

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, October 9, 1952.

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

ASSENT TO ACTS.

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor intimated by message his assent to the Prices Act Amendment and the Renmark Irrigation Trust Act Amendment Acts.

QUESTIONS.

INSERTION OF TABLES, ETC., IN HANSARD.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Mr. Deputy Speaker, on October 2 I was granted leave to have a schedule inserted in *Hansard* without reading it. Later I was requested by the Leader of the *Hansard* staff to reduce the schedule on the claim that it was too long. Yesterday I wanted a table inserted in *Hansard* and you said, "I think I should have a look at the table first. Is it long?" Is there now a censorship on what can be incorporated in *Hansard* by leave of the House and, if so, who are the members of the censorship committee, who appointed it, and under which Standing Order was it appointed?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER—I take it that the honourable member wants to know which authority says that there are certain things which should not go into *Hansard* without being read. I have not examined the position thoroughly and I hesitate to make any ruling on it, but I cannot find anything in the Standing Orders to allow a member to insert anything in *Hansard*, even with leave, without stating it in the House. My reason is that in a debate today an honourable member might get leave to insert something in *Hansard* which members know nothing about until the next day when the debate is all over. I do not intend to be hard in this matter and I shall examine the position further. When the Speaker returns I shall ask him for his opinion on the point. I think honourable members will understand what I am trying to convey. This is supposed to be a debating House, where everything appearing in *Hansard* is uttered. When it comes to a Minister answering a question and he asks leave for a schedule which has nothing to do with any debate to be put in *Hansard* without being read it is there for members to look at. That is a different matter. I am not imposing a censorship. The Leader of the *Hansard* staff told me he had consulted the honourable member for Hind-

marsh about the schedules put in on October 2 and pointed out their considerable length, and I understand he arranged to shorten them. I assure the honourable member that there is no censorship. My idea is that it is fair to the House that somebody should examine the schedules or statements to see whether or not they should go in *Hansard* without being read.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Mr. Deputy Speaker, the matter raised by the honourable member appears to be one of some importance. There are occasions when, as Treasurer of the State, I have information to submit to the House which would be impossible for honourable members to follow except in a table. One such occasion occurred two or three days ago when an honourable member wanted a schedule showing land purchased from the Housing Trust. It was a long schedule containing six pages of information. Would you submit this matter to the Standing Orders Committee with the object of drawing up a rule to enable factual information in table form to be included in *Hansard* by leave of the House without its being read, so that we would have a definite ruling on the matter? That does not cut across the observation you made that debatable matter should be given in the House, which would give other members an opportunity to answer it. I was referring to factual information in schedule form being inserted in *Hansard* so that it would be available to members for future reference.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER—I shall have pleasure in submitting this matter to the Standing Orders Committee and will ask it to consider it. That will satisfy me.

LOAN COUNCIL MEETING.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Can the Treasurer say whether steps have been taken by the State Governments to request a meeting of the Loan Council to deal particularly with interest rates and the rising rate of interest which is being offered by some semi-Governmental borrowing authorities in Australia?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The South Australian Government over a period of weeks has been pressing for a Loan Council meeting to consider this matter, and it has had the support of the Victorian Government. Mr. Cosgrove, the Tasmanian Premier, has indicated publicly that he supports the meeting, but I believe he has not forwarded a definite request to the chairman of the Loan Council. My earlier forecast of what the position would be unless something could be done has proved to be true, and now semi-Governmental bodies are asking for

even higher rates than those previously approved. The position has become so acute that I have received a communication from the Premier of New South Wales informing me that he has asked for a Loan Council meeting to be convened to deal with this matter. On the strength of the support that New South Wales is giving in this matter of an immediate Loan Council meeting, I believe it will now be inevitable, for under the Constitution if three States request a meeting of the Loan Council, the chairman is obliged to call one. I am certain that not one additional pound will be made available to the semi-Governmental bodies by their pushing up rates of interest and that all they will be doing will be to further dislocate the market which is already very weak and in which public support is lacking. By merely pushing up interest rates continuously we will reach that position where every public work in Australia will become jeopardized; therefore strong and resolute action is needed. I say very advisedly that a meeting of the Loan Council is long overdue on this matter.

GUMMOSIS IN APRICOTS.

Mr. TEUSNER—Some months ago I again drew the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the prevalence of gummosis in apricot orchards and referred to the fact that the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization was withdrawing from the research work into this disease. The Minister then said that he had received information from the Federal Minister who controls the C.S.I.R.O. suggesting that research work be carried on by the Waite Research Institute in conjunction with the South Australian Department of Agriculture, and he further stated that he would do everything possible with a view to having an appropriate officer appointed in due course. Can the Minister say whether any further steps have been taken since?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—Following on the deputation which waited upon me in connection with this matter and the promises made to them, I immediately contacted the Federal Minister who is in charge of the C.S.I.R.O. and my information from him was to the effect that the C.S.I.R.O. was definitely retiring from research into gummosis. I immediately took up the matter with the Waite Institute with a view to seeing that an appointment was made in that institute to deal with this matter, and although at the time the institute informed me that it had no funds available for this work, since then I understand it has taken up the matter with the Treasury authori-

ties and satisfactory arrangements have now been made for funds to be made available for the appointment of an officer. My information from the department is that steps are now being taken by the Waite Research Institute to secure the services of a suitable person.

TUBERCULOSIS AMONGST MIGRANTS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Premier a reply to my recent question concerning the incidence of tuberculosis amongst migrants?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have some rather interesting figures in connection with the topic on which the honourable member sought information. Dr. Woodruff, Director of Tuberculosis, who has been placed in charge of this work in South Australia, reports:—

In 1951, 386 new cases of tuberculosis were notified to the South Australian Department of Public Health. Of these 320 were Australian born, 13 entered Australia before 1939, 49 were post-war migrants of whom 10 were British subjects, 12 were Italians and 27 were other European nationalities. There are in South Australia 45,075 post-war migrants, of whom 13,575 are British subjects and 31,500 are aliens. Thus in 1951 in South Australia one out of every 2,125 Australians, one out of every 1,350 British migrants, and one out of every 808 alien migrants became new cases of tuberculosis. That is, tuberculosis among alien migrants appears to be almost twice as common as among British migrants, and almost three times as common as it is among native born Australians. The incidence of tuberculosis in alien migrants in South Australia is thus 0.125 per cent rather than the figure of 10 per cent quoted as the prevalence of the disease among inmates of D.P. camps. Many of these migrants have been in Australia for periods up to five years and a number have contracted tuberculosis in Australia. The numbers entering Australia with active tuberculosis are very small, and the incidence of tuberculosis in alien migrants appears to be very considerably less than the incidence in the countries from which they have come. The numbers are not sufficient to place any undue burden on available treatment facilities, nor to delay or hamper the treatment of native born Australians.

GARBAGE AS COMPOST.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—My question arises from an article in the current issue of *Reader's Digest* dealing with the work done by Dr. Pfeiffer, acknowledged to be one of the leading agricultural scientists in the United States of America. He has finally evolved a system whereby the garbage of large cities may become a very valuable fertilizer for lands which have been intensely developed. Members know the valuable work Sir Stanton Hicks has done in our own State and in other States on the same lines. This article says:—

Dr. Pfeiffer will soon establish an experimental plant in Cuba to convert tons of waste sugar-cane fibre into much-needed organic

fertilizer in that largely one-crop country. A Mexican firm wants him to set up a composting plant. Farm organizations in Australia and New Zealand have invited him for a demonstration tour next year.

Will the Premier ascertain whether Dr. Pfeiffer is likely to visit Australia and, if so, will he see that advantage is taken by this State of the visit? I am informed on the best authority that it is costing metropolitan councils large sums to destroy what could easily be turned into very valuable fertilizer.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The question raises an important matter. I know that research into this question has been undertaken in many countries over a long period and that in some instances it has appeared to meet with spectacular success. I will ask the Minister of Agriculture to ascertain whether it is necessary for us to seek additional information outside Australia, or whether the work being done abroad is being covered here by our own competent scientists. We have a number of scientists in South Australia associated with such bodies as the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science and the Waite Research Institute who might well examine the problem and do any additional work necessary. I understand that the bulk of the work overseas has been directed towards developing bacteria for the quicker assimilation of waste products to turn them into healthy organic manures. That work appears to be well within the compass of our own laboratories. I will ask the Minister of Agriculture to get a report and make it available to honourable members.

SCHOOL TEACHERS' PAY.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Under Education Department Regulation 27, if, for example, a headmaster or head teacher is away and the chief assistant or senior master does his work for, say, five weeks, he is entitled, after four weeks, to apply for pay at the higher duty rate. He then receives pay at that higher rate for one week. However, in the Public Service if a man does higher duty for five weeks, after one month he can make application and he receives pay for the full period at the higher rate. Will the Minister of Works take up this matter with the Minister of Education to see if the same privilege can be extended to members of the teaching profession?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Yes, but I do not think it comes within the jurisdiction of the Minister, but is considered by the board or judicial committee that regulates teachers' salaries.

BUDGET SPEECH AND SUPPLY.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—It was reported in the *News* last week that the Treasurer intended to deliver his Budget speech on Thursday next. Can he say whether it will be delivered on that day?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The report is correct, subject to one thing. As the honourable member knows, the Government Printing Office staff is having a very busy time printing the Budget, a very big and complicated job. A number of items have to be checked and cross-checked. However, I believe the Government Printer will be able to deliver the document in time, and subject to that the Budget will be presented to the House next Thursday. I take this opportunity to say that it will be necessary next week for me to submit a further Supply Bill, as Supply provided this session has been almost exhausted. So that ample time can be given for the Budget debate it will be necessary for further Supply to be provided. I intend to ask the House to consider an additional Supply vote on Tuesday next.

DISSEMINATING AGRICULTURAL KNOWLEDGE.

Mr. BROOKMAN—During the Address in Reply debate I made several suggestions as to how the latest discoveries in agricultural science could be more speedily promulgated to farmers. The Minister of Agriculture promised to consider my remarks. Has he any comments to make now?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—Following upon the honourable member's remarks I discussed the matter with the Director of Agriculture as to how far his officers go in translating scientific documents into language which the man on the land can understand. He reported as follows:—

The problem of extending agricultural knowledge to the farmer is recognized as being both difficult and complex. Essentially the Department of Agriculture is an extension service drawing on results of basic research work on agricultural and livestock problems carried on all over the world. One of the principal functions of the Department of Agriculture is to relate scientific work to practice. Before this can be done it has not only to be translated from scientific to lay language, but frequently results must be tested under local conditions. This is necessary to ensure the soundness of recommendations made. There is no short cut to sound advisory work and every appointment made to the Department of Agriculture increases the capacity of the department to fulfil its advisory functions.

BRIGHTON CEMENT WORKS.

Mr. STOTT—Can the Premier say whether the Brighton Cement Works has been using imported clinker, and because of its price the price of cement to South Australian users is being kept up, and whether it is a fact that until that imported clinker is used up the works will be unable to sell cement at the Australian price? Is it also true that but for the imported clinker the company could be manufacturing cement fully at the Australian price; and is any of this cement being made from the imported clinker going to the South Australian Housing Trust for its use?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The new plant being erected by the company in the Angaston district, which it had hoped to have in operation at the end of last month, is not only not in operation yet, but I am now advised will not be in operation for several weeks. In the meantime, the Brighton Cement Works has had a disastrous breakdown in its plant at Port Noarlunga and consequently was unable to supply its normal customers with cement for housing projects. In these circumstances the company asked the State Government whether it could borrow, I think 600 tons of cement, to meet its urgent needs. That cement is to be made available on the understanding that it will be replaced in due course by Australian-made cement. It is being made available for urgent housing at the Australian price. But for that arrangement there would have been a serious shutdown in employment in the building industry in South Australia during the last week or ten days.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Is that clinker?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Imported clinker. The Government, from time to time, to meet the position, has been releasing for sale to various persons who want to buy it a certain amount of the clinker it has imported and that is being ground both by the Brighton and Adelaide cement companies. It is being sold at £1 a bag, the price approved by the Prices Commissioner.

Mr. Stott—Why do people have to go to Brighton to get delivery?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I cannot answer that; frankly, I did not know there was any difference in the terms of delivery compared with those for other cement, but there is today in circulation cement being sold by the South Australian Government at £24 a ton. In addition, a limited quantity is in circulation under the control of the Building Materials Office, for urgent housing jobs.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. PATTINSON—For the information of members, particularly country members, who may wish to attend public meetings and other functions at night and do not know whether they will be in a position to attend, can the Premier give a clear and reliable indication on whether the House will be sitting on Tuesday and Wednesday evenings for the remainder of the session?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Government endeavours to arrange that the night sittings of the House shall be as regular as possible so as to enable members to make arrangements in regard to other functions that they may wish to attend. I point out that on some occasions members find they have not yet completed their examination of legislation before the House and ask that a certain matter be held over pending the obtaining of further information or the preparation of statements about it. It is the intention of the Government for the rest of the session, unless unusual circumstances arise, to ask the House to sit until about 9.30 on the evenings of Tuesday and Wednesday of each week. The House will not sit on Thursday evenings.

WHYALLA SEWERAGE SCHEME.

Mr. RICHES—Can the Minister of Works make a report on the progress or the preparation of plans for the Whyalla sewerage scheme?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The Engineer-in-Chief supplied me with the details, through the Engineer for Sewerage, and the plans of the scheme proposed are in course of preparation. They will be submitted, through the honourable member, to the Whyalla Town Commission, and we hope they will be ready early in November. I should like the honourable member to understand that the preparation of a scheme for a town of some thousands of inhabitants does not merely entail an ordinary sketchy plan, but a detailed and comprehensive one involving a mass of detail which takes a long time to compile, especially when technical staff is not readily available. The honourable member can be assured that every effort possible has been put into the job of preparing the plans.

HOUSING TRUST CONTRACTORS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked recently about contracts let by the Housing Trust to Martin Housing Limited?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The chairman of the Housing Trust reports:—

The general question of piece work on Housing Trust jobs was recently the subject of discussion by a deputation to the trust from the

Building Trades Federation. As regards the contract being carried out for the trust by Martin Housing Limited, which has been referred to by Mr. Frank Walsh, this company has now stopped piece work and is now generally employing its labour on ordinary day labour methods.

FLAGPOLES FOR SCHOOLS.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Has the Minister requesting the Minister of Education anything further to report in reply to the question I asked last Tuesday regarding flagpoles for primary schools?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The Minister of Education has reported to me that at new schools flagpoles are provided and at all major schools, as far as is known, they are already in existence. In no case has it been officially asked, as far as is known, that the parents provide the flagpoles, so where they are not already in existence it may be through oversight by the department or want of care on someone's part. If the honourable member will let me know the school in question the matter will receive attention.

GALVANIZED IRON SUPPLIES.

Mr. STOTT—Recently the Building Materials Office declined to supply iron for a certain job. Although it had permitted a supply for the roofing of the building it rejected a request to supply iron for the sides. I think that has been a rule for some time, but now that, according to my information, Australian iron is becoming more plentiful, will the Premier take the matter up with the Building Materials Office to see if iron can be released for the purpose mentioned, particularly for jobs connected with primary production?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—An amendment to the Building Materials Act has been passed by this House and is now receiving consideration in another place. It provides a means, whereby, by proclamation, the provisions of the Act can be relaxed from time to time to meet changing circumstances. From information that has come to my knowledge, it seems that Australian galvanized iron will become more freely available in the near future, but it is not yet; in fact, there is still a considerable amount of imported iron being sold on the local market at a much higher price than Australian. That arises out of the fact that Australian iron is not yet readily available, but I heard that, because black iron is now no longer in demand, the companies making galvanized iron are now getting better supplies of sheeting for galvanizing. Further, more zinc and sulphuric acid have become available, so in the future we can expect additional supplies of galvanized

iron and, indeed, later of galvanized piping. The present position does not warrant a relaxation as suggested by the honourable member, but there will be one as soon as circumstances permit. Yesterday I arranged for the Director of Building Materials to personally interview representatives of the companies manufacturing these products in New South Wales to see if additional supplies can come speedily to South Australia to meet urgent requirements.

STEEL WORKS AT WHYALLA.

Mr. RICHES—In 1950 the Director of Mines in South Australia submitted to Parliament a special report on the Australian iron and steel industry, in which he gave a complete survey of the raw materials available and of the demand for them. He advocated, in language as strong as one in his position could use to Parliament, the necessity of establishing steel works at Whyalla without delay. He also said that the work should be undertaken within the next two years and suggested that if necessary the work should be done with Government assistance in the direction of making loan money available. From time to time I have mentioned this report in this House and have attempted to get the reaction of the Government. This week we read in the press that the Western Australian Government has negotiated an agreement with the Broken Hill Proprietary Co. Limited for the establishment of steel rolling mills in Western Australia. We were told over the air that the agreement leading to the decision was related to the granting of leases over Western Australian iron ore deposits. When South Australian leases were granted to the company in 1937 promises were made that steel works would be established here. Can the Premier say whether the Government has taken any action following on the submission of Mr. Dickinson's report? Have representations been made to the company and, if so, who made them and with what result?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—On a number of occasions I have personally discussed with representatives of the B.H.P. Co., the establishment of steel works at Whyalla, which is strongly supported by the Government because it shares many of the views expressed by the Director of Mines in his report, so from that point of view there is no problem. At present the company is engaged in establishing a strip mill at Port Kembla. Originally the estimated cost was about £14,000,000, but because of increases in prices the cost will be considerably

higher. I have heard over £20,000,000, mentioned, but I cannot substantiate that. It will be some years before the work is finished. In the meantime, I understand that the company has entered into an agreement with the Western Australian Government and secured control of the iron ore deposits at Koolan Island and Yampi Sound. The steel works established in that State will be sufficient to cover all steel products required to be rolled, with the exception of sheeting, which will still come from Port Kembla.

Mr. Riches—Our leases are tied up.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Under the Act the company undertook to install a blast furnace at Whyalla following on the extension of its leases and, speaking from memory, an output of 200,000 tons per annum was mentioned. It was also agreed that the company would increase the amount of the royalty from 3d. to 6d. a ton. As far as I know, the company has carried out these conditions and it has publicly stated that as soon as it is able to undertake the additional responsibility of a steel works at Whyalla it will go ahead with its plans. In the past the company has always kept its part of the bargain and I have no doubt that it will do so in the future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—It concerns a report appearing in this morning's *Advertiser* purporting to be a report of the debate yesterday on Mr. Christian's Bill to amend the Licensing Act. Mr. Brookman, the member for Alexandra, is reported to have said, "Some sections of the South Australian public err in holding that the consumption of liquor is a sin," and I was reported to have interjected "There are a lot of sinners here." I made no such interjection, nor do I believe that statement to be true. As a matter of fact, I agree substantially with the remarks made by Mr. Brookman and I made no comments whatsoever whilst he was speaking.

CORONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a first time.

LANDLORD AND TENANT (CONTROL OF RENTS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Committee's report adopted. Bill read a third time and passed.

BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Before introducing it I made some inquiries amongst those people who were most concerned with it—the barley growers of this State—to ascertain whether they desired it, and I do not think I heard of any opposition to it. The general opinion expressed was that barley growers were satisfied with the working of the Barley Board and were of the unanimous opinion that the legislation should be re-enacted because of the benefits this Act had conferred on the industry.

The objects of this Bill are to extend the legislation under which the Australian Barley Board is constituted and to make some amendments to deal with problems which have arisen in the course of the board's operations during the past five years. The Bill has been submitted to and approved by the Victorian Government, and a Bill in the same form has already been introduced in that State. Members no doubt are aware that the Australian Barley Board is constituted under statutes passed in identical terms by this Parliament and the Parliament of Victoria in the year 1947. Under these Acts the barley marketing scheme which had previously been operated by the Commonwealth as a war measure was continued under new administration for a further period of five years. This period will expire after the present season, and the question of extending the Act must therefore now be considered. Discussions have taken place between the Government of this State and the Government of Victoria as to the desirability of a renewal and both Governments have agreed to recommend to their Parliaments that the scheme should be continued for another five years, that, is until the end of the season 1957-1958. Information received by both Governments indicates that the barley marketing scheme is generally acceptable to the growers and that their feelings are in favour of a continuance of the scheme. Some persons have suggested a longer term than five years, but the Governments feel that in a matter such as this it is not wise to make arrangements too far ahead, and that it is better to err on the side of moderation. For this reason, therefore, a term of five years has been decided upon and this extension is given effect to by clause 7 of the Bill.

Clauses 3 and 4 deal with the remuneration and allowances payable to members of the board. At present these are fixed by the arrangement made between the Government of South Australia and the Government of Victoria under which the Australian Barley Board is set up. This arrangement can only be altered by an Act of Parliament. In view of the need for adjusting salaries and allowances to meet recent changes in the value of money it appears to the two Governments concerned that it would be better if the remuneration and allowances of the members of the board could be fixed by agreement between the Ministers of Agriculture rather than by the more formal method of altering the arrangement between the Governments. It is accordingly proposed by clauses 3 and 4 to take away the power to fix members' remunerations and allowances by the arrangement, and to hand these matters over to the Ministers for determination. In the event of the Ministers not being able to agree upon any particular rate they are required to refer it to some other person for decision. Clause 5 extends the powers of the Australian Barley Board in two respects. In the first place, it provides that the board may expend money on experiments, research and work, the object of which is to improve or discover means of improving the quality of seed barley. The board is desirous of promoting a scheme for the production of high-grade seed barley which will be available to barley growers with whom the board deals. This scheme, which will be carried out in co-operation with the Department of Agriculture, will involve some relatively small expenditure from the board's funds. At present there is no authority for such expenditure, but in view of the value of the proposed scheme to growers it appears reasonable that the board should be empowered to assist it financially. The amounts involved are small.

The other power conferred on the board by clause 5 is to charter ships for the transport of barley and other cargo between ports of the Commonwealth. The clause provides, however, that cargo other than barley can only be carried as back loading, because the board has no desire to enter into the shipping business for general cargo in competition with shipping companies. In fact, the board has already chartered a small ketch which is engaged in transporting barley between coastal ports in South Australia and occasionally makes voyages to Melbourne. Possibly the power to do this is already implied in the Act, but as doubts have been raised about the matter, and the

board's expenditure has to pass a strict audit it is proposed to grant the power expressly.

Clause 6 enables the board to set aside into a reserve fund the small balances which sometimes remain after the growers have been paid for a season's barley. It not infrequently happens that after the last distribution has been made for a season's barley there are very small sums of money left which are so small as barely to pay the cost of the cheques and postage involved in sending them to the growers. Legally the board is required to pay out all these sums to the growers in each season, but it would obviously be uneconomic to do so and the board has, in practice, allowed the money to accumulate as a reserve for contingencies. It is desirable to give a legal power for this practice to continue. Clause 6 confers such a power and provides for the building up and investment of the reserve fund and empowers the board to use it to meet such expenditure or liabilities of the board as it deems proper. I have conferred with the Victorian Minister of Agriculture on the terms of this Bill. He visited me in Adelaide and we discussed the matter with members of the Barley Board and the Parliamentary Draftsman before agreeing on the details. The Victorian Bill, the second reading speech on which was to be made last Tuesday, is identical with the Bill now before us, and the Victorian Minister has assured me that barley growers in Victoria are just as anxious as those in this State for the re-enactment of the legislation; therefore I feel satisfied that members will give the Bill their most sympathetic consideration.

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

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH (Minister of Local Government)—I move:—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to make a number of amendments to the Friendly Societies Act which have been suggested by the United Friendly Societies Council or by the Public Actuary. It has been examined by the executive of the Council and meets with their approval. The Friendly Societies Act applies to a number of friendly societies, the names of which are set out in the second schedule in the Act. Section 5 enables the Governor by proclamation to add to this list the names of further societies. The section, however, does not contain provision for striking out from the list

the names of societies which are dissolved or terminated. In point of fact, a few of the societies now included in the list have gone out of existence. Clause 2 provides that where a society is dissolved or terminated the Governor may, by proclamation, strike out the name of the society from the list in the second schedule. Clause 2 also provides that, where a society changes its name, the Governor may strike out the old name from the list of societies and add the new name. Provisions to enable a society to change its name are contained in clauses 7 and 8.

Clause 3 authorizes a society to raise a fund or to add to an existing fund for the purpose of providing physiotherapeutic treatment to members and their dependants. The Act now provides that a society may provide such as medical benefits and treatment including therapeutic treatment and it is in accord with the general scheme of the Act to extend it to include physiotherapy benefits. Clause 4 provides that a society may admit persons to membership upon condition that those persons shall have the right to contribute only to any specified fund or funds of the society. The societies, in order to attract persons to their organizations, are desirous of having this provision to admit persons to what may be termed limited membership. However, the clause also provides that if any person is admitted to this limited membership, he is to have the same rights as other members to vote at meetings of the society on any question relating to the fund or funds to which he contributes.

Clause 5 provides that the committee of management of a society may from time to time vary the entrance fees and subscriptions payable to the society and the benefits provided by it. It is now competent for a society by its rules to give this power to the committee of management, and if this is done, any variation promulgated by the committee of management need not necessarily be submitted to the members. It is therefore provided by the clause that where the committee of management alters the fees, subscriptions or benefits that alteration must be submitted to the next general meeting of the society. If it is not so submitted or if a resolution approving it is not passed at the meeting, the alteration will cease to have effect as from the time the general meeting is concluded. Section 11 of the Act provides that cheques of a friendly society are to be signed by two trustees and countersigned by the secretary or the treasurer. In instances, the same person is both the secretary and the treasurer and, whether or not this is the case,

it sometimes occurs that the volume of a society's business is such as to impose an undue burden on the counter signing officer. Clause 6 therefore provides that the committee of management may authorize one other person to countersign cheques.

At present the Act makes no provision for the change of name of a friendly society and the only way in which this can be done is by the society being dissolved and re-registered under another name. Clause 7 provides that a society may, by resolution, change its name, but the resolution must be agreed to by the committee of management and by not less than three-fourths of the votes recorded by members or of representatives of branches at a general meeting. Clause 8 is ancillary to clause 7 and provides that a resolution for the change of name is not to be effective until it is registered by the Public Actuary. The clause also provides that a resolution proposing a new name for a society is not to be registered if it is similar to the name of an existing society included in the second schedule or if it is so similar thereto as to be likely to be mistaken for it. As has been previously mentioned, where the name of a society has been changed, clause 2 will provide power to enable the necessary changes to be made in the list of societies contained in the second schedule.

Mr. HUTCHENS secured the adjournment of the debate.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 25. Page 656.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Goodwood)—I support the second reading. It is proposed under the Bill to pay medical practitioners an increased fee, 10s. 6d., for reporting instances of tuberculosis to the Central Board of Health. I am afraid doctors will be unable to complete the prescribed form indicating how far the disease has progressed unless the patient first has an X-ray examination. Members should be told more of what is required from the doctors. If a doctor orders an X-ray test this will involve an additional expense to the patient. Perhaps the Government would consider meeting some of this cost. If a country doctor reports a case will he be compensated as provided in clause 3? The question arises whether in certain districts patients could get an X-ray without the expense of travelling to a large country centre or to the city. In reply to a question by me this afternoon the Premier gave figures of the incidence of tuberculosis

among immigrants in Australia. Some of the figures were alarming and indicated that the percentage of prevalence is much higher than among Australians. I am informed that 10 per cent of the patients at Bedford Park Sanatorium are New Australians; although the Premier's reply to my question did not indicate that.

The Commonwealth Government is doing its part in rendering assistance to sufferers and trying to arrest the disease. Over a number of years it has increased financial assistance to sufferers; but there is room for further improvement. Will further hardship be placed on patients by their having to be X-rayed and can the Minister indicate the type of form that will have to be filled in by medical practitioners? Will they have to send it to the Central Board of Health or will they be able to forward it to the local board?

Mr. QUIRKE (Stanley)—Clause 3 increases from 2s. to 10s. 6d. the fee to be paid to a medical practitioner for notifying a case. I oppose such an increase. It seems that everyone today demands payment for every little duty consequential on carrying out his job. The patient has to pay the doctor a consultation fee and also has to pay for an X-ray. The doctor is then compelled to report any finding of tuberculosis. Many private persons and companies have heavy impositions placed upon them in the collection of taxation. Some companies paying high wage bills have to employ competent people whose work is almost entirely that of collecting taxation, but they are not allowed to pass their costs on. A fee of 2s. is quite sufficient to compensate a doctor for having to make a report. I will not vote against the Bill but in Committee I will ask why the fee should be 10s. 6d. I doubt whether the payment of any fee is justified.

Mr. WHITTLE (Prospect)—I disagree with the remarks of the member for Stanley. In explaining the Bill the Minister stated that the additional information sought relates to matters such as X-ray reports, bacteriological reports and an expression of medical opinion as to the extent of the disease. This shows that much more information will now have to be given by doctors when notifying cases of tuberculosis. A doctor has to spend many years of intensive study before being in a position to earn anything, yet the honourable member expects him to give all this information *gratis*. A doctor is paid a fee for every notification of an infectious disease because a certain amount of work is involved. He should receive a fee because it

is his livelihood. A medical practitioner cannot give an opinion unless he has thoroughly examined the patient. The early closing laws do not apply to doctors.

Mr. Quirke—Don't they!

Mr. Fletcher—Go to the country and find out!

Mr. WHITTLE—I know they have certain consulting hours, but they are at the beck and call of the public at all times. One only has to attend a football match to hear calls broadcast during the afternoon, "Will the doctor whose car number is so-and-so please report at the nearest gate?" Further, I know that doctors are often called away from a game of pennant bowls.

Mr. Quirke—What about the St. John Ambulance men?

Mr. WHITTLE—They do a fine work in an honorary capacity, but they have not been through five or six years of intensive study.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Do you suggest that all doctors, after qualifying, would be in a position to complete the details required by the new form?

Mr. WHITTLE—They would give the fullest information they could. Of course, they are not all specialists in tuberculosis, like Dr. Cowan, but they would be able to give what is required by the Bill. I think 10s. 6d. is a fair minimum payment for their services. I support the Bill wholeheartedly.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Duty to notify cases of tuberculosis."

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Can the Minister indicate the type of form which will have to be completed by a medical practitioner?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH (Minister of Works)—The Minister's second reading speech states:—

The National Tuberculosis Advisory Council has recommended that additional basic information should be included in the notification form. The additional information sought relates to matters such as X-ray reports, bacteriological reports and an expression of medical opinion as to the extent of the disease. This additional information is of value in determining priorities for hospital admission, a guide in assessing what public health measures should be taken, and a most convenient means of supplying initial medical information for the Central Tuberculosis Case Registry. It is also of great assistance in determining eligibility for tubercular allowances.

A doctor has now only to report that a person is suffering from tuberculosis. The Bill provides that he must go much further and give additional basic information, so 2s. would not be nearly a reasonable allowance. He has to be an assessor of the extent of the disease, and to say what steps should be taken to combat it. The form required will be laid down by regulation, which will come before the House, so I cannot say at this stage what form it will follow. The fee has been increased to 10s. 6d. because much more information will be required from medical practitioners.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—"Fee to medical practitioners."

Mr. QUIRKE—I have no objection to the payment of a fee of 10s. 6d. or £1, or anything else, but on principle I object to having to pay twice or three times for something. The provision represents a double payment. Whatever job a man has, certain duties have to be performed. Under this Bill the doctor is expected to present a report, but instead of its being a simple notification as in the past he now has to fill in certain details, and for doing that he is to be paid an extra fee. In this State we have a system of compulsory X-ray examinations in connection with tuberculosis, and to be examined some people have to incur considerable expense, but they do not ask to be reimbursed. No doctor will be so over-burdened with work in filling in details of an X-ray examination as to warrant his getting a fee of 10s. 6d. I do not decry the service rendered by doctors. In these days it seems that nobody renders a service without being paid.

Mr. Whittle—What about the St. John Ambulance people?

Mr. QUIRKE—That is a voluntary service and wonderful work is done. Some of the highly trained members have a skill that few doctors have. Medical men deliberately chose their avocation and they knew that at all times of the day and night they would be called on to render a service. In this matter I think they could fill in the necessary details without extra charge.

Mr. BROOKMAN—The additional information is required to enable an assessment to be made of necessary public health measures, and it will be of value in determining priorities for hospital admission. If the additional information is not forthcoming the Central Board of Health will have to get it from somewhere, and probably it is worth 10s. 6d. to the board to get it from the medical practitioners.

An unhappy simile has been drawn in comparing the work of doctors with that of the St. John Ambulance Brigade. We should not expect the doctors to supply the information without charge. As a group they probably do more honorary work than anyone else.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—There is no new principle in this matter. It seems in these days that only two classes of people can get medical treatment—the very rich and the poorer folk who get a free service. I know of a man who was told that an operation at a private hospital would cost sixty guineas, but if it were done at the Royal Adelaide Hospital there would be no charge. Medical men do an immense amount of honorary work. As the additional information is required it is only fair that the medical men should be paid a higher fee.

Clause passed.

Title passed. Bill read a third time and passed.

ADVANCES TO SETTLERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 30. Page 697.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—At first glance this Bill appears to be a rather formidable one, for it has eleven clauses, but on examination I find that it deals with only two matters of any importance. The legislation will probably be rendered more effective as the result of the amendments. For many years we have had a form of State advance to settlers in South Australia, and it has been part of our policy to assist settlers on the land, particularly those who pioneered new districts such as the northern areas, Murray mallee and Eyre Peninsula. In the 1890's the State bank was established for the primary purpose of making advances of this kind and in the early years of this century the Crown Advances Act was passed and later merged with the Advances to Settlers Act. Over the years this legislation has provided that advances could only be made on Crown leaseholds or agreements to purchase, and it was not competent for an advance to be made on a freehold title.

The first reason for this provision was that at that time the banking institutions believed that advances on freehold land were a very desirable type of loan from their point of view, and consequently any influence they might have had—and I remember the time when they had considerable influence in these matters—would have been used to prevent the advances to

settlers system from making advances on freehold titles. Secondly, as these freeholds were considered good security by the trading banks, they were left the prerogative of assisting the primary producers who possessed those titles, and the amount of money available under the Advances to Settlers Act was thus retained for the benefit of Crown leaseholders. I believe that in recent years a change has taken place and that today, because of the inflation in land values that has taken place, the banks do not look upon freehold security as being quite as good as it was in earlier days, therefore we find that for the first time after more than 50 years this Bill provides for advances to be made on freehold titles of land.

I am not unmindful of another reason for the introduction of this Bill—the Premier's alleged scheme for increasing primary production. Advances are to be made to primary producers to establish on their holdings homes for their employees, but I remind members that in recent years, because of the re-aggregation of land into larger holdings quite a number of good and substantial farm homes have been destroyed and I suggest we should have taken steps years ago to correct this anomaly. Similar steps were taken with regard to protecting town houses when under the Building Materials Act the destruction of houses or their conversion for purposes other than housing was prohibited if they had been occupied as homes during the preceding 12 months. Country houses should have been protected in the same way, and if that had been done there would not have been the present dearth of rural homes. However, it was not done, and now it is suggested that the decrease in primary production will be arrested by making advances to landholders so that they may build homes for their employees. Although I do not think it will overcome the difficulty, as a great deal more than is provided in this Bill is required to achieve that end, to the extent it will help, I am prepared to support the Bill.

The other provision, which is important from the point of view of those who will need assistance, is that which permits the amount which may be advanced under the Act to be approximately doubled. That is provided to meet the effect of the falling of the value of money since this legislation was last amended. It is provided that the present maximum advance of £2,200 for improvements, stock, plant, etc., is to be increased to £4,150. The Bill also provides that instead of separate limits being placed on loans for stock, plant, clearings, and other improvements there shall be an overall

limit of £4,150 or 90 per cent of the equity, whichever is the greater. I agree with that provision for it will be of use in some parts of the State, but it is idle for us to pass legislation permitting these advances to be made unless we provide the money for the State Bank to make them. The funds under which the State Bank makes these advances are provided in the Loan Estimates, and only £5,000 has been made available this year for this purpose. I realize that under the Public Finance Act it is possible to effect some re-arrangement of accounts and for the Treasurer to use money voted for other purposes, but I suggest that all the purposes for which money has been voted on this year's Estimates are urgent and important and that in most instances the amount which was intended to be used for any of those purposes has been substantially cut as the result of the reduction in Loan expenditure forced on the State by the disastrous financial policy of the Commonwealth Government. Therefore, if this Bill is to be of any use and if any substantial advances are to be made under it, obviously some other form of Loan expenditure will suffer.

Members are entitled to know which particular forms of Loan expenditure will suffer as a result of the extension of the scope of this legislation, if my suggestion that some form of Loan expenditure is to suffer is correct, but, if it is not correct and only the £5,000 provided on the Loan Estimates is to be used in this respect, this Bill is obviously what at first glance I thought it was—purely and simply a window-dressing measure in view of the election to be held early next year. However, I will not attempt to stop this little bouquet from being placed in the window, for it may do some good and, if next year there is a change of Government which I confidently expect and Loan money becomes more plentiful, then the incoming Government in which I hope to have some say will be able to make generous advances under this legislation which will do a great deal to assist the development of certain areas in the State and increase primary production. Therefore, I offer no objection to the second reading.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—I join with the Leader of the Opposition in supporting the Bill and believe that, if he were to have some personal say in the management of this State's affairs after next year's election, he would under this legislation probably operate just as whole-heartedly and generously as this Government will when it is returned.

Mr. Pattinson—It would be difficult for him to operate more generously.

Mr. SHANNON—Obviously the introduction of this Bill was prompted by the thought of this Government and not by the Leader of the Opposition. The Bill does three things. Firstly, it widens the scope of advances and brings within the ambit of the scheme practically all settlers on the land in whatever category they may be. That is a very important extension, for after all we depend on a very diversified agricultural production in this State. Such diversification is necessary and is one of the gospels the Department of Agriculture is preaching. The more we can encourage any particular section of primary producers by making advances the more production will be achieved by it. The second and a very important aspect of this Bill is the realization by the Government of the change in money values since this legislation first came into operation. About double the amount originally permitted can now be advanced. It is a step in the right direction and one which will help to bridge the gap in rising costs which the man on the land is forced to meet. The third proposal under the Bill is possibly as important as the other two, because very few men seeking financial assistance are not already involved in other financial obligations. Invariably a man who wants further financial assistance already has secured money on mortgage from a lending institution or from the former owner of the property. The Bill, however, will not enable a person to get further money if he is unlikely to be able to repay earlier loans. I know there is much criticism of second mortgages, and as a lender I would view with grave doubts the lending of money under those circumstances.

Mr. O'Halloran—The State has lost about £500,000 under this legislation already but I still think it was money well spent.

Mr. SHANNON—I agree. The losses written off are a mere bagatelle compared with the value to the State of the actual increased produce resulting. Whatever Government is in office, it cannot be denied that the economic structure of our State mainly relates to primary production. It will always be our major function to produce meat, wheat and wool. South Australia is not sufficiently compact to become a highly industrialized State and it is also at a geographical disadvantage because of the two gulfs which divide our land mass. However, I admit that from a strategic point of view the gulfs provide some security for certain activities which have little relation

to production from the land. They are mainly concerned with the production of something for the destruction of mankind. If South Australia is to continue to prosper, and no doubt it will do so as long as the present Government remains in office with its long-term programme, we must take every opportunity to continue increasing production from the land. Often the Government is charged with a lack of sincerity in its efforts at decentralization. Some people favouring decentralization argue that industries should be established in some of the larger country towns. I contend that true decentralization, which would result in most profit to the State, aims at placing people in a position to take up land and produce something from it. The population required to serve them will automatically follow. Civic pride is developing in many of our country centres and in this respect I consider that Cleve is second to none among towns in this State. This kind of thing will grow and snowball if we can keep people prosperous and happy on their farms. Then when the time arrives they will retire into their local towns instead of coming to the city.

Mr. O'Halloran—Provided they have a few amenities there.

Mr. SHANNON—I agree. I am hopeful that this Bill will result in more amenities being provided on farms. These amenities are necessary if settlers are to remain happy and contented. I commend the legislation and am pleased that the Government has seen fit to broaden its scope to enable the State Bank to be more generous in making money available to those engaged in all forms of agriculture.

Mr. STOTT (Ridley)—I am pleased that the Government proposes to enable advances to individual settlers to be increased from £1,200 to nearly £2,400 and also that the definition of "settler" is to be enlarged to include those engaged in agricultural, horticultural, viticultural or pastoral pursuits. This is a move in the right direction. However, the Bill will not result in providing all those glorious amenities visualized by Mr Shannon. Although the Commonwealth Government has decided to relax credit restrictions, unless the State can get more money from the Loan Council the Bill will not achieve what is expected. I am hopeful that our Government will be able to get sufficient money to meet all applications. As a result of the Bill I can visualize an increased number of applications flowing in. I hope applicants will not be disappointed as so many have been during last two years, when,

on applying to the banks and other lending institutions for loans they have been told their overdrafts could not be increased because the loan market was tight. The Treasurer mentioned the possibility of the Loan Council being called together shortly to discuss the important question of interest rates. If there is to be an upward trend in these rates, applicants under the Bill will be called upon to meet increased rates and thus their difficulties will be made worse.

I have previously commended the Treasurer for his efforts to get interest rates pegged so that primary producers would then know where they stood. This would also apply to the general public. They would be given confidence and know how much their investments would earn without all the confusion at present existing in the loan market, or, as the case may be, what their commitments were. Unless we definitely know what the interest rates will be over a period of some years, there may be hesitancy by some settlers to make application for advances when they want to expand their operations. That would be to the detriment of the State. Notwithstanding that many settlers have been earning large incomes from the high prices of wool it may surprise some members to know that even now many farmers have not the ready cash available to expand their operations because of the high taxation. This legislation will provide a happy relief.

Clause 5 increases the maximum advance that may be made for the erection of a dwelling-house from £1,000 to £1,750, but I do not think that will be sufficient. At present-day costs settlers in distant areas will require perhaps £2,500 to erect an adequate house because they have to pay freight on building materials such as galvanized iron and timber, which are very costly. In Committee I will move to increase the amount. Many settlers may want to take advantage of the generous depreciation allowance offered by the Commonwealth Government, but may not be able to do so through lack of finance. Clause 3 increases the maximum advance that can be made for improvements from £1,200 to £2,400, and the advances for the erection of dwellinghouses should be increased on the same lines. The enlargement of a dwellinghouse is not nearly so costly, and the Bill would meet the position if a settler desire to add a room or two for family reasons. Many primary producers have been anxious to increase their production, but they have been unable to do so because of the shortage of rural labour. Some have been approached by the Immigration Department at

Canberra to employ New Australians, but have not been able to do so because they have not the necessary accommodation. With building materials becoming more readily available they will be able to erect houses if they can get the necessary finance and thereby play an important part in the immigration programme. Under the Commonwealth Government's 20 per cent annual depreciation allowance it would not take them long to pay for the structure. This, in effect, would give greater security to the lending institution making advances under the Act.

The Bill will enable primary producers to provide additional amenities on their holdings so as to keep their families on the farms. Many country members know that young people often drift to the larger country towns with modern facilities where they can get higher wages and much more enjoyment of the good things of life. However, if a young man has instilled into him the call of the soil he will stay on a farm if reasonable amenities are provided. Older members will remember the hard times endured by our pioneers. In the district I represent and on Eyre Peninsula they had to contend with many difficulties, and many advances under the Act have been granted to settlers in those districts. Our young people are not now interested in pioneering the country and living in tin sheds, as I did. We must increase primary production and can only do so by providing amenities or authorizing advances to enable farmers to do so.

I agree with the member for Onkaparinga that South Australia must encourage rural workers by establishing better facilities for the man on the land. This State will remain for many years principally a primary producing State. I cannot see our industrialization being increased more than it has over the last decade. Instead of encouraging the establishment of big projects near Smithfield we should decentralize and urge primary producers to take advantage of this Act, thereby helping South Australia and the Commonwealth to play its part with the United Nations as an important bastion in the Pacific. Increased primary production would build up our export trade. Unless the banks have the necessary money they cannot make advances and I hope that the Treasurer will be successful in his mission to the Loan Council. If we can establish greater credit facilities and stabilize the interest rate settlers will be more inclined to take advantage of the Act. Their confidence will be shaken if the interest rates show a tendency to move upwards.

Mr. MICHAEL (Light)—I support the Bill with great pleasure. It is a valuable piece of legislation and will be appreciated more by settlers as time goes on. I have no doubt that it is necessary to increase the maximum advances because of the changed money values. I do not regard that as the most important feature of the Bill. I want to refer to two other matters. One deals with bringing in branches of primary production that did not previously come under the legislation. This will be of great assistance to the State. Mr. Shannon referred to real decentralization to enable more people to go in for farming.

Mr. O'Halloran—I have been talking about that for years.

Mr. MICHAEL—Yes, but the honourable member has not been alone in that matter. Mr. Tiesner has spoken about the Barossa Valley, and I feel much pride when I see the decentralization that is going on in the area. This week I saw where another farm has been subdivided, with a vineyard planted and materials on the block for building a home. By widening the scope of the legislation to include more primary producers, people on small holdings will be greatly assisted. I compliment the Government in this regard. The other matter concerns owners of freehold land being able to get loans from the State Bank, which is a good move. Mr. Stott said that £1,750 is not enough to cover the cost of building a house. I agree that it is insufficient to build a modern farmhouse, but if the money available to the bank is limited it is better to restrict the amount to each settler to £1,750, and so enable more settlers to get advances. It is remarkable what primary producers can do in building a house for £1,750. They are not limited to a 40-hour week and they do much of the work themselves. This is good legislation, and as time goes on the State will benefit. The Leader of the Opposition referred to a possible change of Government, but that is an unlikely event and the Government has taken care to see that the settlers of South Australia will benefit in the future.

Mr. PEARSON (Flinders)—It would be wrong for me to allow this Bill to go through without commending the Government for broadening the scope of the legislation. In particular my district and that represented by Mr. Stott have benefited from this legislation, but they still need assistance. There never was a time when the cost of establishing oneself on a farm was so great

as it is today. Some people have to go to the outer fringes of the State to get land on terms within the scope of their purse. They find that their meagre funds are soon exhausted and that when they endeavour to establish themselves on the land much money is needed to buy very little. The Leader of the Opposition expressed the desire to facilitate the passage of this Bill and to endeavour to make provision for more land development. We all agree with that, but whilst members opposite speak about their desire to improve primary production, do they realize that some of the legislation they advocate have the opposite effect to assisting primary production? The Bill will assist in providing vital necessities for pioneers on the land. Waterpiping, fencing and housing are the basic needs of pioneers. There is a considerable area of land on Eyre Peninsula, much of it in my district, which will be developed through the assistance available under this legislation. Recently, because of the construction of a new road through a fauna and flora reserve east of Tooligie extensive tracts of what appeared to be useful land were discovered. Since that knowledge has become public people wanting to get the land have come to me in numbers asking me to take up with the department the question of surveying and developing the area. The department has heeded my representations and is making investigations. One of the applicants is a New Australian. He has had some agricultural experience, and has an abundance of energy but little finance. He would be unable to establish himself on the land without getting a benefit under such legislation as this.

Mr. RICHES—The legislation will not assist a man with no land.

Mr. PEARSON—It will enable him to establish himself on land which has been granted to him. If the State is to meet the increased demand for food production by a growing population it will have to explore the possibilities of every piece of arable land. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart)—As far back as 1927 the Hon. T. Butterfield delivered a speech on this subject, and it could easily be taken from *Hansard* of that time and included in the present *Hansard* as a part of this debate. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted. Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.44 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 14, at 2 p.m.