, Kulpara, Fullers Hill, Ardrossan, Paskeville, hundred of Barunga	62,000	7,670	—	Shortage of steel and manpower have delayed the construction of all concrete tanks. The extremely wet winter has hampered construction of the Paskeville dam very much. No steel has yet been made available by the B.H.P. for this work, and no indication can be given when it will be supplied.
Bundaleer trunk main	162,000	161,900	—	
Other works	158,000	54,200	—	
Tod River Water District—				
Uley-Wanilla water supply	220,000	—	700	Shortage of labour and of essential materials. Shortage of labour and of essential materials.
Mains and services	43,650	850	—	
Other works	36,350	12,550	—	
Warren Water District—				
Auburn water supply	18,000	—	9,200	
Other works	62,000	22,700	—	
Water conservation—				
County Buxton—Tanks	42,500	41,300	—	Lack of essential materials has precluded any work on this project.
Other works	2,500	1,500	—	
River Murray weirs, dams, etc.	116,000	56,000	—	Amount called up by River Murray Commission depending on work in all States.
Metropolitan floodwaters	1,500	1,500	—	
Glanville pipeworks	5,500	600	—	
Engineering and Water Supply—Plant, machinery, etc.	750,000	—	504,500	This is a new account and the expenditure for the year includes £768,961 actually expended prior to 1950-51 and transferred from other accounts.

SUMMARY OF LOAN WORKS, 1950-51—PROVISION AND EXPENDITURE—continued.

ARCHITECT-IN-CHIEF'S DEPARTMENT.

Total provision	£1,314,050
Total expended	£933,345
Total net unexpended	£380,705

	Voted. £	Un- expended. £	Over- expended. £	Remarks.
Hospital buildings—				
New nurses block—R.A.H.	50,000	7,913	—	Work held up through shortage of materials, particularly cement.
New boiler house—R.A.H.	16,000	1,758	—	Work held up through shortage of materials, particularly cement and steel.
Western Districts Hospital	50,000	12,392	—	Progress delayed through alterations in plans, wet weather, and material shortages.
New female block—Parkside	12,000	12,000	—	Work not commenced account of delay in plans. Tenders now called.
New nurses home—Parkside	15,000	4,923	—	Project held up through shortage of steel and cement.
Other projects, additions, etc.	207,000	140,529	—	This comprises a large number of small projects on which work has been held up through slow progress by contractors, inability to let contracts, shortage of material, and changes in design by departments concerned.
	£350,000	£179,515	—	
School buildings—				
Infant schools	25,600	18,623	—	See also portable buildings.
Primary schools—New schools	24,000	—	587	Substantial progress on Ascot Park, Forbes, and Hendon. Mitcham not commenced.
Technical schools	43,480	—	14,449	Better progress than anticipated on Norwood, Nailsworth, and Adelaide Technical College.
Area schools	16,370	16,109	—	Major portion is for Allendale East. Contract let later than anticipated, work not commenced.

SUMMARY OF LOAN WORKS, 1950-51—PROVISION AND EXPENDITURE—*continued.*ARCHITECT-IN-CHIEF'S DEPARTMENT—*continued.*

	Voted. £	Un- expended. £	Over- expended. £	Remarks.
School buildings— <i>continued.</i>				
High schools	87,220	8,251	—	See also portable schools.
Portable buildings	150,000	—	44,385	Portable buildings substituted in many cases for other types for quick erection.
Factory for prefabricated classrooms	60,000	44,629	—	Progress of contractor delayed through shortage of material. Private architect.
Urgent accommodation	36,000	—	12,322	Programme not known when estimates prepared. Special urgent jobs.
Residences	102,500	—	27,127	Residences purchased as available, including from Housing Trust in lieu of contracts.
Other projects	139,880	93,607	—	Difficulty in letting contracts, particularly in country areas, material shortages.
	<u>£685,050</u>	<u>£181,219</u>	<u>£98,870</u>	
Net unexpended, £82,349.				
Police and Court House buildings	77,000	29,670	—	Slow progress by contractors through shortage of material.
Agricultural College	32,000	30,663	—	Cheese factory project abandoned. Staff block held in abeyance. Tenders called for residences but prices too high; now being erected by Housing Trust. Chemical laboratory not commenced.
Other Government buildings	170,000	58,508	—	Inability to get tenders, slow progress on contracts, and non-arrival of prefabricated buildings from England.
Totals	<u>£1,314,050</u>	<u>£479,575</u>	<u>£98,870</u>	
Total net unexpended, £380,705.				

SUPERPHOSPHATE ALLOCATIONS.

Mr. PEARSON—Some doubt exists in the minds of superphosphate users as regards allocations of superphosphate for next year. They also desire to know whether the percentage of water soluble content of superphosphate will be reduced, thereby lessening the reduction in allocations, or whether the present 48 per cent will be maintained. Can the Minister of Agriculture say what is likely to be the position as regards allocations in South Australia generally, both on the mainland and Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—Fertilizer Sales Limited has advised me that it is not the superphosphate companies' intention to reduce the water soluble content in superphosphate for the coming season, and that as a result there will be rationing and a reduction in quotas. I have received the following report:—

Advice has been received from Fertilizer Sales Limited that arrangements in connection with superphosphate quotas for the 1951-52 season have now been finalized and they have prepared a rationing plan. They point out that the necessity for a continuance of rationing is regretted but unavoidable, and the only solution to the present difficult position would have been to have altered the analysis of superphosphate to provide a considerably increased tonnage for allocation. The manufacturers' aim has been to make the greatest possible tonnage available to farmers by way of quota, and for this reason, the tonnage set aside to provide for allotments for new properties on which no quota exists and for soldier settlement projects is limited. On the mainland, farmers who purchased up to five tons in the 1950-51 season will be entitled to the same quota for the 1951-52 season. Purchasers of over five tons in 1950-51 will be entitled to a 1951-52 quota based on a reduction of approximately 15 per cent on the tonnage purchased during the past season. On Eyre Peninsula, the total tonnage that can be produced for the 1951-52 season is dependent, to a considerable extent, on deliveries moving early, *i.e.*, from the 1st October onwards, owing to limitation of storage space. Fertilizer Sales Limited are seeking the co-operation of farmers in the direction of taking delivery of at least one-third of their supplies any time between October 1 and December 31, and, under this arrangement, they hope it will be possible to supply farmers in this group with the same tonnage as they had last season, subject to there being no further deterioration in the supply position.

PUBLIC SERVICE RETRENCHMENT.

Mr. RICHES—Some consternation has been caused amongst some public servants in my district at the announcement of retrenchments as part of the Federal Government's policy, and reports received of retrenchments in the Victorian Public Service following upon a

reduction of the amounts allowed to the States by the Loan Council. Did the Treasurer support the cuts in the Loan programme at the Loan council meeting, can he say how the reductions in borrowings will affect South Australia, and whether any of our loan works will be curtailed or postponed? Is an officer of the South Australian Government in Germany, or elsewhere on the Continent, seeking labour for the Public Service?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The two cuts mentioned must be viewed from different angles. I understand the Victorian suggested dismissals are due to the Victorian Government having planned heavy expenditure upon equipment, which is now coming to hand. Possibly that could not be included in the Loan programme this year. I understand the Commonwealth dismissals are based on an attempt to halt inflation by setting a good example. Be that as it may, the overall Loan programme of all States is very much in excess of last year's programme. The amount provided for this State is nearly £10,000,000 more than was provided last year. I think it is essential to look at the problem in that way. It will not be necessary for the South Australian Government to make any retrenchments in the Public Service. It is true that we are so short of labour in some of our departments that we are trying to get people from overseas to assist us, in transportation departments particularly. I can give the honourable member the assurance that it is not the intention of the Government to make any retrenchments in the Public Service.

Mr. RICHES—Will any Loan works be postponed?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—When I introduced the Loan programme I informed members that it was an overall programme and that even if we had the money it would not be physically possible to carry out all the work involved, and that we would carry out the most urgent works for which we could obtain materials and labour, and that will be the position. I said then that we did not have the labour to do some of the works set out in the programme, but that I wanted approval so that we could go ahead with them as opportunity offered.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I understand a number of technicians in the Postmaster-General's Department are being dismissed. Some time ago a recruiting drive to bring out certain personnel from England to work as technicians in that department was announced. I am

told that a number of those technicians have arrived and are under a guarantee of employment for two years. I understand that a number of technicians trained in South Australia are being dismissed—some with many years of service and others with service of a shorter duration. Can the Treasurer say whether these reports are correct, or if not, ascertain their accuracy from the Postmaster-General?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—For a number of years the Commonwealth Government has not submitted to the Loan Council any programme for loan works with regard to the Post Office. The funds required for such works have been provided from sources outside the Loan Council. Under those circumstances the honourable member's question does not come within the province of the Loan Council, and therefore I have no knowledge of the matter referred to.

HILTON RAILWAY BRIDGE.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked recently regarding lighting of the Hilton railway bridge?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—As promised I made inquiries and obtained the following information. Under agreements with the various local governing bodies, the Electricity Trust undertakes to supply and maintain all street lighting in the metropolitan area and in the majority of country areas where its supply is available. In the case of the Hilton bridge, however, the lighting is the responsibility of the corporation of West Torrens. The lighting installation was actually made by the Railways Department to whom the corporation pays a rental for the lighting specified by it and for maintenance. The failure of the lighting on the bridge referred to was due to the fact that the automatic time switch was left out of adjustment on the completion of the usual routine testing. Steps have been taken to avoid a recurrence of this happening.

RESERVOIR AT PARINGA.

Mr. STOTT—Has the Minister of Works anything to report regarding the proposal to construct a reservoir at Paringa, and can he say whether it envisages land being taken from landholders near Pike Creek?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Before any work in that direction can be done it will be necessary to have it approved by the River Murray Waters Commission. Before such approval can

be given preliminary plans will have to be prepared to show what is proposed. Surveys have been made. Much of the land affected would be held under miscellaneous or terminating leases. The River Murray Waters Commission has always been looking for other ways of storing water, and now is the time to do something before it is too late. Mr. Dridan, the South Australian representative on the Commission, is now putting the matter forward in a preliminary way for the consideration of that body.

MANNAHILL PASTORAL LEASES.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Minister of Lands anything further to report regarding the proposal which I understand is under consideration for using for a soil regeneration reserve an area of pastoral land in my electorate which was formerly held under lease by the Westward Ho and Homeward Bound mining companies, together with some other areas?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—This question has been considered. Although I am not able to give the exact date, I can say that in the near future a member of the Pastoral Board, together with the Director of Agriculture, will visit that locality, and a report will be made which I will let the honourable member have.

EGG PRICES.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on September 4 regarding the number of eggs handled by the Egg Board, the number sold in South Australia and the Commonwealth, and the number put to other uses?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—I have asked the chairman of the Egg Board to supply the necessary information, but a reply has not yet come to hand.

BUSH FIRE MENACE.

Mr. HAWKER—In view of the fact that there is likely to be a bush fire danger again this year in many parts of South Australia, can the Minister of Railways assure the House that his department will take every possible precaution to see that the bush fire menace from trains is minimized?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I will be glad to give that assurance. I know that this year the menace will be greater than ever. I also ask owners of properties adjacent to railways to bear in mind that it is not only the obligation of the railways to safeguard their property. Owners have a corresponding responsibility. I believe insurance companies do not

put a surcharge on properties adjacent to railways, which indicates that the menace is no greater there than in any other part of the State. The Railways Commissioner is well aware of the danger and will take every step within his control to avoid fires.

IMPORTED CEMENT CONTAINERS.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Although I do not desire to refer to the current industrial dispute, as it is the subject of an inquiry, I understand the packages containing the shipment of cement on the s.s. *Hai Siu* were of a very inferior quality, as a result of which between 20 per cent and 25 per cent of the total consignment, which was to the State Government, has been lost in the stowing and discharging. Can the Premier say whether the cement lost from that cargo as a result of the faulty packages was covered by any shipping or other form of insurance, or does it constitute a direct loss to the State Government?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The experience of the Government with regard to all shipments of cement, even from Tasmania, is that there are a number of broken bags which constitute a percentage loss. As far as I know, the percentage loss on the ship mentioned has been no greater than on ordinary consignments we have received. I received a report from the Chief Storekeeper, made after three days of unloading, and at that time there had been 38 tons of cement in broken bags; but of that quantity 34 tons had been recovered and was being used by the Harbors Board and he expected a substantial quantity of the four tons not then recovered to be swept up and recovered. Therefore, there has been no more loss in this consignment than is usual with imported cement. Unfortunately, paper bags are not suitable for slinging. That has been our experience with regard to all cement, whether Tasmanian, European, or Japanese. Some firms have brought cement out in steel drums. That has been very expensive, but it obviates any loss whatever. However, probably the overall cost is much greater than if it is brought out in bags and handled as in the case mentioned. Fortunately, the Harbors Board is doing a large amount of work at the site, which enables the effective use of the cement in the broken bags.

PUBLIC WORKS STANDING COMMITTEE ACT.

Mr. STOTT—Some time ago, before the Premier went to the United States I asked him whether the Government would consider increas-

ing the minimum amount specified in the Public Works Standing Committee Act (£30,000) in view of present-day circumstances. He promised to place the matter before Cabinet and confer with the chairman of the committee. Has he any further information to give on the matter?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have not had an opportunity of discussing this matter with the chairman of the committee, and consequently have not taken it to Cabinet. However, I hope to finalize it and be able to give the honourable member a reply next week.

WHYALLA WEST SCHOOL.

Mr. RICHES—Has the Minister of Works been able to obtain a report from the Education Department regarding the possibility of calling for tenders for the erection of the Whyalla West school at an early date?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—That matter was submitted to the Public Works Standing Committee last year, and it has now intimated that the work will be recommended. In anticipation of a formal report coming to hand the Architect-in-Chief and the Director of Education have conferred on the matter. Standard plans will be used, subject only to slight variations in the foundations. We will therefore be able to call for tenders in the near future for that and other schools similarly approved.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—During the discussion on the Loan Estimates I sought certain information from the Minister of Irrigation, for instance, fixing water rates for settlers in irrigation areas who use sprinklers so as to put them on the same footing as new settlers in the Loxton irrigation areas. I also asked what use was made of the £10,000 the Minister said was spent on soldier settlement blocks and if he could get a report on the work done in raising the supply basin at Loveday. The Minister promised to obtain a report. Has he yet received it?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have a report only on the £10,000 that was shown on the Loan Estimates, dealing with the settlement of discharged soldiers from World War I. for the five-year period 1946-47 to 1950-51. As it is lengthy I ask leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without reading it.

Leave granted.

Loan Estimates—Settlement of Discharged Soldiers on the Lands, 1914-18.

The expenditure for the five years 1946-47 to 1950-51 comprised:—

	Reverted Sundry Blocks.	Advances.	Current Account.	Miscellaneous Adjustments	Total.
	£	£	£	£	£
1946-47	3,199	2,919	1,441	7	7,566
1947-48	2,184	3,345	1,373	3	6,905
1948-49	1,812	1,212	1,239	655	4,918
1949-50	1,059	716	1,157	—	2,932
1950-51	1,135	1,328	1,201	61	3,725
	<u>£9,389</u>	<u>£9,520</u>	<u>£6,411</u>	<u>£726</u>	<u>£26,046</u>
	(a)	(b)	(c)		

- (a) Covers expenditure on fencing, water services and supplies, clearing, erection and repairs to structural improvements, etc., on approximately 75 different properties which had been surrendered or cancelled, and subsequently let on temporary tenure. When the occupants are in a position to again assume full responsibility of permanent tenure the blocks are so allotted at valuation. This valuation would take into account all expenditure made by the Crown, but such expenditure would only be charged to the extent to which the property could carry it.
- (b) Mainly for repairs and additions to houses and for reinstatement or replacement of buildings damaged by storm, tempest, or fire. The insurance moneys received are credited to the Loan Account and cost of replacement charged to the Loan Account.
- (c) Mainly for insurance of buildings which, in accordance with the leases, agreements, and mortgages, is effected by the department. The cost is met from the Loan Fund and repayments by lessees or occupiers credited to the Loan Fund.

It has been necessary to include provision for this account on the Loan Estimates since 1916.

**PASSENGER BOOKINGS ON PORT PIRIE-
ADELAIDE TRAIN.**

Mr. RICHES—Has the Minister of Railways a reply to the question I asked on August 30 about a request from Whyalla that passengers on the bus service from Whyalla to Port Pirie be enabled to make bookings on the train from Port Pirie to Adelaide?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I have received the following report from the Railways Commissioner:—

There would be no insuperable difficulty in applying the proposal for the Whyalla passengers if the problem were limited to Whyalla passengers only. The procedure would be for every passenger to be prepared to meet the cost of the seat reservation fee, and the charges for the through journey would be increased accordingly. The proprietor would necessarily have to telegraph Port Pirie the number of passengers joining at Port Pirie each day, in sufficient time for the reservations to be effected. It will be appreciated, however, that such reservations could not be confined to Whyalla passengers only, and if the privilege were given to Whyalla passengers it could not be reasonably withheld from all passengers—(a) *ex* stations Alice Springs to Quorn, inclusive; (b) *ex* Port Augusta and stations to Port Germein, inclusive; (c) *ex* Pimba, Rocket Range; (d) from road bus service *ex* Commonwealth train, and it would be quite impracticable to make the necessary arrangement for these various routes.

That is, unfortunately, not the greatest difficulty, for the report continues:—

It must be pointed out that certain people at Port Pirie are somewhat difficult to handle. We have previously experienced trouble when reservations, on special occasions, have been made for a number of passengers the seats having been usurped by local passengers from Port Pirie who refused to vacate same, resulting in a very unsatisfactory situation. The number of passengers arriving at Port Pirie by road bus varies considerably. Experience has shown it would not be satisfactory to lock one car for the purpose as, quite frequently, the bus is very lightly loaded, whilst on other occasions there would be insufficient accommodation in the car so reserved.

Although the Railways Commissioner agrees in principle with the honourable member and me that it would be desirable to grant the request, unfortunately the circumstances do not make it feasible.

RIVER TORRENS DRAINAGE SCHEME.

Mr. WHITTLE (on notice)—

1. What are the respective amounts paid annually by all municipal councils affected by the River Torrens drainage scheme?

2. Is the Minister of Works aware of the protests that have been made by a number of councils regarding anomalies in the original first schedule of the 1935 Act upon which these amounts are based?

3. In view of the great development that has since taken place, is it the intention of the Minister to cause an inquiry to be held, as provided in clause 18 of the Act, to make the amounts payable by all councils just and equitable?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The replies are:—

1. Under Part I.

	£
Adelaide corporation	1,235
St. Peters corporation	824
Kensington and Norwood corpora- tion	824
Prospect corporation	137
Burnside corporation	412
Walkerville district council	229
Enfield district council	275
Payneham district council	275
Campbelltown district council	366

Total £4,577

Under Part II.

	£
Henley and Grange corporation	1,510
Thebarton corporation	321
Woodville corporation	1,236
West Torrens corporation	1,510

Total £4,577

2. The Prospect council, which pays the lowest amount of any contributing body, recently requested a revision of the apportionment of charges, but no other council made a similar request.

3. The apportionment of annual charges was decided upon after a careful and very thorough review by the Public Works Standing Committee and accepted by Parliament, and it is not considered that any inquiry under section 18 of the Act could result in an alternative basis being adopted that would be regarded by all councils as being more "just and equitable."

FORESTRY BOARD AGENTS.

Mr. MOIR (on notice)—

1. Have Forestry Board agents at Mount Gambier and in other forest areas authority to appoint agents in Adelaide without the approval of the Forestry Board and the Minister?

2. Are the extra costs involved by such appointments passed on to the purchasers of fruit and jam cases?

3. Is the Treasurer aware that some contracts have been entered into for the export of fruit and jams, including cases?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. The Forestry Board has no agents at Mount Gambier, other forest areas, or in Adelaide, in connection with the department's timber or case business.

2. This question is answered by No. 1 above.

3. The department has no knowledge of the contracts referred to.

ARGENTINE ANT.

Mr. HAWKER (on notice)—

1. Has the Government full power under existing legislation to deal with the Argentine ant, if found in South Australia?

2. If not, does the Government intend to introduce the necessary measures?

3. Is the danger of introduction of this pest by air being watched?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—The replies are:—

1. and 2. Yes. Power resides in the Vine Fruit and Vegetable Protection Act.

3. Yes. All commercial plant material arriving by air is subject to searching inspection before release. Search of all passengers' luggage is not possible, but airways officials are aware of restrictions on entry of fruit, plants, etc., and are fully co-operative. Publicity measures designed to educate the travelling public in regard to the illegality and dangers to casual plant and fruit introductions are being intensified by means of a special fund of £15,000 jointly established by the Commonwealth and State Governments.

HOUSING TRUST HOMES PURCHASE AGREEMENTS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (on notice)—

1. Is the Treasurer aware that the South Australian Housing Trust provides agreements between home purchasers and the trust to purchase homes?

2. If so, do these agreements state that the purchaser shall pay a sum of £4 per centum per annum on the loan?

3. How many agreements are in existence?

4. Over what period has the trust been arranging such agreements?

5. What number of applications are under consideration at the present time?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. Yes. Timber-frame houses have, to a limited extent, been sold by the South Australian Housing Trust upon agreement for sale.

and purchase for the reason that valuations generally placed upon timber-frame houses by lending institutions are such that, in instances, purchasers who are otherwise suitable and can pay reasonably large deposits have not been able to find sufficient to bridge the gap between the purchase price and the amount which would be advanced on mortgage of timber-frame houses. However, the general practice of the trust is that, where a house is sold, the purchase is financed by the purchaser usually by means of a deposit and a mortgage loan.

2. Yes.

3. 159.

4. Since July, 1949.

5. Seven (7).

TRESPASSING ON LAND BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 23. Page 422.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Frome—Leader of the Opposition)—This Bill, although short, deals with an important matter, and the House has had ample time to consider it. I regret that this type of legislation has become necessary in recent years, because I think the offences it is designed to control are committed by comparatively few people. It will be another case of the innocent majority suffering because a few are not prepared to recognize peoples' property rights, but I agree that we must afford protection to landholders, particularly those with properties adjacent to public roads, from damage that may be occasioned by the unnecessary trespassing of mushroomers into paddocks where sheep, especially lambing ewes, may be grazing. There is another aspect of the question: probably all landholders are not as co-operative as they might be with the mushrooming public. After all, the trend of modern society is to congregate large numbers of people in big towns where their connection with the land is irrevocably severed, and, apart from going down the street and purchasing mushrooms at high prices, their only opportunity of getting them is to traverse the countryside on Saturday or Sunday afternoons and endeavour to pick a few for themselves. With modern transport the opportunity is given to increasing numbers to participate in this kind of "sport." The food value of mushrooms, however, is hardly commensurate with the labour involved. If landowners showed a little co-operation I feel that some of the difficulties associated with the problem might be overcome and that it would be

easier for the law to be administered in relation to those who undoubtedly are offensive and do not show a proper respect for other people's property. The Bill repeals the old Act and makes a new Statute altogether.

I have perused some of the legislation of other States. Although some have no specific provision to deal with mushroomers there are general provisions relating to land trespass. I feel that people will not be severely treated, even under our legislation. The Minister, in introducing the Bill, gave insufficient reasons why cattle were included in its protective provisions. Formerly it was an offence to enter property where sheep were grazing, provided a notice was exhibited on the fence or on the property to that effect, but under the Bill it will be an offence to enter property where sheep or cattle are grazing. The provision which requires a notice to be exhibited is to be dispensed with. I have no great objection to that because it must be obvious to anybody whether sheep or cattle are grazing. However, I cannot understand why we should protect cattle from the invasions of mushroomers. From my experience with cattle I think it would be more necessary to protect the mushroomers.

The Hon. Sir George Jenkins—Many wild cattle are brought down from the north and if they are disturbed they are liable to jump over fences.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I have had experience with wild cattle from the north. Some of them might jump fences, but I think it is more likely that people would jump them. It is unnecessary to include cattle in the Bill. If we make it as wide as that we will close the whole of the areas reasonably adjacent to the metropolitan area to the mushrooming fraternity because there will not be many paddocks where sheep or cattle are not grazing. We should hesitate before dispossessing people of this sport. Later I intend to move that "cattle" be deleted from the Bill. The other provisions are reasonable. It is only right that a trespasser should give his name to a property owner or some person in his employment. If any "sticky" or "busy" impersonates the owner and causes inconvenience to others, he should be punished. This is a new offence created under the Bill. In the main it merits support of the House.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—As the Leader of the Opposition has indicated his support I feel that he accepts the principle, which I believe all members should, that the

owner of a property has some rights in it. After all, the people who cause the bother might bring a lot of trouble upon ordinary decent citizens and restrict their activities. I do not think Mr. O'Halloran will be perturbed about the decent citizen who does not make it his business to go out every Saturday or Sunday and help himself to a landowner's mushrooms. Some people do not worry whether a landowner has lambing ewes or calving cows or any other stock which might be disturbed, such as mares in foal. Blood-stock stud farms are scattered throughout the State and breeders would not welcome intruders disturbing the mares and foals. A most valuable foal could suffer fatal injury if some hoodlum threw a stick or stone at it. This Bill has no bearing on the law-abiding citizen because he is not a trespasser. It deals only with the person who does not respect another man's property. If I had the opportunity I would like to quote from some books I have read on the early history of the Old Country where extreme game laws were invoked to protect the rights of property owners. The penalties in the Bill do not go so far as the hanging and deportation which took place in England in the Middle Ages. I wonder whether the definition in the Bill goes far enough. The Leader of the Opposition said that the harmless mushroomer is not the only person concerned in trespassing on land. The trespasser with a gun in his hand can destroy valuable stock. I know that such a case can be dealt with under common law, but perhaps it could be covered by the definition. There are people who want to cross land in order to get to mushrooms or to shoot a rabbit in another paddock. It is customary in my district for landowners to spell areas, and it is well-known that mushrooms are found only on land which has been idle for some time and where stock have been allowed to run. In order to get to those paddocks and collect mushrooms some people have no hesitation in going across standing crops. Anybody who enters another man's property without permission is a trespasser. The Bill gives the owners of properties some rights which at present they have difficulty in getting under common law. This is a good piece of legislation and I support it. I would go so far as to widen the definition and include in it areas under crop. If a man and his family want to collect mushrooms and seek permission to do so they will find the owner of the land in most cases co-operative. If it is considered fair to allow mushrooms to be collected from any

paddock, commercial growers of mushrooms will be in trouble. If we allow people to enter any property to collect mushrooms we will be well on the way to allowing people to enter land without permission to collect other things, and some may not be too picky about what they take.

Mr. Davis—Where will people get their mushrooms?

Mr. SHANNON—From shops, and they will find it much cheaper, after taking into account the cost of petrol and wear and tear on tyres.

Mr. Davis—Have you never had the pleasure of collecting mushrooms?

Mr. SHANNON—Yes. I am told that there are some people who get a thrill in getting something for nothing. The average man who goes to the races and has a wager on a horse gets a thrill when it wins because he thinks he is getting something for nothing, and I suggest that the same psychological reaction occurs in people who gather mushrooms on other people's property.

Mr. O'Halloran—You do not suggest that all people who do that are thieves?

Mr. SHANNON—No. If the owner of land is approached in the proper way he will in most instances permit people to collect mushrooms on his property, but we must consider whether it is not desirable to protect owners of land from unauthorized persons who create a nuisance. A man has the right to enjoy the use of his property without unnecessary interference. Some people cannot go on to land and see an animal without wanting to throw a stone at it. The owners of animals, because of this, should be protected, and the Bill gives them that protection. I am prepared to listen to any argument which proves that we are going beyond the reasonable protection of owners' properties, but if it is agreed that we should protect them then I think we are doing the right thing.

Mr. GOLDNEY (Gouger)—In my district for many years mushroomers have caused much trouble in the autumn, particularly in fields where sheep and young lambs have been grazing. Many prosecutions have been launched against trespassers, but often they have been dismissed because the owners have been unable to prove that actual damage has been done, although they knew that there had been damage. Mushroomers are definitely trespassers who take something belonging to the owner of the property. Many owners, if approached in a reasonable way, and if there is no likelihood of any damage to stock, readily

give permission to mushroomers to enter their property. However, many trespassers are very arrogant and when spoken to tell the owner to go somewhere. Such landowners have every right to feel annoyed. If asked to leave, a trespasser may go out on to the road and re-enter the property immediately the owner's back is turned. This has been the experience over many years of property owners in an area within about 25 miles north-west of Adelaide on the Port Wakefield Road. Not only do trespassers gather mushrooms; they also carry firearms which they use indiscriminately, thereby causing much trouble. Around Lower Light and Dublin people travelling along the Port Wakefield Road shoot indiscriminately into the fields as they pass.

Mr. Fred Walsh—That is a breach of another law.

Mr. GOLDNEY—The difficulty is to catch them. This practice causes considerable danger as well as concern to landowners, particularly when high-powered rifles are used. I have had many complaints from constituents regarding trespassing. The time has come when some more determined effort must be made to put an end to this practice. Many mushroomers are decent people who, if they knew there were sheep and young lambs about, would not disturb them. However, others are not so thoughtful, and they spoil it for the rest. This measure will give a certain measure of security to owners of sheep, lambs, and cattle. I support the second reading.

Mr. BROOKMAN (Alexandra)—I support the second reading. Although I may support one or two amendments in Committee, I think that in general the Bill has been drawn up very well. It deals chiefly with the problem of mushroomers. I agree with other speakers that, if mushroomers asked to be allowed on to a property, in almost every case permission would be granted. I have never been refused permission to go on to farmland. Not only would farmers allow mushroomers to enter their property, but they would probably offer valuable assistance by indicating where mushrooms might be found, thus saving mushroomers much time. I know of one landowner living near a large country town who finds that during the lambing season his sheep are continually being driven around the paddocks by parties of mushroomers. On one occasion more than a dozen parties entered his lambing paddock in one afternoon. That would mean disturbance by several dozens of people.

The Hon. S. W. Jeffries—What steps did he take to prevent that?

Mr. BROOKMAN—I do not know, but he told me he felt quite helpless to prevent it. His sheep were being driven round in different directions. The stock suffering most from this type of disturbance are lambing ewes. The ewe and lamb, if disturbed at certain times, will probably become separated and not link up again. At times the mother instinct of the ewe is not very strong. It varies with the breed, the age, and condition of the sheep, and is also affected by any disturbance. If separated, the lamb will either survive as a miserable skeleton or die. Even lambs of about two months old may be fairly easily weaned, after being separated from their mothers. Even if weaning does not occur, it is quite obvious that no good can come to a lambing flock which is continually disturbed.

Another type of intruder on farming properties would be worse than the mushroomers, if in greater numbers. In my district many spotlight parties descend on farms at night without any warning to the landowner. There is considerable evidence that some of these parties bring wine and liquor with them. Judging by the fusillade of shots to be heard, they do a good deal of indiscriminate firing. Not many landowners are game to ask them their business and order them away. The damage is not usually caused by the shooting but rather by the disturbing of stock. In Committee I shall be glad to hear members' amendments. The widening of the ambit of the Bill to cover crops should be considered.

Mr. HAWKER (Burra)—I support the measure, but why should this legislation be necessary? As the Minister pointed out, an unauthorized loiterer in a back garden could be charged with being a rogue and a vagabond. Surely the man who wanders across broad acres which are private property should not be allowed to do so without let or hindrance. There has always been a Trespassers Act, but damage has had to be proved before anything could be claimed from the trespasser. He may be asked to leave, and if he does so quietly, no action may be taken against him. However, there is nothing to prevent his re-entering the property after the owner's back is turned. The Leader of the Opposition said that most of the damage was caused through ignorance. We are now more of an industrial than a primary producing State, and that city people do not understand that

indirect damage may be done by walking through a paddock in which lambing ewes or dairy cattle are grazing. I do not agree with Mr. O'Halloran that paddocks in which cattle are grazing should be exempt from the provisions of the Bill, because considerable damage may be done by a party of 20 or 30 people entering a paddock in which dairy cattle are grazing. I have never known an owner to refuse permission to enter his property to a reasonable man who realized the damage which may be done by disturbing stock. Mushrooms grow best on land which has been topdressed. If the owner has topdressed land he has done much towards making good mushrooms grow. I was informed that under the existing Act a prosecution was launched but the defendant was not convicted because it was shown that, although the necessary notice was on the land and the field was fully enclosed, he could not see the sheep from his position. I do not vouch for the accuracy of those facts and I found it impossible to confirm them, but I hope the Minister will look into this aspect. I have spoken to a lawyer and to the Parliamentary Draftsman about this matter and they considered the fact that the sheep were out of sight of the trespasser would not be a good defence. However, I ask the Minister to take up this matter to see if there is any loophole.

Mr. O'Halloran—The trespasser would not be doing any harm if the sheep were over a rise because the sheep could not see him.

Mr. HAWKER—I agree, but that is a poor defence because he might go farther into the paddock. I do not know of any owners refusing reasonable people access to their properties. As long as any mushroomer respects the rights of the landowner he never has any trouble. The provisions of this Bill will not jeopardize the rights of any reasonable person. I am sure that landowners will allow mushroomers to enter their paddocks on request. It would be absurd to provide that a person seeking permission to enter a paddock was trespassing. The Bill fulfils a long-felt want. I would not agree to "cattle" being eliminated from the definition of enclosed field.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River)—The provisions of this Bill are necessary. I do not agree with the Leader of the Opposition that they are too drastic. On the contrary, I feel they do not go far enough. I do not see why a landowner in the country should not have

the right to expel trespassers from his property whilst people in the city with much smaller properties have that right.

Mr. O'Halloran—Hasn't he that right now?

Mr. HEASLIP—No. I know of a case in which a landowner could not take action against a person trespassing on a property in which there were lambing ewes. That is why this Bill is necessary.

Mr. O'Halloran—What section of the Police Act excludes country lands from the provision you mentioned?

Mr. HEASLIP—In his second reading speech the Minister stated:—

At present there are two Acts which deal with this matter. One is the Police Act which declares that any person who is in or upon certain specified types of land or premises without lawful excuse or for an unlawful purpose shall be a rogue and a vagabond and liable to six months' imprisonment. Having regard to the types of premises mentioned in the Act, the courts would very probably hold that it did not apply to such areas.

Mr. O'Halloran—Has the court ever held that?

Mr. HEASLIP—The Bill was introduced because last year there were many cases in which landholders could not obtain a conviction under either of the two Acts mentioned by the Minister. It has been suggested that there is no need for this Bill, but there is a real need for it, so I support it. However, it will apply only to certain areas. I do not see why a landowner in an area which has not been proclaimed should not have the right to get rid of trespassers. Every landholder should have that right. Further, the interpretation of an enclosed field states "enclosed by fences, hedges, or walls and has sheep or cattle grazing thereon." The field may be totally enclosed but unless sheep or cattle are grazing on it the landowner will have no right to eject trespassers. He may have a paddock with valuable tomatoes or peas growing on it, but he will not have the right to eject people.

Mr. O'Halloran—Tell that to the marines!

Mr. HEASLIP—He cannot eject them unless he can prove they are damaging his crop. I agree that the actions of certain mushroomers brought about the introduction of this Bill, but other people damage properties. Most landholders welcome spotlight shooters, but I have had unpleasant experiences of them. Sometimes they have liquor with them and I have known them to come within 200 or 300yds. of my home and shine the spotlights on the windows, thereby alarming the womenfolk. On one occasion I went out to meet them and the

spotlight was turned on me. I felt most uncomfortable because I knew the men had guns, but I could not see them. I realize that the majority of spotlights are doing a good job by destroying foxes, but they should be required to ask permission of the landowner before invading his property. We hear much today about the need for increased production. People trespassing in fields where there are ewes and lambs bring about a considerable loss of production. I support the Bill, and will also support any move in Committee to widen the definition of an enclosed field.

Mr. MICHAEL (Light)—I support the Bill. I have no doubt that it was introduced as a result of the actions of mushroomers in certain parts of the State. The great majority of them do not intend to do any harm, but through ignorance or lack of courtesy much damage has been done. The Bill gives landowners a right to which they are entitled. As some members have stated, the owners of property in the city now have that right. It is not asking too much of people to get permission before entering a field. In most cases it would be granted unconditionally, or the owner would say which paddocks they could enter. So many people now have motor cars and can get into country districts that the possibility of damage by mushroomers is much greater. People from the city may not understand conditions in the country and thereby cause damage unwittingly. Few people wilfully harm stock. It has been suggested by members opposite that this legislation is an infringement of the rights of people who do not happen to own land, but it provides only what a landholder has a right to expect. If it were considered that there was a danger of the law being carried too far, I think the position would be met by clause 3, which says that the Act shall apply only within such parts of the State as are specified by proclamation. I shall not support the proposal of the Leader of the Opposition regarding cattle. Damage can be done to cattle when grazing in a paddock, particularly if they are finely bred animals, which are highly strung and can be easily upset by a stranger appearing among them. I would be prepared to support the inclusion of growing crops, because people could do much damage to them by trespassing. Often such damage is done thoughtlessly. Rather than restrict the operation of the measure I would be inclined to widen it.

Mr. FRED WALSH (Thebarton)—I support the second reading, but am not happy about

certain aspects of the Bill. Its most important part relates to the protection of lambing ewes that are subject to disturbance during the mushrooming season. Mr. Shannon said that it was not a question of mushroomers only, but of trespassers generally. However, I think it will be agreed that the legislation is aimed at mushroomers. In moving the second reading the Minister of Agriculture said—

It is common knowledge that in recent years trespassers, mainly persons in search of mushrooms on other people's land, have become so numerous and enterprising that in order to protect himself fully a landowner would have to put up not one, but a number of notices There is no doubt that a section of the public has allowed its enthusiasm for mushrooming to outweigh its respect for the rights and property of landowners, and some more stringent measures than have been taken in the past are now necessary.

That indicates it is purely the mushroomers that the legislation seeks to control. Just what is a mushroomer? He is a person who is commonly known to us as an enthusiast in the collecting of mushrooms, not so much because he likes to eat them but because of the pleasure associated with gathering them. He probably takes his family for an outing on a Saturday or Sunday and if they get more than sufficient for their own requirements they pass some on to friends. I have frequently collected mushrooms and as a result of my experience knew many good spots. Although I have been refused admission to some properties, I respected the landowner's rights. There have been occasions when I have gone on land without asking permission, but have always been particularly careful that I did not disturb any sheep or lambing ewes. I appreciate what has been said about the protection of property where sheep are grazing during the lambing season, but I am not prepared to extend the same protection to the off-season when sheep are not affected by being disturbed. I do not think a person of ordinary intelligence would go into a paddock and deliberately chase sheep, although children might do so. However, this legislation is not aimed at children, but at adults. It is provided that similar protection is to be given to cattle as to sheep. What harm can be done to cattle by people trespassing on a property looking for mushrooms? The inclusion of cattle suggests to me that there is someone other than the small landholders behind the measure. The people mainly concerned with cattle grazing are the big pastoral companies which own grazing property near the abattoirs and at Dry Creek. The

Minister did not say much about the outlying parts of the State, but referred mainly to the Adelaide plains. There would be no harm in people walking among the cattle near the abattoirs looking for mushrooms, as in any case the cattle would be killed within a day or two.

Mr. O'Halloran—A proclamation issued under existing legislation applies only to land within 50 miles of the G.P.O.

Mr. FRED WALSH—That would negate some of the argument raised by honourable members opposite. To me the Bill savours of class legislation.

Mr. Davis—What is wrong with workers collecting a few mushrooms?

Mr. FRED WALSH—Those who collect mushrooms comprise a cross-section of the community and would not include only workers. Subclause (2) of clause 4 provides:—

An area shall be deemed to be enclosed by fences, hedges, or walls, notwithstanding any gap or break in such fences, hedges, or walls. If there are any breaks it is obvious the land is not intended to be used for grazing alone.

Mr. Heaslip—In that case all that is necessary is for someone to leave a gate open and the Act would not apply.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Where that was done it would be an offence.

Mr. Heaslip—It is done.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Anyone who did that would not have my sympathy. We know that some fences are incapable of keeping stock within a paddock because of the negligence of the owner, and often cattle wander on to the roadside. More than once I have narrowly missed horses or cattle on the roads in the metropolitan area when driving a car at night because they had escaped through a broken fence. Another aspect of the Bill I do not like is that if a person enters upon land he is required to give his name and address on demand by the owner or occupier or an employee. It might be some simple yokel who could not write his own name and address, yet a person would be required to give his name and address to him, and if he refused would be liable to a fine of up to £20. As is indicated by press reports of court proceedings, some far more serious offences bring a much lower fine. The House is asked to increase the penalty for one offence from £5, which has been operating for many years, to a maximum of £20, and for another offence up to £40. That is out of all proportion to the nature of the offence. We should endeavour

to make the penalty fit the crime. Mr. Shannon mentioned what had happened many years ago in England. Perhaps some of our forefathers could be traced as being amongst persons who were deported to Australia for stealing a rabbit or for being on a property for that purpose. Another most serious aspect is the question of onus of proof. We have heard much about that in the last few weeks. Members of the Labor Party are strongly opposed to the provisions contained in the Communist Party (Dissolution) Bill as regards the onus of proof being thrown on defendants. That principle appears in clause 9 (b) of the Bill, which states—

The entry by the defendant upon any enclosed field in respect of which it is alleged that an offence has been committed by the defendant shall be deemed to be unlawful in the absence of proof to the contrary.

It is not the owner of a property who is required to prove any charge.

The Hon. Sir George Jenkins—All it means is that a man must show why he is on a property.

Mr. FRED WALSH—I could be walking past a property and the owner could allege that he had seen me on it. I hope that the provision will be either withdrawn or amended, and that the penalty clauses will be reviewed.

Mr. PATTINSON (Glenelg)—I support the second reading. I have had the benefit of placing before the Minister representations made by the Adelaide Plains Landowners' Protection Association, and this Bill satisfies its members. I desire particularly to assure the member for Thebarton that, as far as I am aware or can discover, there is nothing sinister in the Bill or anything more behind it than there is in front of it. The honourable member made strong comments on several clauses, as if they were extremely far-reaching and novel, whereas they are neither. They are based on the provisions of a comparatively old Act on our Statute Book. The consolidated Act has been there for nearly 20 years, and the original Act has been in operation for about 40 years. It has been amended on at least half a dozen occasions to my knowledge. I refer to the Animals and Birds Protection Act, which contains similar provisions to those in the Bill. Section 19 of that Act states:—

(1) Every person shall be guilty of an offence against this Act who—

(a) enters or is upon any land other than Crown lands, for the purpose of taking any animal or bird or any eggs of any bird without the permission of the owner or occupier of such land;

That provision is designed to control the activities of bird nesters. It is significant that there is no elaborate definition of "enclosed land" or reference to the presence of breeding ewes or cattle. It says "anybody who enters or is upon any land" of some other person. The section continues:—

- (b) refuses to give his name and address, or gives a false name or address, when lawfully demanded under section 18;
- (c) refuses to quit any land when lawfully required under section 18; or
- (d) re-enters upon any land after having been lawfully required under section 18 to quit the same.

The Bill before us is a copy of legislation that has been on the Statue Book for more than a generation. Mr. Fred Walsh was vehement about the onus of proof provision, but subsection (2) of section 19 of the Act mentioned provides:—

In any proceedings for any offence under this section the onus of proving the permission of the owner or occupier shall lie upon the defendant.

Precisely the same provision appears in this Bill. Mr. Walsh's other objection is that the owner or occupier, or any servant of the owner or occupier, can demand the name and address of a defendant. Section 18 of the Animals and Birds Protection Act states:—

The owner or occupier of any land, or the servants or agent of such owner or occupier, may demand the name and address of any person trespassing upon such land whom he suspects of any offence against this Act, and may require any such trespasser to quit such land. The Act has been before Parliament on numerous occasions, the most recent being in 1938.

Mr. O'Halloran—That Act applies to the whole State.

Mr. PATTINSON—Yes, and any land.

Mr. O'Halloran—This Bill only applies to land that is declared by proclamation.

Mr. PATTINSON—The Bill is much narrower in its ambit in every way than the existing law and will be confined to such areas as are specified by proclamation and further confined to such lands as come within the definition of clause 4.

Mr. O'Halloran—In 1937 the distance was 50 miles from Adelaide.

Mr. PATTINSON—The whole of the provisions of the Trespassing of Land Act, 1928, are repealed by clause 2 of the Bill.

Mr. O'Halloran—It has not been repealed yet.

Mr. PATTINSON—The operation of the Bill, if passed, can be confined to an area within 50 miles of the General Post Office, but in any case it will be restricted to such areas as are specified by the Government by proclamation. There is nothing in the Bill to be alarmed about. I am inclined to agree with some speakers that, in complying with the legitimate requests of an aggrieved section of landowners, namely, those who are members of the Adelaide Plains Landowners' Protection Association who have suffered inconvenience, damage and loss as a result of the incursions of trespassers, particularly mushroomers, the Government has narrowed the ambit of the Bill unnecessarily, and some of the suggestions of the member for Onkaparinga might be taken into consideration in Committee. Its scope could be widened judiciously without doing harm to any section of the public.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

LOANS TO PRODUCERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 16. Page 368.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Frome—Leader of the Opposition)—This Bill amends various sections of the Loans to Producers Act, but most of the amendments are consequential upon the proposed repeal of the section dealing with the establishment of the Loans to Producers Fund and the provision that whatever funds are required in future to service the purposes of this Act shall be provided out of money voted by Parliament for the purpose. The section proposed to be repealed provides that a Loans to Producers Fund should be established and that the Treasurer should place to the credit of that fund a sum not exceeding £100,000 in any year, and that moneys repaid should be placed to the credit of the fund. Unfortunately, we do not know how much money was placed to the credit of the fund in days gone by, nor how much has been repaid and re-invested as part of the Loans to Producers Fund. That is information we should have had before being asked to discuss this matter; not that it makes any real difference to the position, for it appears to me that this legislation is only to legalize something which has existed for a considerable period. Under the Financial

Agreement, whereby State and Commonwealth debts were funded and provision made for their liquidation over a term of years, a new relationship sprang up in regard to the expenditure and control of loan money: it then became necessary for the State each year to furnish to the Loan Council a programme of loan expenditure and, of course, loans to producers had to be included in the total. Repayment of those debts was provided for in the sinking fund arrangements associated with the Financial Agreement, and therefore any special provision for the amortization or repayment of any particular section of the Loan Fund ceased to be necessary. Consequently we have reached the position now when it is proposed to amend the Loans to Producers Act in order to standardize procedure along lines which have, as I understand it, been followed practically ever since the Financial Agreement was ratified. It does not appear that the position of those whom it is intended to benefit will be jeopardized in any way by this measure. As the Minister pointed out in his second reading speech, the limitation of £100,000 was purely arbitrary and ineffective, for Parliament could at any time increase or reduce that amount by appropriation. Now it will devolve upon Parliament to see that sufficient money is made available annually to meet the commitments of the Loans to Producers Fund, so as to assist those entitled to assistance. Consequently I see no reason why we should object to the passing of this legislation but, as I indicated when discussing the Loan Bill some time ago, I think we should have in future more information as to how various loan moneys have been allocated and a clearer picture of loan finances up to the time we are asked to make further appropriations. However, that is beside the point at the moment. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee; Committee's report adopted.

ADVANCES FOR HOMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 23. Page 432.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Goodwood)—I approach this Bill with some diffidence. One is compelled to lend it support though aware that it places a further burden upon the young people of this country, and that it is not very complimentary to the Playford Government and its price control measures, and

certainly not to the Menzies-Fadden Government, which promised to put value back into the pound. In an article in the *News* of Wednesday, September 12, under the heading "Interest Rise? House Loans Hint," it was predicted by one of Adelaide's leading economists that higher interest rates were almost certain. Many ex-servicemen have borrowed £2,000 through the War Service Homes Division, and many others who are not ex-servicemen have borrowed up to £1,500 in order to relieve themselves of the anxiety caused by extremely unsatisfactory living conditions, and this Bill allows home purchasers to increase their mortgage indebtedness by a further £250. The Minister said that this would increase the weekly payments by 2s. 6d. a week for each £100 borrowed. At present, I understand, on a State Bank loan of £1,500 for a 30-year term the monthly payment is £7 12s., plus 3s. insurance, with one-half per cent rebate if payment is made between the first and eighth day of each month, both inclusive. This rebate is the equivalent of about 1d. for every £10 of the loan. In terms of weekly payments it would be £1 15s. 3d., and this will be increased by 5s. 9d. a week, making a total of £2 1s. With the higher council, water and sewerage rates home owning becomes a costly proposition for the purchaser. The monthly instalment on a loan of £1,750 is £8 18s. 4d. With a view to easing the burden I recommend that the term be extended to 42 years. I emphasize this suggestion because the State Bank Board, as at present constituted, endeavours to insist upon a 30-year term, particularly for ex-servicemen. As I have said, the monthly instalment on a £1,500 loan is now £7 12s., plus 3s. insurance. On a £1,750 loan under the extended term it would amount to £7 14s. 9d., plus 3s. insurance, with, of course, the one-half per cent rebate of interest for payment between the first and the eighth of each month. The Minister said that the State Bank is an agent of the Government, and if that is so it is time the Government recommended to the bank that it revert to the 42-year period for the repayment of a loan. This would make the position more in keeping with that under which loans are repaid to the War Service Homes Division. In the latter case the ex-serviceman is asked which period of repayment he prefers, and invariably he selects the longer period. Let us look at the position of the man 40 years of age who buys a house on a 30-year term, and the man 24 years of age who buys one on a 42-year term. The latter has an advantage

of 16 years in age, and he has 12 years more in which to repay the loan. It must not be forgotten that the young man on getting married finds the first 20 years of his married life a period of great financial hardship. If the amount of the advance is increased by £250 there will not be much difference between the repayments on a loan of £1,750 over a 42-year period and the repayment of a £1,500 loan over 30 years: The difference would be about 2s. a month. I do not oppose clause 2, but if the bank is to meet its obligations under the Act its charges will be about 17s. per centum. As indicated by the Minister in his second reading speech, the cost to the bank of advancing money under the Act in the year ended June 30, 1951, was £36,163, and the amount recouped under its commission of 10s. per centum was £21,268, showing a loss to the bank of £14,895. Under the Bill the Auditor-General is to issue a certificate respecting the accounts of the bank, and I would accept that. Clauses 3, 4, 5, and 6 are machinery provisions.

The State Bank has done a splendid job as the agent of the Government in the building of homes for purchase. It has built up an organization and has an experienced staff, which, I believe, see that the best basic materials are used in the construction of homes. The bank has a credit foncier department, about which Parliament knows, but, according to some statements in this House recently, Parliament does not know about all the activities of the Housing Trust. The State Bank has built homes for purchase, but if the trust had gone in more for building houses for letting more would have been built. The Government has seen a way out of its difficulties by passing increased costs on to home builders without in any way trying to prevent costs being increased. On this matter, I shall have more to say when another Bill is discussed. Today we were informed that the trust advances money for the purchase of homes, but only on a certain type upon which other lending institutions will not advance money because of insufficient equity.

Mr. Quirke—What type?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—The timber framed type erected at St. Marys. According to the information given today, that is the only area where the trust will advance money for the purchase of a home.

Mr. Quirke—Is it an inferior type?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—It is not up to the standard of the brick homes built by the State Bank, and it has not in it the same

equity as the house built by the War Service Homes Division. Parliament was not given any information about the activities of the trust in advancing money for the purchase of homes. I do not know whether the trust has anything to hide. The War Service Homes Division charges interest at the rate of 3½ per cent, whereas the trust charges 4 per cent on money it has borrowed on the average at 3½ per cent. The trust should build a type of home upon which other lending institutions will advance money. In the St. Mary's area the trust will advance £1,300 on a house costing £1,800, leaving the purchaser to find the balance. In isolated cases under the power given to it by the Act, the trust can make concessions in the purchase of homes. Clause 7 amends section 42 which deals with the restraint on the power of alienation during the period of mortgage. Subsection 5 of that section states:—

Consent as aforesaid shall not be granted within 10 years after the entry into the contract of sale or the making of an advance, as the case may be, unless it is proved to the satisfaction of the bank that the refusal thereof would inflict great hardship.

According to the Minister's second reading speech the State Bank Board has been advised by the Crown Solicitor that it is not possible to reduce the period of 10 years, and for once I agree with the Crown Solicitor. I would like to know what constitutes a hardship. A number of State Bank homes are being built, but preference in the purchase of them is given to ex-servicemen. If the original purchaser has made improvements to a State Bank home, I do not object to his being compensated on its re-sale for those improvements, provided he has a reasonable proposition to place before the State Bank Board. For instance, he may be transferred by his employer to another State or to a country town. However, because of certain happenings in the building industry today, the deletion of this subsection will help to set up a racket in the sale of homes.

Mr. Quirke—The Bank Board does not have to consent. It is merely given a discretionary power.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Yes. Subsection 3 of section 42 states:—

No purchaser shall transfer or assign his interest in any contract of sale under this Part or under any Act repealed by this Act, except with the consent of the bank thereto in writing, and any transfer or assignment without such consent shall be void and of no effect.

I do not think that subsection alone is sufficient to meet the case I mentioned earlier.

When a loan is granted interest rates cannot be increased until the expiration of 10 years, although the purchaser may benefit from a reduction in interest within that period. Parliament would be well advised to retain subsection (5) of section 42, for we are not yet free from the necessity of housing our people. If ample homes for sale or rental were available, I would not raise this point. I believe that Parliament in introducing the original Bill in 1928, wished the payments to be as low as possible so as to give people the opportunity to purchase their own homes; yet subsection (5) was included. Only today I was told of a person who had borrowed the maximum loan from the War Service Homes Division, who had paid for certain furniture, and who had then found that he could not meet his commitments. The home was sold at a price which included a vacant possession premium of at least £500. In many cases the premium is much greater. The Government should seriously consider instructing the State Bank Board as its agent to make loans available for repayment over a period of 42 years so as to enable young people to meet their commitments. The State Bank Board should continue to be given the opportunity of considering applications for the re-sale of homes within the 10-year period and of interpreting the phrase "great hardship". I support the second reading.

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore)—I support the Bill which will serve the needs of those people for whom the Act was designed. I welcome the increase of £250 in the maximum advance to applicants. That is in keeping with the increasing costs of materials and labour. I also appreciate the proposed amendment of section 42 by striking out subsection (5). From time to time, like some other members, I have been approached by persons who built under this scheme and who, because of prosperity, have been able to liquidate their commitments within 10 years. After having repaid their loan, they have been refused the right of re-sale by virtue of subsection (5) which refers to "great hardship." I agree that that phrase may be hard to interpret, therefore I feel it is better to eliminate it, because subsection (4) of section 42 provides that the State Bank Board shall have the power to agree or disagree to a transfer. In the Address in Reply debate I referred to a man who built a home at Seaton Park with the assistance of an advance of £500 under this Act. Within a few years he was able to repay that loan but was unable to dispose of the property

until the expiration of 10 years. He appealed to the State Bank Board, but his case was rejected. That was most unfair, because special circumstances attached to his case. He had a child suffering from asthma and had been told by a doctor that it would be better for the child to live in the country than near the sea. Following that advice the man sought to buy a country business, and, had the bank agreed to the transfer, he might have purchased a business at Avon where his child would benefit. His case was rejected, because of the board's interpretation of the phrase "great hardship." If subsection (5) is deleted, the way will be clear for the bank to decide on the merits of any case. The member for Goodwood seems to fear that by deleting that subsection opportunities will be created for speculators, but I do not agree with that, because a speculator is a man able to pay cash for a house which he proposes to sell again at a profit. Such a man would not need the assistance provided under this legislation. I support the second reading.

Mr. O'HALLORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

HOMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 23. Page 432.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Goodwood)—The purpose of this Bill, like that of the last before the House, is to permit an advance on homes of up to £1,750, an increase of £250 on present legislation. The Government guarantees that portion of the advance which represents between 70 per cent and 90 per cent of the valuation. In his second reading speech the Minister stated:—

Since the passing of the Act in 1941 until August 8, 1951, a total of 5,536 applications had been approved under the Act.

I should like to know how many advances were made on houses built by the Housing Trust. Further, will the timber-frame houses which are to be imported by the trust come within the ambit of the Act? Will advances be made on those houses up to 90 per cent of valuation or up to 90 per cent of cost, as has been done by the Housing Trust when it suits the trust? I do not know whether advances of up to 90 per cent are made only on homes of solid construction, but I hope the Minister will give all the information I require when he replies. In his second reading speech he also stated:—

There have been increases in the basic wage, some of considerable proportions, and the

inevitable effect of those increases has been to increase the cost of site labour and of building materials.

Little mention was made of the increased cost of building materials, but because the Minister in charge of housing was absent on an important mission when I spoke on these topics some weeks ago it may be as well if I remind Parliament of them. I noticed in the press some time ago that the Matson Line may again send ships to Australia with timber. I hope that the Senator in charge of shipping in another Parliament will support the efforts of our Premier in getting the Matson Line to bring timber to this country. On August 22 I stated:—

Imported timber adds to the cost of home construction today. At the latter end of 1948 timber freight was £15 per standard, the trade name used in the building industry. It really refers to the quantity of timber, measuring 1,980 super feet or, as roughly calculated in the trade, about 2,000 super feet. The latest freight figure obtainable is £62 10s. per standard.

The import freight charges in 1948 were £15 a standard, but they had increased to £62 10s. by the second week in July last. Why did the Minister stress the cost of site labour? That has not risen in proportion to the rise in costs of building materials, particularly imported materials. Further, if the Government had carried out its obligations to the community and not allowed the drift that has taken place the materials used today would not be so costly. Its agent, the South Australian Housing Trust, should have informed the Government of the position, and the tragic happening that occurred in Croydon could have been prevented. The Hoffman kiln there should have been retained. The firm that took it over has not produced an earthenware pipe. The kiln could have produced 100,000 bricks a week for the next 20 years. The Government is now importing cement, despite the resulting hardship and disruption in industry. We have clay deposits as good as any in Australia, yet the Government allowed this kiln to go out of production. This is vital to costs. If Government officers had given the matter the attention necessary we would not have seen a Hoffman kiln demolished which could have been used to produce the basic requirements for home construction. The Government has failed in its obligations to the people, therefore it behaves it to take notice of some of the things said in this House from time to time on the importance of the need to arrest the increasing

costs of home construction. Some members say that it is the fault of some sections of the industry which did not examine the real consequences of the increases in the cost of building materials. There would be no need for the Government to seek a further increase in the amount made available for home construction had it met its responsibility to the people. Visitors to South Australia admire the type of home erected here, but express regret that there is not as much variety in the more recent homes compared with those constructed 20 years ago. My criticism of the Government is that it has not made any real contribution toward keeping building costs down. With houses built of cement bricks and blocks there will be everlasting upkeep costs. Had clay bricks been used instead, there would have been ample cement available for some of the big Government projects. Only today I received a letter from the Premier's Office in response to a request I made on behalf of an Italian engaged in the terrazzo industry. To my knowledge he is the only Italian by birth engaged in this industry who volunteered for service with the Australian forces in World War II., and as a result lost most of his business connections, and yet the Building Materials Office will not make cement available to him. What a way to repay a man for his efforts on behalf of this country's interests. I consider that when the Bill becomes law there will be few applicants who will seek the extra allowance provided.

Mr. DUNKS (Mitcham)—I am pleased to support the Bill. Last session I asked a question on the matter, because I found that it was impossible for people to build the type of house they required for £1,500. It appears that the next basic wage increase may be greater than any since the £1 a week previously granted, and therefore I believe this legislation will have to be reviewed again shortly. I am not very concerned about the price of a house under this legislation being a prohibition against the building of homes. We must realize we are living in an age when everything is very much dearer than it was, and I question whether a house at £2,000, when the basic wage is £9 4s. a week, is not somewhat in line with the cost of a house being £1,000 when the basic wage was about £4. Another thing we must remember is that the rate of interest on loans today is very low.

Mr. O'Halloran—It is rising.

Mr. DUNKS—Yes, and that might be another difficulty. A person on the present

base wage who can borrow money at 4½ per cent is just as well off as regards interest as the man who, on a considerably lower income 15 to 20 years ago, paid between 5 per cent and 6 per cent.

The Hon. T. Playford—The real problem is whether present interest rates will be permanent.

Mr. DUNKS—That applies to practically everything. It applies to the man who purchases land to produce wheat or wool.

The Hon. T. Playford—You do not suggest that a man would buy a property to produce wool at recent prices?

Mr. DUNKS—People are buying and taking a risk.

The Hon. T. Playford—Some are selling, too.

Mr. DUNKS—Yes, and people are selling houses. The member for Goodwood suggested that people would be frightened to purchase houses because of their high cost. Even if they get £1,750 the question is, "Where will they get the deposit?" Since price restrictions on properties have been lifted the only people able to buy houses at a price out of all proportion to what they are worth are those who have saved sufficient to pay a big deposit or purchase straight out. The same thing applies to motor cars. I agree with what the Government has done and probably it might have gone a little further to meet present conditions but, as the Premier said, we must be careful of what the future holds. I hope the Bill will assist people in building their homes, because our best citizens are those who have a stake in the country.

Mr. WHITTLE (Prospect)—Members know from contact with the man in the street that there is a great need for a realistic approach to this difficult matter. It is no use shedding crocodile tears about the enormous increase in building costs; they are no worse in South Australia than in other States. I listened attentively to Mr. Frank Walsh's remarks. The man who wants to buy a home today takes a definite risk, but many are prepared to do so. Numbers have pledged everything they have, including their furniture, to pay the necessary deposit. The man who builds a home under those conditions is not taking as great a risk as those foolish people who purchase existing homes, some of them not by any means new, at fantastic prices. Some old houses have deteriorated badly. Of the two risks I would rather pay a bigger price

for a new home with expectation of a longer life, than purchase an old building. Plenty of young people are tired of living with their in-laws and want a home of their own. I heartily support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Limit of loan."

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Will this provision apply to homes being imported and erected and to timber-frame houses which might be under construction or to be constructed?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—Under the Homes Act a number of institutions can make loans on property up to 90 per cent of its value on a guarantee by the State Government on the last 20 per cent. The honourable member's question can only be determined by the lending institution concerned. I think that the institutions lend on timber-frame houses, but are most conservative in that regard. That is why the Housing Trust has made loans on timber-frame houses of its own construction. It is really a matter for the various lending authorities. As Treasurer I have not refused any loan because it was in relation to a timber-frame house. The Government believes that timber-frame houses can serve a most useful purpose, but we guarantee only 20 per cent of the loan. The lending institutions, which lend up to 90 per cent, have their own policies in the matter.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—It is on record in *Hansard* that I supported the contention that councils would be well advised to reconsider some of the areas they have reserved entirely for homes of solid construction. I do not object to a timber-frame house provided it is erected on substantial studs or foundations, with a jarrah base to window sill height, and solid chimneys. I am simply trying to protect people who have gone into timber-frame homes, and trying to direct the attention of the Housing Trust to the advisability of making some improvements. I frankly admit that there has been a determined effort to improve the latter section of the St. Mary's group, but they still do not measure up to the standard I desire. If the State Bank Board sets a maximum of £1,350 as an advance on a St. Mary's timber-frame home, has the Housing Trust sufficient money to guarantee 90 per cent of the cost? If it is good enough for the trust to advance almost 90 per cent of the cost should we not see that

there is at least an equity in the homes? Will the trust have that equity in the imported timber-frame homes which is demanded by the War Service Homes Division as a lending institution? Will the State Bank, or any other institution, advance 90 per cent of the cost instead of curtailing the advance, as is now the case?

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment; Committee's report adopted.

BUSINESS AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 5. Page 545.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Goodwood)—Having reviewed the provisions of section 18 of the principal Act I agree with the explanation of the Minister of Works. He said that this measure is to repair a certain omission in the 1949 amending Act, and this causes me to wonder whether we expect too much of our capable Parliamentary Draftsman and Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman, in that the Government uses their services for other duties, thus preventing them from giving their full attention to their major responsibilities. The proposed amendment will provide for smoother working and will be in conformity with the rest of the Act, and therefore I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee; Committee's report adopted.

SWINE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 5. Page 545.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Frome—Leader of the Opposition)—This Bill alters the definition of "disease" in section 4 of the principal Act by striking out "swine plague" and inserting the more embracing phrase "infectious pneumonia of swine (including swine plague) and swine dysentery." I understand this has been recommended by veterinary experts, and on that matter I have no complaints. The Swine Compensation Fund, which is made up of contributions by the owners of pigs sold in the Abattoirs market, has a credit balance of £52,000. Last year only £8,550 was paid out in compensation for condemned pigs suffering

from one of the diseases covered by the Act. In order to provide protection for the meat-consuming public the animals were killed. I do not know whether the money is placed in a special pigeonhole or whether it is available for expenditure in cases of emergency. If that is the position, it is nice to have accumulated funds available, but it seems that too much is being collected from owners of pigs. Unless the new disease to be inserted in the Act will create greater commitments I suggest that serious consideration be given to reducing the amount of the levy until the fund is reduced to a figure which will allow commitments to be met. In recent years we have seen the production of pig meats drop alarmingly. If we assist producers, even by reducing the amount of the levy, to build up production to what it was some years ago, when the Commonwealth Government was criticized for not doing enough to increase pig meat production, we will be doing something worth-while. I suggest that we pass the second reading and that the Government take note of what I have said.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee; Committee's report adopted.

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 5. Page 545.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Frome—Leader of the Opposition)—The Act provides that compensation shall be payable to owners of cattle if the carcasses are condemned because of the animals suffering from certain diseases. According to the Minister's second reading speech, the diseases are pleuro-pneumonia contagiosa, tuberculosis, actinomycosis and Johne's disease. It is proposed to widen the ambit of the Bill by extending the definition of "disease" to include trichomoniasis, and also to extend the term actinomycosis to include actinobacillosis and other affections with club formations. The Minister said that trichomoniasis is a very serious and infectious disease, and it is desirable that it should be included in the definition. I support the Bill.

Mr. McLACHLAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.51 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 19, at 2 p.m.