

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, August 20, 1952.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Dunks) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.**PUBLIC SERVICE RE-CLASSIFICATION.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Premier any further information to give following on the question I asked on August 14 regarding a claim submitted by the Public Service Association for a revision of public servants' salaries?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have received the following report from the Public Service Commissioner:—

The claim of the Public Service Association for a general revision of salaries of public servants has been investigated by the Public Service Board and was discussed at the meeting last Friday when a special meeting of the board was fixed for Tuesday of next week to consider the matter. The claim will be finalized as soon as possible.

HIGH SCHOOL BOOK ALLOWANCE.

Mr. DAVIS—Has the Minister representing the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on August 7 regarding the allowance for books for high school children?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The total amount involved in this matter is very great. Speaking from memory, I think the present amount is over £50,000, and any increase in the allowance per child would be of first class importance. The matter must be dealt with when the Estimates are considered as a whole and not piece-meal. It is a matter of high policy and until the Estimates are framed I am afraid I cannot give any further information than that the matter is under consideration.

NATIONAL INSURANCE.

Mr. McKENZIE—On several occasions I have brought before this House, without success, the matter of national insurance. There is a crying need for it and the abolition of the means test. Will the Premier say whether the Government can do anything in the matter? As a private member I cannot do anything. If, as the result of a motion passed in this place and referred to the Commonwealth Government, we could get national insurance it would be one of the biggest blessings ever to come to Australia.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It is a matter for the Commonwealth Parliament which is at

present in session. I suggest that the honourable member communicate his views to the Federal member for his district.

GLOSSOP DRAINAGE SCHEME.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Has the Minister of Lands anything further to report following on the questions I have asked previously regarding the drainage of the Glossop township? The Minister said that there was some delay in obtaining the information necessary to show whether or not a drainage scheme was possible, and I inquired whether the Minister would indicate the nature of the difficulties as a local committee might be able to assist by providing information at its command.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have a report, but it does not cover the point raised by the honourable member. The engineers say that the reason for the delay in providing a design for the township of Glossop is that further observations are necessary before a definite scheme can be recommended.

ASSISTANCE TO SETTLERS.

Mr. RICHES—I have received a letter from a Mr. Hawes of Quorn inquiring what assistance, if any, the Government is prepared to offer young men prepared to set themselves up as dairy farmers, mixed farmers, or to interest themselves in other farming operations. It is claimed that unless financial assistance is given to further the acreage this man holds it will be impossible for him to get satisfactorily established. He has the impression from announcements over the air, and the appeals made to increase food production, that there is some form of Government assistance. Can the Minister of Lands say whether there has been a promise of assistance by the Government and, if not, does he know whether there is an offer of assistance from any source whatsoever?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The honourable member showed me the letter, and I have obtained a report from the Director of Lands. According to Government records, Mr. Hawes does not hold any land, leasehold or freehold, in his own right. If Mr. Hawes is working land under lease it is presumed that he could obtain assistance from a stock merchant, or perhaps from a bank, to enable him to purchase additional stock. Mr. Hawes has been noted for any Crown land which may become available. This afternoon I thought that I might be able to get further information from Mr. Hawes. I would like to know if he is an applicant under the soldier settlement scheme and whether there is any particular district

in which he is interested. If he is not a returned soldier applicant and Crown lands are thrown open for application, we will see that he is advised. There is a scheme under the Crown Lands Development Act whereby land can be developed. It is similar to the soldier settlement scheme. It is the desire of all members of this place that we should do everything as speedily as possible to settle returned soldier applicants. However, when that is completed we will do all we can to immediately settle civilian applicants. The honourable member should inform me whether the man referred to is an applicant under the scheme.

INTEREST ON COMMONWEALTH ADVANCES.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Treasurer a reply to the question I asked yesterday relating to the rate of interest on advances made by the Commonwealth Government towards the cost of South Australia's public works programme during the year ended June 30 last?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Interest on advances made by the Commonwealth Government to the State for works purposes during 1951-52 was at the rate of 15s. per cent per annum. This rate was paid on advances totalling £16,062,000. On June 30 this amount, together with a further payment made on June 30 of £2,004,000—a total of £18,066,000—was funded and issued to the State as a loan maturing on April 15, 1955, at £2 per centum per annum interest.

RED SCALE ERADICATION.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question regarding the eradication of red scale?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—The Chief Horticulturist (Mr. Strickland) reports:—

The procedure for securing effective action by suburban gardeners who fail to take measures to control red scale is involved. It requires in each instance the formal service of a notice, and several visits by an inspector. In view of the large number of citrus trees growing in Adelaide home gardens, even an army of inspectors could not cope with the formalities of enforcing red scale control regulations generally throughout the suburban area. To the extent that staff is available the department is always ready to assist in control of red scale in suburban gardens. The pest has been established in these areas for many decades and eradication is not practicable.

ANGASTON CEMENT WORKS.

Mr. TEUSNER—In reply to a question I asked last year the Premier said he expected

the new Angaston cement works to be in production during the latter part of this year. Can he say whether that expectation will be fulfilled, and, if so, to what extent the increased production is likely to alleviate the present cement shortage?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—My latest information, which I received about three weeks ago, is that the expected starting time of September will probably not be realized and that it will be October before the plant commences operations. Such commencement will have some effect on the local production of cement but will not be sufficient to provide for all local requirements and obviate importation of cement until the second plant at Port Adelaide is in operation. Then not only shall we have sufficient cement for all our requirements but also I think, a surplus.

MIGRANTS' FINANCES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I have been informed that certain German migrants working in the building industry at Port Adelaide and other places receive an award rate of £14 a week, plus 15s. for fares, out of which they must pay £3 10s. for their board, 15s. for their room, income tax of £1 15s. a week, and a repayment of their fare at the rate of £2 a week. In addition, they are required to send £5 a week to their wives in Germany leaving them a very small margin to set aside for the purpose of bringing their dependants to this country. In reply to a question by the Leader of the Opposition on July 22, the Minister of Railways informed the House that their passage out had been paid by the Government and a certain amount had to be recovered from their wages each fortnight for the repayment of their fares. Will the Treasurer consider the inauguration of a scheme whereby part of the £2 now being deducted as a repayment for fares could be reserved as a fund to be used for bringing out the dependants of these men? Could steps be taken to reduce the present cost of their board and lodging from £4 5s. a week? Could an approach be made to the Taxation Department to consider them married men with dependants and reduce the amount of the present taxation deduction from £1 15s. a week?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It is not clear from the question whether or not these migrants are working for a private firm.

Mr. Frank Walsh—They are.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Then I have no knowledge of the circumstances of either their

introduction into South Australia or any arrangements made in connection with it, but I will inquire into the matters raised by the honourable member and advise him of my conclusions. I believe the question of taxation is one capable of adjustment, and it is one that I would be prepared to sponsor very firmly, for I believe that, if a person is providing for a wife, the Taxation Department should not be unmindful of such a provision. In connection with the second point raised, I believe that negotiations are already proceeding between the German and Australian Governments with a view to concluding a migration agreement which if reached would undoubtedly provide, amongst other things, for bringing out migrants' dependants under an official scheme which would probably very much lessen, if not completely remove, the financial obligation involved in their coming out privately.

SUPERPHOSPHATE CONTENT.

Mr. PEARSON—Has the Minister of Agriculture a report on the superphosphate analysis about which I asked a question last week?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—I have a report from the Director of Agriculture of considerable interest to the agricultural community, and as it is lengthy I ask permission to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without reading it.

Leave granted. The statement was as follows:—

At a recent conference of agronomists, the various State Departments of Agriculture and the Waite Agricultural Research Institute presented the results of a number of past experiments with phosphatic fertilizers on pastures and crops. The experimental data available shows the general superiority of the water soluble superphosphate over the more insoluble forms of phosphate for crops and pastures in areas which have not previously received substantial dressings of superphosphate. However, it is also shown that—

1. On wheatlands which have received frequent applications of superphosphate the residual value of previously applied phosphate is considerable. Waite Institute results indicate that when land has received slightly more than ½ ton of superphosphate, only maintenance applications may be required which, for an average 20 bushel crop, will be supplied by about 30 lb. of superphosphate.

2. On sown pastures on the acid soils which have been top-dressed annually for a number of years, strong residual effects become apparent after ½ ton of superphosphate per acre has been applied, suggesting that production can be maintained by lower superphosphate dressings.

3. The more insoluble forms of phosphate such as basic slag and ground rock phosphate

have given delayed but appreciable responses on sown pastures. In an experiment at the Waite Institute, ground rock phosphate was just as effective as superphosphate in maintaining production after the fifth year of the experiment, when ½ ton of superphosphate or its equivalent had been applied.

These findings suggest the possible role for the more insoluble forms of phosphatic fertilizer in maintaining phosphorus status and pasture and crop production on land previously heavily fertilized with the water soluble superphosphate.

As a result of the conference, trials have been established throughout the State over a wide range of soil and climatic conditions to test the effect of various forms of superphosphate and other phosphatic fertilizers on cereals and pastures.

With these facts in mind, together with the analyses for the old and new superphosphate, viz.:—

	Old %	New %
Water soluble phosphate . . .	45	36
Citrate soluble phosphate . . .	1	1
Acid soluble phosphate . . .	2	18
Total phosphate	48	55

the questions raised by the member for Flinders can be dealt with.

Question 1—Will the new superphosphate be equal to the old as a fertilizer for (a) cereals, (b) pasture in the various rainfall areas of the State?

Except on virgin country which has no residual phosphate, the overall effect of equivalent dressings of new and old superphosphate will be approximately the same on both cereals and pastures. Although the old superphosphate contains a higher percentage of W.S.P., there is some measure of compensation with the higher percentage of T.P. in the new superphosphate.

On the lower rainfall areas on alkaline soils (e.g., Mallee soils), it is probable that the "old" superphosphate may have a slight advantage over the "new," but the above-mentioned trials will provide the answer. On virgin land, it is expected that the "old" superphosphate will have a distinct advantage over the "new" superphosphate.

Question 2—What are the department's recommendations as to the quantity per application of new superphosphate by comparison with the old on (a) cereals and (b) pasture in the various rainfall areas?

Where substantial reserves of residual phosphorus are present in the soil, i.e., on improved pasture land and wheatland which has received liberal dressings of superphosphate, the quantity of "new" superphosphate used need not exceed the standard dressing of "old" superphosphate.

On virgin land, the quantity of "new" superphosphate used will need to be increased by 15-20 per cent to give the same immediate effect as "old" superphosphate.

Question 3—Will the texture and mechanical properties be in any way adversely affected?

Mr. A. Hicks, Chief Chemist of Adelaide Chemical and Fertilizer Company considers that these properties will remain the same or will be slightly improved.

Question 4—Will the department brief its district advisers as fully as possible on the above points so that they may help farmers in their districts?

The district advisers are kept informed of latest developments which take place.

PLEURO-PNEUMONIA IN CATTLE.

Mr. McLACHLAN—Is the Minister of Agriculture aware of a serious outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia amongst cattle in Victoria and that there are cases within four or five miles of the South Australian border? Are his officers doing everything possible to see that cattle coming from Victoria into South Australia do not become contaminated by infected animals?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—I have not been informed of the outbreak in Victoria, but it is incumbent on the stock inspectorial branch in that State to protect South Australia in accordance with the arrangement between the two States. I will bring the matter under the notice of the veterinary branch and see that every precaution is taken to protect the interests of stock owners in South Australia.

GRUBS IN NORTHERN AREAS.

Mr. RICHES—Has the attention of the Minister of Agriculture been drawn to press reports about a plague of grubs in the northern areas of the State, particularly to a report from the Willochra plains that the grubs have eaten over 400 acres of stock fodder and that the carrying capacity of Mr. Lloyd Jones' station has been reduced by 50 per cent? According to the report Mr. Jones would welcome an investigation by the Department of Agriculture with a view to eradicating the grubs. Have any investigations been made and, if not, will the Minister have one made, because the plague is causing great concern in the northern districts?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—I am afraid that the grubs are prevalent over a much greater area than the Willochra plains. Reports of their presence have come from an area stretching from Murray Bridge to Oodnadatta, and their eradication under those conditions would be extremely difficult, but the Waite Research Institute is making investigations in the northern areas and I am expecting a report at any time. It is obvious that such a widespread plague will be extremely costly to combat, and I am sure the Treasurer would ask questions if I embarked on a scheme of eradication.

EDILLILIE-KYANCUTTA ROAD.

Mr. PEARSON—Has the Minister of Local Government any further information to give in reply to the question I asked last week about the condition of the Edillilie-Kyancutta Road?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I took the matter up with the Commissioner of Highways. I will say at the outset that the conditions that operated this winter are not likely to occur again. We have had a remarkably fine sequence of years on the West Coast during which, in some cases through shipping difficulties, and in others through railway difficulties, an accumulation of stock occurred at country sidings and then, when shipping became available, the products had to be rushed down by road because the railways were not in a position to cater for the traffic. Since then rail facilities have been improved and so has the turn-round of ships, and consequently the difficulties have been ironed out satisfactorily along the lines indicated by the Highways Commissioner. He has stated that to meet the conditions on the Edillilie-Kyancutta road brought about by the conditions to which I have referred it was decided to temporarily cease work near Tumby Bay, and to transfer the gang to Cummins. This decision was made with regret, as it will disorganize the programme, but no other option exists. There is no truth in the suggestion that another gang is to be transferred from the mainland, as no such gang is available. The existing gang is to be strengthened by additional men as available, which probably accounts for the rumour that the honourable member referred to during his question last week. The department is doing as much as is feasible to meet the exceptional conditions on the Edillilie-Kyancutta road, and if wheat is transported by rail during the coming harvest it is hoped that conditions will be much improved. The latest information is that the railways expect to be able to catch up on all the lag in wheat transport, and they will be in a position to cater for the coming harvest, particularly as there is now greater co-ordination between the Wheat Board, Barley Board and the railways, and we will be able to stockpile in some focal points and that will remove the strain on the roads.

RIVERTON-SPALDING RAILWAY.

Mr. QUIRKE—Has the Minister of Railways anything further to add to the reply he gave me last week about the condition of the railway line between Riverton and Spalding?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The Railways Commissioner has stated that there are 2,614

miles of mainline railways in South Australia and nearly 7,000,000 sleepers in the tracks. If a 60 year life is given to the rails and a 30 year life to the sleepers, which is generous, this would require 5,250 tons of rails and 230,000 sleepers per annum to maintain the property in good order, plus requirements for new works. Unfortunately, supplies of rails from the Broken Hill Pty. Co. Ltd. for the last 10 years to South Australia have been at an average rate of 3,300 tons per annum and the supply of sleepers at the present time is less than half this figure. Unless this situation can be remedied speeds will have to be reduced. The railways should form the backbone of our transport system and the Government takes a serious view of the situation and is doing its utmost to assist the Commissioner to obtain necessary supplies.

RIVERTON RAILWAY REFRESHMENT ROOMS.

Mr. QUIRKE—Has the Minister of Railways obtained a report in reply to the question I asked on August 7 about the hours of opening of the refreshment rooms at Riverton?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—So long as the cafeteria car runs on the Broken Hill express on Friday evenings the Riverton refreshment rooms can service trains as follows. All trains not now serviced from Mondays to Fridays can be taken care of. On Saturday afternoons a Spalding to Adelaide train, which is now being serviced with an average of only two to three passengers, also the 6.55 p.m. train Adelaide to Peterborough (not now serviced) will not be serviced. In effect, all trains from Monday to Saturday can be serviced, with the exception of the two trains on Saturdays before mentioned. To summarize, five additional trains, Mondays to Fridays, can be serviced. Two trains on Saturdays, including one now serviced, cannot be serviced. It is, of course, understood that neither Riverton nor Terowie refreshment rooms will be open for the Broken Hill express on Friday nights and Saturday mornings and passengers will be served in the cafeteria car.

GAWLER TRAINS.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—During the debate on the Address in Reply I raised the possibility of getting an additional train on the Gawler service between the 6.16 p.m. and 9.55 p.m. trains. I have been approached by a number of constituents about this matter. They believe that there is room for an additional

train and that none of the existing trains need be cut out. Will the Minister of Railways investigate the possibility of running this additional train?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Yes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: LAND SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. TEUSNER—I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. TEUSNER—It relates to the report in this morning's *Advertiser* of yesterday's discussion on the Land Settlement Act Amendment Bill. The paper reports that I said "The Government had not been looking for land strenuously enough. When given the opportunity of buying it was too slow in deciding." I have conferred with the member for Alexandra and he confirms that this statement was made by him and not by me.

HOMES FOR AGED AND INFIRM.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—I move—

That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that the Government should take steps to provide suitable homes both in the country and the metropolitan area for aged and infirm persons who are pensioners.

I think honourable members are conversant with the fact that with our growing population, and owing to the marvels of surgery and medicine considerably prolonging the life of our population, we have growing numbers of aged people and lesser numbers of infirm persons in the community. I have been unable to get any very comprehensive figures of the aged and invalid pensioners in South Australia, but those I have for the year ended June 30, 1951, which include those in the Northern Territory, are as follows:—Aged pensioners, 30,998, and invalid pensioners 4,423, a total of 35,421. Members must realize the growing inadequacy of the accommodation available for these people. In recent years, ever spiralling costs have been too great a hardship to enable them to obtain suitable accommodation, and as a result large numbers at the moment are living in most deplorable circumstances. Indeed, that has been the position for many years, particularly for aged men, and especially those who have spent their lives following casual occupations as farm and station workers. For a long time I have been seriously troubled by

large numbers of these aged men, who have given a lifetime of service to the pastoral industry in my electorate and in contiguous electorates, and who, when they reach the age at which they can no longer serve in the industry, find themselves without a home in their locality. The same can be said of other parts of the State. Up to the present the great majority of these folk have been compelled to come to the metropolitan area, which is entirely out of their environment, to get any accommodation provided for them.

Local people in certain areas have recently moved in the matter. For instance, the good folk at Mount Gambier have taken it up with much enthusiasm. A fund has been inaugurated and already substantial subscriptions have been provided towards the establishment of a home for aged folk of this type in that area. I understand something has also been done in the district of Port Pirie and also the district of Stanley at Riverton. It will be obvious to all honourable members that these worthy people are doing their best to provide accommodation, but are trying to cope with a situation which is beyond their resources and capacity. Something more comprehensive is required than the spasmodic efforts which have been made from time to time by the Government and religious organizations. I pay a particular tribute to those religious organizations which have done such valuable work for the care of the aged and infirm, and which are still doing their best with their limited resources. This matter has exercised not only my mind but those of many others of goodwill—not only members on both sides of the House, but people throughout the community. We have the very laudable appeal launched by the *News* for a "Pound for pensioners fund" to provide Christmas cheer for these folk throughout the State. I am very pleased to notice that the appeal has the support of the Premier, the Opposition, religious leaders, and leaders of trades unions and other organizations. It would appear that this appeal will be successful, because it is launched with the backing of practically every section of the community. In addition, we find that our kinsfolk overseas have in recent years also become very interested in this problem. In the course of my researches on this matter I discovered that Lord Nuffield established a foundation in England with very substantial funds to care for the aged and infirm in the Old Country. There is in our Parliamentary Library a report of a special committee appointed under the aegis of the

Nuffield Foundation to inquire into the problems of the ageing and the care of old people. The terms of reference under which the survey committee was appointed are of material interest and are as follows:—

To gather as complete information as possible with regard to (1) the various problems—individual, social and medical—associated with ageing and old age; (2) the work being done by public authorities and voluntary organizations, and the public and private resources that exist for the care and comfort of old people in Great Britain; (3) the provision made for old people in those countries that have given special thought to this matter; (4) medical research on the causes and results of ageing; and (5) the lines on which action might usefully be taken in the future by public authorities and private organizations, including the Foundation.

These terms of reference are comprehensive. From the little time I have been able to devote to the study of the report I am satisfied that as a result of the inquiry some valuable suggestions were made for dealing with the problem in the Old Country. For this reason I shall quote briefly from the report. Some of the points mentioned have particular reference to South Australia. I shall not quote extensively, but from each paragraph valuable information can be gathered about how the problem should be tackled. Paragraph 259 is headed "Vast Majority of Aged are Independent." This is typical of our aged people. They are independent and they like to preserve their independence, and, whatever is done in the way of providing homes for them, this matter should always be borne in mind. The paragraph states:—

In the past the problems of old age have too often been considered principally in terms of accommodation and amenities in institutions and homes, whereas the vast majority of old people, probably more than 95 per cent of them, live in private dwellings. The committee's field surveys have shown that of these old people a high proportion lead independent lives, living either alone or alone with their spouse, or as householders having their children (or other relatives or strangers) living with them. It is certain, however, that a considerable number of old persons who are leading independent lives, as well as many who are living as guests of their children, are really unfit on physical or mental grounds to do so. Many cases have been encountered, in each area covered by the field surveys, of old people maintaining a hopeless struggle against adversity in order to cling to their last vestiges of independence. Such excessive devotion to independence can be explained partly by the present serious lack of suitable homes for old people, and partly by the regulated life which is widely believed, not always with justice, to be the common feature of all institutions. If

sufficient homes can be provided, and if the homelike atmosphere found in some of them is introduced into all homes, many old people will prefer no doubt to enter them rather than to continue living in unsatisfactory conditions in private houses. This will lessen the need for extensive plans of home help, home nursing, visiting, and home meals service for old people who would be better off in a home or an institution. The right sphere for such domiciliary services is in helping able-bodied old people in cases of temporary illness or during convalescence.

That deals with conditions in Great Britain, but we have somewhat similar conditions here. Paragraph 260 states:—

Although old people, when left to themselves, usually tend to be immobile from inertia, there is evidence that those occupying houses that are too large for them can frequently be persuaded to move if a suitable small house is available. As less labour and materials are required to build a small bungalow than to build a family house, the building of houses specially for old people constitutes a potential contribution to the cheap and speedy re-housing of younger sections of the population.

Similar conditions exist here. Many aged folk are living in comparatively large houses, where they formerly raised children who have since married and gone elsewhere, with the result that the maintenance of the large houses has become a heavy burden on the aged folk. Under prevailing circumstances they have nowhere else to go. If we could make a small start in South Australia by providing the right type of home for them, in addition to more pleasant surroundings in their last years, this would help to solve our housing problem in the interests of younger people. Paragraph 261 states:—

When building houses for old people it is important that they should be as close as possible to the locality in which they have previously lived, so that they are not cut off from their friends. It is desirable that they should be as near as circumstances permit to a bus stop, to shops, to a place of worship, and to a cinema or other place of entertainment. Segregation of the aged is undesirable, but some grouping would facilitate the provision of domiciliary services. This stresses my point that it is cruel to take aged folk from that part of the country in which they have lived and worked all their lives to an institution in the metropolitan area. Paragraph 268 provides a part summary of the findings, and states:—

Practically all of the five per cent or so of aged persons who do not lead independent lives are living in public assistance institutions or in homes administered by public authorities or voluntary bodies. The visits by members of the committee to a number of institutions have

confirmed the widely-held view that, in the majority of them, the structure, equipment, and regulations are unsuited to the needs of most old people. It is no longer in accordance with the wishes of informed public opinion that old people, unable to lead independent lives, should be housed in large, mixed institutions.

The Committee accordingly recommended:—

(a) That sufficient homes should be provided by local authorities and voluntary agencies to accommodate substantially all the old people now living in institutions, together with the vast number who are now seeking but unable to find accommodation in homes. With reasonable economy homes for 30 to 35 residents can be run at a cost per resident little, if at all, greater than the cost of maintaining them in an institution. It must be realized that the number of homes required over a period of the next 15 or 20 years will total several thousands. All local authorities should give urgent attention to the matter.

(b) That, as an interim measure until homes are available, highly classified institutions should be provided for old people wherever suitable buildings are available. Such institutions could accommodate up to 200 old people in reasonable comfort if restrictive rules are reduced to a minimum. Few, if any, of the old workhouse buildings would be suitable for this purpose.

(c) That there should be general-purpose institutions in which the residents would include the very small number of old people unsuited by nature or circumstances to the freer life of a home. The size of these institutions would depend on the density of the populations that they serve.

(d) That there should be institutions for senile demented. These could be large in areas of concentrated population, but the residents must be medically examined at appropriately frequent intervals to ensure that any who improve sufficiently in condition are removed and either placed in a general-purpose institution or a home or handed over to the care of their relatives.

That extract opens up a very important aspect of this problem in South Australia where we have no institution, except our mental institutions, to care for those people who through age have become somewhat mentally infirm. This problem came before the Public Works Committee in the course of its inquiries when I was a member. One inquiry related to the advisability of providing a new admission and treatment block for female patients at the Parkside Mental Hospital, and in the course of its investigations the committee visited that institution. I am sure that every member of the committee was immeasurably saddened by the pitiful conditions of the aged women who were confined to that institution, which was not built for the treatment of such cases but to which they had to go because there was no other place for them.

From the economic aspect it is more expensive to provide treatment for these people in such institutions than if they were cared for in suitable homes as suggested by this responsible committee of inquiry in Great Britain. The report of the Public Works Committee on the Parkside Mental Hospital (new admission treatment block for females) presented to Parliament on August 17, 1949, states:—

The principal cause of the overcrowding is the increasingly large number of people that the hospital is being called upon to look after who are suffering no more than mental and bodily infirmities arising from old age. The committee referred to the strain that these patients impose on both accommodation and staff in its report on new quarters for the mental nurses, also in reports on proposals for a new general hospital for the metropolitan area, as the same problem exists at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Dr. Birch said that the mental institutions were getting patients of 90 and more years of age and altogether he thought that there were some 500 who simply required a little care in addition to nursing, which could be provided in an infirmary type of hospital. A tremendous amount of the time of the medical and nursing staff was spent in looking after the merely physically ill when they ought to be devoting the whole of their attention to those who had a chance of recovery and those who, because that chance was remote, must be cared for.

That should bring home to members the fact that the problem in South Australia is similar to that in Britain, and it is therefore imperative that steps be taken to solve it. Firstly, there should be small institutions where the restrictions on the freedom of inmates would be as few and as light as possible. These institutions should be provided for the aged of both sexes, whether single, widows, or widowers, and certain amenities for recreation and enjoyment should be provided to enable them to spend their last years in comfort, enjoying a reasonable measure of the social amenities which their more fortunate fellow citizens better endowed with worldly goods are able to enjoy. It should be possible for small gardens to be planted in these institutions and for bowling greens for the men and croquet lawns for the women to be established. I am sure the inmates of such institutions would be prepared to do most of the work required in maintaining such institutions. In fact all that would be required would be perhaps some nursing supervision to care for the minor ailments which were not of sufficient severity to require hospital treatment. Such a plan should take care of the great bulk of the single persons to whom I have referred. There should also be groups of small homes estab-

lished for couples where they could live their own independent existence and where recreation facilities could be provided. Some type of nursing supervision could be provided here too so that minor ailments could be taken care of. Last but not least, instead of sending those who become senile to mental hospitals, there should be some intermediary institution to take care of such cases at much less cost to the State than under the present system. Country members will know this, but if others inquire from hospital boards in country districts they will find that a substantial number of patients are not in hospital because they are suffering from any physical ailment, but largely because they are unable to care for themselves without a little assistance. As they have no relatives to help them the only place they can get assistance is in a hospital ward.

Mr. McKenzie—I learned of a case like that yesterday.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I have many cases of that nature in my electorate, and with the growing costs of hospital services these patients represent a considerable problem to boards of management in maintaining their hospitals in a solvent position. It is to the credit of the Government that the Chief Secretary has usually been fairly generous in his recognition of the cost of maintaining this type of patient in Government-subsidized hospitals, but the point is that this is not the type of patient that hospitals should be taking. They should be admitted to institutions of the type I have mentioned where they may be given more happiness and independence and in the final analysis, be a smaller charge on the State. The question has been asked of me whether these institutions should charge fees, but I am not prepared to say that they should not. This is a question of administration in which the merits of each case would have to be carefully examined, because if we made it financially easier for our aged folk to live we should only be encouraging the Commonwealth Government to reduce old age and invalid pensions, and we should not accept that responsibility. I desire types of homes to be provided where elderly people will be guaranteed the right type of accommodation at a cost within their means. This will mean that the little money they have, which should be partly used to purchase food and clothing, will not all be used in the payment of house rent. Many aged people in the metropolitan area and in the larger country towns are paying exorbitant rents for single rooms, some being 25s. a week for a room

without a fireplace or other necessary comforts. This is a problem that merits the serious attention of all people of goodwill. I feel confident it will have the unanimous backing of members and that as a result the Government will be encouraged to take steps to provide the type of accommodation required to bring a little more happiness into the declining years of the grand pioneers of this country.

Mr. McKENZIE (Murray)—I have much pleasure in seconding the motion, as it is the most humane piece of legislation that has come before this House. As the Leader of the Opposition said, many of these old people have been pioneers of this country and have carried the heat and burden of the day. Perhaps some of them had money at one time but, through no fault of their own, they now find they are almost in the lap of charity. It would be a great thing for them if the Government established homes of the type desired by the Leader of the Opposition. I have had occasion to visit many fine homes in this State which are run by religious bodies. The Salvation Army, for instance, has a wonderful home. The Little Sisters of the Poor, established by the Roman Catholic Church, is also a fine place, and the Methodist Church, and others, have splendid homes for elderly people. They are all doing a wonderful work. Someone has written:—

To the scrapheap we are going
When we're overworked and old,
And our weary heads are showing
Silver threads amongst the gold.

Let us never allow our pioneers to be thrown on the scrapheap. The cost involved means nothing if we consider what these people have done for South Australia. Money does not count now. We are spending millions of pounds every year on our works programme. I could speak for hours on this subject, but I content myself by congratulating the Leader of the Opposition on bringing this motion forward, and trust that it will be carried.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONTROL OF MURRAY WATERS.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY (Chaffey)—I move—

That in the opinion of this House a Select Committee should be appointed to inquire into and report upon the control of the waters of the River Murray within the State of South Australia.

The River Murray is receiving considerable publicity, but that will not do any good to the old river or to those who reside on its banks. If the river were like the one flowing

through Devon, which came down in flood overnight, drowned over 30 people and caused thousands of pounds worth of damage to property, it would be entitled to the publicity it is getting, but the River Murray comes down in flood so quietly and harmlessly that one can hardly see the floods rising. Some slight damage may be caused by the present flood, but for every hundred pounds of damage done there will be many thousands of pounds of benefit to the State, because when the floods subside the plains will have been thoroughly soaked with fresh water, and after being exposed to the spring sunshine the country will be covered with lush grass, while the highlands bordering the river will be as bare of feed as the floor of this Chamber. I make it clear that my motion has no relation to the present flood, but it has something to do with what will take place after the flood recedes. At present the Murray is being murdered by those who are supposed to control this wonderful asset to the State, probably our greatest asset because it is the only sure source of water supply that we have. Practically all organizations, such as women's movements, returned soldiers clubs, primary producers, and traders, have been concerned about what has happened on the river during the last two years.

A conference of the Murray Citrus Growers' Association dealt with this question in my home town of Barmera on March 26. A newspaper report stated that concern at the high salt content of irrigation water resulting from the low river led to a decision by the conference for an approach to be made through the Premier in reference to the delayed closing of weirs. The report stated that the conference discussed the serious conditions which had resulted in districts below Benmark as a result of the delayed closing of the weirs following the recent flood period. This, it was contended, had permitted the waste of much fresh water and created difficulty in regaining normal lock pool levels. The result had been a sharp rise in salt content, which, it was stated, had exceeded 30 grains to the gallon. In the course of discussion it was suggested that authority and control of the closing of locks should be decentralized to facilitate quick and more effective action. As a fruitgrower in the area, I have had on two occasions to pay for special irrigations. On both occasions I was warned by the responsible officer of the Irrigation Department that the water was extremely saline, that it was possibly detrimental to young plants and that

it should be used with the utmost care. I knew, as a grower, that my trees and vines needed water, and one must irrigate if he is growing green manure, but if I used the water I was paying for I would possibly add much salt to my property. That is an invidious position for any grower, and the conference of citrus growers complained about it. The following letter, dated January 15, 1952, was forwarded from the Berri Traders and District Progress Association to the Premier:—

Members of the Berri Traders and District Progress Association which comprises the business interests of the town of Berri are much concerned that once again the Berri punt was out of commission at a period so soon after the river having been in flood. You will no doubt have been informed that over the whole of the Christmas holidays it was impossible to use the Berri punt as the river was too low to effect a landing. This meant that growers of fresh fruit were unable to bring it across the river at Berri but had to cart a much longer distance to the Berri Co-operative Packing Shed *via* Lyrup, apart from the fact that travelling public and business interests connecting with Loxton had to by-pass the town. Several private orchardists with pumps direct from the river found their intakes above the water, due to the rapid fall, and suffered much inconvenience as a result.

Members of my association felt that a statement in the daily press about Christmas time by an officer of the Water Supply Department to the effect that the boards in the lock were being put in and that the water should soon rise, was not a satisfactory answer to the position, especially as this same anomalous position occurred following the last flood. The punt was out of commission due to the flood and within a week or two it was out again on account of the water having gone out of the river. At Berri the position on the occasion of the annual rowing regatta was that the boats had no proper landings, but crews had to handle their craft down the muddy banks in contrast with the situation at Renmark where no effect, such as experienced here, has been noticed. Lock 5 of course controls Renmark, and Lock 4 Berri. On a previous occasion no direct protest was made, but as the same condition has occurred again members of this association feel that an emphatic protest should be made in the interests of the town and district.

Members will agree that is an emphatic reproach to those responsible for controlling the Murray waters. At the time the road at the Loxton punt had been out of commission for some time and the punt had been closed. Within a week of the river starting to drop the road was again closed, because of the low water, it having been allowed to empty out like a bath when one has pulled out the plug. Again connection between the two towns was

held up because those responsible for closing the weirs in the river had delayed the operation too long.

Mr. Hutchens—Surely there is some local person to advise the department?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—This is only one of the instances of inconvenience suffered by Murray dwellers because control is too remote. Unless he is advised from Adelaide the lockmaster can take no action, it not being left to him to decide whether certain work should be carried out. He probably refers the matter to Adelaide, but by the time he is advised it is too late. This trouble I am referring to has happened on a number of occasions. The lockmasters should be consulted. I was pleased to see a statement in the press that there had been a conference of lockmasters for the first time. Settlers at Waikerie have been punished time and time again because of the very saline water they have been forced to use for irrigation. It is not unique for citrus trees in that district to lose their leaves because of this. One must remember that the value of a citrus grove is between £600 and £1,000 an acre. To think that all this could be ruined after one irrigation because the water is too salty!

The Hon. M. McIntosh—I think you are doing a disservice to Waikerie. Waikerie is not ruined, never has been, and is never likely to be because of salty water.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Evidently the Minister knows more about it than I do.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—Just as much. Do you think you are doing the district a service by saying that the citrus trees will be ruined because of salty water?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Has the Minister never heard of citrus trees at Waikerie losing their leaves because of salty water? I have lived continuously on my property at Barnera for 30 years, and that is a lot longer than the Minister ever lived on the river. I doubt whether he has lived there as many months as I have years. Waikerie has on occasions suffered the dropping of leaves from the citrus trees because of the salty nature of the water.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—What do you suggest is the remedy for that?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I will give what I consider conclusive proof of what I am saying. I have used hundreds of millions of gallons of Murray waters. In reply to a complaint by the Renmark Irrigation Trust, the Engineer-in-Chief (Mr. J. R. Dridan) made a statement.

The following was published in the *Murray Pioneer*:—

In a letter to the Renmark Irrigation Trust, the Engineer-in-Chief (Mr. J. R. Dridan) has replied at some length to correspondence from the trust, and discussions at the recent Murray Valley Development League meeting, on the question of replacing weirs, following the recent flood. Complaints had been made at the manner in which the river level had fallen away before the weirs were back in operation, following the flood. Mr. Dridan stated that the department gives particular attention to the level at Renmark, in order to eliminate the necessity for operating No. 1 pump.

Mr. Dridan said that the River Murray Commission decided some time ago to mechanize lock cranes, and the one at Blanchetown had been converted for experimental purposes. As soon as the commission was fully satisfied on the safety and reliability of the equipment the mechanization of all lock cranes would be proceeded with. Lock 5, he stated, had saved Renmark thousands of pounds in this way over the past 25 years. However, no undertaking could be given that the level above this or any other lock would not recede below pool level on occasions.

I quote these various bodies because it shows that from Berri to Barmera and on to Renmark all the river settlers are concerned. Why cannot the full level be kept practically stable? The whole function of the weirs is to keep this level at a given height, and I cannot see why this could not be done. There are considerable reserves of water in Lake Victoria and this is released to enable the pool level to be maintained. I have seen the river for practically two years without any flood waters and with no movement over the weirs; in effect the Murray was a series of lakes. Despite that, the pool level can be kept up because of the reserves. The article continues:—

The River Murray Commission had appointed an executive engineer to co-ordinate and supervise the workings of the separate State authorities in connection with the regulation and operation of all River Murray works. Mr. Dridan stated that any pumping installations on the river should be designed so that they could draw water at any level of the stream.

If the river level were kept stable that would overcome the difficulty. I understood that was the function of those who control the weirs. The article continues:—

He stated that in the instance to which the trust's letter had referred, the river fell away rapidly. Further, none of the weirs could be replaced until the water had receded to a certain level.

What happens, he pointed out, is that the replacement of the upper-most weir temporarily reduces the level further downstream, thus causing a quick fall in the level at the next weir. And this effect is multiplied to some extent lower down.

At this juncture I shall draw the House's attention to a report recently placed before members from Mr. T. A. Barnes, M.Sc., Deputy Director of Mines and Deputy Government Geologist. I have the permission of the Deputy Speaker to place a map on the blackboard in the Chamber. It shows, on the south side of the river, an extensive area coloured pink. Above it is the area from which the pink area gets water. It is saline, which is the reason why the Government has provided pipelines in various districts. The Engineer-in-Chief points out that when the river empties the water in the banks seeps back into the river. The first weir has prevented any fresh water coming down and, in effect, there is a concentration of saline water in the river. Like other settlers I was interested to know why, after two years of fresh water flooding, the water became so salty that it was a menace to growth. I formed the opinion that when the water from the River Murray was out, and there was a large exposure of land on either side, the water held back by the river water seeped back into the river. Mr. Barnes says:—

Saline waters occupy the northern portion of the area, and presumably originate from the Barrier Range intake. The possible effect of these saline waters following any disturbance of present equilibrium (*e.g.*, by large withdrawals of good quality water for irrigation purposes) needs careful study. An extension of the survey northwards, together with the establishment of a number of salinity check-points for periodic sampling and analysis, is thought advisable.

Mr. Barnes pointed out that the action of withdrawing a considerable quantity of water from the river by irrigation has to be carefully watched, because if a large body of water is withdrawn in this way there is a greater concentration of salt from the water in the river banks. The department allows the river to empty, and the level of the water becomes so low that there is not enough to float a punt. When the first lock near the Victorian border was put in we automatically cut off the fresh water supply at every lock in the river, and salt water seeped in. Is there any wonder that the growers have to use this salt water? yet the Irrigation Department warns them of the dangers of using it. If a settler does not take the water during a dry summer his trees die, and if he takes it they still die. This may be an extreme point, but there is no doubt that the trees are detrimentally affected. I suggest that this is a matter which could be investigated. The press report continues:—

During the recent replacement of weirs, the effect has been accentuated to some extent through some unavoidable delay in replacing

the weir at Lock 7. This is unfavourably situated, as it was necessary to place it above the mouth of the Rufus River, and this is the lake Victoria outlet.

When the time had arrived to replace the weir at Lock 7, after the trestles had been lying on the concrete floor for 21 months, the floor of the weir was covered with from five to six feet of sand, and this could only be removed by building up the weir on one side to create a greater velocity, and ejecting the sand with jets of compressed air.

The point here is that the sand had accumulated.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—It had accumulated over the years.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—That is the danger weir of the whole system. For 21 months the trestles were down and when an attempt was made to put them back it was found that five or six feet of sand had accumulated. If the sand had accumulated over the years, the department should have known that it would be necessary in a comparatively short period to replace the weir. One would have thought that preparations would be made to do that. It is common practice to use a diver in a matter of this sort. If the department had shown any foresight it would have had a diver available to move the sand and speedily replace the weir. There is a discussion on whether the present type of weir is what it should be. It holds back water, but it does not allow silt at the foot of the weir to escape. It has been suggested that instead of allowing the water to escape over the top, there should be some way for the bottom of the weir to be lifted to cause a forced draught and allow the silt, or anything else accumulated there, to be washed away. On occasions the river has been more or less stagnant. Before irrigation takes place the department releases water from Lake Victoria in order to freshen the river water. Everybody knows that fresh water floats on the top of salt water. Therefore when the fresh water is released it flows over the top of the salt water. If it were released through the bottom of the weir the salt water would go on and the fresh water would be retained. This is a matter on which evidence could be obtained. The press report continues:—

Before this difficulty was overcome, it had been necessary to lower the level at several locks further downstream, in order to avoid subjecting them to an excessive head of water, and while pool levels were recovering normal, water had been released from Lake Victoria to assist South Australia. The Engineer-in-Chief further stated that the control of locks and

weirs is co-ordinated and weekly bulletins are issued by the R.M. Commission, showing flow conditions from Albury down, and when weirs are out, proposed replacement dates for the various weirs.

If all this co-ordination takes place it is singularly unsuccessful. One would assume from a statement of that kind that when there is not enough water in the river to float a punt, and not more than three or four feet is necessary, there is something wrong with the organization. This is another point on which there could be an inquiry.

I did not know whether to move for a Select Committee or a Royal Commission. I hope that a decision on this motion will be reached soon so that the Select Committee will be able to complete its inquiries before the end of the session. I decided against incurring the extra expense of a Royal Commission. The time is long past when only those who live along the banks of the river have a direct interest in its control. We have the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline, and there is to be an extension of it to Woomera. We have also the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline. No doubt as time goes on more and more areas of the State will depend on the River Murray for a permanent water supply. Recently I read a statement in the press that many water users in Adelaide had their electrical appliances detrimentally affected because of some impurity in the water. I gathered that it was from using the bore water supplied at the time. If it is true that bore water affects appliances of this sort, I have no doubt that the added salinity in the River Murray water will also affect them. If that is a fact, why spend five or six million pounds to get River Murray water to the city?

The Hon. M. McIntosh—You do not suggest that we are bringing water from a saline source?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I suggest that the water comes from the River Murray, and the Engineer-in-Chief has said that it is saline.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—That water has been used for years for all purposes.

Mr. Shannon—What about Murray Bridge, Mannum and other towns?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I do not know of any town along the river where the water is used for cooking purposes.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—The water in the river between Mannum and the Lakes is far fresher than the water from any reservoir in South Australia.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—When flowing, the water in the River Murray is perfect. It is when it gets salty that it becomes a danger to plant life, and I suggest that if £5,000,000 is to be spent in bringing water to Adelaide we should be sure that we bring the best water available. If the water is not abused it will be good, and we must ensure that this beautiful permanent supply is kept pure.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—It cannot be impure at Berri and yet pure when it reaches Murray Bridge.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—That is my point. Today not only are settlers along the banks of the Murray directly affected by its flow, but people as far away as Woomera and Whyalla have become interested in the control of Murray waters, and soon people in Adelaide and other places will become directly interested in it. Water is a prime necessity of life itself and is more important than all our deposits of uranium and coal, no matter how important these may be. So far gold has not been discovered in South Australia, but along the River Murray water has been turned into gold. If the proposed committee could assure interested parties that everything possible had been done to adequately control the river waters, then it would have done a worthwhile task in cleaning up existing doubts. If on the other hand it made recommendations which would stabilize the amount of water in the river following on a flood it would benefit not only the settlers but the responsible department. I ask the Government in particular and this House in general to seriously consider this question. Sooner or later it will have to be seriously considered, for the waters of the Murray are too valuable to allow anything but the very best use to be made of them. Grave major mistakes have been made in the past, and I ask that a committee representing all lines of political thought in this House be appointed to inquire and report on the matter because of the very real feeling that the best use has not been made of South Australia's most valuable asset—the water from the River Murray.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. FLETCHER (Mount Gambier), having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Local Government Act, 1934-1951.

Read a first time.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. CHRISTIAN (Eyre), having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Licensing Act, 1932-1949.

Read a first time.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The subject of this Bill is a very vexed question and one full of difficulties. I have applied myself to solving some of the problems involved and express to the Chairman of the State Traffic Committee (Mr. Pattinson) my appreciation of the courtesy extended by him in discussing this subject with me. He and his committee have given much time and thought to the problems involved, and, although agreeing in principle that something along these lines would be beneficial if accomplished without undue interference with the motor trade generally and without undue cost to any State department, they feel that it might not be worth the expense involved to act in the proposed manner, and have reported adversely on it. The Registrar of Motor Vehicles (Mr. Walker), a member of the committee, is one who holds this view. He frankly admitted to me that, although he considers there is some merit in the suggestion that the motorist should be protected against unlawful use of his vehicle, he thinks my proposal would mean unnecessary expense and work for his department. The secretary of the Royal Automobile Association (Mr. Boykett), although heartily supporting the principle behind the Bill, is a little worried about all the inconvenience which might be occasioned to motor vehicle owners. The Commissioner of Police (Mr. Green) and the Superintendent of the Criminal Investigation Branch (Inspector Gill) support my proposal unequivocally, as they claim it would definitely assist their department in its work. Inspector Gill estimated that thousands of man-hours a year would be saved by the adoption of one particular suggestion, namely, police inspection of vehicles before registration.

Because of conditions obtaining in modern society motor vehicles frequently travel over State borders, and the interstate aspect of this question renders essential the adoption of some uniform practice throughout the Commonwealth. I shall outline later what is being done in the United States of America, but the problem in Australia is not so great because we have only six States and far fewer motor vehicles. I

admit that if one State tackles the problem and others do not there may be a grave weakness in the system. At present car thieves are operating in many States, but if some of the loopholes in our laws can be closed other States may follow our example, especially if this can be done without undue cost to the owner or undue labour to a Government department. Some members may say that Victoria has a system under which a certificate of title is given to the owner, but that only 50 per cent of authorities favour the system. In that State the Police Department is the registering authority, and the police there say that the issue of a certificate of title has some merit. Some may say that the courts have held that such a certificate is not evidence of ownership and may point to the ease with which one can secure a certificate if the original is lost or destroyed. This can be done by making a statutory declaration, and a new certificate is issued for a fee of one shilling. The making of a false declaration, of course, means nothing to a rogue and he has not much trouble in obtaining a certificate. That is one of the weaknesses of the system in Victoria, but I have applied my mind to overcoming it.

The methods adopted by car thieves are interesting. Perhaps a thief obtains the necessary particulars about a car he plans to steal from the registration disc on the windscreen. He may then pay the registration fee and get a receipt from the department as well as a sticker to place on the windscreen. He may keep the papers and the sticker for weeks before stealing the car. After removing the disc on the windscreen he attaches his sticker and sells the car in another State. The purchaser, after inspecting the registration papers and the disc, has no reason to suspect that the car has been stolen, but ultimately the police will discover it.

Mr. O'Halloran—Do you know of cases where that has occurred?

Mr. SHANNON—Yes. A North Terrace doctor lost his car under those circumstances. Some thieves buy a new, popular make of car and register it. A little later they steal its full brother of the same colour, so they now have two cars as alike as two peas, with the exception that the engine numbers, of course, are different. They then tinker with the engine number of the stolen car to make it the same as the number of the one purchased. The stolen car is then taken to another State and sold. The police now have in their possession a car suspected of having been stolen by this method. Close examination by the police generally

reveals whether the engine number of a car has been tampered with. A case came before Mr. L. F. J. Johnston, S.M., at Port Adelaide, in which a person was apprehended for a minor traffic offence. The traffic constable was surprised to discover when he saw the registration papers that in not one particular did they comply with the car, except that the registration expired at the same time as the date shown on the windscreen disc. The thief in this case did not worry about obtaining the necessary particulars before applying for registration. He merely went to the Motor Vehicles Department and took out registration papers and obtained a disc.

Mr. O'Halloran—Wasn't the car even of the same make as that shown on the registration papers?

Mr. SHANNON—No.

Mr. Pattinson—He registered a non-existent car.

Mr. SHANNON—Yes, an imaginary vehicle. Having obtained the registration papers he stole a car and put the sticker on the windscreen. He drove the car for months before being apprehended for committing a traffic breach. His malefactions were then uncovered. I asked Inspector Gill what steps the police could take to prevent such practices. He said it would be like looking for a needle in a haystack, and that if it were a popular make of car the police would have to block traffic and examine every vehicle of that make. If a thief knew that the police intended to organize traffic blocks he would keep the car in a garage for a time. I think I have shown that it is easy for a thief to obtain registration papers and a sticker to place on the windscreen. I pay a tribute to the South Australian Police Force for the good work it has done in locating stolen vehicles. Inspector Gill told me that in the year 1951-52, 284 motor cars were stolen in South Australia. Of these, 280 were recovered, leaving only four still not accounted for. There were 575 motor cycles stolen, and 563 were recovered. That is a great effort when one considers the magnitude of the task of recovering stolen vehicles.

Mr. Whittle—How many vehicles were recovered in other States?

Mr. SHANNON—I did not ask for that information. The motor cycle is particularly easy to break up for parts. Spare part dealers are very numerous, and it is therefore difficult to trace cycle parts. I asked Inspector Gill whether he would favour a law making motor vehicles operating in this State subject to an

examination by a police officer before they could be registered for the first time, if a new vehicle, or re-registered if an old vehicle. With such a law he believed that the police would recover a number of vehicles stolen from other States which they do not know about at the moment and which are being driven by people who have documents which appear to be in order. However, the police would be unable to make a check unless they examined the vehicle. I have an extract from the Mercantile Trade Protection Association Journal of May 3, 1952. This association is interested in looking after the State's commercial life and is possibly the most reliable source of information traders have to refer to when seeking information regarding people who want credit. It is well known and of high repute. It contains the following under the heading "Title To Motor Cars":—

One of the nightmares of the average motor car dealer is whether in purchasing a motor car for cash he is obtaining a good title to it. The vehicle may have been stolen; it may be under a bill of sale or subject to a hire purchase agreement. When purchasing a car registered in South Australia a fairly reliable check up can be made with the assistance of the police as regards stolen property, a trade protection association as regards a bill of sale, and by inquiring from the previous vendor of the vehicle, whose name and receipts should always be obtained; the question of a hire purchase agreement can usually be satisfactorily settled. In the case of vehicles from another State, however, the position is more difficult, conditions are somewhat different, and a brief outline of the method of registration in the adjacent States may be of interest to our subscribers.

New South Wales is perhaps the happiest hunting ground in Australia for the car thief. There all registrations are made by the Department of Road Transport in Sydney, and no record of bills of sale or hire purchase agreements is retained at that office, although it is felt by many there that the situation in that regard is unsatisfactory. The police in all States give reciprocal information regarding descriptions of cars reported stolen. The article sets out to acquaint the motor owner with the risks he is running in respect of the proprietary rights in the vehicle. An article appeared in the *New Australasian Post* of July, 1952, headed "Car Stealing is now Big Business." It gives numerous instances of how these cars are dealt with by rogues in various parts of the Commonwealth, and shows how easy it is for documents to be obtained to verify ownership. Last year in New South Wales, 2,558 cars were stolen, 15

per cent of which were never recovered; 1,200 cars have been stolen this year up to July. A total of 1,498 motor cycle were stolen last year, 35 per cent of which were never recovered. I have no details of the number of cars stripped. In Victoria 1,147 cars were stolen between February 1 and June 1 this year, 60 were not recovered and 217 were stripped; 511 motor cycles were stolen in the same period, two-thirds of them not being recovered or being found stripped. In Queensland 228 cars and trucks were stolen from December 1 to May 31 last and only two were not recovered. No figures are available of the number of vehicles stripped, but the police say there are very few. Queensland has some police supervision of car registration, and I think that accounts for its better figures. In Western Australia no official figures are released, but it is estimated that five cars and two motor cycles are stolen on the average every week. Most of them are recovered. Few cars, but many motor cycles, are stripped. No official figures are available for Tasmania, but the police say that car thefts are on the increase. Since World War II, every stolen car has been recovered. Possibly the reason is that it is not easy to ship a stolen car out of Tasmania. I shall now deal with what the other States have attempted to do to improve the position. Victoria has what they call a certificate of title. Section 36 of the motor regulations provides:—

Every application for the registration of a motor car . . . , registration of a trailer . . . , or registration of a motor cycle shall be in the form or to the effect of the form contained in the 10th schedule.

Section 37 is as follows:—

The owner of a motor car or trailer residing outside a radius of 13 miles from the General Post Office, Melbourne, who desires such a car or trailer to be registered shall present such car or trailer for inspection by a member of the police force in charge of a police station in the State of Victoria.

If an owner desires to get an owner's certificate for his car the law provides as follows:—

The Chief Commissioner of Police shall—

- (a) on the first registration of any motor car effected after the coming into operation of these regulations; or
- (b) on the first renewal of registration or on the first transfer of registration (whichever is the earlier) of any motor car effected after the coming into operation of these regulations;

issue to the registered owner in respect of such motor car on payment of the prescribed fee an owner's certificate in the form contained in the 32nd schedule. The fee for such owner's certificate shall be one shilling.

The following is what I consider a weakness in the Victorian legislation:—

The Chief Commissioner of Police may on production of a damaged or defaced owner's certificate, or on being satisfied by statutory declaration or otherwise, of the loss or destruction thereof, issue a duplicate owner's certificate. The fee for such duplicate shall be one shilling.

The Victorian police are really in charge of motor registrations. An attempt was made by the Victorian Parliament to provide a regulation which would tie up the transfer of vehicles. In that State if a man sells a motor vehicle he must produce a certificate of title, and that is what I propose should be the law here. The Queensland regulation on the matter provides:—

Such motor vehicle shall be submitted to the Commissioner of Main Roads or to an authorized person for inspection.

This official is in charge of vehicle registration and is empowered to delegate the authority of inspection to the police or other authorized person. The information I have placed before the House indicates that this question of checking the ownership of vehicles and the issuing of documents relating to ownership has been taken into serious account by the other States, and it is about time we did something about it. I have before me a copy of the American Motor Vehicle Administration, Registration, Certificate of Title, and Anti-theft Act, section 30 of which provides:—

Police authority of department—The commissioner and such officers and inspectors of the department as he shall designate and all members of the division of highway safety and patrol shall have the power . . . to inspect any vehicle of a type required to be registered hereunder in any public garage or repair shop or in any place where such vehicles are held for sale or wrecking for the purpose of locating stolen vehicles and investigating the title and registration thereon.

I understand this is the form of control that Washington desires to introduce in the various States so that there will be a uniform system for the whole of the United States of America. Section 34 (6) says:—

No certificate of title need be obtained for any vehicle of a type subject to registration owned by the Government of the United States. I do not propose to exclude Government vehicles from the obligation of having registration books. Section 35 says:—

Every owner of a vehicle subject to registration hereunder shall make application to the department for the registration thereof and issuance of a certificate of title for such vehicle upon the appropriate form or forms

furnished by the department and every such application shall bear the signature of the owner written with pen and ink and said signature shall be acknowledged by the owner before a person authorized to administer oaths and said application shall contain . . .

These are some of the steps taken in that country. I shall be glad to let honourable members have a look at the booklet. Clause 3 of the Bill provides for the inspection of vehicles before registration. After the Bill becomes law, any new vehicle for registration will have to be taken to a police station for inspection. One copy of the certificate will be handed to the owner of the vehicle for registration purposes, another will be sent to the Registrar, and a third will be retained by the police station for record purposes. The sending of a copy to the Registrar will prevent any tampering with the certificate by the owner of the vehicle. The sergeant in charge of the recovery of stolen vehicles in Adelaide says that if we could get this inspection and issuance of certificates it would go a long way towards catching offenders. At present it is easy to registrar a vehicle without any questions being asked. After the Registrar has issued a registration book there will be no need for a further inspection of a vehicle by the police. The registration book will apply for the life of the vehicle. The book will cost 2s. 6d. and then there will be the expense of having the vehicle inspected by the police. The ordinary motorist will have no heavy expense to bear. The Bill provides for the issuing of registration books to cover the full 12 monthly period. After the proclamation of the legislation, it will probably be 12 months before some vehicles need registration books. I have done that purposely after discussing the matter with the Police Commissioner. Mr. Green said that if this matter is spread over a period of 12 months the 300,000 odd motor vehicles in South Australia can be handled, perhaps without any additional staff, but if extra staff is needed there will be only a slight increase. He thinks it will necessitate a number of inspecting officers at the Motor Vehicles Department, and that the work can be done by the police without undue interference with their other duties.

The Bill provides for the transfer of ownership of registration books. When a vehicle is sold the book will have to be produced to the Registrar and the name of the new owner and all the details inserted in it. This will keep the record of the vehicle intact. One firm in Adelaide advertises that it is unnecessary to have engine repairs, and suggests putting in

a new engine. I understand that the service is being fairly widely availed of by certain commercial interests. In the event of any change in the physical characteristic of a vehicle, and it may be a change in passenger or goods carrying capacity, a record must be made in the registration book. The Bill makes it compulsory to present the book at each re-registering time, and this will enable the department to make a note that the vehicle has been registered for the current period. This will provide also a check on anyone who wants to re-register a stolen vehicle. No vehicle will be registered without the production of the book. After discussing the matter with the police I feel that this provision is necessary. Penalties are provided for any wrongful alterations to the book by the owner. The Bill provides for the going out of existence of a vehicle through being broken up. The owner has the obligation to deliver the book to the Registrar, who will file it for a satisfactory period before destroying it. The Bill also provides for its production on certain occasions when the police suspect the honesty of any persons.

The 48 hours mentioned in the clause for the production of the book is considerably shorter than the 21 days at present allowed an owner to supply certain information on selling his vehicle. According to Mr. Walker there are a great number of occasions when the 21 days is not complied with, and he doubts whether the 48 hours will be complied with, so I consulted Mr. Bean on the matter. He said that when it comes to a matter of proving ownership it is necessary to have a short period. He thinks 48 hours is long enough, because that covers the period of the week-end. A longer period is considered unnecessary because if the police have any suspicions and they are well founded the suspected person in 21 days can get away and be hard to find. The Bill ties up the issue of duplicate registration books much more securely than has been done in Victoria, by providing that, on the owner's reporting the loss of a book to the Registrar, such loss shall be advertised in the daily press at the expense of the owner. Surely that is not an undue hardship on the careless motorist who has lost a valuable document. As an owner will be required to produce his book only once or twice a year on renewing his registration and when a vehicle changes hands, after becoming aware of the loss of his book he will probably have some time during which to apply to the department for the issue of a duplicate.

New section 291 deals with offences relating to the misuse of registration books. The Bill contains good points from the British law relating to the issue of registration books, and it should be allowed to go into Committee so that its provisions may be discussed clause by clause. In particular members should consider the value of the Police Department as an agent of the Registrar in examining every vehicle before registration. I cannot see how illegal interstate trafficking in motor vehicles can be stopped in the absence of a uniform law throughout the Commonwealth, nor do I suggest that this Bill will stop the activities of the so-called joy rider, for it has been held that such a person, not having taken the car for his own permanent use, is not guilty of theft. The only way to slow down the activities of the joy rider is to give the courts greater power to punish him, for surely if he uses another person's car for his own purposes, even for only a short period, he is a thief. I ask members to support the Bill.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

EARLY CLOSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time. This Bill deals only with hardships existing in certain cases and I introduce it because I have had brought to my attention the difficulties of people living in my district, some of whom work in the city and must leave their homes early in the morning, some even before 6 a.m. These people arrive home long after 5.30 p.m., the normal closing time of shops. As a result of the enforced absence of a considerable number of people from the district during the legal trading hours, hairdressers at Stirling, Hahndorf and Woodside have gone out of business, and other hairdressers are trying to cope with long queues of people requiring haircuts on Saturday morning. Clause 3 provides that the Governor may proclaim that the closing times prescribed by sections 35 and 36 of the Early Closing Act shall not apply with respect to the business of hairdressing carried on in hairdressers' shops within a shopping district other than the Metropolitan Shopping District. Though I had in mind the needs of people living in my district, the Bill will also open the door to other country districts where similar conditions may apply and in respect of which

the Governor may issue a similar proclamation. For instance, farm labourers may experience difficulty in visiting hairdressers' shops in ordinary trading hours. This Bill has the merit of enabling the provision of a facility which the country hairdresser is only too willing to give because it is part of his livelihood, but which he cannot give under present conditions. These small country hairdressers are not wealthy, many of the shops being one-man businesses, and, if a large part of the trade they should have is denied them because of the provisions of the Act, a genuine hardship is imposed upon them. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

Mr. TAPPING secured the adjournment of the debate.

DECENTRALIZATION OF INDUSTRY.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. O'Halloran—

That in view of the alarming concentration of population in the metropolitan area of South Australia, an address be presented to the Lieutenant-Governor praying His Excellency to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into and report upon—

- (a) whether industries ancillary to primary production, such as meat works, establishments for treating hides, skins, etc., and other works for the processing of primary products should be established in country districts; and
- (b) what other secondary industries could appropriately be transferred from the metropolitan area to the country; and
- (c) what new industries could be established in country districts; and
- (d) whether more railway construction and maintenance work could be done at country railway depots; and
- (e) what housing provision should be made to assist a programme of decentralization.

(Continued from August 13. Page 373.)

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—Members will see that the motion deals with the problem of trying to build up the population in the country and of building up country activities generally. It is general in its nature and covers almost the entire field of decentralization of industries and population. The Leader of the Opposition suggests that a Royal Commission be appointed with wide terms of reference with a view to finding means for a better decentralization of industry than has been achieved up to the present. From one point of view it will have the support of every member. Every country in the world is seeking a solution of this problem.

Mr. O'Halloran—I merely suggest that we make a start at arriving at a solution in South Australia.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The lure of the city is not peculiar to South Australia. Some countries are affected more by centralization than others. Even in European countries we find immense centres of population alongside sparsely-settled rural areas. I do not think any member will disagree with the motives of the Leader of the Opposition in submitting the motion. Anything that can be done to achieve decentralization is desirable. I have lived in the country all my life and believe the advantages of living there are much under-rated and that those of living in the city are over-rated. Nevertheless, the problem of centralization has intensified in recent years. I believe that every political party and organization of any standing in Australia would support the motive of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. O'Halloran—With all that support we should be getting somewhere.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have no doubt that we will get somewhere. I agree with an eminent writer who said that in discussion one frequently finds cures for many problems. I welcome this discussion because I believe it will be a fruitful one, irrespective of whether the means suggested by the honourable member are ultimately adopted. However, his speech in one or two respects, was illogical. He is one of the best debaters in the House and all members will agree that he is usually extremely logical, but in his speech he asked for a Royal Commission to make an inquiry, and that naturally suggests he was looking for solutions. However, from his speech it was apparent he was not looking for solutions, but for an opportunity to expound a policy he believes to be right.

Mr. O'Halloran—A simple way to test it would be to appoint a Commission.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—He put forward a policy that has been adopted by his Party for many years.

Mr. O'Halloran—That does not make it wrong.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I am not suggesting that. I merely say that makes his request for a commission rather illogical when he has the answers before putting the questions. When controversial matters arise, instead of doing some useful thinking to find solutions, the immediate reaction is often to get a committee appointed to work out the solutions. The appointment of a committee is of great

advantage because if its recommendations are not acceptable, one need not trouble to read the report, but if newspaper reports indicate that the recommendations are acceptable one may obtain a copy and quote them on appropriate occasions. The idea of appointing a Royal Commission to find solutions of a problem is not novel. In 1943 the late Mr. J. B. Chifley, who was then Minister for Post-War Reconstruction, appointed a committee under the National Security (Inquiries) Regulations and the National Security (General) Regulations. An extract from the *Commonwealth Gazette* of March 4, 1943, states:—

In pursuance of the powers conferred by the National Security (Inquiries) Regulations, I, Joseph Benedict Chifley, the Minister of State for Post-War Reconstruction, hereby appoint the Honourable Frank Joseph Scott Wise, Mr. James Francis Murphy, Professor Samuel MacMahon Wadham, and Mr. Cecil Ralph Lambert, to be a Board of Inquiry to inquire into, and report to me on, the following matters, being matters in relation to the public safety and defence of the Commonwealth:—

- (a) The organization of Australian rural economy for the purpose of the defence of the Commonwealth and the effectual prosecution of the war, including the efficiency of methods of production, distribution and marketing of primary products, and the conservation, maintenance and development of the natural resources of Australia; and
- (b) The reorganization and rehabilitation of the Australian rural economy during the post war period:

and I appoint the said Honourable Frank Joseph Scott Wise to be the chairman of the board.

I do not query the wisdom of appointing those persons. I know the first three persons mentioned. Mr. Wise served in the Department of Agriculture of Queensland with outstanding success for some years. He transferred to the Department of Agriculture in Western Australia, where he served with great success and introduced the production of tropical fruits there. He then became a member of Parliament, and later Leader of the Opposition before becoming Premier of Western Australia. He is now Administrator of the Northern Territory and, incidentally, was appointed by a Liberal Government so his high qualifications have been completely acceptable to all political parties. Mr. Murphy is head of the Commerce Department and one of the most able public servants the Commonwealth has ever produced. He has been responsible for the wartime marketing of many commodities, and possesses the greatest sincerity and integrity. Professor Wadham is

the authority whom the Leader of the Opposition quoted last week, so no one can belittle him.

Mr. O'Halloran—I quoted an article based on another article by Professor Wadham, and not the professor himself.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It amounts to the same thing, for it shows that the professor was regarded as a very great authority by the other authority whom the honourable member quoted. I do not know Mr. Lambert, but have not the slightest doubt that his qualifications are very good or he would not have been appointed. In order that there shall be no doubt that this matter has been thoroughly investigated, I quote a brief extract from the preface to the first report of the Commission, as follows:—

Early decision was required to determine the extent of the evidence to be taken and the tours of inspection to be made in country districts. The Commission took the view that it was quite impracticable to visit every rural centre in Australia; on the other hand, as the inquiry concerned the country side as much or more than the cities, it was necessary to visit typical country centres and districts. In this way local groups of citizens or prominent individuals would be able to make contact with the Commission, and, further, the Commissioners themselves would be the better able to form an impression of the quality and special features of certain areas or projects upon which they would be called either to report or to base their conclusions. Naturally there are many areas which the Commission has not been able to see in the time available, notably the northern parts of Western Australia and South Australia, the Northern Territory, Western and Central Queensland, and that portion of New South Wales to the west of the Darling. Members will see from that that the Commission visited substantially the whole of the agricultural areas of Australia. As to the scope of the inquiry the preface goes on:—

The Commission visited South Australia from the 17th April to the 27th May and Tasmania between the 12th and the 22nd June. It had been intended to take Victorian evidence about this period but, at the special request of the Honourable the Premier of that State, inquiries were postponed until a later date. Queensland was visited between the 1st July and the 5th August, the Commission moving as far north as the Atherton Tableland and as far inland as Chinchilla. Inquiries in New South Wales, in Melbourne and in irrigation areas on the Murray occupied the period between the 6th August and the 21st November. A country tour in Victoria took place from the 6th December to the 18th December. From the 14th March to the date of this report, evidence has been taken in the capital cities and, in addition, 232 country centres throughout the Commonwealth were visited for the purpose of taking evidence or

making inspections; during the period of its activities the Commission has travelled a distance of 33,350 miles, mainly by railways. The Commission has held 202 sessions at which

evidence was taken, 808 witnesses being heard. The wide field from which representative witnesses were drawn is indicated by the following statement and references:—

Number of Witnesses representing:

State.	Total number of witnesses.	Farmers' organizations, wealth institutions and business firms, Individual citizens.			
		State Government Departments.	Commonwealth Government Departments.	State Government and business firms.	Individual citizens.
New South Wales	257	83	2	162	10
Victoria	214	45	7	114	48
Queensland	105	26	—	77	2
South Australia	86	20	8	55	3
Western Australia	91	27	5	48	11
Tasmania	55	32	—	17	6
Totals	808	233	22	473	80

It will be seen that the report was based on the widest possible national scope without respect to expenditure and compiled by the most competent people that one of our greatest statesman was able to select.

Mr. O'Halloran—I agree as to the greatest statesman.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Exactly, and I think the honourable member will agree that this commission went to untold trouble to get at the truth of this problem.

Mr. O'Halloran—That was the problem of rural rehabilitation.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will refer to the topics which this commission dealt with in due course because I do not want to destroy my consecutive line of thought. I will also deal with the findings of the commission upon this topic, because this will be an example of just how ineffective the best commission is if it brings in findings with which one does not happen to agree.

Mr. Pattinson—We are not without experience of that in this State.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The report goes on to say:—

The farmers' organizations, the institutions and business firms from which evidence was taken included various associations in each State; the Federal executive, State executives and numerous country sub-branches of the Returned Sailors, Soldiers and Airmen's Imperial League of Australia, the Associated Banks, the Royal Agricultural Societies, institutions established for the advancement of agriculture, stock firms and business establishments having rural interests. So far the Commonwealth Government officers who have appeared before the commission are mainly associated with the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research. Apart from arrangements already made to take further evidence in Victoria, a few other organizations and institutions have indicated their desire to be heard.

The commission feels, however, that it has sufficient information upon which to base its findings and, because of the need for expedition in submitting a first report, it may not be necessary or possible to arrange for such evidence to be taken in all cases.

This commission, which was set up almost in line with many of the things the honourable member seeks, in its report dealt with, for example, the question of cutting up land for closer settlement, on which the Leader of the Opposition had some very specific comments. It dealt with the general question of the policy of closer settlement; the size of holdings; co-operative farming; marginal areas; decentralization of industry; and rural population. It even made inquiries into the Snowy River scheme and the Bradfield scheme for diverting Queensland coastal waters to Central Australia; indeed, I cannot find anything into which it did not inquire. The Leader of the Opposition made some pertinent remarks about the size of agricultural holdings, and on this, at page 40 of its first report, the commission said:—

Size of Farms: The general course of development of Australian land use has not been well co-ordinated in the past. As a result there are many farms which are too small for modern methods of management. For instance, in the old days when hand-milking was in vogue, a herd of 20 cows or less was a reasonable size. Nowadays, this unit is too small for the economic use of a milking machine, and opinions have been freely expressed in evidence that an improvement in the standard of life of the operative in the dairying industry cannot be achieved without mechanization. It follows, therefore, that the size of a farm is of major significance in determining the standard of living. It should be a long-range objective to induce the gradual increase in the size of farms where necessary until they are large enough to warrant reasonable mechanization which would facilitate relatively low-cost

production and at the same time give reasonable returns to those who work them. This does not mean that the Commission is in favour of very large farms employing many sets of machines or implements. These are very difficult to manage and often become wasteful and uneconomic. The case of grazing properties in districts of doubtful rainfall is a special one. Their reduction in size leads to many difficulties which will be considered in a later report, as will proposals for the development of groups of small farms using machinery co-operatively.

We see, therefore, that in the Commission's opinion small farms were not necessarily good.

Mr. O'Halloran—And unduly large farms just as bad.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—In its second report it dealt with the topic of soldier settlement after World War I., and with regard to the size of farms it says:—

It was suggested to the commission that many failures occurred because areas of the farms made available were too small. Sufficient farm area can be a flexible quantity varying according to the relations between several factors, of which land commitments and price of commodities at a given time are important. Some of the witnesses who appeared before the commission obviously confused lack of sufficient area with disturbance of the economic balance of a holding brought about by a fall in the price of commodities subsequent to establishment. Farms in the latter category can often be restored to home maintenance by corresponding adjustments in rent or commitments. There is evidence, however, that in a number of cases some bad mistakes were made. They will again occur if subdivision is based on prospects indicated by a prevailing short-term trend of high prices and not on long-term averages, if there is absence or disregard of basic knowledge and experience and if pressure succeeds in forcing settlement too intensively in an endeavour to cope with the demand. The determination of farm size and design should be based on long-term averages of prices and conditions, with a margin for contingencies, and a full realization that an error on the side of paucity can more often than not mean complete failure.

There again we see that the commission emphasizes that there must be a sufficient area if holdings are to be economically held to enable a livelihood to be obtained on a long-term basis of prices.

Mr. O'Halloran—Have you ever heard of stabilization?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The last report of the commission deals with nothing else. This report, dated August 7, 1946, is a remarkable document. It is not made clear whether this is the commission's final report and I can find no signatures in it. The

following appears in relation to the size of farms:—

Contrary to the general opinion many of the large estates which are the natural areas for subdivision are efficiently managed for the purpose for which they are used. There is a common belief that increased efficiency must follow from subdivision, whereas in fact, the medium sized farm employing a moderate amount of labour, is probably the most efficient unit if properly managed. Efficiency is reached by the operation of large machinery and buildings and the employment of men who are particularly skilled for certain kinds of work. Also, commodities can be purchased in fairly large quantities, while transport is easily arranged and marketing facilitated by the opportunity which a large volume of production affords for grading the products efficiently and selling them in large bulks rather than small. If a large property is split up into a number of smaller units, not only are many of these advantages lost but extra equipment, in buildings, fences, machinery, and roads has to be installed; all this means more capitalization per acre and a heavier load of overheads on the subdivided property. If a sheep station, carrying 15,000 sheep and earning interest on £5 per acre is cut up into 10 smaller properties, the net capitalization per acre may well rise to between £6 and £7 per acre before the settlers have established their holdings in proper working order.

Mr. Macgillivray—How does that compare with the subdivision undertaken by the Government in the South-East?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will deal with that. On the subject of the possible need for resisting pressure for subdivision the commission submits recommendations and suggests in the following terms that certain principles should be embodied:—

That a national agricultural settlement policy should be formulated by the Commonwealth for discussion with the States. In such a policy the undermentioned principles should be embodied:—

- (1) Settlement policies should be designed so as to facilitate the working of, and avoid any obstruction to agricultural policy.
- (2) Agricultural policy should be directed towards a progressive improvement in the location of production by the elimination, or change in the use of the areas of high cost production and, as opportunity offers, an extension of production in more favourable areas.
- (3) In general, new lands should be opened for settlement in order to meet increased agricultural requirements when those increased requirements cannot be economically met by a more intensive use of already settled areas.
- (4) The more intensive use of suitable areas already settled should be stimulated to meet any increased requirements

of farm produce, and this should be effected by the State taking powers to resume land for settlement purposes where the existing owner is not prepared, or is unable to put the land to sufficiently intensive use.

That is the kernel of the whole matter and incidentally it is contained in legislation South Australia has had in operation for many years.

Mr. O'Halloran—There is a vast difference between under-developed and surplus land.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The last paragraph is the whole kernel of land occupation in South Australia. If a person is occupying his land efficiently he should have every right to continue with the good work. That is what our legislation sets out to do; but if a man is not occupying his land effectively he is vulnerable to have it investigated by the Land Settlement Committee.

Mr. O'Halloran—That last paragraph supports my contention up to the hilt.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The report continues:—

The commission recommends that the Commonwealth should endeavour to promote agreement with and between the States for the adoption of the following general principles of closer settlement policy:—

- (a) That closer settlement shall only be promoted where, in conformity with an agricultural production policy, it is necessary to put land to higher or more intensive uses than those adopted by the present owners, or where it is possible to increase the efficiency of production by subdividing into two or more farms.
- (b) That attempts to thwart closer settlement in order to cater for the demands for land shall be discountenanced when they are inconsistent with the above directives.
- (c) That powers to take land compulsorily for purposes of closer settlement be created by statute and that such powers be substituted for, and not made complementary to powers of voluntary acquisition where these now exist.
- (d) That compensation for land taken for closer settlement be allowed on fair market value and having regard to the purposes to which the owner was putting the land during the five years immediately prior to notice of resumption.
- (e) That the owner of land which it is proposed to resume for closer settlement shall have a right of appeal to a tribunal against the proposal to resume and also against the amount of compensation.

There we see that the commission recommends precisely the procedure being followed in this State.

Mr. O'Halloran—Oh no!

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—A procedure which was introduced by my Government.

Mr. O'Halloran—It is restricted to under-developed land.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The appointment of the Land Settlement Committee, which is the tribunal which goes into these very matters, was the result of legislation introduced by my Government, and the whole object is to take away land held out of production and put it into efficient production.

Mr. O'Halloran—It must be under-developed land.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—If it is developed land, it is in production. There is no topic of rural reconstruction or agricultural policy which the honourable member can mention and for which I have not the answer, because it is here in these reports. The eminent members of the commission took years in their investigations and in presenting their reports. Another paragraph in its third report deals specifically with the question of farm sizes in the following words:—

Whereas farm size is of great importance in determining the efficiency of production the commission recommends the Commonwealth should endeavour to promote agreement with and between the States for the adoption of the following principles as part of settlement promotion policy:—

- (a) That the proper size of farm units should not be determined by the criterion of income but by what is necessary for the employment with the least waste of those essential factors of production which make for the greatest efficiency.

In his speech the Leader of the Opposition said in effect, "Don't worry about efficiency. We have too much talk about economics in these matters. Let us forget them for the moment." In an endeavour to overcome the policy of centralization he says that we can fairly disregard economic factors. The commission did not substantiate that view; in fact, it expressed the opposite view. The report went on:—

(b) That the concepts of "home maintenance area" and "living area" as determinants of the proper size of farms be discouraged and that their use be confined to illustration of the area below which a farm should not be brought into existence.

There are pages more in the report on this matter. The Leader of the Opposition said that land should be taken away from large landholders and subdivided, but an eminent authority has expressed a completely different view.

Mr. Macgillivray—The commission may be wrong in its view.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I cannot agree with that. It was set up by Mr. Chifley, and its chairman was the one-time Premier of Western Australia, Mr. Wise. I will not pit my view against that of the commission, but if any member says that its view is wrong, I can only say that he has not studied the report properly. If he had, he would come to the conclusion, as I have, that much thought was given to the matter. In its reports the commission dealt with many topics. They range from Bradfield's irrigation scheme for central Australia to the Snowy River water scheme. There are more words of wisdom in the tenth report than in any every day book on the subject. In the fourth report the matter of land areas was mentioned. Marginal wheat areas were particularly referred to. The Leader of the Opposition has often said that the number of wheatgrowers in South Australia has been reduced, and that the wheat industry has gone back. I refer him to figures given in the fourth report of the commission.

Mr. Macgillivray—What was the date of the report?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—August 28, 1944. The commission presented a number of reports, and it would not surprise me if it submitted another. The tenth report was not signed, except by Professor Wadham, who dissented from the report. I would not say that the final report has been presented. The fourth was the last submitted to Mr. Chifley. The fifth and later reports were sent on to Mr. Dedman, then Minister for Post-war Reconstruction. The sixth report—

Mr. John Clark—What about the fifth?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I did not mention the fifth because I thought it might bring some members to their feet, as it deals with rural credit. I pass on from that report to the sixth.

Mr. O'Halloran—We gather that you do not agree with all the conclusions in the fifth report.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not agree with one of them, and I do not think the honourable member agrees with it. One of the conclusions was that our Savings Bank should not lend any more money on rural properties.

Mr. O'Halloran—I think there was a suggestion that a financial agency should be set up to finance rural properties.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes. The commission said, in effect, that the Savings Bank

should desist from lending money on rural properties, because it should be done by the State Bank. I will not deal with the sixth report now, except to say that the matter of farm size was mentioned in the introduction. Paragraph 930 states:—

The commission has clearly expressed the opinion that farms should be of a size which will permit the economic use of machinery. The commission appreciates that this view may be unacceptable to some people who are wedded to the idea of the "one man farm" as a national ideal; those who hold this view fail to appreciate that in many industries their particular farm can only result in low returns to farmers or high costs to consumers of the products, or both.

That shows that the commission took the view that it was not necessary to subdivide land into small holdings. It said that we must provide for the economic use of land by using modern plant and machinery—

Mr. O'Halloran—Collective farming.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No. The commission was opposed to collective farming. It said that land should be held in sufficiently large areas to enable modern plant and equipment to be used, and that if the land-holder failed to do his duty the land should be taken from him and given to someone who would effectively use it. It is not necessary for us to inquire into a matter of this kind, and we did not need the report of the commission. I have an idea that some of the information in the sixth report was copied from our legislation, which it follows very closely. The seventh report refers to rural amenities. Many topics are dealt with and they are all important. Some of the topics were mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, who said we should provide assistance to place industries in the country, irrespective of whether they were economically sound.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is not quite a correct interpretation of my remarks.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I read the honourable member's remarks carefully, and I think he clearly said that we should not base everything on economic considerations.

Mr. O'Halloran—Exactly.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I think the honourable member said he was tired of talking about economics. Later I shall show that industries placed in the country, where the economics have not been right, are in trouble. In the States where unemployment is rife it has been the uneconomic industries which have been the first to dismiss employees. The week before last I went to the South-East where a

valuable woollen mill has been established. It has operated for many years.

Mr. O'Halloran—It went broke once.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes. It has had its trials and tribulations, but it is sound today. After receiving a deputation from those engaged in the industry I shall take up the case presented, because at the moment the industry is at a disadvantage when compared with similar industries in other parts of Australia. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted and debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2).

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

BUILDING OPERATIONS BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 19. Page 447.)

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore)—I support the Bill, with certain reservations, as it indicates a gradual relaxation of controls on building materials. Relaxation will prevent further embarrassment of those who desire to build homes and will increase the quantity of building materials that have been available during the past year. I have heard here, and in other places, that the Labor Party stands for controls. We stand for control of essentials, but supply and demand are the dominant question in regard to building materials. Piping and pinus radiata, I believe, are still in short supply and therefore a permit system for them is essential. According to Housing Trust reports, which are available to members each quarter, there is a tendency for the trust to build more homes for purchase than for rental. Letters received from the manager of the trust by members who make representations on behalf of their constituents who are living in rather parlous circumstances inform them that, although rental houses are not available, it would be a good idea if applicants considered purchasing homes, which proves that purchase homes must be in more plentiful supply. I refer particularly to prefabricated structures. The high cost of materials has a tendency to prevent demands being made for them. Materials have advanced to such a high price that they are beyond the resources of many people and so minimize building.

According to the trust it is necessary for a person who desires to buy a home to deposit between £700 and £800, but that is beyond

thousands who desire better living conditions, not only basic wage earners, but numbers who receive above the basic wage. I was pleased to note, from the Premier's second reading speech, that sufficient cement would be available for all purposes in two years. I made a minute inspection of the Adelaide Cement Company's works at Birkenhead and was amazed at the progress made by the company and the plans it had in hand to develop its plant and increase production. I share the Premier's optimistic view that when the Birkenhead plant is in full production, as well as the plant of another cement company, public demands for cement will be satisfied.

Mr. Quirke—When will that be?

Mr. TAPPING—By the end of the year Adelaide Cement Company will be producing more than twice the quantity it is today. Turning to timber supplies, my observations on the waterfront disclose that an abundance of oregon is being imported from America. Large stacks of oregon can be seen in the yards of timber merchants in the Pt. Adelaide district. The accumulation of this large quantity is due to its cost and people who desire to build will have to purchase it at a high price. It would appear that any person who has sufficient money will be able to secure as much oregon as he desires.

Clause 6 relates to the prohibition of demolition of dwellings. The Minister will have power to issue a permit for the demolition if the property is required for industrial expansion or something of a similar nature. I do not object so strongly to giving the Minister that power, but I take exception to paragraph (b) which gives local boards of health the right to order demolition if it considers a dwelling is unfit for habitation. I agree that it is highly desirable, under normal conditions, to demolish sub-standard houses, but in my district of Semaphore between 65 and 70 sub-standard houses, which have been condemned by the Local Board of Health are still occupied. Because of the shortage of houses the health officer, the local board and its inspector have not effected any condemnation orders. I know of at least a dozen or more cases of people who have been living in sub-standard houses for seven or eight years. Although the Pt. Adelaide board does not insist on its moral and legal rights, some councils might have a different approach to the matter and make a demolition order, forcing people out in the street and inflicting grave hardship. I strongly object to such power being vested in local boards of health.

I have always protested against the demolition of any type of house when houses are in such short demand. It is pitiful to notice that many big industries have purchased houses along Port Road and other places in the metropolitan area, forcing people into the street. I desire to see industry progress, but I have noticed that in several cases a factory has not been enlarged and there seems to be a desire on the part of managements merely to demolish the outer walls and use the materials for other purposes. I strongly oppose the policy that has been adopted since 1946 of forcing people out of their houses to allow industries to expand. Thousands are still wanting homes and we should refrain from inflicting any undue hardship. I sincerely hope that by this time next year there will be no necessity or desire to continue this legislation.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY (Chaffey)—Before addressing myself to the Bill I desire to comment on an interesting feature of the debate especially as the Premier said, when speaking on another matter this afternoon, that he was glad it had come before Parliament because he felt that nothing but good could come from open and free debate. The whole foundation of our Parliamentary system is based on the forum in Rome, which was the beginning of our system, and was also founded on open debate. All affairs of State should be discussed in open debate, but although there have been numerous speakers on the Bill not one Government supporter has expressed any opinion. I do not know whether it is an instruction from the powers that be, but I hope they will not depart from the basic principles of our Parliamentary institution and allow the Government to say that they shall do as it sees fit. I hope that by advocating this it may be the means of lifting any fiat which has gone forth and that Government members will speak. Evidently they have been prevented by an order from a much higher power. The Premier said that every speculative house builder would still require a permit. Why? "Speculator" has a very sinister and objectionable sound. We have been brought up to believe that anybody who speculates does so to the detriment of other sections of the community.

Mr. Hutchens—Could there be a better definition?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Yes. A speculator is a man who is prepared to invest his money in a legitimate undertaking, such as building a house, and in open competition with other sections, offers it for sale.

Mr. O'Halloran—I think that the real definition of "speculator" is one who takes risks.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I am glad to accept that because I think it is absolutely sound. Anybody who builds a house takes risks. It has become a saying in England that "Fools build houses for wise men to live in." In other words, the building of houses for rental or sale is definitely speculation; but there are people prepared to invest money in housing rather than in Government bonds or other things.

Mr. O'Halloran—In these days the risk involved in putting money into houses is less.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Yes, but it does not affect my argument that because the Commonwealth Government has let down the bondholders there are people who would invest money in houses. I was interested to hear the honourable member for Goodwood assert that it was his amendment that was responsible for stopping people from building houses for sale or rent; he used the words "for speculation." One wonders exactly where this is going to stop, and it seems to me that there is a sinister movement afoot in South Australia to gradually oust anyone who is prepared to play a part in the development of this State unless it takes place through a Government Department.

Mr. Frank Walsh—I hardly agree with that.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I would not expect the honourable member to agree with it, but rather to side with the Government. Circumstances often make strange bedfellows and the honourable member for Goodwood and the Government are bedfellows on this matter. The occasion referred to was not the only one on which the honourable member for Goodwood had an amendment accepted by the Government. The result of this continual limiting of activities by any section of the community unless controlled by a Government department seems entirely wrong.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Do you suggest that I have any influence with the Government?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I do not know how the honourable member manages these things, but the fact is that the Government occasionally accepts socialistic amendments moved by him. Recently I directed a question to the Premier about a man who had built up a valuable trade by the expenditure of large sums of money, but having done so, it was handed over to a Government department. There was no question of compensation; the law of the jungle that might is

right prevailed, and that law seems to apply to housing. One would think that if the need for housing is as great as is stated the Government and the Opposition would be glad to let anyone with spare cash invest it in home building, because for every house built there is a family housed, but because of the bugbear of bureaucracy we are doing the very thing with our hands that we deny with our lips. The Labor Party is continually arguing against monopoly because it says that monopoly comes from private enterprise. It overlooks the fact that the menace of monopoly, which is great in Australia today, comes from Government departments which are growing stronger and more powerful all the time and the taxpayer who pays the losses those departments make is becoming more impotent. A man cannot do anything to advance Australia unless he gets a permit or some concession from a Government department. When we hear talk about working harder, producing more and putting more into the common cause, what does it mean? We are not allowed to do anything in that direction because the Government has already granted a monopoly to some Government department which has neither a soul to damn nor a body to kick. It is an abstract organization for which the Ministers of the Crown apologize, but over which they have at best a remote control.

The Bill suggests that the supply of materials is easier and there is no longer the need to prevent persons from building large houses because materials are needed elsewhere, as was the case during the war. The Government has seen fit to ease the restrictions on the size of a house, but it still maintains another restriction—that unless you are a Government department you cannot build a house for anybody else. The Housing Trust can build hundreds of houses, get all the kudos, and be lauded to the skies by the Premier for doing so. I do not object to that, but I do object when the Premier says, in effect, “While I am prepared to allow the Housing Trust to do these things, I am not prepared to allow any individual to do them.” Why not? What of all this talk about freedom-loving democracies? The Premier made a most emotional speech yesterday about the freedom of the individual, but what freedom has the individual? Freedom is only a matter of opinion. Freedom for Government departments, but not for individuals. Any losses made by Government departments are met by the general taxpayer,

although I believe it is true that no losses have yet been made by the Housing Trust.

Mr. Hutchens—Taxation is paid by all individuals, but you would give the right to speculators to make huge profits out of persons desiring houses.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I take it that anybody who invests money in any legal undertaking is entitled to a fair return for his money, and I ask no more than that.

Mr. Quirke—Nobody can compel another to pay a price.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—That is true. A man does not have to pay a price he cannot afford. If a person can afford to buy a better house built by a speculator then surely he is entitled to. If he does, it means another empty house for a person with less money. In the *Advertiser* recently land estate agents have pointed out that one cannot get the price for homes today that one could a year ago. The price for homes is coming down, as there is a tendency for the price of other things to come down.

Mr. Hutchens—The production of bricks is down, but not the price.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I am a great admirer of brick homes, but we have drifted away from using bricks in recent years because sufficient are not being manufactured.

Mr. Hutchens—And because private enterprise has exploited the people.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Private enterprise is tied hand and foot by Government departments; regulations, control and taxation are brought to bear upon it and the whole system is slowing to a standstill. If we want freedom of enterprise, we should let people invest their money as they think best. Money derived from taxation has been spent in many ways which some people do not think desirable.

Mr. Davis—What about the unfortunate man who has no money to spare for house building?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I know of no system whereby a man without credit can get a house. I deprecate this continual attack upon private enterprise. I am sorry that in South Australia there is a Government and an Opposition which see alike on socialism and that the Government continually accepts socialistic amendments from the Opposition.

Mr. Davis—You have not said what is wrong with it yet.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I believe socialism is a policy of tearing someone down without building anyone up. I support the Bill, but hope that if it is again found necessary to introduce a similar measure the Government

will not try to stultify or negate the opportunity of a man to invest his money in any way he sees fit.

Mr. WHITTLE (Prospect)—This is a Committee Bill which is similar to those to which we have become used in recent sessions. It is interesting to notice that this session it has an entirely different name to that of previous years, and I hope that before many years it will be found unnecessary to introduce this type of legislation as there should be sufficient building materials provided under ordinary circumstances for the erection of all the houses required. Any one sufficiently interested to read the speech of the member for Chaffey would assume that the operation of house building that has been designed and fostered by the Housing Trust has been carried out entirely by it, but I remind members that private enterprise has played a large part in the construction of houses for the trust.

Mr. Macgillivray—Yes, but such operations have been conditioned.

Mr. WHITTLE—Scores of private contractors have built houses for the trust and have been paid for that service.

Mr. Macgillivray—They are slaves of the trust.

Mr. WHITTLE—This Government has not ignored private enterprise, and that has been proved by the trust's practice of letting contracts to private builders. Every member on this side is pleased that a man wishing to build a house for his own occupation is to be allowed to do so within reasonable limits. The member for Goodwood suggested that because of this legislation there would be a greater demand for the limited building supplies available and that certain classes would experience even greater difficulty in obtaining housing accommodation, but one of the fundamental reasons for the introduction of the Bill is to ensure that the building industry will not experience a surplus of manpower, some of which may drift to other industries.

It would be a calamity if building were restricted to such an extent that there were artisans whose labour could not be used, for they would tend to drift to other avenues of employment. Some talk is heard today about a coming recession, but anyone associated with the building industry knows that, generally speaking, if that industry prospers, so does the nation. Scores of major projects require to be completed both in city and country. I look with great optimism to the next two decades and forecast that during that period

there will be plenty of work for the building industry. Only last week I visited Gilles Plains where building work is being carried out by a British firm, the Martin Construction Company. There I met two countrymen of the member for Chaffey, and had he been with me he could have acted as my interpreter, for their brogue was even broader than his.

Mr. Hutehens—Were they New Australians?

Mr. WHITTLE—No, they were Scotchmen. One of them questioned me regarding prospects in the building industry here, and I assured him that he would have plenty of work for the next 20 years. He expressed appreciation of the living quarters provided for the artisans of that company. The Leader of the Opposition questioned whether the Bill conferred power on the Government to issue stop notices as an alternative to a fine in cases of infringement of the provisions of the Bill, but I draw his attention to clause 8 which provides that the Minister may give notice to a builder, as in the present Act, to cease unlawful construction of a building or structure, and which also provides for a penalty not exceeding £100 for every day during which the requirements of the notice are not complied with. In the past stop notices have been issued to some builders, and provision was made last session for such builders to apply to the court at the end of a certain period with a view to having their notices lifted.

The member for Hindmarsh referred to brick production and said that 83,000,000 bricks were produced in 1926. On inquiry I could get no information in respect of that year, but I know the honourable member has had much experience with regard to this industry, a large part of which is situated in his district.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Why didn't you consult the brick manufacturers?

Mr. WHITTLE—I did, but they could give me no information in respect of 1926. When he said that there had been no appreciable increase in production, I do not think the member for Hindmarsh told the full story. He said that the Government had treated brick production as a matter of no consequence and had made no effort to increase production, but in refuting his claim I quote the following figures:—

Year.	Brick Production.
1943-44	11,600,000
1945-46	28,200,000
1946-47	34,070,000
1947-48	38,600,000
1948-49	44,360,000
1950-51	45,350,000
1951-52	45,010,000

Mr. Frank Walsh—Therefore production over the last two years has been static?

The Hon. T. Playford—The figures completely disregard country production.

Mr. WHITTLE—In 1950, also, country brickyards produced 9,550,000 bricks, some of which have been used in the erection of city homes. Those figures do not verify the suggestion of the member for Hindmarsh that the Government through the Building Materials Department and other departments has done nothing to encourage brick production. This Government has done a great deal in that regard, and if the honourable member's statement of the brick production in 1926 is correct, it may well be that the shorter working week has been at least partly responsible for the decrease in production. I know of no revolutionary advance in brickmaking machinery over the past 25 years, as I believe that the Hoffman kiln was used as early as 1926.

Mr. Hutchens—Brickyards today are using pallets, fork lifts and bulldozers.

Mr. WHITTLE—That may be so, but some deposits of clay may be getting worked out and the profit in the industry may not have been sufficient to encourage greater brick production.

Mr. Hutchens—There are five brickmaking plants in Hindmarsh standing idle.

Mr. WHITTLE—Possibly, but we cannot make them work if the artisans have gone into some other industry or if the margin of profit has not been sufficient to encourage production. Red bricks are not the only material of which houses are built nowadays. Some fine houses have been erected in my district by the use of all sorts of materials, including Mount Gambier stone, and cement bricks, if well laid, can make an attractive home.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Would either of those materials be as cheap as burnt bricks?

Mr. WHITTLE—I do not say they would, but that it has not been due to any neglect on the part of the Government that we are in the position we are today. The history of Government brickyards has not been a happy one. Most members realize that this legislation is necessary in order that the housing programme can be continued and that materials, as far as possible, may be reserved for the primary object of building houses. To some extent I endorse the remarks of the member for Semaphore, who usually is not too extravagant in his remarks. He questioned the right of a board of health to authorize the demolition of sub-standard dwellings.

Mr. O'Halloran—To order their demolition.

Mr. WHITTLE—I thank the honourable member for his correction. Usually boards of health comprise the whole of the council, and they realize there is a shortage of homes. Hardly any board would move for a house to be demolished if it is at all habitable. Up to the present the order has had to be consented to by the Building Materials Office or some other authority. I do not think there will be any great change in the administration of this matter. In my district the Housing Trust provided a home for a family because a side wall of the house in which the people were living was in danger of collapsing. Several children were living in two rooms in grave danger. The house could not be reconstructed because underpinning, or any other method, could not save it. An application to the Building Materials Office for its demolition was quickly granted, but the member for Semaphore need not have any misgivings that the boards of health will be anxious to have any houses demolished if they can be used as dwellings.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE (Burnside)—The use of building materials was controlled with the object of producing the largest number of houses in the shortest possible time. As a result of the war there was a pent-up demand for housing, not only as a result of the cessation of building during the war years, but also as a result of the many early marriages contracted in that period. The success of the housing programme in this State can be ascribed equally to private enterprise and to Government action, for up to 18 months ago at least two-thirds of the houses built in this State were erected by private enterprise. Possibly in the last year, half of the houses were built by the Housing Trust and half by private enterprise, but that does not show any diminution of private enterprise but an accelerated programme of the trust, which carried out the temporary housing programme. Other States have already taken similar action to that contemplated by this Bill and I believe Queensland today announced the abolition of all building controls. I should have liked to see that done here but the Bill is a major step in the right direction, and I trust, with the member for Semaphore, that by this time next year the law of supply and demand will dispense with the need for any controls. It is pleasing to note that the two or three controls which are retained may be relaxed by proclamation, and this avoids the necessity for waiting until next session to completely wipe

out the remaining controls. It is also satisfactory to see that controls may be relaxed by proclamation, but cannot be reimposed by proclamation.

It was encouraging to hear from the Premier this afternoon that in the near future supplies of cement will meet our needs and that there will probably be a surplus for export. The control of cement has probably been one of the most vexatious to administer from the point of view of the hardware trade and suppliers. It has been necessary for merchants to keep detailed records of the sale of cement, and while that has not built one additional house it perhaps has kept the use of cement within closely defined lines. I hope that in this transitional period of decontrol the position will be watched closely, for there is today a great demand in the city for business premises. I am not referring to luxury buildings, such as theatres, but to the tremendous demand for business and professional premises. It is virtually impossible for any man or woman entering business today to find a vacant office in the city. Many offices are overcrowded and architects have on their drawing boards a vast number of building projects which will keep the building industry going for many years. I trust that permits for building premises, other than houses, will be readily granted if any slight slackening in the building trade becomes apparent. Australian materials are in plentiful supply today. In the near future many more materials will become readily available.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Do you say that flooring boards are plentiful?

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—No, but Australian materials generally are in much better supply, particularly brassware, leadware, water piping, and many other items.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Where can you get Australian galvanized iron?

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—It is now readily available for use in the country and permits are granted for its use in roofing and for rainwater tanks. I could nominate reputable merchants who have supplies of many lines required in the building trade. A year or so ago it was almost impossible to buy brassware for household purposes or lead for plumbing. Those two lines at least are readily available today and a number of substitutes have been developed to take the place of those items in short supply. Satisfactory substitutes have been developed from cement to take the place of earthenware pipes for drainage.

I hope that in 12 months there will be no necessity to re-enact building controls.

Mr. TEUSNER (Angas)—In rising to speak on this Bill I shall bear in mind the words of an eminent Frenchman that those who talk too much never say anything. I support the Bill, which repeals existing legislation dealing with building controls and provides a new method for the regulation of building operations. The Building Materials Act was passed in 1945 and provided that permits had to be obtained to erect houses costing over £1,000, irrespective of size. It was amended in subsequent years and controls were eased so that now it is possible to build a house without a permit if it does not exceed 12½ squares, provided it does not cost more than £2,200. Conditions in 1945 demanded stringent controls as there was an acute labour shortage. Brick production in that year was only 20,082,000 bricks, roofing materials were in short supply, and I believe the cement tile industry was in its infancy. Further, only 150,000 terra cotta tiles were being produced monthly. A total of 2,873,061 super feet of flooring boards from South Australian timber was being produced. Those figures reveal that in 1945 the position in regard to essential building materials was very serious. We now find that the materials position has improved considerably so that in the financial year 1950-51, 57,255,000 bricks were produced, that figure including country as well as metropolitan production. Mr. Hutchens mentioned a figure of 45,000,000, but I should think that did not include country production, because my information comes from official sources. Furthermore, the cement position has improved considerably and is now from 35 to 40 per cent higher than in 1946. The production of floor boards from Australian timber rose from 2,873,000 super feet in 1944-5 to 6,108,679 for the year ended June 30, 1951. In addition we have had since 1947 a considerable increase in the production of cement bricks and blocks, and if those are taken into consideration the position with regard to bricks is not as acute as it might seem because, for the year ended June 30, 1950, nearly 4,000,000 cement bricks and blocks were produced.

Mr. Macgillivray—If materials are so plentiful why the restriction on private enterprise in building houses?

Mr. TEUSNER—There has been an increase which enables legislation of this nature to be introduced to mitigate the controls of the past. I am not suggesting that the increase is such

that it would be possible to dispense entirely with controls, but I hope that in the near future that position will be reached and I have no doubt that that will be the case in regard to cement.

Mr. O'Halloran—It has improved from very bad to just bad.

Mr. TEUSNER—I will show that the position, particularly when compared with that of the other States, was not so very bad and indeed that we have done exceptionally well. Some members of the Opposition, particularly Mr. Hutchens and, I think, the Leader of the Opposition, strongly criticized previous legislation and the present Bill, and Mr. Hutchens rather strongly criticized the administration as well. The legislation now in existence and the original measure passed in 1945 have resulted in the materials available being diverted to essential users, particularly home builders, and I think we owe a deep debt of gratitude to the officers of the Building Materials Office, and particularly to a committee which has been in existence for some time which has dealt with priority certificates and permits. We have done an exceptionally good job compared with the other States. I can recall some of the criticism offered by members opposite from time to time, and in particular two years ago prior to the State elections. I think the Leader of the Opposition will recall the accusation he made against the Liberal Country League Playford Government that it had failed to provide homes for all of the people of South Australia. Speaking in another debate in the same year I referred to that and I dealt with some figures on home building. I have gone further into the position and checked up the latest situation in the other States, and I find that the South Australian administration, which has been so hotly criticized—

Mr. O'Halloran—The administration has not been criticized by anyone on this side.

Mr. TEUSNER—With all respect, the member for Hindmarsh yesterday referred to the administration of the Act in somewhat strong terms, but I will show that it has been responsible for putting South Australia in a very happy position compared with other States, as the following figures reveal. For the financial year 1950-51, according to the Quarterly Summary of Australian Statistics, the number of homes built in the respective States was:—New South Wales, 19,771; Victoria, 21,025; Queensland, 10,275; South Australia, 6,725; Western Australia, 5,160; Tasmania,

3,914. I have also taken out figures to show the number of homes built in each State per 10,000 of population, and they are as follow:—New South Wales, 60.4; Victoria, 94.2; Queensland 86.3; South Australia, 94.7; Western Australia, 90.5; Tasmania, 134.9. The average for the six States is 93.5 and we find that South Australia was the second highest.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is an improvement from being second last two years ago.

Mr. TEUSNER—I had not proposed to quote those figures, but I will do so now. In 1949-50 the number of homes built per 10,000 population was respectively:—New South Wales, 59.2; Victoria, 72.2; Queensland, 81.4; South Australia 72.1; Western Australia, 64.9; Tasmania, 101.8 It will be seen again that South Australia was still to the fore when the average for the six States was 75.2. We must remember, too, that, particularly in early years following the initial legislation of 1945, we were in an unfortunate position as regards certain building materials and so got away to rather a bad start, but so excellent has been the progress that at present we are surpassed only by Tasmania. I remember that two years ago in this Chamber I referred to the fact that in Queensland, Tasmania, Victoria and Western Australia a large proportion of the homes built are not of brick or stone construction, but of timber, and I pointed out on that occasion that for the period 1947-49 only 2,408 homes built in Queensland, or 12 per cent, were of brick, brick veneer concrete or stone.

Mr. O'Halloran—You know that wooden construction is the traditional type in Queensland?

Mr. TEUSNER—Yes, and I am not objecting to it. All I am saying is that only 12 per cent were of solid construction and there is no doubt that it takes longer to build a brick or stone house. In the same period only 43 per cent of the homes built in Western Australia were of solid construction and in Tasmania only 22 per cent. However, South Australia can proudly boast of building solid homes of stone, brick or brick veneer and very few of the flimsy type. With those remarks I have pleasure in supporting the Bill and trust that by the end of next year it will be possible to eliminate existing controls entirely.

Mr. QUIRKE (Stanley)—I approve of the Bill. I am glad that restrictions can be lifted. Every year that we have had this legislation before us I have expressed the wish that it would not be long before it could be abolished, and this measure goes a long way towards

achieving that desirable objective. There is a tendency for some honourable members to write down homes of timber-frame construction. The only reason South Australia has more houses of the solid type is that it has an extremely poor supply of native timbers. Had there been large supplies of these timbers suitable for building purposes this State would have had many more timber homes. Properly constructed timber houses in the other States that are carefully looked after are even more picturesque than a red brick house. They are very adaptable, very often at considerably less expense, and one is thus enabled to provide more amenities. At one time I had a preference for solid construction, but during the last two years I have come to the conclusion that our ideas have been fallacious. I agree with Mr. Macgillivray that individuals should be allowed to build homes for sale. The assumption at once drawn by some honourable members is that there must then be exploitation, but that is entirely wrong. In building a timber-frame home there is plenty of opportunity to make a profit without exploiting the purchaser. If the restrictions upon private buildings were lifted I am certain many more homes would be erected and the increased number built would restrict prices to the capacity of the people to purchase them.

Let me give some figures concerning a timber-framed home of nearly 13 squares containing three bedrooms, a dining-sitting room, kitchen, laundry, bathroom and all other conveniences, with brick footings built in cement, and with solid concrete floors for the bathroom and laundry. All the materials, which included Australian iron and reinforcing rods, and imported oregon costing £12 10s. a 100 super feet, cost £1,500, and the labour £700. Labour was paid for by the contractor at full rates. Plenty of people are capable of building similar houses with their own labour, and a number are doing so. If English iron were used instead of Australian an increased cost of £100 would be involved. Members opposite said there had been much private building. Of course there has. Every house built under permit was probably the result of private enterprise. No-one denies that, and no one can deny that if I have a house at present I cannot build another and sell it to my neighbour. We have been told that here are many people who cannot afford to build a home. That is also true. The South Australian basic wage is, £11 4s. a week, and if a person purchases a home today, even one from the

Housing Trust, repayment costs amount to about £2 10s. a week. Assuming that a man receives £12 10s. a week, that leaves £10 for his other commitments. A man with a family can be ruled out as a purchaser of one of these homes, and these are the very people for whom houses must be provided. I agree entirely with the Treasurer that it is most desirable that people should be able to live in their own homes, but there are thousands to whom that realization is an impossibility. In that regard most country towns of any size are no different from the city. It is Housing Trust policy—and I suppose that is Government policy—that no houses for rental are built in the country except at big industrial centres like Port Pirie, Port Augusta, and Peterborough. At towns like Clare and Kapunda they must be built for sale. In such towns many people are receiving wages amounting to £12 or £13 a week, and cannot afford to pay £2 10s. or £3 a week to pay off even a Housing Trust home.

Mr. Macgillivray—There is also a floating population of bank clerks, teachers, postal authorities and similar officials who have to be catered for.

Mr. QUIRKE—Those who have been most negligent of their servants' interests in this regard are the banks, the Postal Department, and the Education Department, who transfer their employees willy nilly from one country town to another, irrespective of whether accommodation is available for them. I know of one postal employee whose family is living in a country town while he has to work 300 miles away, where there is no home for them. Private banks have been similarly remiss until recently, but now have adopted the policy of buying homes for their employees. I do not see why restrictions should not be lifted to enable any person to build a home for sale. By doing this the number of homes available would be increased. Often when people retire from their farms, instead of going to the city they now prefer to live in their local town. In the main, they do not build homes. They have the money and they are prepared to pay enormous prices—even up to £5,000 for a house of five rooms. It should be possible for them to have a home built.

Mr. Christian—Could it not be done under clause 4 of the Bill?

Mr. QUIRKE—No. One can build a home for himself, but not for another person.

Mr. Whittle—If a man buys a block another person can build a home for him.

Mr. QUIRKE—Yes, but if he has a block of land he is not allowed to build a home on it and then sell it. There are people in Clare who have built their own homes. I know of one family there who have built four and they not bricklayers, stonemasons or carpenters by trade, yet these homes are beautifully built with cut freestone fronts. They were only amateurs. Although the home built by the amateur may be lacking in some degree as compared with that built by a contractor, the difference is mainly a matter of time. If an amateur takes much time on the job, and is careful about his work he can do a very presentable job. There are hundreds of homes of this type being built by people who never before had placed one brick on top of another. They should be permitted to build for other people. They could build and sell at a reasonable price, by using their own labour, without making a great profit. Today more building materials are available. There is no need to wait six months for Australian iron or rods or piping, and I hope that by this time next year there will be a total lifting of all controls on building materials. Now many people will not build because of the restrictions, but by this time next year it is hoped that they will have gone and then our housing position will be much better.

Mr. BROOKMAN (Alexandra)—In his second reading speech the Premier said that speculation house building would still require a permit. For a long time I have held the view that if such building were permitted more houses would be built. It is a pity that we cannot call on the large army of amateurs to go in for house building in their spare time, instead of doing less important work. If they could use their initiative it would help to overcome our housing shortage. The amateur builder is fairly efficient in building a house if he takes his time. In the main he can build a house with his own hands. Speculation building has been labelled wrongly, and somewhat unjustly. In a small dictionary I have found that the definition of "speculation" is to purchase with the expectation of an advance in value and consequent profit. We are talking about a different kind of speculation. It is not a matter of purchasing with the expectation of an advance in value, but the building of houses with a view to providing accommodation. It is said that speculative building makes the cost of a house too high. If we want houses we should consider whether we should protect people who are prepared to pay a high

price for a house. I do not believe in this protection. We cannot protect every person from his folly, and it is difficult to judge what is his folly. If a man is firmly convinced that he is not making a mistake, let him go ahead and pay a high price for a house. Every house built will mean accommodation for someone. It will mean that each house is occupied by a person who had no home previously or who has moved from a house which can be occupied by someone else. I support the second reading, although I think clause 4 is too restrictive.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Will the Premier explain what is intended by paragraph (b) of subclause (1)? At present when a verandah or porch is added to a house being built under permit half the area of that verandah or porch is included in the number of squares covered by the house.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—The honourable member is under a wrong impression. If a man is entitled to 14 squares the Building Materials Office will issue him with a permit for 13 squares, plus a verandah.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—I think the member for Goodwood has in mind that, in calculating the cost of a square, verandahs are usually calculated at half the cost of a square.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I understand that if the total area of a house was 12½ squares and the applicant desired to erect a porch or front verandah it would be calculated as 12½ squares.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Building Materials Office, in its administration, and I as Minister, have always made concessions as regards verandahs because they do not involve the same costs, labour and materials as are required for other parts of a building. If a person qualifies for a permit for 14 squares the first thing that the Building Materials Office does is to advise him that it is prepared to grant him a permit if a suitable plan is submitted not exceeding 14 squares. If he submitted a plan for 14½ squares, one square being for a verandah, it would be accepted as reasonable. In considering costs, we have accepted a verandah as being half a square.

The definition set out in the Bill is the same as in the Act.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—“Regulation of building operations.”

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Can the Premier say what is meant by “if completed” in subclause (2) I. (a)?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Unless those words are included it would be possible for a person to put down foundations for a house of 30 squares. If proceedings were taken against him he could say that he did not propose to finish the house to 30 squares, but only 18. He then proceeds to build the walls up to 30 squares.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—The Bill still gives speculative builders an open go. There is still a desire to conserve as much building materials as possible to allow people to be housed. If a person is considered to be adequately housed and desires to erect another house not exceeding 18 squares he would be able to dispose of it at a larger profit. There is no control over the sale of homes once they are completed. I still hold the views I stated 12 months ago because we have not reached a stage where there is an over-abundance of materials. The materials that become available should be reserved for the best possible use. Can the Premier indicate whether this subclause will permit speculation building?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—There will be a loophole whereby a person can chain build. He can build a house, occupy it, and while occupying it build another house and when that house is completed sell the house he was occupying. The facts are that he is building a house and possibly making another one available. There are two difficulties in the way of preventing that. The first is that it frequently happens that a person's circumstances change after he has built a house for his own occupation and he is obliged to dispose of it. His employment may change, his family may increase or his health may be affected, but there is not necessarily any subterfuge. The second difficulty is that it is difficult to prove intention. If a person owns a block of land and builds upon it, it is difficult to know whether or not he intends to live there. Taking all circumstances into account and realizing the difficulties of administration it has been decided that it will be best to leave the legislation as it has been drafted. The defect was known when the clause was drafted.

Mr. BROOKMAN—I move—

To delete subparagraph (b) of paragraph 1 of subclause (2).

Although I have not consulted the Parliamentary Draftsman I believe the effect of this amendment would be to reduce the restrictions on speculation building. The Premier has advanced no reasons why speculation building should not be permitted and his remarks in the last few moments strengthen the case for this amendment. He has stated how controls can be relaxed to meet circumstances. A person can get a permit to build a house so long as it is not for sale. More houses would be made available if this amendment were accepted and building would be conducted on an individual basis rather than on the present system of erecting several units in large areas with no house completed before another.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The effect of the amendment would be to take away the preference that is given to the legitimate home builder. The Building Materials Act was designed to give preference to a person who desired to build a home for his own occupation and that is the purpose of these limitations. The amendment takes away that preference and places the home builder in the same category as everyone else. At present commercial builders must get permits, but the amendment takes away the preference at present enjoyed by the home builder. Secondly, it takes away the preference given to an employer who seeks to build a house for his employee and puts him in direct competition with the speculative builder. Many locally produced materials, including burnt bricks, cement, galvanized iron and flooring timbers, are in short supply, and many farm houses are being built using imported galvanized iron roofing bought at a very high price. Under import restrictions many building accessories will be even more difficult to obtain than hitherto, and it is not correct to say that more houses could be built than are being built today. The Building Materials Department has always taken into consideration the fact that the amateur builder does not incur as great a labour cost as other builders, and if the honourable member wishes to move an amendment enabling the amateur to build a house I have not much objection to that, but, when he seeks to take away preference from the home builder in favour of the speculative builder, I ask members to oppose his amendment. Under it the speculative builder could compete with the home builder for materials in short supply and, by virtue of

the fact that frequently he is building for a person with the money to pay he can outbid the home builder.

Mr. Brookman—An 18 square house is only medium-sized.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Judged by present-day standards it is big, and it will be possible, under present circumstances, to build a house of 18 squares costing £6,000 without any trouble. The amendment takes away the preference which should be given to the home builder, whom the legislation has always sought to protect.

Mr. Quirke—Would you agree to a relaxation so as to allow the building of a house provided that no burnt bricks, galvanized iron or other local materials were used?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—That is an entirely different proposition which I do not think would be unreasonable, but in designing this clause the Government had the idea not of suppressing anybody, but of assisting the home builder—a laudable object which members should support.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—This Bill does not preclude permits being issued to any worthy person other than a home builder.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No, and under the changed circumstances today permits are being issued more freely. I ask the honourable member not to press his amendment, for it will rob the home builder of that small amount of preference which protects him to a certain extent in his bid for Australian materials which are much cheaper than the imported. We have already issued permits to people wishing to build houses for sale, and provided there are certain safeguards for that practice we will continue to do so. The experience of one or two other States in this matter has not been very happy, particularly from the point of view of giving a reasonable preference to Australian citizens over immigrants. In Sydney an organization was set up to build houses which, on completion, were made available not to Australians, but to immigrants who were not in Australia when the houses were being erected. There was a great outcry from returned soldiers because there was a great shortage of materials and they deeply resented the fact that outsiders were getting a pre-emptive right to use materials.

Mr. Brookman—Were they New Australians?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Not under the official immigration programme. This clause was framed to give the legitimate home builder a measure of assistance that he would not

get if the doors were thrown open to everybody to compete with him for Australian materials.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Would the Premier be prepared to permit an amount of £300 to be spent on any building subjected to a stop notice? Will he permit the people concerned to spend up to £300 on such a building by June 30, 1953?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—When the legislation becomes law stop notices will be withdrawn from all work if the people concerned comply with the new legislation. Therefore, the stop notices will be modified to the extent that the legislation is modified.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I am particularly concerned about the erection of any structure, other than a dwelling, the total area of which when completed will not exceed three squares. Will the Premier agree to permitting £300 to be spent towards the completion of such structures before June 30 next? It may be necessary to build more than three squares in order to make a building weatherproof.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—If it is desirable to amend the clause as implied by the honourable member it would be desirable to alter it completely because it would amount to giving the lawbreaker a concession which the law-abider does not get. I would not be prepared to withdraw stop notices under the circumstances mentioned by the honourable member.

Mr. PEARSON—There appears to be some slight conflict between the provision of subclause (2) I (a) which limits the total area of a dwellinghouse, including all outbuildings, to 18 squares and subclause (2) III, which refers to the construction of any outbuilding upon land used as grazing area, farm, orchard, vineyard, etc. It would appear that a primary producer could erect a dwellinghouse of 18 squares without taking, say, his garage into consideration and I would like to be quite clear on this point. Whereas a garage of 1½ squares in the city would usually be adequate the normal garage in the country is almost invariably a double garage which would use up about three of the 18 permitted squares.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—There is no conflict in these two paragraphs as they deal with different matters. A special concession allows primary producers to erect any outbuilding without any permit from anybody because it is realized that primary production is important and cannot be held up by inadequate means of production.

Mr. QUIRKE—In the event of my desiring to move an amendment to allow a person to build a house for sale with materials other than those listed as priority materials what clause of the Bill would it be necessary to amend?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I think it should be a new clause containing a special exemption to deal with an entirely new matter.

Mr. QUIRKE—Could progress be reported to enable me to have it drafted?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It is proposed to report progress as soon as clause 4 is completed.

Clause 4 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

FRUIT FLY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS (Minister of Agriculture) moved—

That the Deputy 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 Fruit Fly Act, 1947-1950.

Motion carried.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.1 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 21, at 2 p.m.