

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, September 20, 1951.

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

LOAN PROGRAMME.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—When the Loan Estimates were submitted to the House by the Treasurer before his departure for the United States of America they were for a total sum of approximately £41,000,000. Since then, we have been led to believe from the press that, as the result of the Loan Council's deliberations, the amount available for South Australia would be reduced to approximately £28,000,000. We have also learned from the press that the Commonwealth loan, which closed last week, was under-subscribed to the extent of about £7,750,000. Can the Treasurer say what overall effect these circumstances are likely to have on the Loan programme for the ensuing 12 months, whether it will be necessary to curtail some of the works which it would normally be possible to complete, and, if so, what works are to be curtailed?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—At the Loan Council meeting there was a very wide difference of opinion as to what should be the policy on the borrowing of money this year. The total programme of all States and the Commonwealth amounted to £308,000,000. The Commonwealth Government's advisers strongly expressed the view that it would be impossible to secure so much money on the loan market, and they recommended a considerable reduction in the loan programme. After some investigation I moved that the programme be reduced from £308,000,000 to £225,000,000 overall, on condition that the Commonwealth would guarantee that that sum of money would be available—that the Commonwealth would underwrite loans to that extent.

Mr. O'Halloran—Will that mean Treasury Bills to finance any deficiency?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not think so. At present we are holding abroad sterling credits amounting to between £600,000,000 and £700,000,000; and as the States' programmes to a large extent depend upon very heavy purchases overseas, I think the matter is quite capable of being adjusted without resorting to a lot of debenture credit or short term finance. That was the responsibility accepted by the Commonwealth with regard to this proposal.

Therefore, although the first loan was under-subscribed—I think it was realized at the outset it would be—that does not mean that this State's programme has been permanently jeopardized. The amount of money available with our credits from repayments for our Loan programme this year, speaking from memory, will be about £32,000,000. That would be a reasonable programme to be carried out under existing circumstances. I think that programme can be carried out without a serious curtailment of the works which would have normally been done had further money been available. There was a physical limit to how much work could be done, and I think the £32,000,000 available will enable the programme to be proceeded with in a logical manner. At the moment I do not expect difficulty in financing that programme, except perhaps in connection with the time of the year in which the money will be made available to us. This could create some difficulty. For instance, in Victoria, where the State has started its programme very heavily committed and, I believe, with no cash in hand, the position is causing the Victorian Government considerable concern. In general terms, I expect that the programme we would be able to accomplish reasonably, without overtime or excess expenditure, will be capable of being carried out and financed.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Am I correct in assuming that the substantial overseas surpluses referred to by the Treasurer are the result of income earned by the export of commodities from this country and as such belong, not to the Commonwealth, but to the people who earned them? Does the Treasurer know if it is the intention of the Commonwealth Government to place some restrictions upon those surpluses in order that portion of the money may be available to meet the overseas commitments of the various States?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member is not quite correct in his surmise. Those overseas credits, which were the property of persons selling commodities abroad, have been purchased by the Commonwealth Government and a great deal of the money has been released on the Australian market in Australian currency: that is one of the big inflationary influences. Overseas prices being high and the money being released locally, it has not been possible to buy compensating overseas commodities to meet the price factor which immediately arises here. These moneys are, almost without exception, in the hands of the Commonwealth Bank or Commonwealth

authorities, and not in the hands of private banks or persons. Under a pegged exchange the Commonwealth Bank has always purchased overseas credits at the prevailing rate, less the prevailing discount.

BAROSSA VALLEY HIGHWAY.

Mr. TEUSNER—The people of the Barossa Valley welcome with enthusiasm and jubilation yesterday's announcement that Her Royal Highness Princess Margaret will tour that district and view the annual Vintage Festival on March 15 next year. I assume that the motor trip by which Her Royal Highness will travel into and from the Barossa district will be made over the main Gawler-Angaston road. The bitumen surface of this highway is in many places in a bad state of repair. Will the Minister of Works confer with the Commissioner of Highways with a view to having overdue repairs to this road effected before the date of the Royal Visit so that the proposed trip may be made in reasonable comfort?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I am sure that matters connected with the proposed Royal visit will receive a very high priority. Whether they include the construction or reconstruction of roads will depend on circumstances, but I am sure everything that will contribute towards the comfort and safety of our Royal visitors will be done.

PORT PIRIE BRICK SUPPLY.

Mr. DAVIS—The following letter to me from the Returned Servicemen's League is the result of my question to the Minister of Lands, as Acting Leader of the Government, during the absence of the Premier in America:—

Following your recent efforts regarding War Service Homes in Port Pirie, I notice that, according to a published report (*Advertiser*, August 15, 1951) the Director of Building Materials has power to direct bricks to a particular contractor. In a further report it was stated that, after inquiries had been completed, neither the War Service Homes Commission nor the State Housing Trust is very perturbed about the position. It appears, sir, that through no fault of your own, you have come up against a brick wall. This personal feud between the manufacturer and the contractor resulting from an employee of the former, who had left to take another job in any case, and then being employed by the latter, seems to have gone a little too far and, in view of the following, I fail to see why the War Service Homes Commission and the State Housing Trust are not perturbed. The site for the homes was cleared of weeds last summer, some foundations laid, others pegged out. Now, the weeds have taken possession again to the extent of hiding all

but two partially constructed homes built with bricks made by the contractor himself. His output is inadequate to cope with the contracts in hand. I contend that, especially in view of the time that has elapsed since the contract was let, War Service Homes should have some priority on any bricks available locally. The same firm, Brick Manufacturers Ltd., is supplying bricks to War Service and Trust homes in the city. A fortnight ago, at my request to test the position, the contractor placed an order with the local manager of the above firm, with the result that ex-servicemen are still waiting for homes without any knowledge of when materials will be available. If, as stated previously, the Minister has power to direct bricks, I suggest that he make a thorough investigation of this case from the beginning and then use that power.

Will the Premier make further investigations about the brick supply for Port Pirie?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—If the honourable member will let me have the correspondence I will have the position examined.

COMMONWEALTH SERVICE RETRENCHMENTS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Last Tuesday I asked whether the Premier would ascertain from the Postmaster-General whether employees from overseas had been retained in his department while other employees with long service and trained in South Australia had been dismissed. Will the Premier ascertain from the Postmaster-General or the Prime Minister whether it is the Commonwealth Government's policy to continue the practice of dismissing employees with long service and retaining the services of people from overseas?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I observed in the press in the last two days a statement which had come officially from Canberra to the effect that the Prime Minister, as soon as the Commonwealth Parliament meets next week, proposes to make a full statement to the House on Commonwealth policy in regard to retrenchments. I presume that that statement will be subject to debate. In those circumstances I suggest that the honourable member's question will be answered in the course of a few days and any communication that I may make to the Prime Minister would be held up until the public statement is made. I suggest to the honourable member if the matter is not then cleared up that he raise it again with me.

SEED POTATOES.

Mr. QUIRKE—There is a real shortage of seed potatoes and those on sale are of doubtful seed value, and in some cases are diseased.

Is there any form of potato seed certification in operation in this State or any conditions calling for the grading of seed potatoes?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—I have not the particulars regarding seed certification, but I will get a report from the chairman of the Potato Board who is also the Chief Horticulturist, and bring it down for the benefit of the House.

EGG PRODUCTION.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Has the Minister of Agriculture the report he promised to bring down some time ago with regard to production figures from the Egg Board regarding the distribution of eggs in this State?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—The chairman of the Egg Board reports that from July 1 to September 8 the South Australian Egg Board received 1,788,043 dozen eggs. The number of eggs sold on the local market in shell was 683,875 dozen; manufactured into egg pulp, 301,865 dozen; and 18,753 cases (30 dozen in each) were packed for export to the United Kingdom, that is, 562,590 dozen.

CULTURAL ACTIVITIES IN COUNTRY DISTRICTS.

Mr. RICHES—Keen satisfaction has been expressed in country districts because cultural activities in the country have been stimulated during this Jubilee year by the visits of prominent city artists and leaders of thought, which have been financed in part by Jubilee funds. There is a very strong feeling in the north that these facilities should not cease with the Jubilee year. I understand that the chairman of the Whyalla Town Commission, who is country chairman of the State Jubilee Committee, supported by other bodies in Port Augusta and other northern centres, has asked the Premier to consider making a small grant available each year to subsidize the continuation of these visits, which have meant much to country areas. Has the Premier had an opportunity to consider that request and, if so, can he say whether provision will be made next year for that purpose?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The matter is perhaps rather more than merely a Jubilee year problem. Some time ago the Government entered into an agreement with the Australian Broadcasting Commission and a committee of very zealous citizens to enable the establishment of an orchestra in South Australia. The agreement is for a number of years and under it the State will subsidize the orchestra annu-

ally to enable it to function. On the other hand, the committee of management undertook that the orchestra would conduct a number of public performances in the metropolitan area and in the country. I agree with the honourable member that this arrangement has been extremely well received both in the metropolitan area and the country, and from the highest authority I have had very eulogistic remarks concerning the standard the orchestra has achieved during the short time it has been in operation. It is still only a small orchestra, but an extremely good one, and I can say without hesitation that the Government is prepared to continue the arrangement already entered into and perhaps will be prepared to extend it to enable additional musicians to be added to one or two sections of the orchestra.

TRAMWAYS TRUST GENERAL MANAGER.

Mr. MOIR—Following the announcement that Mr. Moyes desires to be relieved of his position as general manager of the Municipal Tramways Trust in January, can the Premier say whether applications will be called to fill the position, or is it the general policy for the next in charge to be promoted?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Government appoints only two members of the trust, the majority of whom are selected by the metropolitan councils. Consequently, the Government members are only a small minority and therefore I am unable to answer the question. I did see in the press a few days ago a statement that it was proposed to call for applications for the position, but whether that had any official backing I do not know. I will attempt to get the information for the honourable member.

CONDITION OF WHEAT TRUCKS.

Mr. DAVIS—In reply to a question I asked yesterday regarding the dirty condition of wheat trucks at Port Pirie the Minister of Railways said, "It is not the desire of the Railways Commissioner to have, dirty trucks, but we have to do first things first." Does the Minister not think that one of the first things which should be done is to protect the health of the men unloading wheat? Will it be necessary for those engaged in that work to take direct action and force the Government to accept the responsibility for the men's health?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—As indicated yesterday it is not a question of force. Representatives of railwaymen themselves, including members of this House, have complained about

the long hours that the men have to work. We are trying all over Australia and on the Continent to obtain men, but we cannot get them, and as those already engaged are fully employed we cannot run the service except under existing conditions, although we do not like doing so. Speaking generally, the trucks are in a bad condition, but it is a question of what other work should be stopped to improve their condition. We will doubtless receive a complaint from the honourable member if we stop other works.

ERECTION OF NEW SCHOOL CLASSROOMS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—The following statement appeared in an article in the *News* of September 12 under the heading "Schools Plan: Extra 100 rooms":—

Mr. Playford said the State Government had completed negotiations with the Housing Trust for the manufacture and erection of 100 portable classrooms.

Can the Premier say whether the negotiations which were in progress by the Architect-in-Chief's Department with the Master Builders and Contractors Association have been completed and were its prices comparable with those now being accepted by the Housing Trust?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—When the Government called tenders for the new classrooms it had secured all the material necessary for their erection by contractors. Public tenders were called, but not one was received. These classrooms are urgently required to accommodate children who will attend school early next year, therefore it was necessary to find other means to get the rooms erected. The Government asked the Housing Trust to obtain prices from some of the contractors normally employed by it. Prices were obtained and accepted and, as far as I know, the work is proceeding satisfactorily. Generally speaking, it is not the Government's policy to undertake building on a cost-plus basis. Where that system has been adopted it has led to a great increase in the price of building. The Government's policy is to call for public tenders and accept the most satisfactory. If it cannot obtain public tenders it will do its best to arrange for private ones.

HYBRID TREES.

Mr. FLETCHER—The following is an extract from the New South Wales *The Farmer and Settler*:—

Some revolutionary forestry news from the United States indicates that hybrid trees may prove as sensational in the timber world as hybrid corn has in grain. In California the U.S. Forestry Service has had spectacular results of crossbreeding with 64 different species of pine.

Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether his department has any information regarding the practice adopted in the United States and, if so, is it intended to put it into operation in this State?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—I do not know that the department has specific information on that matter, but I know that the Conservator of Forests and his officers keep a close watch on developments which take place in the forestry world. I will draw their attention to the question and get the information the honourable member seeks.

FREE MILK FOR SCHOOL CHILDREN.

Mr. STEPHENS—I have noticed in the press that, in connection with the distribution of free milk to school children, some schools have been supplied with milk, but others have not because it has not been possible to get contractors to supply milk in those districts. Will the Minister of Works bring down an early report, next week if possible, as to the schools in the metropolitan area which are getting milk and those which are not, and whether it is a fact that in regard to the latter it is not possible to get contractors to supply milk?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I will get a report from the Minister of Education and bring it down next week.

EGG BOARD HANDLING CHARGES.

Mr. TAPPING—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on September 4 regarding a complaint that with each rise in the basic wage the Egg Board increases handling charges?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—I have obtained a reply from the chairman of the Egg Board, and it shows that the handling charges have not, as suggested, been varied with every rise in the basic wage. The table showing increases in the basic wage under the Storemen and Packers Award from January 1, 1951, and the deductions made by the S.A. Egg Board from producers' account sales for handling charges is as follows:—

Date.	Adult basic wage per week.			Handling charges (per dozen).		
	Male.			Female.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Prior to January, 1951	8	3	0	6	2	3
January 1, 1951	9	4	0	6	5	6
February, 1951	9	12	0	6	11	6
May, 1951	9	17	0	6	15	0
May 24, 1951	—	—	—	7	6	0
August, 1951	10	10	0	7	16	0

It will be seen that for the increase in wages which were granted in February and May, no additional charges were deducted from the account sales of the producers. The board, before increasing allowances to the grading floors for handling charges, makes a very detailed investigation into the additional increase in wages. In view of the present position of wages, the board is not in a position to decrease the allowances for handling charges. It is pointed out, however, that the wholesale prices for eggs for the period July, 1951, to September 17, 1951, have been approximately 8d. per dozen more than for the corresponding period of last year.

FURNITURE REMOVAL CHARGES.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I have been informed that complaints of extortionate charges for the removal of soldier settlers' furniture to Kangaroo Island were made at a recent meeting of the R.S.L. Sub-branch at the Parndana settlement on the island, and they appear to be authentic. My informant says:—

The criticism does not apply to all removalist firms who have done business with prospective settlers, as some firms give the men a fair deal, but others are making a racket of the business. In one instance, a carrier's agent quoted £65 for a removal to Kangaroo Island, but the firm later said this was a misquote and demanded £110. Some firms won't supply written quotations for such jobs. . . . Upward of £60 was being charged by certain removalists allegedly to cover sea freight on what they call a "box" of furniture from Port Adelaide to Kangaroo Island and the return of the empty "box," yet the R.S.L. had been told that £30 to £35 would be a reasonable charge.

Can the Premier say whether this type of service is subject to price control and, if not, will he have the matter investigated to see whether it can be brought under price control to prevent what appears to be extortionate charges made to soldier settlers in certain instances?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Speaking from memory, this particular charge is not subject to price control at present, but I will have an

inquiry made to see if it is necessary to take action along the line suggested by the honourable member.

LOVEDAY-NOOKAMKA PIPELINE.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Has the Minister of Irrigation obtained a report regarding the raising of the supply tank at Loveday and also a direct line from the Loveday tank to Nookamka?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The manufacture of reinforced concrete pipes has been retarded mainly because of the shortage of cement and, as priority is being given in the supply to the irrigation war service land settlement scheme at Loxton, pipes have not been available for the Loveday-Nookamka pipeline. Additional supplies of cement are now being received and the production of pipes will proceed to the limit of factory output but, having regard to the lag in production and the further requirements of the Loxton irrigation scheme, it is not possible at this juncture to say when pipes will be available for the Loveday-Nookamka line.

BUTCHERS' PRICES.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Recently I have had complaints from two country towns about local butchers exhibiting their prices. In one case they were not exhibiting in their shops a list showing the fixed prices for meat, and in the other case the list was typewritten and placed so far away from the counter that the customers were unable to read it. Can the Premier say whether there is any provision that prices displayed in butchers' shops should be in such type and in such position as to be clearly legible to the public, and whether inspectors will see that the law is carried out regarding the exhibition of prices in shops? Will the Premier have this matter investigated by the Prices Department to see that the law is complied with?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes, I will ask the Prices Commissioner to send inspectors to country areas to examine the position.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT
AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).

Introduced by the Hon. T. PLAYFORD and read a first time.

Second reading.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Gumeracha—Premier and Treasurer)—The object of this Bill is to make general substantial increases in the rates of compensation prescribed by the Workmen's Compensation Act. The Government is anxious that these payments should at all times be kept at a level which is fair to workers, having regard to current wage rates and the standards adopted generally throughout Australia. The rates are kept constantly under review by Ministers and in framing its legislative programme before the present session opened the Government decided that as soon as its investigations were complete a Bill would be introduced. In framing this Bill the Government has taken into account the most recent alterations in rates made in the other States and has endeavoured to raise the South Australian rates so that on the whole they will be above the general Australian level. It is not claimed that every rate in this Bill is higher than the corresponding rate in every other State; but it is claimed that if the Bill is passed as introduced our scheme of payments on the whole will be appreciably above the general average level of the other States. The Bill is not a long one. This is because no attempt is made to alter the general principles of the compensation which are now well settled and understood but the Bill is restricted to the purpose of altering amounts.

Clause 3 amends the definition of "workman." At present no-one whose average weekly earnings, exclusive of overtime, exceed £15 is covered by the Act. It is proposed, in recognition of the substantially increased earnings of workers in recent months, to raise this figure to £24. The result will be that workers earning up to £1,000 a year will be entitled to compensation. Clause 4 increases the maximum amount of compensation payable to dependent members of the workman's family where the workman dies as a result of his injury. This maximum is at present £900 plus £50 for each dependent child. The proposal in the Bill is to raise the maximum to £1,500, plus £50 for each dependent child. Clause 5 deals with the compensation payable where a workman dies leaving no dependent members of his family. The compensation payable in such cases is medical and burial expenses. The medical

expenses are now subject to a maximum of £50, and the burial expenses £20. It is proposed, as I will explain later, to raise the medical expenses to £75 in all cases, including the case where a workman dies without dependants. By clause 5 the allowable burial expenses are raised from £20 to £30.

Clause 6 raises the rates of compensation for incapacity. It increases the general basis of weekly payments for total incapacity from two-thirds to three-quarters of the workman's average weekly earnings and the allowance payable in respect of a wife is raised from £1 per week to 30s. The over-riding maxima which the principal Act imposes on the weekly payments and which at present are £8 in the case of a man with dependants and £6 in the case of a man without dependants are raised to £12 and £8 a week respectively. Finally, the maximum amount of the total payments for incapacity is raised from £1,150 to £1,750. Clause 7 deals with the special additional amount of compensation which is payable to cover the medical expenses of an injured workman. At present the maximum total amount allowable for these expenses is £50 which is apportioned between ambulance, transport, medical attention, nursing, and the like. It is proposed to increase the £50 maximum to £75 with corresponding increases in the individual allocations. The amount available for transport is increased from £2 to £5. General medical expenses are raised from £25 to £35, nursing fees from £3 to £5, and hospital charges from £20 to £30. Clause 8 contains consequential amendments only. Clause 9 provides that the Bill will apply only to accidents happening after the Bill is passed. This is in accordance with the usual rule is cases of amendments of the law relating to workmen's compensation. Looking at the Bill as a whole members will see that the average of the increases proposed in it is over 50 per cent. These increases, when taken in conjunction with those made by Parliament last year will, in the Government's opinion, ensure a just and equitable scale of compensation. I move the second reading.

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

POLICE PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT
BILL.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering

the following resolution:—"That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Police Pensions Act, 1929-1950."

Motion carried. Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

TRESPASSING ON LAND BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from September 19. Page 616.)

Clause 4—"Interpretation."

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—Last evening, prior to the adjournment, I moved to delete "or cattle" from paragraph (b) and I press that amendment strongly. Substantial justice will be served and all the protection required by the landowners concerned will be given if we confine that protection within the limits of the Act which is being repealed, namely, to lands on which sheep are being depastured. Although we have every consideration for the landowner who may have been subjected to loss as the result of actions, mostly thoughtless, of people who do not understand the damage they may cause, I see no reason why we should extend the ambit of the Act. If we include cattle as well as sheep it is obvious that almost all land in the area proclaimed will be enclosed land on which mushroomers may not enter. Admittedly, they can enter with the permission of the owner, but at the times when people are most likely to be concerned, Saturday afternoons and Sundays, many owners would be difficult to find.

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS (Minister of Agriculture)—In my absence yesterday I understand that my colleague indicated that the Government was not prepared to accept the amendment and I ask the Committee to reject it.

Mr. STEPHENS—I support the amendment. Yesterday we rejected Mr. Hawker's amendment under which it would be illegal to trespass on any enclosed area, as members thought that went too far. Under the Bill, if sheep or cattle are in any part of an enclosed area, even though a mile away, a person commits an offence if he merely walks through that paddock. That goes too far. I do not want to see antagonism created between landholders and the general public. It was only a few years ago that I arranged for men to be sent to assist landholders to combat a bush fire, and some of those men, as the result of injuries received in fire fighting, were out of work for some weeks and their families practically starved. Collections had to be made

in Port Adelaide to help them. A landowner should not be able to prosecute a person who walks innocently across his paddock; but he should get compensation from any man causing injury or damage to his cattle or property. I would support the Minister if he agreed to withdraw "or cattle" and provided a heavy penalty for damaging property. What would be the position if there was a fire on a property and a man, in rushing to help the owner, crossed an enclosed field? I take it that he would be liable under this Bill.

The Committee divided on the amendment:—

Ayes (8).—Messrs. Davis, Hutchens, Lawn, O'Halloran (teller), Riches, Stephens, Tapping, and Fred Walsh.

Noes (21).—Messrs. Brookman, Christian, Clarke, Dunn, Dunnage, Fletcher, and Hawker, Hons. C. S. Hincks, S. W. Jeffries, and Sir George Jenkins (teller), Mr. Maegillivray, Hon. M. McIntosh, Messrs. Michael, Moir, Pattinson, and Pearson, Hon. T. Playford, Messrs. Shannon, Stott, Teusner, and Whittle.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. McKenzie, Duncan, and McAlees. Noes—Messrs. Goldney, McLachlan, and Heaslip.

Majority of 13 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. SHANNON—I have discussed my printed amendment with the Parliamentary Draftsman, who thinks that "cultivated crop" would not cover an orchard, which should be protected just as much as, say, a crop of potatoes. Therefore I move it in the following amended form:—

To add "or" at the end of paragraph (b) and to insert new paragraph (c) as follows:—" (c) has a cultivated crop or fruit trees or vines thereon."

A person looking for mushrooms would have no valid reason to enter a vineyard or orchard, because they do not grow where soil is cultivated. The only reason for the amendment is to protect property from damage.

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—I am prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I hope the Committee will not agree to it. If it does, I cannot see any reason why yesterday it defeated the amendment moved by Mr. Hawker. If the amendment is agreed to it will be unlawful for a person to enter upon any enclosed land where sheep or cattle are grazing, where there is a cultivated crop, which I assume would include lucerne, or where fruit trees or vines are growing. I assume that if there was one fruit tree

or one vine in a remote corner of a 100 or 200 acre paddock it would be an offence to trespass, and a person would be liable to the stiff penalties provided under this legislation. The Committee should have a proper sense of perspective. In season and out of season I have listened to allegations from members opposite that my Party was trying to regiment the people, but who is trying to regiment them today? I do not want to raise the question of class distinction or try to create class hatred. I lead a Party which believes in fundamental justice and that some human rights transcend ordinary property rights and should be preserved, but that will not be done under this legislation. All that is being preserved is what used to be called "the inviolable rights of private property." I ask the Committee to seriously consider the amendment before accepting it.

Mr. SHANNON—The honourable member talks about the inviolable rights of the individual. Has not the owner of property any rights at all? Is it reasonable to allow people the unrestricted right to enter on a property upon which a man has spent much money and labour, no matter what damage they do? If the Leader of the Opposition can show me one mushroom growing in any of the restricted areas my amendment covers I will not only give him the mushroom but also its weight in gold. It is obvious that anybody within the areas mentioned by me would not be in search of mushrooms. I cannot see any logic in Mr. O'Halloran's argument. The only intention of my amendment is to prevent thoughtless people from causing damage to property of landowners by trespassing.

Mr. FRED WALSH—The amendment would confine people to the roadways and not allow them to enter any property. Does the term "sheep or cattle grazing on land" include the parklands? As the committee has not accepted Mr. O'Halloran's amendment the clause should be left as printed. I ask the Committee to accept the Bill as drafted, rather than amend it in the way Mr. Shannon suggests.

Mr. STEPHENS—The Committee is being asked to extend the Bill's provisions further than was intended by the Minister when introducing it. Mr. Shannon's amendment will only set a trap for innocent people. If a man had two vines or apricot trees growing in the corner of a 40-acre paddock, with large openings or gateways in it, and a person entered the property he would be trespassing. I would like to hear from the member for Glenelg what is the legal position.

Mr. PATTINSON—Although I approved of the drafting of Mr. Shannon's original amendment I do not like his proposal to add additional words. I think it goes farther than he and most members think. Besides the case Mr. Stephens mentioned, I think it would include my suburban property at Glenelg, on which I have fruit trees and vines. I do not think Mr. Shannon intends that such a property should be covered. Section 5 of the Landlord and Tenant Act exempts premises which for the time being are used, or which are ordinarily used, as a grazing area, farm, orchard, vineyard, market garden, dairy farm, poultry farm, pig farm, or apiary. I do not suggest that all these exemptions be included in this Bill, but if Mr. Shannon wants only orchards and vineyards excluded he should say so in plain language. It is going too far to say that if a person goes on to my property at Glenelg he is committing an offence, and that if I take him before the Glenelg Police Court on a charge of trespassing the onus is upon him to prove that he was there for a lawful purpose. If we desire people to respect the law, the law should respect itself, and we should not put into our legislation a series of twopenny-halfpenny offences which will bring the law into ridicule. Our police force does not enjoy anything like the respect the police force in Great Britain enjoys, because there far greater moderation is used in administration. Far more moderation is experienced in legislation in some of the older countries than here. It seems to me that we are adopting in this State the dangerous practice of creating offences for small matters which do not amount to much. It would be a sorry thing if we put into our penal law provisions which would apply to a person coming on to my premises at Glenelg, and then thrusting on him the burden of proving to a court of law that he was there for a lawful purpose. If the amendment were accepted I could take him to the court on a trivial charge of trespassing when perhaps he was only one of the many hundreds who come and plead with me to get them a Housing Trust home. The acceptance of the amendment would hold up Parliament to ridicule.

Mr. SHANNON—Obviously the matter has been placed in an entirely different light by Mr. Pattinson. He would not charge me with desiring to bring into effect a law covering his property at Glenelg. I think the position can be overcome. Originally I wanted to include "orchard or garden" but I was advised not to use those words. I now ask

Mr. Pattinson whether, if the words "fruit orchard or vineyard" were included in the provision his backyard could be regarded as either a fruit orchard or a vineyard. I do not think the acceptance of the words would prevent people from getting mushrooms.

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—In view of the importance of the points raised by Mr. Pattinson I move that progress be reported in order that I may discuss the position with the Parliamentary Draftsman.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

HUNDRED OF SHANNON WATER SUPPLY.

The Speaker laid on the table the final report of the Public Works Standing Committee on hundred of Shannon water supply, together with minutes of evidence.

Report ordered to be printed.

LEFEVRE PENINSULA WATER SUPPLY EXTENSION.

The Speaker laid on the table the report of the Public Works Standing Committee on LeFevre Peninsula water supply extension, together with minutes of evidence.

Report ordered to be printed.

ADVANCES FOR HOMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 18. Page 579.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Frome—Leader of the Opposition)—This Bill is not as simple as it appears on the surface nor as we were led to believe when it was introduced. It contains two main provisions. One raises the amount of the advance that may be made under the Act to conform with increased costs in the construction of houses, and I support that. The other removes from the Act subsection (5) of section 42, which has been in the legislation in some form or another since 1910, when the principal Act was first placed on the Statute Book. The restriction on the right to transfer a home within a certain period of negotiating the loan was imposed in 1910 for the specific purpose of preventing speculation in houses which were obtained under the scheme. The purpose of the original Act was to enable workers to purchase their own homes in which to live permanently and not to use the advantages presented by the law for speculative purposes. Therefore, in 1910 a provision was included that the mortgage could not be dis-

charged until the expiration of five years without the consent of the Bank Board, which consent could only be given in cases of great hardship. Apparently that provision worked reasonably well until 1924, when we were passing through a period resembling the present one. The values of all kinds of property had considerably increased as a result of circumstances born of the 1914-1918 War. In 1924 the Gunn Government introduced a Bill to amend this section by extending the period to 10 years. In introducing the Bill the then Minister of Housing, the Hon. W. J. Denny, said:—

The object of this Bill is to prevent trafficking in homes purchased from the Government on advantageous terms under the Advances for Homes Acts, especially in connection with the Thousand Homes Scheme of the present Government. The present law is that a person who has obtained a home through the State Bank and has given a mortgage to the Board of Trustees of the State Bank to secure the advance made to him by the bank, is not entitled to sell his house, so long as the mortgage remains undischarged, for a period of five years from the date of the making of the advance. It is considered that this period is too short and the Bill proposes to extend it to 10 years. This period is not too long when it is remembered that the object of the owner in obtaining the house, and the object of the State Bank in making him the advance, is to provide him with a permanent home, and in the great majority of cases there is nothing unreasonable in expecting the mortgagor under a State Bank mortgage to settle down in his home for life. On the other hand there must be a great temptation presented to the owners of homes provided for them by the State Bank to accept advantageous cash offers which are made to them from time to time by outsiders, for it is well known that the homes that they obtain through the State Bank for £700 are easily worth from £100 to £300 above that amount in the real property market. The effect of clause 3, if passed, will not be to prevent any transfer of a State Bank house for 10 years; all that it will do will be to put upon the owner who wants to transfer the property during the first 10 years the obligation of satisfying the Board of Trustees of the Bank that he would suffer great hardship if the board refused its consent to transfer. The power of the board to give a consent to transfer is conferred by subsection (2) of section 23 of the Advances for Homes Act, 1910, and the board before giving the consent must be satisfied that the refusal of consent would entail great hardship on the applicant.

Following on that speech the second reading was passed without debate. In the Committee stages two Government supporters, Mr. Collins, the member for Murray, and the late Mr. Fitzgerald, the member for Port Pirie, questioned whether difficulty might not ensue

in the case of a railwayman or other public servant transferred from the town in which he had purchased his State Bank home and wishing to dispose of it to secure the equity in it in order to purchase a home in the town to which he was going. Those members were assured by the Minister of Housing that no difficulty would arise, because the "hardship" clause would cover the position. Apparently it has done so until now, when a Bill is introduced repealing the restriction on the granting of transfers. In his second reading speech the Minister of Lands gave no reason why we should accept the repeal of this long-standing provision. He said:—

The provisions of subsection (5) providing that consent during the first 10 years is only to be given in cases of hardship have caused concern to the State Bank. The bank has been advised by the Crown Solicitor that it cannot give consent to a transfer of the house if the application was made to enable the applicant to improve his economic position, for example, if he has a chance of a better job elsewhere.

That is the only indication given by the Minister with regard to the repeal of subsection (5). I want more information than that before I will vote for this clause. I am amazed that this provision has remained the law for 40 years and that it is only now, when a very great profit is to be made from the resale of properties, especially those with vacant possession, that difficulties crop up with regard to its administration. It may save much debate if the Premier accedes to my request to make available to members the Crown Solicitor's opinion, so that they may know what the difficulties are and, if possible, overcome them without throwing wide open the gate, as it appears to me the amendment will do, by enabling State Bank homes to be used for speculation. With that reservation I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Consent to alienation."

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I listened with interest to the Leader of the Opposition on this clause. A difficulty has arisen over the correct interpretation of the phrase "great hardship." This Act was not designed to enable people to enter into a course of speculation on houses, but to provide a medium for the housing of people who would otherwise have found themselves without sufficient means to buy a home. That

interpretation has always been placed on the Act both by the State Bank Board and by the Government. The question has arisen largely on account of the changed economic conditions. Many people have applied for permission to sell their houses because of the increased value of property. The bank was most anxious to comply with the law and submitted each application to the Crown Solicitor for an opinion as to whether the circumstances constituted great hardship, taking the view that it was instructed by Parliament not to approve of such transactions if they were merely for speculative purposes. In actual fact I believe the definition of "great hardship" has too restrictive a meaning. This is the sort of thing which happens and which has been brought forward as one of the reasons for the amendment; a railway employee at Murray Bridge may be transferred to, say, Peterborough, but he is not permitted to dispose of his house in Murray Bridge because a transfer of that nature is not held to cause great hardship. Mere changes of locality of residence is not held by the Crown Solicitor to be hardship and I have seen what I believed to be *bona fide* applications rejected because the State Bank Board has no discretion.

Mr. Pattinson—It turns down every application as far as I can see.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No, it refers each one to the Crown Solicitor.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Why doesn't it make up its mind?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Because the Crown Solicitor is the bank's official adviser, and our legal friends here will agree that the term "great hardship," is merely a relative phrase and fairly difficult to define. Under the Housing Trust legislation, which contains no provision of this description, the trust has, by administrative action, built up very largely the same sort of wall.

Mr. O'Halloran—A few escaped before it built the wall, but now you want to pull it down.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The State Bank Board will still have complete discretion and will not give permission unless hardship will be created by refusal; it is not to be a means of facilitating speculation.

Mr. O'Halloran—If someone pays his money and demands his title how can the bank refuse it?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I assure the honourable member the bank will still have power to do so. However, it may assist members if I obtain some concrete cases which are held not to be of great hardship. I therefore move that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 18. Page 582.)

Mr. McLACHLAN (Victoria)—As this Bill involves my constituency considerably I take the opportunity to bring certain suggestions under the Minister's notice. It is well-known that the South-East is noted for its production of baby beef and fat lambs, and from my own observation greater production can be brought about, with consequent advantages to the State generally, by the importation of dry stock into the locality. Every year possibly some 10,000 dry sheep are brought into the area, and in the last two or three years some thousands of cattle have been bought at the abattoirs and taken to the South-East. Our particular anxiety about the introduction of northern cattle is due to the prevalence of pleuropneumonia, and the compensation provisions have been very helpful to owners. Unfortunately there has been a recent outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia in the South-East and there are certain rumblings amongst stockowners who have brought up the matter at their meetings, and it is possible that the Government may be asked to receive a deputation from some of them asking for a prohibition on importation of northern cattle into the area. For that reason I take this opportunity to impress on the Minister that this concession would have a detrimental effect upon beef production. Although I would not advocate a higher fee, if it were found necessary I feel that the industry could afford to pay it. The recent outbreak has certainly interfered with importations. A well-known cattle dealer who attended the Adelaide market last Monday week told me that he considered he could buy a type of beast in Adelaide for £25 that would make £35 at Naracoorte. It is generally the case that that type of beast can be purchased more cheaply in the city market than in our locality. That is why stock are brought from Adelaide to the South-East and consequently I feel that the industry could afford a higher tax if necessary.

Another thing I would bring under the Minister's notice is the fact that it is very difficult to police the regulations and restrictions placed upon importations. People who import cattle are supposed to take them from the station with two drovers and keep them in a paddock which has a buffer fence at least 20ft. distant from the outer fence. In the past the authorities have not rigidly enforced these restrictions, for which I think they are to be commended, but there is just the possibility that the suggestion may be made that the regulations should be enforced to the letter, and if that comes about I feel that the permission to import cattle under certain conditions will be of little value. It has been suggested that cattle should be inoculated before they leave the Adelaide market. That has many advantages, but I understand that inoculation does not cure a "carrier." Consequently inoculation in the city would not serve any good purpose, in as much as when the carriers got amongst cattle which were not inoculated they would contract the disease. The third condition is as follows—

The Hon. Sir George Jenkins—Those conditions are not in the Bill, but would be covered by the regulations.

Mr. McLACHLAN—That is so, but the same regulations would apply to the diseases we are now discussing, and the same restrictions would apply. The third condition in regard to permits is as follows:—

They may be disposed of only as follows:—

(a) By return to Metropolitan Abattoirs for resale at market or for slaughter. (Notice to be given to Market Inspector.)

(b) By sale to local butchers for slaughter only, subject to permission in writing from the Chief Inspector of Stock, Adelaide.

(c) By sale at country markets, subject to permission in writing from the Chief Inspector of Stock, Adelaide.

Those restrictions are quite generous and in the past we have been able to get permission for the removal of cattle from the Metropolitan Abattoirs saleyards, even after they have been there for three months, for sale at country markets. There may be a move from some graziers to prohibit this. If this is acceded to there may be difficulties in that a man may buy stock and put them on his property, but perhaps on account of climatic conditions the cattle will not fatten and he will be overstocked. For that reason I urge the Minister to seriously consider clause 3 (c) of the permit because graziers could be caused much inconvenience if, after three months, the cattle purchased could not be disposed of. I admit

those graziers have a responsibility to see that other herds in the locality are not infected, and naturally I would not expect them to ignore any of the conditions necessary to the health of other cattle. Another point is that cattle can become infected after they are brought into the South-East, and the maximum compensation that can be claimed is £30, but the unfortunate owner can only get three-quarters of that amount. Today cattle becoming infected may be worth up to £45. In view of the large amount of money in the Cattle Compensation Fund at present and because it is increasing owing to high prices will the Minister confer with the Chief Inspector of Stock to see whether the maximum can be raised while prices are high? I support the Bill and believe the Government is wise in bringing it down because it will be helpful to stockowners to include the diseases listed.

Mr. FLETCHER (Mount Gambier)—I support the Bill. I doubt whether our inspectors are getting the support they should get.

The Hon. Sir George Jenkins—From whom?

Mr. FLETCHER—Stock agents and landholders. No-one knows better than the stock agents where cattle come from. They should know the provisions of the Act and what stock should be allowed into any district, and what should not be allowed. Recently we had an outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia in the South-East and I understand that for some years butchers were not allowed to take cattle from the Metropolitan Abattoirs into the district unless they were killed immediately. I have always understood that cattle must be certified by a certificate of health if they come from the northern areas to the South-East. One can visualize what would happen if an outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia became widespread among dairy herds and beef cattle. We have some of the finest herds in the Commonwealth at present around Mount Gambier. There should be closer co-operation between the Minister's officers and stock agents, and the same applies to combating lice in sheep. For years graziers in the South-East have had to dip their flocks. A few years ago much trouble was caused in the South-East through lice in sheep. The agents should refuse to handle stock which may be infected. We cannot be too careful in policing stock disease. Only this week I had a request from a friend in the Mount Gambier district for permission to bring stock from over the border into the area. He was asking permission for something contrary to the provisions of the Act and I had to tell him the law must be obeyed.

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS (Newcastle—Minister of Agriculture)—Mr. McLachlan suggested that we consider amending the Act to enable higher compensation to be paid. In view of present values this may be worthy of consideration and I will look into that aspect. I point out to the member for Mount Gambier that cattle from the northern areas are not allowed to go into dairying districts, but it would be a real hardship upon people who wish to graze cattle in grazing areas, apart from dairying districts, if we were to impose an absolute prohibition on them in any other parts of the South-East. Cattle owners in the South-East are in the same position as those in any other district in South Australia. No special conditions are laid down for any particular locality, except for dairying districts, where cattle are not allowed to enter. The Stock and Brands Department has been very vigilant and must have received much help from cattle owners and stock and station agents in order to keep our State as free of pleuro-pneumonia as we have. This is the disease most prevalent among cattle in the northern areas. An instance occurred the other day supporting Mr. McLachlan's statements. A mob of cattle from the channel country in Queensland were brought south. The station concerned has always been very careful in inoculating its cattle and considered it had a herd free of pleuro-pneumonia. It sold one draft out of its mob to a northern butcher and one of them developed pleuro-pneumonia. As a result the whole mob were quarantined and sold on an off-day at the abattoirs here. Those who are acquainted with the conditions of mustering in the pastoral country of northern Australia will appreciate that it is difficult to get a clean muster and the odd bullock left out may develop pleuro-pneumonia, and as a result the whole mob, which may have been previously inoculated, must be quarantined. I assure all members interested in this Bill that the utmost vigilance is exercised by the Stock and Brands Department and that it has had splendid co-operation from owners of cattle and stock agents themselves in detecting and controlling diseases.

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

SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD, having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Succession Duties Act, 1929-1950. Read a first time.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—“That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Superannuation Act, 1926-1949.”

Motion carried. Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House.

INDUSTRIAL AND PROVIDENT SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Gumeracha—Premier and Treasurer)—The object of this Bill is to increase the maximum permissible shareholding in a co-operative society and to make some other consequential and allied amendments to the Industrial and Provident Societies Act. Section 5 of the Act provides that no member shall have any interest in the shares of a society exceeding £500. This limit was fixed in 1923. It was previously £200, having been fixed at that figure in 1864. It has been represented to the Government that, in modern conditions, the present limitation tends to prevent co-operative societies from expanding their activities to the extent now required in the interests of their members. It was suggested by the Berri Co-operative Packing Union Limited that the limit should be raised to £2,000. The Government gave careful attention to this matter. In the first place it considered the origin of the limit, and the reasons for it in order to decide whether it was necessary to retain any limit at all. Ever since the first Industrial and Provident Societies Act was passed in England in 1852 the Parliaments of England and of all the Australian States have maintained a limit on individual shareholdings. In England it is still £200, unless it has been changed in the last few months; in Victoria, £200; in Western Australia £750, to which figure it was increased from £200 in 1947; in Queensland £300; on New South Wales the limit is one-fifth of the total capital of the society or any smaller amount fixed by the society's rules; in Tasmania £1,000; and in New Zealand £300.

The societies have always acquiesced in limits, no doubt because they tend to keep the societies democratic and prevent control from getting into the hands of a few men or even

one man, and because generally speaking the co-operative movement has been fostered by men of moderate or small means. If there were no limit the Industrial and Provident Societies Act would provide a means whereby trading corporations of any size could be formed without being subject to the controls and obligations imposed by the Companies Act in the interests of the general public. For these reasons the Government considers that a limit should be retained; but it should be such as will enable societies to obtain sufficient funds both to provide for the increased costs and prices of today and also for the widening range of their functions. Taking both these factors into consideration the Government has decided to propose to Parliament that the maximum allowable holding of any shareholder be raised from £500 to £2,000. The amendments required for this purpose are contained in clauses 3, 6, 8 and 9.

Clause 4 deals with the classes of shares which may be issued by an industrial and provident society. The question has arisen whether a society has power to issue different classes of shares, *e.g.*, preference shares or redeemable shares. At present the Act is silent on this point and the position is doubtful, although it is commonly assumed that the rules of a society may provide for different classes. It is proposed to clear up this matter by declaring that the rules of a society may provide for the issue of different classes of shares and may prescribe the rights, privileges and conditions attaching to each class of share.

Mr. Macgillivray—Who raised this matter?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will look up the docket and see precisely who asked for it. It may have been raised by the Registrar of Companies.

Mr. Quirke—It sounds as if it had been asked for by someone who wants to smash co-operative societies.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Clauses 5 and 7 deal with what are called nominations. One of the statutory privileges of a member of an industrial and provident society is that he may, by a writing delivered to the society during his lifetime, nominate the person to whom any shares or other property he may have in the society shall pass on his death. Any such nomination is valued up to the extent of £200 and provides a simple method by which a man may make some provision for his dependants operating immediately on his death without probate or letters of administration. In view

of the decreased purchasing power of money the Government proposes to increase the amount of shares or other property which may pass under a nomination from £200 to £400. The request for the maximum allowable holding of any shareholder to be increased to £2,000 came from a reputable society. The Government has always felt that provident societies have performed a valuable function and it is anxious to foster them to enable them to take their place properly in the community. In saying that I do not mean that they should have privileges which would enable them to oust private enterprise from its proper function.

Mr. Whittle—They have certain privileges. For instance, they do not pay company tax.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No, but I believe it is essential that these societies should be encouraged, as they perform a useful function in the community. I move the second reading.

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

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Gumeracha—Premier and Treasurer)—The main purpose of this Bill is to extend the Prices Act, 1948-1950, until the end of next year. If not extended, the Act would have no effect as regards transactions taking place on or after the 1st of January next. The justification for the extension of control is so well known that little needs to be said on this subject. The strong inflationary tendency now prevailing renders the continuance of the Act more necessary than ever and it has been recently found essential to re-introduce control over many commodities and services which had previously been de-controlled or had not been brought under the Act. The extension of the Act is therefore unavoidable. While proposing an extension of the Act the Government has included in the Bill two minor provisions to facilitate administration. One of these, which is contained in clause 3, provides that the rate chargeable for any service which is subject to control under the Act may be proved by a certificate signed by the Prices Commissioner. The other pro-

vision, which is in clause 4, sets out the methods by which notices under the Act may be served. Its main object is to enable such notices to be served by post.

Experience has shown that price control cannot be considered to be anything like a complete cure for the present inflationary trend, which is sweeping not only through Australia but the whole world. Nevertheless, price control is a useful method in assisting to retard the rapid development of inflation. It has been the experience not only in this State but in every State of Australia that where price control has been relaxed invariably there has been a fairly stiff increase in prices for most commodities. That demonstrates that whereas price control cannot perhaps cure a basic defect in the economy of Australia, it does have the effect of steadying increases to a justified figure. I am certain that had control not operated price increases would have been much steeper. I pay a tribute to business interests generally in South Australia for the way they have co-operated in price control. We have tried to give every section of the community a fair deal and have not refused a price increase merely because it has meant extra cost to the community; wherever justified we have granted it. Price control has been welcomed by business interests generally and the Government has received tremendous assistance, not only in determining price levels, but by business firms carrying out fully and honourably the orders issued. Generally speaking, price control in South Australia has been efficiently carried out by the Prices Commissioner and his staff. We were fortunate in being able to take over almost the entire Commonwealth staff and I believe that prices officers have rendered good service to the community. The staff is not large and it has not been possible for them to police every individual item. That would be practically an impossibility. The prices law has been well maintained and respected in this State. I move the second reading with confidence.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.48 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 25, at 2 p.m.