

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, November 5, 1953.

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

ASSENT TO ACTS.

His Excellency the Governor intimated by message his assent to the following Acts:—Barley Marketing Act Amendment, Offenders Probation Act Amendment, and Wheat Industry Stabilization Act Amendment.

QUESTIONS.

GRASSHOPPER PLAGUE.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I have noticed recently that the vexed question of grasshoppers has assumed considerable importance in New South Wales and Victoria and that an inspection of likely areas in South Australia has revealed that apparently there is no serious trouble in this State at the moment. I have also noticed that assistance is being sought from the Commonwealth Government in the provision of soldiers and equipment to combat grasshoppers and I have felt for a long time that if the eradication of grasshoppers in Australia were tackled seriously on a nation-wide basis it might be eventually successful. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether this question has ever been discussed on a Commonwealth level at a meeting of Ministers of Agriculture and, if so, has any policy been devised? If it has not been discussed will he take it up at an appropriate time?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—The problem of grasshoppers has been before the Agricultural Council on more than one occasion, but no agreement has been arrived at on the measures that should be taken. It was usually a case of some States being particularly interested, but others not, and those not interested objected to contributing towards the destruction of grasshoppers in the other States, but I will have the matter again listed for discussion at the next meeting of the Agricultural Council if there is time to get it on the agenda.

ROAD LIGHTING.

Mr. PATTINSON—I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Local Government though I do not desire an immediate reply. In fact, I prefer not to have one now, but put my question for future consideration by the Minister and perhaps the Government. I refer to a statement made yesterday by Mr. D. R. Schumann, president of the National Council of Illuminating Engineering Societies

of Australia, after a conference in Adelaide of delegates from all States. Mr. Schumann said:—

With the exception of the Port Road and Anzac Highway, the main arterial roads of South Australia were not lit to the minimum standards recommended in the 1939 street lighting code of the Standards Association of Australia. While most councils were aware of the necessity for good street lighting, the expenditure involved was usually beyond their resources. The State Government must therefore help local councils to finance new lighting schemes.

As chairman of the State Traffic Committee I publicly endorse the opinions expressed by Mr. Schumann. I believe poor road lighting is a prolific source of road accidents at night in the Adelaide suburbs, far too many of them being fatal. As a resident of the metropolitan area I am prepared to dip my hands deeper into my pockets to help my impecunious friends in the country to obtain better roads, but I should be pleased to know whether the Director of Highways and Local Government could provide some fund by which metropolitan councils could install more adequate road lighting, not only for the benefit of residents of the metropolitan area, but for visitors from the country and other States.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I have had a communication from the gentleman mentioned, but in a progressive world we never catch up with what the public desires. It is all a question of who pays for it. I commend the honourable member for saying that he is prepared to put his hand in his pocket and help pay for better roads. I will get a report on the various phases concerned. Up to the present Parliament has been prepared to provide for the lighting of Anzac Highway, which is in the position of being a national war memorial road, and also the Port Road, the main arterial road leading to Port Adelaide; but the lighting of no other road has come out of Government funds. Road lighting is the peculiar and proper function of local government, and I am pleased that the councils have realized more and more that it is their responsibility and have increased their rates to meet the cost. The Premier has introduced a Bill which will enable the Highways Commissioner to get more funds, out of which we may probably be able to afford better facilities in the way of lighting for the benefit of citizens. I shall be glad to take the matter up with the Highways Commissioner to see if it would be proper to introduce a supplementary measure, because he cannot do this work out of the present highways funds. If, after the Bill introduced by the Premier is

passed, there are some funds which could be properly used for that purpose, I am sure that the Highways Commissioner, the Government and myself will be glad to see what more we can do.

TIME PAYMENT PURCHASES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—During the Budget debate I inquired as to the desirability of introducing legislation to provide for a 10 per cent deposit on goods purchased by time payment. There is an ever-growing practice in Adelaide for advertisements to appear concerning hire purchase without deposit. Has the Premier given any further consideration to the matter and, if so, is it intended to introduce legislation to provide for a 10 per cent deposit or thereabouts?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It is not intended to introduce legislation as suggested. Anyone is well advised to keep his time payment purchases well within the scope of his ability to pay. This matter, of course, is one between the trader and the purchaser. As far as I am aware there is no suggestion of fraudulent practice, and in the circumstances there appears to be no justification for the Government to take any action to repress an extensive method of trading which, as the honourable member has pointed out, is becoming more rather than less popular. If there were any suggestion of fraudulence I think Parliament would have ground for taking action. What the honourable member is objecting to is that the purchaser is not required to put down a deposit. If the trader is prepared to trust the purchaser what grounds have we to interfere?

ADELAIDE BOWLING CLUB PREMISES.

Mr. HEASLIP—Has the Premier noticed in this morning's *Advertiser* a plan of the proposed site for the Adelaide Bowling Club, to which the Parklands Preservation League has taken exception? On the plan the site is shown as an insignificant portion of the park adjacent to Dequetteville Terrace. As Victoria Park nearby is mainly used for horseracing, to which I take no exception whatsoever, and as I understand the parks are to provide breathing space for the city and recreation and exercise for its citizens, could the Premier say whether it is more desirable to exercise horses or human beings in these parks?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The question of another site for the Adelaide Bowling Club has come under the Government's notice because its present premises belong to the Government. It is a continuation of the area from Kintore Avenue to the River Torrens, and has been

occupied by the club for a number of years under a lease from the Government. Some time ago I suggested to the Adelaide City Council that using this area for a continuation of Kintore Avenue would provide a valuable extra means of avoiding congestion of traffic at the corner of North Terrace and King William Street by furnishing another access to the north. At that time the council did not take up the suggestion, but more recently the Lord Mayor has communicated with me and stated that the council is now most anxious to construct an additional road which would give access to North Terrace, and for this purpose to secure the block of land occupied by the club. My reply was that the Government believed the land was necessary for public purposes as suggested by the council, and would be prepared to make it available provided that the council reached an amicable agreement with the club for the release of the lease, and for some other arrangement with the club. Negotiations have been not purely on the basis of whether the club should have a block of land as suggested, but whether the City Council should acquire a most valuable access to the city. I have not been conversant with the negotiations, but I understand they have been amicably carried out. A small amendment to the Licensing Act may be required, because the Bowling Club would require permission to have its liquor licence transferred from its present premises to the new premises, but as there is no different licensing district involved I do not think there would be any complication in that regard. The negotiations received the full support of the Government because a public purpose will be achieved by them.

WALLAROO SHIPPING.

Mr. McALEES—About six weeks ago, in reply to my question regarding the scarcity of shipping at Wallaroo, the Premier promised to take up the matter with the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping, but, up to the present no apparent results have been achieved by such approach, although thousands of tons of calcines from the Wallaroo-Mt. Lyell Fertilizer Coy. are awaiting shipment to Risdon. A little over two months ago it was suggested, both inside and outside this House, that the Wallaroo branch of the Waterside Workers' Federation should take in more members, but today no barley or wheat is being shipped from Wallaroo and the waterside workers there are standing by and receiving only attendance money, which proves the wisdom of the Federation in refusing to take in more members. Can the Premier say when more ships will call at

Wallaroo so as to enable these men to be employed?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member's previous question dealt not with interstate, but with overseas shipping, and I took up with the Commonwealth Minister of Shipping the question of making more overseas ships available to handle the grain. I shall be pleased to take up with the Federal Minister the question of interstate shipping to see if some relief can be given. Normally the zinc concentrates for Risdon are handled by interstate ships running only on that run. I will see whether I can arrange for additional ships to lift the surplus ore now awaiting shipment.

ELECTRICITY VOLTAGES.

Mr. GEOFFREY CLARKE—Can the Premier say whether the work being undertaken by the Electricity Trust in changing over from 210 to 240 volts is still proceeding in certain suburbs and, if so, when is it expected that it will be completed?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will get a reply for the honourable member from the chairman of the trust.

POLICE AMBULANCE WORK.

Mr. FRED WALSH—This morning's press reports that instructions have been issued to the effect that the assistant on the police ambulance is to be taken off that work. This is a retrograde step, for the driver would have to handle the patient single-handed. It is the generally accepted practice to employ an assistant on civilian and St. John ambulances. Will the Premier take up this matter with the Commissioner of Police with a view to repealing the instruction and conforming to accepted practice?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will get a report for the honourable member.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLIES FOR MOCULTA.

Mr. TEUSNER—Has the Premier a reply to my recent question regarding electricity supplies for Moculta?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have a report from the chairman of the Electricity Trust, which is as follows:—

We have investigated alternative methods of supplying the residents of Moculta and surrounding districts, one from Angaston and one from Truro. Homes are very scattered in this district, and connection costs very high. If connections were made from Angaston, approximately 5½ miles of distributing mains, 4½ miles of low tension mains, and 4 transformer stations would be required for connecting 29 houses, at an estimated cost of £11,890. From Truro, approximately 4½ miles of distribution and 3 miles of low tension mains, plus 3 trans-

former stations, would be required, at an estimated cost of £8,140, to serve 19 houses. The first mentioned proposition is therefore the better of the two. However, due to the very large programme of rural extensions to which we are already committed, it would not be possible, even assuming a Government subsidy, that we could undertake to begin this work for approximately three years.

One or two members have asked questions on a number of occasions in regard to the Government subsidy on country electricity supplies. I have taken up the matter with the trust and agreement has been reached on the form of subsidy. Although one or two details have not been completed, next week I hope to make a complete statement which will clear up the difficulties which have attended this matter and should enable a steady flow of rural extensions to proceed.

WATER PRESSURES.

Mr. TAPPING—Last Tuesday, following on a letter I received from Mr. Frank Nieass, Secretary of the Australian Government Workers' Association, I asked the Minister of Works a question regarding low water pressures. He sent a communication to the Minister, and in a further letter to me he made the following comments:—

Despite the necessity of the larger trunk mains, will he say that the present reticulation street mains will stand the extra pressure? Any waterworks maintenance employee knows perfectly well that the street mains will break and blow the valves if the Minister's idea is applied. Will the Minister of Works call for a report upon our contentions? Our suggestion is that the Government must proceed at once with the relaying of many of the street mains so that they can take the extra pressure when the arterial mains are completed,

Will the Minister call for a report in connection with the statements made by Mr. Nieass?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I am in constant consultation with the Engineer-in-Chief or his deputy, and, of course, the statements made do not apply universally by any means. Mr. Hutchens said that in streets in his district there were low pressures, and a thorough investigation showed that many of the faults were due not so much to the mains themselves but to the corroded condition of the pipes leading to the houses from the mains. We have continuously tried to put everything into line. It is useless doing one thing before another out of its order. We will deal with the worst cases first. Some are localized, because of old established districts, but we will sift out those and install new pipes wherever we think they are necessary. There is no real contention between the two viewpoints. It is a matter of doing first things first, and

we must first get the water here. As far as possible I shall see that the water is brought here and that the pipes are in good condition. Mr. Nieass wrote to me in similar terms, and I shall write to him in more general terms than my reply here today. We are doing everything required. The point raised by the honourable member will not be overlooked.

SUBORNATION OF PERJURY.

Mr. TRAVERS—Has the Government received the final report from the detectives concerning the alleged subornation of perjury charge, and will the Government consider amending the law in relation to absolute Parliamentary privilege so as to prevent innocent people from being unjustifiably attacked in this House by those who ascertain that there is no justice in the charge but still refuse to withdraw it, and to prevent the whole Parliamentary institution from falling into disrepute?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The latter part of the honourable member's question will be referred to the Minister concerned. As to the first part the following further report has been obtained from the detective constable handling the case:—

On October 14, 1953, I reported concerning inquiries into allegations of incitement or inducement to proposed witnesses to commit perjury in the matter of an application for a licence for an hotel at Challa Gardens. I have made further inquiries and have been unable to discover anything to substantiate the allegations. I have interviewed the last of the persons subpoenaed, also Harry M. Guy and Mary Deslandes, the two persons who witnessed the signatures of all persons signing the memorial, and Rev. C. P. Hughes, General Secretary of the Temperance Alliance of South Australia, none of whom can substantiate in any way what has been alleged by Mr. Hutchens, M.P. I have been unable to discover Mr. Hutchens's source of information but it seems that his informant was not fully aware of the true facts.

PARINGA WATER SCHEME.

Mr. STOTT—Has the Minister of Works obtained a further report following on the questions I have asked about the Paringa water scheme?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—No, but extempore I can say that it is regarded as one of the current works of the year, and consistently with attention to works of a similar nature it will proceed. I have spoken in a preliminary way to the Deputy Engineer-in-Chief and asked for the work to proceed, and I shall use my endeavours to see that it is done in the time mentioned.

LAND SETTLEMENT.

Mr. PEARSON—Recently the Minister of Lands gave the House information regarding the number of applicants for land settlement under the War Service Land Settlement Scheme, the number of applicants so settled, and the number still remaining to be settled. In addition to this direct settlement scheme there are a number of other ways in which returned servicemen were assisted to rehabilitate themselves on the land. Can the Minister give any figures or information regarding the number of returned servicemen so assisted, and, if not, will he obtain it? I refer to settlements being made through the Lands Department under Crown Lands arrangements, and the number of settlers assisted with re-establishment loans, agricultural loans, subsistence allowances, etc., some of which were administered from funds provided by the Commonwealth and through the State Bank?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Some two or three years ago officers of the department made a list of the ex-servicemen who had received some type of assistance to enable them to engage in primary pursuits. I have not got the full information required by the honourable member, but I will get it for him. If my memory is correct, the last total figure I saw concerning all types of assistance was between 1,100 and 1,200.

COST OF CLOTHING.

Mr. HUTCHENS—When reading press advertisements of early September I found that standard lines of men's, boys' and youths' clothing were quoted as follows:—

	S.A. £ s. d.	Vic. £ s. d.	N.S.W. £ s. d.
Youth's clothing—			
Knickers	1 5 11	1 4 11	1 4 11
Suit	6 16 6	6 11 6	6 11 6
Melange school knickers	1 15 0	1 13 11	1 13 11
Youth's double-breasted suit	10 17 11	10 10 0	10 10 0
Youth's long trousers	3 19 11	3 17 3	3 17 3
Men's shirts—			
Pelaco "Whitemaster"	1 16 0	1 15 0	1 15 0
"Arrow" shirts	2 3 6	2 2 0	2 2 0
"Holeproof"	1 19 11	1 18 6	1 18 6

It will be seen that prices in South Australia exceeded those in States where price control exists. Taking into account the cost of living regimen, the usage per person for males of 15 years and over is one and two-thirds fashion shirts and four working shirts a year. There are approximately 266,000 males in South Australia, and an average of four shirts a person makes a total of 1,064,000 shirts, costing on the average about 1s. 3d. above those in the eastern States. This results in South Australians paying a total of £66,500 over that paid in eastern States. In view of those figures, will the Minister representing the Premier take steps to have the prices of such lines recontrolled and give protection to South Australian purchasers?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I did not see the report referred to, but I am wondering whether the goods listed were manufactured in other States and brought here, because freight charges would make those articles a little more costly. Generally, I have found it cheaper to buy in this State than in others, but perhaps South Australian craftsmen manufacturing the goods listed turn out a better article at a slightly higher price, thus accounting for the additional costs. However, I will get a reply for the honourable member.

PRICES DEPARTMENT STAFF.

Mr. STEPHENS—Has the Minister representing the Premier a reply to the question I asked last week about a reduction in the Prices Department staff?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—A report from the Prices Commissioner states:—

1. The answer is, No.
2. Only reductions in staff at any time have been due to death, resignations to accept outside employment, and voluntary applications and transfers to other departments (assistance, but no directions to obtain positions). Certain members of the present staff will shortly be redundant and, if they do not obtain other employment, services will have to be terminated. Since the department opened in September, 1939, the services of two only have been terminated. Since June 30, 1953, the staff has been reduced by eight—five voluntary transfers to other departments, one deceased, one to Long Range Weapons, Salisbury, and one purchased a business. Wastage has, up to the present, been sufficient to reduce the numbers.

COUNTRY SEWERAGE SCHEMES.

Mr. RICHES—Has the Minister of Works the statement he promised me about the probable date upon which country centres could expect the installation of sewerage schemes? I said that unless these schemes were started within a measurable time councils would have to consider alternative proposals.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I do not think I went as far as to say I would give the honourable member the probable date on which the schemes would start, but that I would bring down a considered statement on the matter. I think I indicated that the probable date depended on many factors; for instance, on the amount of loan money required and on the order of priority in which schemes might be accepted. In the meantime the member for Mount Gambier asked the Premier a question indicating that councils themselves might be prepared to raise loan funds in order to expedite works. That has brought in another question, and the two will have to be considered at the same time. The order of precedence of sewerage schemes will depend on the will of this House. The loan money becoming available from time to time is allocated with the acquiescence of the House and the Government attempts to meet the wishes of members generally. The various works are given the priority that they deserve.

I did hope to have a general statement, but the position has now become more complicated because of an inquiry as to whether councils can be expected to undertake the financial responsibility. As a matter of fact, I do not think they can. At a rate of 1s. 9d. in the pound, as provided by the Act, I doubt whether any council under any circumstances would be prepared even to consider such a project. Until we have an assured water supply in each area we cannot consider the question of sewerage. It would be unjust to give one town a water supply and sewerage while another town was without even water. I did intend to sound a note of warning that councils would not be justified in the foreseeable future in waiving any other scheme they might have in mind because they might get a sewerage scheme. In towns with a water supply which are contemplating the installation of septic tanks, Government officers are prepared to advise on ways and means for the installation at the lowest possible cost.

Mr. CORCORAN—Can the Minister of Works say whether there have been any developments in connection with the proposed Naracoorte sewerage scheme?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—There is no line on the Estimates this year. I think my reply to the member for Stuart might be accepted in this case. We have to make up our minds what we want first—water supplies or sewerage.

Mr. Corcoran—Naracoorte has the water.

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—It did not ask for the scheme until long after the Government suggested that it might have it. As it has a water supply, I am sure it would not be envious enough to want a sewerage scheme at the expense of people who are without a satisfactory water supply.

Mr. RICHES—Are we to understand from the Minister's reply that there is no possibility of any country sewerage schemes being instituted in the next five or six years? Port Augusta and Whyalla want to know whether they have any possibility of getting sewerage within measurable time. If not they will then be justified in considering some other scheme, but if there is a chance of some of the Government's promises being honoured we should like to know. Surely we can be told whether there is any chance of getting these schemes or not?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I thought my remarks were self-explanatory. The spending of loan funds is in the hands of this House. All the Government can do is to get as much loan money as it can and then, with the approval of this House, expend it. It is no use some members coming along and saying "We want a water supply," and others "We want a sewerage scheme." To the best of its ability the Government spends the money as Parliament authorizes. Any work undertaken today must be at the expense of some other work. The order of priority of works depends on factors not immediately under my control, namely, the availability of money, manpower and materials. I am not a prophet or the son of a prophet. I can say with sincerity that it is the Government's and my desire that all these schemes should be proceeded with at the earliest possible date, but I would be deluding the public if I said I thought it was immediately possible to proceed with them. Over the past few years the Government has spent more money on water supplies than ever before. It is its anxious desire to proceed with sewerage works but while water supplies are more urgently required we must proceed with them first. To what degree we can proceed with both simultaneously depends on the amount of Loan moneys available and not on the desire of the Government. The present maximum rate of 1s. 9d. in the pound, which was fixed not by the Government but by Parliament, renders it impossible for any State to finance a scheme if regard is given to the economics of the scheme. That maximum was introduced when the value of money was

double its present value, and I believe that maximum would have to be reviewed if extraordinary losses were to be avoided. The matter is one of great complexity. This morning a gentleman recently returned from Victoria told me that there the municipalities are supplying water and sewerage facilities which in this State the Government is obliged to supply. You cannot do two things with the same money and the same materials, and the question resolves itself into which you desire most—water or sewerage.

Mr. Christian—Water!

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I think that would be the main thing, and with that limitation the Government will proceed to act. Septic tank systems are quite satisfactory; in fact when I first came to the city my house had a septic tank. Only 30 per cent of all Brisbane homes have any other sewerage system, and there are more people living in unsewered homes in Sydney today than in the whole of Adelaide. A septic tank system can be installed at very little expense and later connected to a main. There is not much merit in the honourable member's suggestion to supply some towns with deep drainage facilities before some other towns have been supplied with water. A practical municipalist such as the member for Stuart should advise his constituents to install septic tanks, in anticipation that, at some future time and at the least possible expense to them, a deep drainage system will be installed.

Mr. CORCORAN—The nature of the ground at Naracoorte does not permit of the establishment of a septic tank system. In 1947 we were told that in the near future Naracoorte would have its own sewerage system, but after six years nothing has been done, nor has such a system been installed in any important country town. Can the Minister say whether the money to pay for such a system will be forthcoming next financial year?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The next Budget will take care of itself. To the fullest extent possible I want to see septic tanks installed everywhere.

The SPEAKER—If honourable members have any more questions, they must be questions and not speeches.

Mr. RICHES—If, on the Minister's advice, a town installs septic tanks, will that interfere with its priority in any subsequent sewerage scheme, for it would obviously mean that town without septic tanks would more urgently require a sewerage system? Did I understand

the Minister to say that on the installation of a sewerage scheme Parliament would have to review the maximum rate?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—No, I said that before embarking on that as a policy this Government or any future Government would have to seriously consider the economics of the question. This Government will adhere to the law as it then stands and a town prepared to help itself by installing septic tanks would not lose priority in regard to sewerage.

Mr. QUIRKE—Along with the Government I have given up the idea of country sewerage schemes, for I do not think deep drainage will be installed in country towns during my lifetime. In recognition of that and in anticipation of the installation of septic tank systems where there is a water supply, I have previously asked whether the Government is prepared to make available money on loan to councils enforcing the compulsory installation of septic systems, so as to assist people such as pensioners who are unable to pay the full charge for such an installation, which may vary from £70 to £100. Such people should only be required to pay an instalment equal to about the ordinary sanitary rate of £5 a year. Will the Government consider the advisability of making such loans available to councils in those towns for which deep drainage facilities are being no longer considered?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—The honourable member is taking a much more pessimistic view of prospects than I am. I said that a septic tank or sewerage system is impossible without a water supply. The suggestion of the honourable member is a practical one which would in the main be more capable of accomplishment. Loans could be made at a low rate of interest for the installation of septic tanks in preference to spending the money on costly sewerage schemes. If sewerage schemes were proceeded with on a large scale, it would mean the denial of the first essential—water—to some towns. I thank the honourable member for the aptitude with which he put his question, and I will have the matter investigated.

Mr. RICHES—Can the Minister say how the amount of £3,000 provided on the Estimates for country sewerage schemes will be spent?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—It will be spent on surveys so that ultimately the Government will be able to go ahead with the schemes.

LAND DEVELOPMENT SCHEME UNITS.

Mr. QUIRKE—I have been credibly informed that what are known as units, instead of shares, are being sold in a land development scheme

in South Australia, and that the Registrar of Companies took action in the matter, but it was ruled that a unit was not a share. Therefore, the Registrar has no control in the matter. Will the Minister of Works call for a report from the Registrar on the necessity of amending the Companies Act in this regard?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I will take up the matter with the Attorney-General and bring down his reply as early as possible.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION LEGISLATION.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Last week I asked the Premier whether the report of a committee which recently inquired into proposed amendments of the Workmen's Compensation Act could be made available to members so that they could be better fitted to discuss the amendments. Has the Minister representing the Premier any information on the subject?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The report will be made available with the Bill.

NEW HILLS HIGHWAY.

Mr. SHANNON—Can the Minister of Works say how much money has been spent on the acquisition of land for the new highway from Burnside to the Crafers Summit and on the road-forming work done on the lower section of the road by the Burnside Council at the direction of the Highways Department? Have tenders been called for work on the second section of the road, and, if so, has any satisfactory tender been received?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I will get the information for the honourable member.

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

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

CROYDON PARK SEWERAGE EXTENSION.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works on Croydon Park Sewerage Extension, together with minutes of evidence.

Ordered that report be printed.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).

The Hon. C. S. Hincks, for the Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer), introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Traffic Act, 1934-1952. Read a first time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Minister of Lands) moved—

That for the remainder of the session Government business take precedence over all other business except questions.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—Although I do not take the extreme step of opposing the motion at this stage, I remind members that for some years I have urged the holding of two sessions a year instead of one. It would give more time for consideration of Government business and private members would have a greater opportunity to bring their matters forward. The Opposition has introduced a number of matters this session, but only two appear on the Notice Paper at present. There are other matters which I still desire to introduce, but if the motion is carried I shall be prevented. Will the Minister at present in charge of the House indicate to the Premier that the Opposition feels strongly on this question and believes that consideration should be given to having two sessions of Parliament each year.

The SPEAKER—There can be no debate on that matter. The motion does not deal with Standing Orders, but with precedence exclusively. It refers to sessional order governing the business of the House, to which the debate must be confined.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Goodwood)—Two private members' matters are set down for consideration next Wednesday. One is a notice of motion to be moved by Mr. Dunstan, and the other is the Scaffolding Inspection Act Amendment Bill. It seems to me that if the motion is carried these two matters will not be further considered this session.

Mr. Dunks—We did not hurry yesterday.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I am not responsible for the conduct of the business of the House. As a private member I keep within the rules, and I have always extended courtesy, even to the honourable member when he has been Chairman of Committees. I have been out of step with his rulings on many occasions, but have agreed to them without having to withdraw any of my remarks. Mr. Dunks should not say that I am responsible for the conduct of the business of the House.

Mr. Dunks—I did not.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—That was the inference. If we did not progress very far yesterday I was not responsible. I did not tell members that they must not speak. It was not proper for the honourable member

to make such an interjection. Will the two private members' matters on the Notice Paper be considered?

The SPEAKER—I remind members that this is merely a precedence motion. If it is carried the Speaker will see that all business is called on every day, but private members' business will be called on after "Orders of the Day: Government business."

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I am particularly concerned with the Scaffolding Inspection Act Amendment Bill. Yesterday Mr. John Clark obtained leave to continue his remarks at a later date and normally that would be next Wednesday. Can the Minister say whether time will be given next Wednesday, even if it means one or two hours of Government time, for the honourable member to continue his remarks, and for Mr. Dunstan's matter to be dealt with? Opposition members at the request of the Government have attended this place to enable certain business to be discussed, but sometimes it has been found that the business was not on the Notice Paper. If that had been dealt with, there would have been no need for this motion. Can the Minister say whether consideration will be given to private members' business already on the Notice Paper?

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—You, Mr. Speaker, clarified the position. This is a precedence motion and does not take from the Notice Paper any private members' business, nor prevent other private members' business from being placed on it. It follows on what has been done in previous sessions and gives the Government the opportunity to finish its business within a reasonable time. There is a good reason for the motion. Mr. Frank Walsh said that he was concerned with a Bill which will not be dealt with if the motion is carried. Members on this side have been ready to speak on it, but have been denied the opportunity because the debate has been adjourned by Opposition members. If an investigation were made it would be found that about 25 per cent of the time of the House has been taken up in dealing with private members' business. The Leader of the Opposition realizes that the business of the House must conclude within a reasonable period. None of us want to be here until Christmas. Private members have received every consideration from the Government, and we cannot complain about the motion.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—Mr. Shannon said that Opposition members adjourned the debate

on the Scaffolding Inspection Act Amendment Bill and prevented Government members from speaking on it. The adjournment was obtained in order to permit other private members' business to be discussed, so no private members' time was lost. The Government has had opportunities to proceed with its business but has not always done so. On August 11 it found it necessary to adjourn the House early because of the lack of business. I wanted to protest against this happening after the House had been out of session for many months, but the Speaker would not allow me to speak, so I called for a division. Later in the session the Government has had so much business that we have had to sit late at night. Mr. Frank Walsh pointed out that the Opposition has always met the wishes of the Government when dealing with business. I have tried on occasions to arrange for parties of people to inspect Parliament House at night, but had to tell them at 6 p.m. that they could not come in because at 5.30 I had been advised the Government did not want us to sit that night after having asked all members, including the Opposition, to sit on Tuesday and Wednesday nights. Sometimes we ring the Premier's office on Tuesday morning, and again make inquiries at lunch time to see whether Parliament would be sitting at night. After being told it would, we have been informed at 5.30 that it would not. We have sometimes declined invitations to functions on Tuesday or Wednesday nights, but found later that the House would not be sitting and that we could have attended. The Government should at least permit us to discuss private members' business on Wednesday afternoons. On those days hardly any questions come from this side of the House, but Government supporters ask more questions then than on any other day, though they rarely speak on Bills or motions then before the House. The Government should allow private members' business still before the House to be disposed of in the normal way, and assure the House that next year it will adopt the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition—a suggestion made year after year—to have two sessions in each year.

Mr. DUNKS (Mitcham)—It is extraordinary that there should be some objection to the motion, which affects all members, whether on this side of the House or on the other. Some members have missed the point that the Government has given private members a privilege in allowing them to bring forward and discuss motions and Bills on Wednesdays.

Mr. Lawn—In other Parliaments private members can discuss matters they want to bring forward on the motion for adjournment, but we cannot.

Mr. DUNKS—I understand that in the House of Commons, the Mother of Parliaments, it is difficult for private members to get a hearing, and few privileges are given to them, but over the years the South Australian Government has given private members the opportunity to bring forward business on Wednesdays. It is extraordinary that on many Wednesdays during this session private members' business has finished before 6 p.m., showing there was not enough of their business on the Notice Paper to exhaust the time available to them.

A member—It has often finished at 4 o'clock.

Mr. DUNKS—Yes. Like other members, I should like private members to have more opportunities to bring forward business, but I realize that the Government is in charge of the House. Much business is still on the Notice Paper, and I think we shall be surprised at the number of Bills yet to be brought down.

Mr. Lawn—That is because the Government wants only one short session each year.

Mr. DUNKS—For the last few weeks I have had in mind putting a motion on the Notice Paper, but I realized it would not be long before the motion now before the House was moved. I suppose the House will rise in about the first week in December.

Mr. Lawn—You would know.

Mr. DUNKS—I would not know any more than the honourable member, but I am judging the future by the past. This motion is usually moved about four weeks before Parliament prorogues. By way of interjection I said that yesterday much time was taken up unnecessarily.

The SPEAKER—The honourable member cannot debate what he said yesterday.

Mr. DUNKS—I want to reply to the member for Goodwood, who took me to task and accused me of not doing the right thing yesterday. I only made a general suggestion that yesterday we might have done much more business. This has been an extraordinary session, because I cannot remember one when we debated so much Government business before 6 o'clock on Wednesdays. The Government has been very generous in giving private members the opportunity to bring down motions and Bills. Under the Parliamentary system the Government is in charge of the House, and when it has been good enough to give fair

latitude to private members' business we should accept this motion as something that happens in every Parliament instead of opposing it.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart)—I do not know what the member for Mitcham was driving at, but I inferred that he believed a debate yesterday was a waste of time.

Mr. Dunks—I did not say that.

Mr. RICHES—If he implied that the debate about the establishment of a steelworks at Whyalla was a waste of time I take it as a reflection on the good judgment of members on this side of the House. It was a statement unworthy of the honourable member and I hope than on reflection he will be sorry he made it. Opposition members do not accept the opportunity to debate private members' business on Wednesday afternoons as a concession. Parliament determines the sessional procedure at the beginning of each session, and Parliament decided that Wednesday afternoons would be set aside for the discussion of private members' business. I hope that is a right that no member will let pass lightly. I was surprised at the tone of the speech of the member for Mitcham, who seemed to think that the Government was allowing members a special concession in letting them bring business before the House. I know this is a right not enjoyed in some places, but let us protect it by all means. I resent any implication that discussing the motion about steelworks at Whyalla was a waste of time.

The SPEAKER—We will not debate that at length. The honourable member should have taken that point yesterday.

Mr. RICHES—I support the stand taken by my colleagues on this motion.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Minister of Lands)—It seems that a mountain has been made out of a molehill. I shall not debate the pros and cons of all the arguments put forward, but I think on all occasions when the House has seen fit to rise early or sit late it has been as a result of an understanding between the Leaders of the House. This Parliament has been a happy one as a result of that co-operation, and I regret that some feeling has come into this debate. As is usual, I am prepared to allow a vote at the end of the session on the private members' business now on the Notice Paper. I assure the Leader of the Opposition that if time permits—and the Government will endeavour to make time—all questions will be debated.

Motion carried.

BUILDING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 6. Page 890.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—This looks a formidable Bill, and since it was introduced the Minister has placed two or three formidable looking amendments on the files. However, the Bill is not likely to greatly disturb the political or economic structure of the State. Apparently it is a machinery measure that has been recommended by the Building Act Advisory Committee. It clarifies the law relating to the submission and approval of building plans and the disposal of drainage waters. It will be easier to prevent people from discharging surplus waters from their properties to the detriment of neighbours. It also deals with the disposal of night soil and other noxious matters. I was rather surprised to learn that the question of the safety of doors and flaps on cellars and other structures below street level had previously been provided for in the Police Act. I know of nothing more foreign to the duties of a policeman than his having to go around inspecting hinges and fastenings on flaps and doors on underground structures near footpaths. This section is now to be repealed and in future the matter will be covered by the Act. The measure will also remove some of the difficulties which have occurred from time to time in local government administration as to the period for which temporary structures could be occupied after a permit had been granted to the original occupier. I see no objection to the passing of the Bill.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Goodwood)—During the war period I made representations to councils in my area to permit back-enders houses to be erected, but they have found it difficult to get people to carry out their obligation to have these premises completed owing to the short supply and increased costs of building materials, and have been compelled to review the position. Then we have the position of councils, in extreme emergency cases, allowing a person to occupy a temporary structure on the condition that he placed in position the foundations for his future home before the temporary portion was erected. Some of these temporary structures have been extensively improved and the structure on the foundations completed, and thereby we have two buildings on the one block, despite the fact that the owners signed an agreement that they would not allow the temporary structure to be used

for habitation on the completion of the permanent structure; and for these temporary structures they are receiving rent. That is an infringement of the Act. Then we have instances of persons occupying temporary structures and then selling them to others who are in dire need of accommodation, and others of people who have laid the foundation for a permanent home but living in a temporary home without the council's approval. I believe the amendments have merit and I therefore support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 11 passed.

New Clause 6a—"Powers of inspector to exercise powers of surveyor."

The Hon. M. McINTOSH (Minister of Local Government)—I move the insertion of the following new clause:—

6a. The following section is enacted and inserted in Part VII. of the principal Act after section 68 thereof:—

68a. (1) In any case where the surveyor of the council is not employed by the council as a full-time officer of the council, the council may from time to time by resolution declare that an inspecting officer of the council may exercise all or any of the following powers and carry out all or any of the following duties of the surveyor:—

i. Any power given to or duty imposed upon the surveyor under any provision of this Act with relation to any single storey building of ordinary construction the design of which building does not involve any computations:

ii. Any power given to or duty imposed on the surveyor by section 15, section 27, or Part VI.

(2) Any inspecting officer to which this resolution applies may exercise the powers and undertake the duties of the surveyor in accordance with the resolution.

(3) Any such resolution of the council may from time to time be revoked or varied by a subsequent resolution of the council.

Section 58 of the Building Act provides that a council, to the area to which the Act applies, is to appoint a fit person as its building surveyor. The Act imposes important duties on the surveyor. When plans and specifications for a building are submitted for the approval of the council, the surveyor, under section 9 of the Act, is required to examine them and to report to the council whether or not they comply with the Act. In the case of big buildings, the examination of the plans involves computations and a close examination of the design and this task can only be performed properly by a person with considerable technical qualifications. In addition, the Act gives to the

surveyor powers dealing with a variety of matters such as seeing to the protection of excavations near streets, the steps necessary to protect the public from dangerous structures, and so on. Thus, it is necessary that the building surveyor should have professional qualifications and, by regulations made in 1946, it is provided that apart from persons holding the office of surveyor at that time, all building surveyors should hold certificates of competency which are granted after examination in a number of technical subjects or to persons possessing equivalent academic qualifications.

The Act does not require a council to have a full time building surveyor and the practice is for the smaller councils to retain the services of a properly qualified building surveyor and to refer to him the plans, etc., lodged with the council and any other matters which, under the Act, are required to be dealt with by the surveyor. Whereas it is essential, in the interests of the safety of the public, that plans of big buildings should be scrutinized by a building surveyor with the proper professional qualifications, there are many buildings for which plans are lodged which do not require the same scrutiny. The necessity for the council to refer all matters to the consultant building surveyor causes some difficulties in administration, and the Building Act Advisory Committee has suggested that in some cases the council should have power to refer plans to a building inspector of the council and to delegate the duties of the surveyor to the inspector. The new clause therefore provides that, where the council does not employ a full time building surveyor, it may by resolution delegate to an inspecting officer, that is, a building inspector, the powers of the surveyor with respect to any single storey building of ordinary construction the design of which does not involve any computation.

A building of ordinary construction is, under the Act, a building in which the load on the building is carried by the walls, such as the ordinary dwellinghouse. A single storey building may, however, be very extensive, for example, a factory, but in such a case it will invariably be found that the construction involves the use of columns or piers and either beams or trusses which involve detailed computation of the stresses involved. The effect of the new clause, therefore, will be that plans for ordinary single storey houses, shops, garages, and similar premises can be dealt with by the building inspector. Where the building is two or more storeys in height or where, in the case of a single storey building, steel or concrete frame construction is used

or piers or columns are used involving computations the plans must still be referred to the building surveyor. In addition, the clause authorizes the council to delegate to a building inspector the powers of the surveyor under section 17 (which enables directions to be given to secure the safety of the public where a building is demolished) under section 27 which provides for the guarding of excavations near footways) and under Part VI. (which deals with the control of dangerous and neglected structures). The clause will thus provide a compromise method of administering the Act and whilst the clause will enable the building inspector to exercise functions with respect to the type of building where technical problems do not generally arise, the clause will still require the council to consult its building surveyor in cases where plans require the scrutiny of a person of a high professional standard.

New clause 6a inserted.

New clause 10a—'Proceedings for offences.'

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I move that the following new clause be inserted:—

10a. Section 86 of the principal Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:—

(3) A complaint in respect of any offence against this Act shall be made within twelve months from the time when the matter of complaint arose.

The new clause provides that a complaint for an offence under the Building Act may be laid within 12 months of the time when the matter of complaint arose. The ordinary rule of law is that laid down in section 52 of the Justices Act which requires complaints for offences to be made within six months. It has been suggested to the Government that the six months' limitation is not appropriate to cases arising under the Building Act. If a person commits an ordinary simple offence such as, say, a traffic offence, the act creating the offence is over and done with and, if the offence is detected it is almost invariably detected more or less contemporaneously with its commission. However, if a person carries out building work contrary to the Building Act, the contravention of the Act has lasting effect and the building is a continuing fact. It has been pointed out that, with the present six months' limit, some offences against the Building Act escape prosecution. It is, in most local government areas, impracticable to make continual inspections of the area and, in instances, breaches of the Act are not detected until after the lapse of six months from their commission. To meet this position,

therefore, it is proposed by the clause to provide that complaints for offences under the Act may be laid within 12 months of their commission. A somewhat similar state of affairs applied to offences under the Building Operations Act and it will be remembered that section 24 of that Act provided for a period of 12 months in which a complaint under that Act could be laid.

New clause inserted.

Title passed. Bill read a third time and passed.

HONEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 27. Page 553.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—The Honey Marketing Act, originally enacted in 1949, provided that before it should come into force a poll of producers who produced more than a certain quantity of honey should be taken to ascertain whether they were satisfied with its provisions. That poll resulted in a substantial majority in favour of the legislation and the Honey Board was established. This Bill proposes to extend the operation of the Act for a period of five years. This legislation is on all fours with Labor policy and consequently the Opposition supports it. The Playford Government, which is supposed to be an anti-Socialist Government and the supporters of which often take to task members of the Opposition for their alleged socialistic proclivities, is prepared to re-enact this legislation after a trial period of four years without any further consultation with the honey producers who are vitally concerned with it. I do not think there is any opposition to the Bill from the producers of honey. The Minister made his second reading explanation on August 27, so that any aggrieved producer of honey has had ample opportunity to protest against the Bill, but as far as I know no such protest has been made.

As in many other instances where a non-socialist Government meddles with Socialist principles, in this instance the Playford Government has applied those principles, not to the fullest extent but merely for the purpose of organizing the marketing and disposal of honey in South Australia. That is a laudable object, but for the past four years the Honey Board has over-emphasized the question of securing the absolute maximum return to the producers at the expense of maximum satisfaction for

honey consumers. In his second reading explanation the Minister said that as a result of the board's activities the quality of honey in this State had improved, and, although I think that is correct, I believe that the quantity consumed has probably decreased. I have no reliable figures to support that statement, but I remember the time when every country store prominently featured tins or bottles of honey on its shelves, whereas today one does not see honey displayed nearly so prominently, which leads one to believe that there is not the same public demand for honey. Reports of the board set out its objects, but it seems that the board has over-emphasized the producers' side to the detriment to some extent of the consumers. The objects are set out in the first report and repeated in the next two. The first is:—

To develop and preserve the honey industry in South Australia and to promote and protect the interests of all apiarists from time to time engaged in the production of honey.

I have no quarrel with that, because industry should be developed and protected. The Opposition has always endeavoured to assist in this direction. The second object is:—

To secure for apiarists the best possible price for the sale of honey and as far as reasonably practicable to distribute the proceeds so that all apiarists receive the same price per grade over a given period.

Again there is no quarrel, except that "best possible price" is open to debate. I think it should be tempered with a little mercy for the consumer. The third object is:—

Not to set up packing floors, but to preserve the identity of existing packers who become agents of the board with as little interference as possible with their trade connections.

There is not much wrong with that, because it allows packers at the time of the establishment of the board to carry on at less cost than would be the case if the board had to set up an organization. The fourth object is:—

To control the quantity of honey exported or placed on the local or interstate markets, so that any such markets are not over-supplied and price levels weakened thereby.

The board has to be careful in its administration otherwise difficulties may arise. The fifth object is:—

To improve the standard of honey produced and marketed so that there is an increase in the consumption of South Australian honies.

There has not been an increase in the consumption in South Australia of South Australian honey; there has been a decrease, but a substantial increase in the export of South

Australian honey. The sixth and seventh objects are:—

To arrange finance so that maximum advances can be paid to apiarists ahead of sales.

To promote the sale of honey by effective general advertising, distribution of literature, provision of articles, and talks or activities.

The Bill conforms to principles for which the Opposition stands, and although we are not completely satisfied with the machinery used to make things work I will support the second reading to help maintain the organization for a further five years.

Mr. WHITE (Murray)—There are a number of bee keepers in my district, which is not a large honey producing area, but it is between the South-East and the Adelaide hills where bees are kept for the production of honey. The Bill extends for another five years the operations of the principal Act. I have discussed this matter with a number of persons interested in honey production, and only a few have a grouse against the board. Generally speaking, they are pleased with its operations, because there has been a stabilizing of the honey industry through the introduction of orderly marketing. From the figures supplied by the Minister, and they are available in various journals, it is obvious that the board has built up a substantial export trade. Apparently the producers generally would be annoyed if it ceased to exist. The Leader of the Opposition mentioned a poll, but I do not think one is necessary because the result would be along the same lines as the one held when the legislation was first introduced. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Mr. QUIRKE (Stanley)—In my district there are also a few bee keepers, and the honey produced is the finest in South Australia. Honey producers in the northern areas are generally in accord with the Bill. I have had one or two disagreements, not with the principles of board control but administrative ones, which need not concern us here. The Leader of the Opposition eulogized the Act as a socialistic measure, and said that it was successful because of that fact. It has one fault usually associated with this type of measure—it has reduced the overall quality of honey. I mean that the blended standard honey obtained through board control is of a lower standard than the best grade honey, which cannot be bought except direct from producers. Bee keepers would have no real problems if every family consumed as much honey as my

family. There are five of us, and we get through two 60 lb. tins of honey a year. I like the wonderful pure blue gum honey, which is produced in the northern areas. We ran out of it before the new season's honey was available and we had to purchase honey from stores, and that is how I know that the general overall quality is lower than the top grade. No commodity should be blended to get a uniform standard below the top quality. Let it be done if it is acceptable to some people, but the really top grade honey should be available for purchase even though at a higher price. This fault is probably the inevitable result of socialization in this form.

I do not disapprove of the operations of the board, which is doing a good job. It has enabled apiarists who produce low grade honey, particularly the apiarists in the South-East, whence most of the low grade honey comes, to get reasonable returns. By itself this honey would not be saleable in any great quantity, but through blending it with the high grade honeys, gum and lucerne, from the north a generally acceptable commodity is available, and returns a decent price to the low grade producers, and does not deny to the top grade producer a price according to the quality of his production. He gets a return according to grade, and for his high grade honey he gets more than the producer of low grade. The future of apiarists in this State is not very bright. England has recently concluded a deal with the West Indies for enormous quantities of sugar, and this is having an impact on the market which previously existed in England for our honey, particularly that used by the brewing interests. Every avenue must be explored for selling our honey. Although it has increased considerably in price since the war, a high-grade product is not available in this State. That is wrong, because many people will not accept anything less. If they cannot buy it from the shops they will endeavour to obtain it from apiarists, and that is not always easy. These people will go without, and the market is reduced to that extent. Although I am not opposed to the Bill, I feel that the board should alter its methods of grading to allow the sale of top grades instead of blending it all. By doing so it would be rendering a service to South Australia because more honey would be sold. I support the measure.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River)—Like previous speakers, my district has bees, and they produce good honey, because there is lucerne, blue gum and box there. I do not agree with the

Leader that this is a Socialistic measure; I believe it is one of the most democratic measures possible. Before this Bill was introduced five years ago, every producer was provided with a ballot paper. Of the 500 in this State, 302 voted, and there was a vote of two to one in favour of this legislation. As a result, the board was set up at the expense of the growers to ensure a reasonable price for them. The board is paid for and managed by the growers, and it markets their product to the best advantage. At a conference of South Australian beekeepers held last July the following resolution was passed:—

That this meeting expresses its confidence in the South Australian Honey Board as it is at present constituted and congratulates members of the board on the excellent results obtained.

With this evidence before him, the Minister considered it unnecessary to conduct a poll. I believe he was right, because the expressed opinion of the majority was in favour of a continuation of the board. The honourable member for Stanley said that he considered the board had lowered the average grade of honey, but I challenge that statement. Before the board was formed, merchants obtained honey and blended it, using such a lot of low-grade quality that it was practically unsalable for table use. Tea-tree yields one of the poorest types of honey, and unfortunately too much of it was mixed with blue gum, box and lucerne honey, and the quality was reduced. I agree that we must have certain standards. However, I do not believe the standard has been lowered, but rather it has been raised. If consumers want to obtain quality honey today, there is nothing to prevent them from buying it.

Mr. Quirke—Can it be bought from the board?

Mr. HEASLIP—It can be bought from individual producers.

Mr. Quirke—But not from the board or the stores; that is my argument.

Mr. HEASLIP—I say that quality honeys are still available.

Mr. Quirke—So is the moon, if you can get there.

Mr. HEASLIP—It is possible to purchase blue gum, lucerne or box honey if it is so desired.

Mr. Quirke—I know that, but it is necessary to travel long distances to the producers, and city people cannot do that.

Mr. HEASLIP—Agents endeavoured to get people to buy honey, because they did not want more on their floors than they could handle.

The Honey Board is trying to dispose of as much honey as possible to the South Australian public, without its coming on to their floors, but because the people are not able to absorb it all it is necessary to have this board, which sets up a standard quality and thus enables the producers to export any excess.

Mr. Quirke—Nobody denies that, although it does not answer my question. A person who wants true blue gum honey cannot buy it unless he goes into the country, whereas he should be able to purchase it from the grocer.

Mr. HEASLIP—It can be purchased direct from the producer. It could not be purchased before the board was introduced, because the merchants blended it.

Mr. Quirke—That is no reason why the board should pursue a deliberate policy of preventing them from obtaining it.

Mr. HEASLIP—If the producer cannot sell to the consumer direct, he sells to the board; he is free to do whatever he likes.

Mr. Quirke—That is nonsense.

Mr. HEASLIP—When the board came into operation five years ago there was a huge surplus of honey, particularly in this State, and

the board cleared it at the satisfactory price of 105s. a cwt. Conditions have changed since then, and now we are meeting strong overseas competition, particularly from California and Argentina. To dispose of our honey, the board has to accept a price of about 82s. a cwt.

Mr. Quirke—That means the honey is not as good as that of our competitors.

Mr. HEASLIP—It is not a matter of quality, but one of quantity. When anything is in plentiful supply the price falls—scarcity brings about increased prices. The future of honey marketing is uncertain. It seems there will be a lower yield this year, but it may be difficult to dispose of it. The best way the producers can dispose of their honey is through the board. The growers have representation on the board, and its expenses are borne by them. I have much pleasure in supporting this re-enactment of the honey marketing legislation.

Mr. BROOKMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.47 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, November 10, at 2 p.m.