HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, October 25, 1955.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended to the House the appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue as were required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

QUESTIONS.

PRICE RISES.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—This morning's *Advertiser* contains the following report:—

Rent charges are spiralling faster than any other item of the Australian wage earners' normal domestic expenditure. This is revealed in the September interim retail price index figures released today by the Acting Commonwealth Statistician (Mr. S. R. Carver). The index, which has been compiled since 1950-51, is more comprehensive and up-to-date than the C series index on which quarterly cost of living adjustments are based. It shows that retail prices have risen by 1 per cent in the last quarter. Rent charges have risen the most, followed by food and clothing and drapery in that order. The index also shows that retail prices are rising more quickly in Australia's smaller capital cities—Perth, Hobart and Adelaide—than in Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane.

Can the Minister of Lands, as Acting Leader of the Government, say whether those figures have been brought to the notice of, and considered by, the Government, and can he explain why prices are rising more rapidly in Adelaide than in the larger capital cities?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I did not see the report referred to. Apparently, the movement is Commonwealth-wide and, according to the report, occurring particularly in smaller capital cities. I will get a full report for the Leader and let him have it as soon as possible.

OPOSSUMS AT ROCKLEIGH.

Mr. WHITE—I have received complaints from the Rockleigh area regarding the prevalence of opossums. Although landholders in that area do not wish to see them cleaned right out, they believe their present numbers constitute a big nuisance, and have suggested to me that there should be an open season of one month a year to destroy them. Will the Minister of Agriculture have this matter investigated?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—If the landholders do not favour completely exterminating the opossum, with which attitude I entirely agree, their correct method of reducing the numbers is to obtain a permit for such a purpose. Such permits are readily available from the Chief Inspector of Fisheries and Game and permit any landholder to destroy a specified number and sell the skins. If all the landholders applied, I am sure they could reduce the numbers to reasonable proportions.

TUCK-SHOP PRICES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I have been informed by a number of constituents who have children attending a school in the Glenelg district that a shopkeeper near that school is charging 10d. for a single-cut tomato roll. On inquiry I have been informed by a responsible shopkeeper in Adelaide that the price of a double-cut tomato roll would be 11d. and a shopkeeper near another school informs me that he charges 7d. for a single-cut roll. Will the Minister of Lands have representations made to the Prices Commissioner with a view to fixing a reasonable charge for single-cut rolls, small cakes and buns supplied to school children?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I will obtain a report on the matter.

RABBIT PRICES.

Mr. TAPPING—Last week uncooked rabbits were being retailed in the metropolitan area at from 4s. 6d. to 5s. each. I have ascertained that the trappers are paid 2s. each and the skin becomes the property of the purchaser. In view of this disparity of prices will the Minister of Lands ascertain why this excessive profit exists?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I will endeavour to obtain additional information, but at the moment the price of rabbits is not controlled.

BRITISH INSTITUTE OF ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY.

Mr. HUTCHENS—In Saturday's press there appeared an advertisement over the name of the British Institute of Engineering Technology offering a handbook free of charge and making the fantastic statement, "We definitely guarantee no pass no fee." I have been informed by constituents that a number of ambitious parents and young men have negotiated with this company and found that on failure to pass they are asked for extra fees. The company, I understand, avoids the issue and claims that it has the support of the Education Department, the University of Adelaide, and a number of manufacturing concerns. Can the Minister of Education say

whether that is so? Will he make inquiries and bring down a report?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yes. Firstly, I did not see the advertisement; secondly, I have no personal knowledge of the company and thirdly, I will make inquiries and bring down a reply. I will be obliged if the honourable member will let me have the particulars to which he referred.

COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES.

Mr. TEUSNER—On September 7 I asked the Minister of Works a question concerning representations made for a water supply for Mount Pleasant, Springton, and Eden Valley areas. The Minister said that the Director of Mines had completed a geological investigation of the area and that his report was expected during September when the matter would receive further consideration. Can the Minister of Works say whether the Director has furnished his report and, if so, what consideration has been given to it?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I have seen the report and, from memory, have forwarded it to the Engineer-in-Chief for his report thereon. The matter is involved because it provides for a wide scheme embracing not only Mount Pleasant but surrounding hills areas. My recollection of the report is not sufficient to justify my saying what is proposed at the moment, but I will bring down a comprehensive report tomorrow.

PORT PIRIE TRAIN SERVICE.

Mr. DAVIS—Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week concerning the speed of the train from Port Pirie to Adelaide?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—I have received the following reply from the Minister of Railways:—

The Railways Commissioner advises that there have been no alterations in the passenger schedules between Adelaide and Port Pirie for very many years. The train movements on this line, as on others, are, of course, subject to speed restrictions from time to time on account of relaying and reconditioning of tracks.

ANGAS CREEK PIPELINE.

Mr. JENNINGS—I have recently heard several disquieting reports that the construction of the extension of the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline beyond Angas Creek is proceeding at a greatly diminished rate. Can the Minister of Works state whether it is true that the rate of construction on the extension compares unfavourably with the rate of construction on the previous part?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—This is rather a surprising question because the pipeline is not due to operate this year. We hope that, with all reservoirs full, it will not be necessary to pump water. In as much as we will have restrictions on money, men, and materials it is obvious that first things must come first and at present the extension of that pipeline is not a matter of major importance.

MOUNT GAMBIER HOSPITAL.

Mr. FLETCHER—Can the Minister of Works say what progress has been made in calling tenders for the new Mount Gambier Hospital?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Many sub-contracts are involved, and instead of giving them in detail I shall let the honourable member know by letter and then he can tell people in his district what is happening.

POLICE OFFENCES ACT.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Since the passing of the Police Offences Act a difficulty in the administration by the police of certain localized offences has come to the notice of most police stations. I do not know whether the drafters of the Bill intended that it should be no longer an offence for a person to use indecent language other than in a public place or at a police station, but if a person is within his own fence he can use extremely offensive language to someone on the other side and in a public place, or in a neighbouring household, and yet not be committing an offence under the Act. Police from other districts on many occasions have complained to me, and I regret that I have received complaints from my own district. Does the Government intend to cope with this anomaly by amending the Act this session?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I shall be pleased to refer the question to the Attorney-General and bring down a reply as soon as it is received.

VALUELESS CHEQUES.

Mr. LAWN—Has the Minister of Lands representing the Premier a reply to my recent question regarding valueless cheques?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—I have received the following reply from the Crown Solicitor—

I would not recommend any alteration of the law on this subject. It is an offence under section 39 of the Police Offences Act, 1953, to "obtain any chattel money or valuable security *credit benefit or advantage* by passing any cheque which is not paid on presentation." The words italicised did not occur in the previous legislation and their insertion in the 1953 Act has gone as far towards remedying

the difficulties referred to by the honourable member as I think would be reasonable. If a valueless cheque is given in payment of an existing debt in circumstances where the person giving the cheque obtains no credit or advantage, then no harm has been done to anyone. The person receiving the cheque simply acquires the advantage of receiving further evidence of his debt and a fresh right of action. If, on the other hand, the valueless cheque is given for the purpose of securing further credit or some other advantage for the person giving it to the prejudice of the person to whom it is given an offence is committed under the existing law.

WOODVILLE SCHOOL ATTENDANCE.

Mr. STEPHENS—Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question regarding the attendance of children at schools in the Woodville North area?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—A report I have received from the Director of Education shows that the percentage of children absent through illness in the last six months from schools in the Woodville North area was:—Ridley Grove 5, Challa Gardens 8, Ferryden Park 7.7, and Mansfield Park 8.4. The State average is probably from 7.5 to 8 per cent, so Ridley Grove is below and the others are slightly above average.

ALLOTMENT OF BLOCKS.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—I was informed this afternoon that a vacant block in the Cooltong settlement has been allotted to a certain applicant. I will not mention names, as I am only dealing with principles. One applicant was a man who had gone overseas on June 9, 1940, as a member of the 2nd 27th Battalion. He served in the Middle East from October, 1940, to April, 1942, and was wounded in action in the Syrian campaign in June, 1941. He served in New Guinea from September to December, 1943, and when discharged was a corporal. He was born at Renmark and later went with his father to live at Berri for many years until he joined up. He has four children. One would assume that that man, according to the points system, would have a strong claim on any land available. On checking up, with the permission of the Minister, I found that the Land Board had allotted the property to a soldier who had never left Australia and who had no family and no experience of fruitgrowing prior to the war, as had the applicant I mentioned. Will the Minister make available to Parliament the points under which the successful applicant got the allocation of land, as against the man who did so much for Australia and democracy?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Yes, but I point out that under the Repatriation Act a man who has not seen active service is entitled to repatriation under land settlement. I do not say that I agree with it entirely, but that is the position. I will get a report.

GEPPS CROSS MIGRANT HOSTEL.

Mr. JENNINGS—When a meeting was held at the Gepps Cross Migrant Hostel about three years ago to decide whether the tenants would agree to the Housing Trust managing the hostel under certain conditions a promise was allegedly made that the high rental, resulting from the fact that the flats were furnished, would be reduced after the hostel furniture had been replaced by furniture supplied by the tenants. Since then much of the furniture supplied has worn out or been replaced by furniture supplied by the tenants, many of whom bought complete suites in the hope of some day getting a home of their own. Most of the furniture right throughout the flats is now owned by the tenants instead of by the trust or the Commonwealth authorities. Will the Minister of Lands ask the trust to make an inventory of the furniture with a view to giving effect to the promise of a reduction in rent?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Yes.

MOONTA BAY BOAT HAVEN.

Mr. McALEES—I ask the Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee when the Public Works Committee will visit Moonta Bay to take evidence on the proposal to provide a boat haven at Moonta Bay or Port Hughes?

Mr. SHANNON (Chairman, Public Works Committee)—The inquiry into a boat haven at Moonta Bay has not yet been opened. The Harbors Board has not yet submitted its evidence, and until this is done the committee will not visit the area.

LOXTON DRAINAGE.

Mr. STOTT—Has the Minister of Lands received any report from the District Horticultural Adviser regarding drainage at Loxton and, if so, will he make it available?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—From time to time I have received various drainage reports, the main objective of which has been to do something to overcome these problems. About six or seven weeks ago, with officers of the department, I met the Drainage Committee at Loxton and discussed this very serious problem with it. I agreed that the committee and engineers should visit Victoria and other

States to inspect drainage schemes and ascertain the possibility of improving our system. I also agreed that when drainage works were to be done the committee could advertise interstate and engage interstate contractors to do the work. However, if there is a late drainage report I will endeavour to obtain it and make it available to the honourable member.

MORPHETTVILLE RACECOURSE GAS METER.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice)—Is the Minister of Agriculture aware that a large gas meter was disconnected and partially repaired on September 2, 1955, at the Morphettville racecourse contrary to regulations under the Gas Act?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—A meter was disconnected and partially repaired on September 2, 1955, at the Morphettville racecourse, but such action was not in breach of any specific regulation under the Gas Act.

IRON KNOB RAILWAY FATALITY.

Mr. RICHES (on notice)—

1. Has the investigation been completed into the railway accident at Iron Knob in which Mr. Frank Branford was killed?

2. If so, what were the complete findings?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The replies are:—

1. The investigation into this accident has been completed.

2. The answers to the six subparagraphs to the question which appeared on the Notice Paper for Tuesday, September 20, are as follows:—

(1) The report of the Inspector of Mines and Quarries in this matter has been examined by the Crown Solicitor and he advises that there is no evidence from which the condition of the truck in question could be attributed to any failure of proper maintenance by the Broken Hill Proprietary Company.

(2) and (3) All witnesses who had been subpoenaed and were present at the inquest were called. Sergeant Hann who was assisting the coroner was informed by Mr. Dunstan who, according to the coroner's note, appeared for the relatives of the deceased and the Australian Workers' Union, that the Traffic Superintendent had been subpoenaed but was absent in Newcastle. At the conclusion of the evidence Sergt. Hann inquired if either party desired any further witnesses to be called. Neither Mr. Dunstan nor the solicitor for the company indicated any such desire and no request was made for any adjournment for such a purpose. The Quarries Officer was not called and no request was made by anyone that he should be.

(4) Sergt. Hann read to the coroner section 19 of the Coroners Act as amended in 1952. Under the Act as it now stands the coroner's inquiry is limited to deciding (*a*) who the deceased was, and (*b*) how, when and where he came to his death. The jurisdiction formerly exercised by coroners to inquire whether the death was caused by negligence or in such circumstances as to amount to a criminal offence was taken away by the 1952 amendment. The coroner is in any case a judicial officer and the responsibility for his decision is left by law in his hands.

(5) According to the coroner's depositions a Mr. Ryan was asked some questions about a collision between a train and some trucks some 10 years ago. These questions were objected to and the coroner upheld the objection. It is not my function to supply the reasons for judicial decisions, but it is difficult to see how an incident which had occurred 10 years earlier could possibly have helped the coroner to decide "the manner and cause of the death" which he was investigating.

(6) No. The Government is advised that there is no evidence which would support any such charge.

AGRICULTURAL CHEMICALS BILL

Introduced by the Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN (Minister of Agriculture) and read a first time.

LAND SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Minister of Lands), having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Land Settlement Act, 1944-1952. Read a first time.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. C. S. Hincks (for the Hon. T. PLAYFORD) moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—That it is

desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Highways Act, 1926-1954.

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

SUPPLY BILL (No. 3).

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended the House to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the several departments and public services of the Government of South Australia during the year ending June 30, 1956.

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of Supply.

Motion carried.

In Committee of Supply.

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS moved—

That towards defraying the expenses of the establishments and public services of the State for the year ending June 30, 1956, a further sum of £5,000,000 be granted: provided that no payments for any establishment or service shall be made out of the said sum in excess of the rates voted for similar establishments or services on the Estimates for the financial year ended June 30, 1955, except increases of salaries or wages fixed or prescribed by any return made under any Act relating to the Public Service, or by any regulation or by any award, order or determination of any court or other body empowered to fix or prescribe wages or salaries.

Motion carried. Resolution agreed to in Committee of Ways and Means, and adopted by the House.

Bill introduced by the Hon. C. S. HINCKS and read a first and second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Payments not to exceed last year's Estimates except in certain respects."

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Is there no explanation of this Bill?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Minister of Lands)—Yes. Clause 2 provides for further supply of £5,000,000 for the year ending June 30, 1956. Supply already granted, £14,000,000, will be sufficient to provide for expenditures of the Public Service until the first week in November and the supply now sought is necessary to meet expenditures pending the passing of the Appropriation Bill. The Legislative Council will not sit again until Tuesday, November 1, and it is desired that this Bill should go through Executive Council on November 3. The reason why it is brought forward today is to afford ample time for it to go through the Legislative Council by November 2.

Clause passed.

Remaining clause (3) and Title passed. Bill read a third time and passed.

BUDGET DEBATE.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from October 20. Page 1204.)

Legislative Council, £10,246.

Mr. STEPHENS (Port Adelaide)—I listened attentively to what the Treasurer said when introducing what may be called this unfortunate Budget. He told us that at June 30, 1955 the public debt was £236,462,000, a net increase of £21,740,000 for the year. On our population of 820,000 our debt has increased by £10 3s. a head, which does not speak well for a State like South Australia. It represents a total public indebtedness of £288 a head. Since the beginning of the last war our public debt has increased by £120,000,000 and our position is becoming worse each year but the Treasurer has not told us what he intends to do about it. We are drifting on, getting further and further into debt and it is time something was done to remedy this state of affairs. If this happened in a private company it would face liquidation and its directors would be dismissed. The Government directs this State and it is a wonder that the people have permitted it to remain in office so long. The Treasurer has not indicated how he intends to improve this position. He said that we were not getting a fair deal from the Federal Government and I do not think any member will deny the truth of that statement, but notwithstanding that the Treasurer and his supporters will soon be asking the people of this State to support the Menzies Government and return it to power. It would be interesting to know how much the Commonwealth Government has received from income tax from this State. I would like to know whether we pay interest to the Federal Government on our own money which has been paid back to us and, if so, how much. We are getting more into debt each year.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—Every deputation to a Minister asks the State to get further into debt to provide additional amenities.

Mr. STEPHENS—I expected that interjection after the deputation I introduced to the Minister this morning.

Mr. Tapping—How did he treat you?

Mr. STEPHENS—The same as usual. He did, however, put what he thought to be the facts to us. Ever since this Government has been in power we have got further into debt.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—Is not the position the same in New South Wales and Queensland?

Mr. STEPHENS—We are only dealing with South Australia. Let us look after our own house and not worry about what is happening in other parts of the world or in other States. The people of South Australia have had a raw deal from the Menzies Government and the workers have suffered more than anyone as a result of its bad administration. Our interest bill is more than the State can stand. If it were not for that bill every Government department would make a profit. Many companies and firms have increased their capital, made increased profits, and paid increased dividends, but the workers have had their basic wage pegged. In order to avoid paying such huge sums in interest to outsiders we should establish our own bank. By so doing we would not be faced with such heavy interest commitments. We should also establish our own insurance department. Before I entered this Chamber, the Gunn Government established an insurance office from which we made thousands annually. In 1926-27, £15,000 was paid into revenue from that office. The Liberal Government said that although that office was helping the people it would not continue with it, therefore profits from insurance which rightly belonged to the people were presented to the insurance companies. Had we continued the Government Insurance Office sufficient profit would have been made to pay all our hospital expenses. The only way the people of Australia can put wrongs right is to get rid of the present Commonwealth Government and install one that will be controlled by the people for the benefit of the people. That also applies to the South Australian Government. I support the first line.

Mr. STOTT (Ridley)—I shall place before the House a problem in my electorate which requires urgent consideration by Parliament. It has been under the notice of the department concerned for some time, but the lack of action has caused much anxiety to the settlers. I refer to the Loxton irrigation area. Some few weeks ago the Loxton Soldier Settlement Association asked me to arrange for a party of members of both Houses to investigate the area, and a committee comprising the Hons. F. J. Condon and C. R. Story and Messrs. Brookman, Hutchens, Macgillivray and myself duly visited the area and were escorted over it by members of the local committe. We visited what is known as D channel. It was made clear that it was wrongly constructed as it will not allow sufficient pressure of water through the pressure boxes to give an adequate supply to settlers at the end of the channel. The water is conveyed by a series of open channels to pressure boxes and it then surges through to give greater pressure and carry it along the contours to settlers at the end. At this particular spot there is an open channel for a few chains leading away from the pressure boxes, and the complaint is that the pressure is such that sufficient water is not carried through the channel and pipes to settlers at the end. When the officials were questioned about a higher pressure it was said that if that were provided it would cause an overflow at the open channel and cause seepage. I placed this matter before Parliament previously, and said that a grave engineering blunder had occurred because the engineers responsible had recommended open channels instead of a pipeline. Members of the Parliamentary Committee were able to see evidence of that. Had a pipeline been installed a greater pressure could have been put through to supply those at the end of the line, and there would have been no overflow.

Mr. O'Halloran—When this matter was brought up before, we were told we were wrong.

Mr. STOTT—Members of the committee were amazed that this mistake had occurred, because there had been a similar mistake in the Loveday and Barmera areas after World War I. Obviously, the department did not learn enough from that mistake, as we now have a similar mistake at Loxton. It is a source of disappointment. Without laying the blame on anyone, I shall present the facts and hope the Minister will be able to meet the committee later and thrash out this problem. This morning we had a meeting and decided that it would be best to place the facts before Parliament. We visited a settler's block where the drainage problem is apparent, and members of the committee were amazed at the seepage. It has been a fundamental principle in irrigation schemes for many years that if water is applied to the land there must also be adequate drainage to dispose of surplus water, otherwise there is seepage and the trees and vines are destroyed. Plenty of seepage and salt were noticed and many of the vines were going out. The department had been made aware that drainage was necessary in the

area, and it was stated an attempt might be made to put a drain on this settler's block. It was apparent to the committee that some of the drains were not properly constructed. They are too far below the clay and consequently are not doing an effective job. The department has recognized there is a drainage problem at Loxton because it has attempted to put in drains on various blocks. However, to my mind it is making a hit and miss attempt to solve the problem without taking out a proper survey, and is not undertaking the work on a comprehensive basis in order to provide an effective drainage scheme for the whole area. At present opinions differ as to the answer to the problem in the Loxton area. We had evidence from the soldiers' representative on the drainage committee and he impressed us by the way he presented his case; also when on an inspection of blocks. It has been suggested that a geological survey of the Loxton undersoil would show a sandy bed similar to that in the Waikerie irrigation area and that a bore similar to the Waikerie type would be sufficient to allow water to drain into the sandy bed. As I said earlier, Loveday had similar problems to Loxton, but it took the Government and the department some time to recognize the position there. One area became known as Puddletown Lake. The water seeped over the clay into this one spot, which soon became a lake, and destroyed vines on nearby blocks. This showed the Government the need for a comprehensive drainage scheme, and one was installed.

Last week at Loxton the committee saw evidence of practically the same conditions. We were told of one low area that was covered with about half an acre of water two years ago and now has about 40 acres with rushes growing in it. I am not certain that a bore will solve the problem. I am not a drainage engineer but I would support any action taken at Loxton after an inquiry by an expert. Mr. Lyons of Mildura knows a lot about the problem. He has written articles on drainage and irrigation, of which he has had practically a lifetime experience. He could consult the local people and decide whether a bore would meet the position or whether there should be a comprehensive scheme of drainage. I would support whatever he suggested. The Loxton settlers asked the department to arrange for Mr. Lyons to make a report but they were told that it could not see the need for it. Last week we saw plenty of evidence that there was a need for it.

The Hon. C. S. Hincks—It would be fair to say that the settlers were not refused.

Mr. STOTT—That is so. There was not a refusal, but the department said it could see no need for it. The drains put in by the department are not effective. If the problem on the first mentioned settler's block is left for a few years nearly three parts of his vines will go out. On another block the drain has been put in the wrong place. On another block held by a soldier settler there was evidence that the seepage had been so bad that it had come through the floor of the house and buckled the floor boards, spoilt the linoleum and caused an undesirable smell in the kitchen. We were told that there were no vents in the house. Surely in designing a house the engineers could have thought of vents. About July this year there was a move for vents to be put in, but nothing was done. The settlers are worried about the position. They take up their troubles through the proper channels but there is always a delay in getting action taken, and almost always two departments blame each other for the delay. That applies not only to Loxton but to other important projects.

Mr. Quirke—Did you say there were no vents in the house?

Mr. STOTT—Yes. Eventually pipes were put there with instructions to keep them clean, but because of the dusty weather the pipes soon get blocked. I have said that the drains are not efficient. They were put down at too low a level. We were taken to one spot where water should have run into a drain, but the water table was some feet above the level of the drain with the result that the water seeped over the clay soil and then ran off on to nearby blocks instead of into the drain. That proves that the drain is too low. Further evidence was given that the engineers working on the drains on Henderson's block and at other places were not working under proper supervision. Their work was not in accordance with the specifications. All engineering work should be carried out under the supervision of a clerk of works to see that the contractors are doing the job according to specification. That is not being done; consequently, the drains are not being laid as they should be. The drainage problem is a most serious one. If this area is not properly drained the livelihood of the soldier settlers will be seriously affected. Further, inadequate drainage could affect this State's equity in the Loxton scheme for many acres of fruit trees and vines could be destroyed. Either the Waikerie bore method or a comprehensive scheme should be used.

Mr. Quirke—You mentioned 40 acres that were covered with water. Are there any blocks on that land?

Mr. STOTT—There are blocks all around it. There was only about half an acre under water two years ago, but now 40 acres are flooded. The department has attempted to drain the land, but it has had little effect. The Parliamentary party was told by Loxton soldier settlers that the cause of the trouble lay in the lack of supervision, laying of the tiles too deeply below the clay, and failure to enforce specifications. I agree with those settlers. It was clear that there was no effective supervision and that the tiles were not being laid in accordance with specifications. The local committee at Loxton believes that Mr. Lyons should be invited to inspect and report upon the drainage problem at Loxton. If he agrees that the Waikerie type of bore should be installed at the bottom of a shaft and the water drained into a sand bed below would meet the position such bores should be installed forthwith. If a comprehensive drainage scheme is necessary it should be carried out at once, and the bores should be used to relieve the most pressing cases. Obviously, an expert committee would take some years to make an investigation and formulate a comprehensive scheme. If we wait too long some of the blocks at Loxton will be ruined. Therefore, it is necessary to relieve the most urgent cases by adopting the Waikerie bore method.

Mr. Quirke—Has it been proved that there are sand beds in the area?

Mr. STOTT—Yes. A geological survey was made and the geologists reported that there is a sandy bed in the area. They considered that the Waikerie type of bore might be the answer to the problem.

The Hon. C. S. Hincks—Those reports were obtained before there were any plantings at Loxton.

Mr. STOTT—Yes. I am not sure whether the Waikerie type of bore would solve the problem because seepage is occurring at many places at Loxton. I think a more comprehensive scheme may be required, but I am not an expert on these matters and would be prepared to accept the opinion of a man of the calibre of Mr. Lyons.

Mr. Quirke—The only way to find a solution is to put down bores.

Mr. STOTT—Bores have been put down. At present the department is putting down shafts and bores, and this has relieved the problem in some cases, but the trouble is that the drains have been placed too far below the clay bed. We saw on Henderson's block that the drains were not carrying any drainage water at all, and at three other places there was just a dribble of water going through. Where a lot of water is put on a property by irrigation the drainage pipes should be running at about three-quarter capacity, but in some there was just a dribble of water and in others there was none at all, so it is apparent that the Loxton drainage scheme is not effective. A much better scheme is urgently required. This matter cannot be delayed another 12 months because further seepage will occur and once vines and trees are affected by salt they are ruined. The vines that were planted in 1948 will die and the settlers will be put back four or five years if they have to replant. The Loxton settlers are very worried about this problem. I pay a tribute to them because they are excellent men and good citizens, but they are extremely worried because they fear that all their good work will go for nought.

Several settlers gave evidence to the Parliamentary party about their finances. It was clear that the finance policy must be reviewed at once. This is a matter of policy, so no blame can be attributed to the department. The Minister of Irrigation cannot be held entirely responsible because soldier settlement is a joint scheme carried out by the Commonwealth and State Governments: the Commonwealth Government provides the money and the State Government administers the scheme. We were told that settlers are placed on the assistance period too soon. To illustrate this point I will quote from a letter sent by the Director of Lands to a settler. The letter reads:—

> The assistance period was declared in your case as from July 1, 1954, and, in accordance with the War Service Land Settlement Agreement Act, ends on June 30, 1955. From the proceeds of the 1954-55 crop you will be required to meet all commitments due to this department, namely, water rates for 1954-55 (not yet declared); rent for 1955-56 (falling due 1/7/55); current account (including insurance). The total payment required by the department will be advised you at a later date. If you so desire, the department will accept a procuration order over the 1954-55 crop proceeds for the amount owing. Any amount so secured would bear interest until payment is received under the order. Amounts debited to your capital account following the valuation of your property will bear interest as from July 1, 1955, which, together with the first instalment of principal, will become due on July 1 in the year following, that is 1/7/56.

In other words, a procuration order would be issued and he would not know what his interest or his indebtedness would be. I also have a letter from a very fine type of settler at Loxton, who does not get off his high horse and make exaggerated statements, but has been trying to do the right thing. He states:—

It has been with great alarm that I have seen my current account with the Department of Lands increase to the very high figure of £927 18s. 5d., and with another year's water rates due at any moment, it could reach £1,150, which places me in a hopeless financial position. This position has been brought about by the placing of myself on my own too soon, with no reserve payments to call upon and being mainly a vinegrower with 30 acres to look after and very little time to spare to subsidize my income by growing catch-crops. It would seem that the more attention I pay to producing dried and wine fruits, and the less I spend on catch-crops, the worse my position becomes. The enthusiasm that I held for my block and the keenness to do the best I could resulted with myself being placed on the "assistance period" by virtue of the proceeds of 56 tons of wine fruits and about £50 worth of apricots. At the end of the financial year there was a deficit in my bank account of £156, including interest. This amount was advanced by the Department of Lands and, as a result, the Department of Lands took out a procuration order on all further payments for security for this amount. The letter dated August 11, 1952 (R5205) written to me by Mr. A. C. Gordon, set out the estimated expenditure for the year.

I would like to bring to your notice the last paragraph on the first page, which reads, "You'll also be required to execute a procuration order in favour of the Minister of Irrigation over the whole of the proceeds of the crop. This order will operate only after advances as set out above, together with interest thereon, have been liquidated." The deficit of £156, which was put on my current account, only helped to cover the working costs of my block, to item No. 10 (sundry expenses) leaving £224 water rates and current account £253. As the £156 debit placed in my current account was incurred by the use of the advances from sundry expenses upwards, then, if your department is to adhere to this schedule, this debit should be the first amount to be liquidated when more payments under the procuration order are paid. The reason for this statement is obvious because, if the proceeds had been available at the end of the financial year in which I went on the assistance period, then the deficit would not have existed, and my current account would not have been debited with the £156. This procedure has not been followed, and I find that a payment made on May 16, 1955, for the 1952 vintage, amounting to £168 15s., was paid to my development account, leaving the £156 deficit on my current account. The position at the commencement of my first year of operating on my own was not very encouraging, and not exactly in accordance with the spirit of the Repatriation Act; to be precise, I was trying to work the property on too little finance and had a deficit of £577 9s. 2d. with no equity in the property.

Later in the letter the following appears:—

Having insufficient cash on hand it was necessary to receive credit from the State Bank and the Loxton Co-op. Producers, and it was during this year that costs in working the block exceeded the income by at least £500, and even with this deficit being carried for me the money short of requirements to meet my full payments to the Lands Department was approximately £250; and on July 1, 1954, my current account stood at £635 4s. 8d. However, the water rates again fell due and on September 20, 1954, another £292 13s. 9d. was added, bringing the total to £927 18s. 5d., an amazing increase for two years' operations. I would like to point out that at this juncture no possible way could have been found by me to pay any larger amounts. The £150 off my water rates was actually a mistake as I eventually ended up with a deficit for the year of approximately £500—this makes a total of £750 when added to the £250 short of requirements to reduce my current account. Since then £164 was paid and the total of £1,340 as at September 28, 1955, was reached.

What hope has this man got? None at all. The letter continues:—

The resultant back lag has been a stumbling block to progress, with the knowledge that £600-£700 had to be made up, plus enough to cover one year's operations and pay water rates, approximately £2,340, the position at the moment seems to be well nigh impossible. The 1953-54 harvest was more successful from the point of view of quantity, but here again this only helped to overcome the increased costs of harvesting and working. The valuation placed on the crop was £2,900, of which approximately £2,000 has been received, but the backlag from the previous two years has kept my bank account at a constant low to minus quantity. From this crop £140 has been paid to the Lands Department for water rates, reducing it to £848 but, in the near future, this will rise to at least £1,150. It is interesting to note at this juncture that water rates have risen from £224 in 1952 to £292 in 1954. The 1954-55 crop, owing to fall in values, rain damage and considerable heat damage, is only valued at £2,237, of which £1,293 has been received.

The Hon. C. S. Hincks—Naturally, rain damage to fruit has reduced his income and made it difficult for him.

Mr. STOTT—But he has a backlag that is increasing all the time, and there is no hope of getting out of it.

The Hon. C. S. Hincks—Possibly he has a large tonnage of grapes at the Loxton Distillery for which he has only received a small payment.

Mr. STOTT—Even if that is so, and I do not deny it, he should not have been put

on his own until he had some hope of paying the accounts and thereby avoiding interest on back debts. The letter continues:—

With the ever present backlag in payments and losses made in 1952-53 harvest, and the 1953-54 harvest not yet breaking even, as far as current account and water rates are concerned, it looks as though there is little likelihood of reducing either packing shed accounts or current accounts. The task of reducing these ever-increasing accounts in the next five years will take all the pleasure and gloss out of this form of occupation, and it is a strange type of repatriation that tries to keep one below the bread line for the first 10 to 12 years, after which one has physically deteriorated and is not in a position to enjoy the fruits (if any) of one's labours.

To illustrate what these boys are thinking I will read another letter, which states:—

It is the opinion of this association that settlers should not be placed on the assistance period until such time as the cash return from the harvested crop is sufficient to meet all necessary working expenses for the following year, and that the Commonwealth free grant living allowance be paid the year the settler goes "on his own" and not the year he is on the assistance period. The reason for this is that the inclusion of the free grant in the crop allocation the year the settler goes on the assistance period gives the false impression that the value of the crop harvested is capable of paying all the settlers' requirements and other commitments, where in actual fact it falls £416 behind this estimate. It has been stated by the Department of Lands that the net proceeds of the crop, after all harvesting, living, working expenses and water rates, etc., have been allowed for, must be the equivalent of the free grant, £416. In cases where the net proceeds do not reach this figure the department has made available a special grant to make this figure up. As an example, here is a copy of a settler's allocation of crop proceeds. The estimated value of the crop is £1,392 and is allocated as follows:—harvesting and expenses £307; cartage distillery fruit £7; living allowance £576, less Commonwealth free grant £416, £160; council rates £14; cultivation allowance £104; manures £214; general wages (including pruning) £119; spray materials £32; sundry expenses £45; water rates £357; total £1,359. Net proceeds £33; special grant £383. It can be readily seen by these figures that had the settler not been placed on the assistance period and the full living allowance, £576, debited against his crop, the proceeds would be insufficient to meet all expenses. As it is, this settler is now in the position where next year's crop will have to increase by £383, plus harvesting expenses —approximately £500—to meet next year's expenses.

The Hon. C. S. Hincks—That would not be a very great increase on a £1,300 crop.

Mr. Macgillivray—It would under present conditions, with frost damage and low prices.

The Hon. C. S. Hincks—But when budgeting a person does not know that he is going to get frosts.

Mr. STOTT—With the backlag and interest, the settlers can see no future in the industry, and that is worrying them. Later in the letter, under the heading "Commonwealth Free Grant," the following appears:—

As has been previously stated, this is the living allowance grant paid by the Commonwealth Government to the settler the year he is placed on the assistance period. This grant, in our opinion, should be paid the year the settler goes on his own. This is the year it would be of real value to the settler because this is the year he is looking for some ready money to pay his living expenses while waiting for his fruit payments. It would also save the settler having to borrow money at 3¾ per cent from the Department of Lands to carry on.

Dealing with interest on procuration orders, the document continues:—

When a settler reaches the assistance period, and later goes on his own, all moneys advanced by the department to meet working expenses, water rates and rent, are covered by procuration orders; these orders bear interest at the rate of 3¾ per cent. As most orders are taken on the Loxton co-operative winery over distillery fruit, it can be seen that by the time the distillery makes the final payment on this fruit a considerable amount of interest has been debited to the settler. Here is an example of a settler's account, the settler being on his own for the first year:—

	£	Interest to 30/6/55. £ s. d.	Yearly Interest. £ s. d.
Current a/c No. 1	254	35 11 2	10 17 6
Current a/c No. 2	496	6 5 10	18 12 0
1955 water rates and rent	336	—	12 12 0
To be borrowed	464	—	17 8 0
	£1,550	£41 17 0	£59 9 6

As can be seen I anticipate to have to borrow £464 against the value of last year's distillery fruit to meet this year's working expenses. I expect my total debt to the department to be in the vicinity of £1,592 bearing interest of £59 9s. 6d. Even if my cash return increases next year to cover working expenses, an order will have to be given to cover my water rates and rent. So, as the settler gets further into debt under the present setup and administration, the interest charged on procuration orders adds to the already heavy

burden. It is asked that these orders be interest free. In conclusion it is pointed out that the settlers are liable for any instalment of principal and interest on the value of the property, at the end of the first year "on his own." As valuations have not yet been placed on the properties we do not know what this commitment may be, but it will bear interest at £37 10s. per £1,000. Mention must also be made of the fact that in placing the settlers on the assistance period the settlers are being made to pay for all the working expenses, water rates, and power charges on citrus planting, as little as five to six acres of citrus. This has been the case with vine growers also; the crop is expected to carry whatever citrus is planted. In short, the settler is paying for the developing of his citrus plantings.

That was never the intention of the Repatriation Act, this Parliament, or anybody else. I want to impress members that this matter is urgent and requires their special attention. The boys on the river are rapidly reaching the stage where they are losing hope in the future of the Loxton scheme. One man, about 50 years of age, has been on about £8 a week for some years, and if present conditions continue, he can see nothing more than that until he reaches 54 or 55 years of age.

Mr. Macgillivray—It might even be for the next seven years.

Mr. STOTT—Yes. I do not think there is even one member who would not want to see these boys at Loxton do a good job, so members should take notice of the irrefutable evidence I have presented. This problem should be tackled now because it has become a national question to see that these boys get a fair go. They are good boys and anxious to get going; there has never been any heat in their argument; they have attacked no particular person; they have placed their evidence before the committee to see whether something could be done to save the Loxton soldier settlement scheme. Only one Minister should be responsible for the problems involved, both engineering and irrigation, because it is embarrassing when one department blames the other.

I deprecate the tendency of departmental officers to mislead settlers by telling them that they should not approach their member to bring these questions before Parliament. That advice should not be given in any democratic community. The whole district is concerned about this matter, and Parliament is the place where such national problems should be ventilated. I trust the Minister of Repatriation will meet the committee and thrash out this problem to see whether it can be solved.

The Hon. C. S. Hincks—Can I have the names of the departmental officers who made those statements?

Mr. STOTT—I shall be pleased to supply them. Last week the committee received certain evidence, which is now being collated so that it can take suitable action. This morning the committee decided that I should explain the matter here this afternoon and ask the Minister to meet the committee. Today I received the following telegram from the Loxton Ex-servicemen's Land Settlement Association:—

Loxton E.L.S.A. requests Parliamentary delegates to press for immediate and urgent Parliamentary inquiry into the administration of war service land settlement in Loxton irrigation area—Atkins secretary.

I have placed before members the various factors involved. The failure to provide harvest accommodation has aggravated the position. Unless action is taken soon I shall have no alternative but to move that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into these matters in accordance with the wishes of the Loxton association.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Is it your intention, Mr. Chairman, when dealing with "The Legislature," to take each item *seriatim*?

The CHAIRMAN—Yes.

First line passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

BRIGHTON HIGH SCHOOL NEW WING.

The SPEAKER laid on the table a report by the Public Works Standing Committee, together with minutes of evidence, on Brighton High School New Wing.

Ordered that report be printed.

BRANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN (Minister of Agriculture)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes a number of amendments to the Brands Act. Clause 2 amends the definition of "tag" contained in section 4. The present definition defines "tag" to mean a piece of metal impressed or marked with numerals, letters or signs. Section 31 provides that the owner of a registered paint brand or tattoo mark for sheep may mark his sheep with earmarks and may also attach tags to the near ear of any male sheep or to the off ear of any female sheep. Plastic tags are now widely used and are satisfactory but do not comply with the existing definition. Clause 2 therefore extends the definition of "tag" to provide that, in

addition to being of metal, a tag may be of plastic or of any other material prescribed by regulation. Clause 6 extends the regulation making power in section 68 accordingly.

Section 14 regulates the size and places where numerals denoting the age of horses or cattle may be branded whilst section 18 limits the places where distinctive numerals for stud or herd book purposes may be branded and also limits the size of those brands. A request has been made by the South Australian Division of the Blood Horse Breeders' Association of Australia that these provisions should not apply to racehorses for which various rules differing from those laid down in sections 14 and 18 are followed. The Government is of opinion that compliance with the sections is not necessary in the case of racehorses and clauses 3 and 4 therefore provide that these sections are not to apply to the placing of age numerals or distinctive numerals upon any horse which is registered in any register of racehorses for the time being approved by the Minister.

Clauses 5, 6 and 7 deal with registered paint brands for sheep. Section 28 provides that a paint brand is to be made only with oil paint or with such other substance as is permitted by regulation. Oil paints have been largely superseded by a branding fluid developed by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, the formula for which has been patented by that body. This branding fluid is scourable and it is generally accepted that this fluid or any other fluid having similar properties should be used for paint brands and that the use of oil paint should be abandoned.

The Australian Wool Bureau has made representations that the use of branding fluids not conforming to the C.S.I.R.O. formula should be prohibited. It has also been suggested that the use of any black branding fluid should be prohibited as it could be confused with unscourable substances such as tar. In this State, sheep brands are allotted in any one of four different colours, namely, black, red, blue, and green. Black has been the first choice of most owners and approximately 55 per cent of brands have been registered in this colour. In order to provide a substitute for black, the C.S.I.R.O. was asked to consider the testing of an alternative colour to black as their range of colours at present includes only red, blue, and green. Two alternative colours have been produced, namely, brown and yellow but, before allowing their manufacture for general distribution, the C.S.I.R.O. intends to conduct large scale field trials. In this State, samples of these colours have been supplied and will be tested on sheep at the research farms at Minnipa, Turretfield, and Kybybolite. Arrangements have been made for samples of pelt branded with the five C.S.I.R.O. colours to be available for inspection at the offices of inspectors of stock at Port Lincoln, Cleve, Quorn, Jamestown, Murray Bridge, and Mount Gambier and at the Department of Agriculture in Adelaide. If the field trials of the alternative colours, yellow and brown, are successful, it is expected that brands now registered in black will be changed to yellow or brown. However, the result of these field trials will not be known for at least a year.

The following amendments relating to paint brands are therefore proposed by clauses 5, 6, and 7. Clause 5 provides that a paint brand is only to be made with a substance and to be of a colour prescribed by regulation whilst clause 6 provides that regulations can be made for these purposes. It is contemplated that regulations will be made providing that paint brands may be made only with the C.S.I.R.O. branding fluid or some fluid having similar qualities. In addition, the colours permitted to be used will be prescribed and it is expected that black will not be included among those colours. Subclause (2) of clause 5 provides that the amendments made by the clause are not to take effect until a day to be fixed by proclamation and it is expected that this day will be not earlier than 1st July, 1957, thus giving manufacturers and distributors of the prescribed branding fluids ample time to adjust their manufacturing and distributing programmes.

Clause 6 makes provision for the changeover from black as a brand colour. The clause provides, in effect, that if black is not prescribed as a colour, the regulations are to prescribe that every brand now registered in that colour is to be of another colour, such as the brown or yellow previously referred to. The clause provides that, in such an event, the registration of every black brand will be deemed to be changed to the new colour and, of course, the change will not involve the payment of any fee by any sheepowner concerned. The clause also provides that, if such a change of colour is made, the Minister is to give public notice of the change by advertisement inserted in at least three newspapers circulating throughout the State.

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

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. M. McIntosh for the Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill gives effect to recommendations made by the Workmen's Compensation Committee, in a recent report to the Government. The report was prepared after consideration of a number of proposals submitted to the committee by Mr. O'Connor on behalf of the trade unions. Some of the proposals were accepted by the committee without alteration, and others in a modified form. All the members of the committee signed the report, but Mr. O'Connor's concurrence in the report was subject to a memorandum of dissent, reservations and addenda, in which he set out his reasons for thinking that in some cases higher amounts of compensation might be recommended. The report and Mr. O'Connor's memorandum are available for perusal by any member. Since last year's Act was passed by this Parliament there has not been much alteration of workmen's compensation law in Australia. The only Bill of any importance which has been passed is one in Western Australia. In that State by a Bill passed early this year, the maximum weekly payment for incapacity was increased from £10 to £12 8s., and the maximum total payment for incapacity from £2,100 to £2,400. The maximum payment on the death of a workman was raised from £1,800 to £2,500, and the allowance for each of his children from £60 to £75. It will be noticed that even after these changes, the maximum weekly rate for incapacity in Western Australia is still 8s. below the rate agreed to by this Parliament last year, and the only rate in the Western Australian Act which has been raised above the corresponding rate in South Australia is the maximum amount payable on death. However, the Western Australian Act had the effect of slightly increasing the average Australian standard of compensation and the committee took it into account in making its recommendations.

Dealing now with the clauses of the Bill, clause 3 abolishes the present rule that no compensation, other than medical expenses, is payable unless a workman is disabled by his injury for at least one day. This rule was in all the early Workmen's Compensation Acts, but has now been generally abolished. The committee was satisfied that in some cases the rule created anomalies and caused hardship to a workman, and therefore recommended its abolition.

Clause 4 extends the definition of workman so as to cover employees whose average weekly earnings are up to £35. At present the figure is £33. The average weekly earnings taken into account for the purposes of this clause are the workman's average weekly earnings for a period of one year before the accident. The committee was informed of some cases in which the average weekly earnings of industrial workers were in excess of this amount, but it appeared that if the amount fixed by the Act were raised to £35 they would have been covered. The committee therefore recommended an increase to £35.

Clause 5 deals with the maximum amount of compensation payable on death. The present limit in South Australia is £2,250, but as the recent increase in Western Australia has raised the general Australian level of these payments the committee recommended an increase of £100. In addition to this increase, the committee also recommended that in cases where a workman died leaving dependants an allowance of £60 for burial expenses should be paid. No burial allowance is at present payable in South Australia in a case where the workman dies leaving dependants. The Commonwealth, Victoria, Tasmania and Western Australia, however, have already passed laws providing for the payment of an allowance in such cases, and the committee thought that in the interests of the widows and children of deceased workmen a similar payment should be provided in the Act of this State. These recommendations are included in clause 5.

Clause 6 deals with the amount of compensation payable where the workman dies without leaving dependants. In these circumstances the South Australian Act, like the other Acts of Australia, has always provided that the compensation is to be the reasonable amount of medical and burial expenses, and at present the maximum allowable for burial expenses is £50. The committee reconsidered this figure and the information which it obtained indicates that if a reasonable allowance is made for the cost of a burial plot as well as ordinary funeral expenses, the total cost of burial is now approximately £60. The committee recommended, therefore, that the present maximum of £50 should be increased to £60.

Clause 6 increases the maximum amount allowable for total incapacity from £2,500 to £2,600. The committee recommended this for two reasons. The first was that the committee

had arrived at the conclusion that it was desirable to increase the maximum amount allowable on death by £100, and a corresponding increase in the maximum amount for incapacity was desirable in order to maintain the accepted relationship between the amounts of these payments. Secondly, the committee took into account the increase in the Australian average which resulted from the action of Western Australia in increasing the maximum from £2,100 to £2,400.

By clause 8 alterations are made in the amounts of the fixed payments for scheduled injuries, consequential on the increase in the maximum amount allowable for incapacity. The clause also makes another change in connection with compensation for the scheduled injuries. The committee was asked to consider the question whether a workman who received one of the scheduled injuries should be given the option of having his compensation assessed in the ordinary way on the basis of his actual loss of earning capacity, as an alternative to taking the fixed amount. After inquiry, the committee came to the conclusion that in some cases a scheduled injury could cause a worker a loss of earning capacity for which the fixed amount of compensation might be inadequate, and therefore it would be just to grant the worker who suffered a scheduled injury the right of having the compensation assessed in the usual way. An amendment for this purpose is included in paragraph (*a*) of clause 8. Clause 9 is a provision of the usual kind declaring that the Act will apply only to injuries occurring after it comes into operation.

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

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (RACING DAYS AND TAXES).

Second reading.

The Hon. C. S. Hincks for the Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill deals first with the number of racing days available in the metropolitan area and in the South-East. As regards the metropolitan area, the proposal is to allow one additional day in each year and to provide that it is to be allotted to the South Australian Jockey Club. Under the present law, owing to the limitation on the number of days on which any club may race in any year, it happens that there are two Saturdays this year on which no races can be held in the metropolitan area, and in every year there is at least one Saturday without races. With the increasing population of the State, the public demand for amusement on Saturday afternoons is rapidly growing, and the Government has been requested to take steps to provide for an additional racing day.

The Government considers the request to be a reasonable one and has decided to ask Parliament to pass the necessary Bill. It is proposed that the additional day shall be available for the Morphettville racecourse. In allotting the day to this course, the Government has been influenced by the fact that the South Australian Jockey Club is the principal racing club and bears the greater part of the expense involved in controlling racing throughout the State, and that in accordance with the practice in the other States it has a claim to be allowed one day more than the other clubs.

With regard to the South-East, there are at present six clubs in this area, each of which can race on not more than eight days a year. It has been pointed out to the Government that some of the clubs do not use the eight days available to them, while others could do with more. Mount Gambier and Naracoorte are the only clubs which at present race on all the days available to them. There is in the law a provision allowing days allotted to one club to be switched to another at the discretion of the Minister, but there is no general power to grant totalizator licences in the first instance to any club in the South-East for more than eight days. In response to requests by the South-Eastern District Racing Association the Government has agreed to propose an alteration of the law so that the 48 days now available in the South-East may be allocated among the clubs in such way as they may arrange, without any restriction on the number of days to be allotted to any individual club. It is, however, the intention of the Government that additional days will not be allotted for any mid-week race meetings other than those which have been customarily held in the past. The present alteration of the law is being proposed on the distinct understanding that there will be no increase in mid-week racing and this condition has been accepted by the South-Eastern District Racing Association.

Clause 4 makes an amendment relating to the time for payment of the betting taxes. Bookmakers are required to pay the turnover tax for each week not later than noon on Saturday of the following week. The winning

bets tax has to be paid not later than noon on Friday in each week. The difference between these times of payment is due to the fact that one section of the Act was drafted before, and the other after, the introduction of the five-day working week. In practice the Betting Control Board collects the taxes before 3 p.m. on Thursdays, and the bookmakers lodge their weekly returns at the time of paying the tax. The board has asked that the Act should now be amended so as to give statutory force to the existing practice which, according to the information received by the Government, is generally acceptable. Clause 4 makes the amendments required for this purpose.

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

MARRIAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. A. W. Christian for the Hon. B. PATTINSON (Minister of Education)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to raise the age of marriage. At present, there is no legislation in South Australia fixing any minimum age for marriage. The matter is regulated by common law. The position at common law is that girls who have attained the age of 12 and boys who have attained the age of 14 are capable of contracting a completely valid marriage. In theory, a valid marriage can be contracted by a girl or boy under these ages, but the marriage is not binding unless affirmed after both of them have attained the age mentioned. Although girls and boys have thus full capacity to marry on attaining the ages of 12 and 14, in other words, as soon as they attain puberty, under the Marriage Act they cannot marry without parental consent until they attain the age of 21.

The Government was recently approached by representatives of a number of organizations with the request that the age of marriage should be raised. The principal reason advanced for so doing was to protect young people from unhappy early marriages. It was submitted that the provisions of the Marriage Act prohibiting minors from marrying without parental consent do not protect children adequately. It was argued that when an unmarried girl becomes pregnant the parties are often forced into marriage by their parents, and that such marriages are not usually satisfactory. Attention was also drawn to the great differences between the age of consent under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, and the age at which persons can marry. It was also pointed out to the Government that the age of marriage is 16 for both sexes in Great Britain, and 16 for girls and 18 for boys in Tasmania.

The organizations which approached the Government were:—The Adelaide University Women Graduates' Association, The Business and Professional Women's Club; The Housewives' Association, The League of Women Voters of South Australia, The Methodist Church of Australasia, The Salvation Army, The Soroptomists Club of Adelaide, The S.A. Country Women's Association, The S.A. Medical Women's Association, and The Women's Christian Temperance Union.

It will thus be seen that the proposal has wide support. The Government has given very careful consideration to the proposal and has come to the conclusion that the minimum age for marriage should be 16 for girls and 18 for boys. Information obtained by the Government indicates that in modern times girls under 16 and boys under 18 are too immature to undertake the responsibilities of marriage and that boys under 18 do not, in most cases, earn enough to marry. In addition, it seems that marriages of young girls are very often only entered into to save the reputation of the parties, and in many cases only to save the man from prosecution. Such marriages frequently fail and when they do the children become the responsibility of the State or charity.

Members may be interested to know that statistics show that in South Australia in the last five years, 94 girls under 16 and 86 boys under 18, have married. Figures for 1954 indicate that, while the boys who married under 18 married girls of approximately the same age, girls who married under 16 married men for the most part considerably older than themselves. The Bill provides that all marriages celebrated after the commencement of the Bill between persons either of whom is a girl under 16 or a boy under 18 shall be void.

The Bill provides for its provisions to come into operation by proclamation. This will enable the provisions of the Bill to become known before they come into force. If the Bill went no further, one of its effects would be that a child born of parents prevented from marrying by the Bill would be incapable of being legitimated by the subsequent marriage of his parents. This is because under the Births and Deaths Registration Act, a child

cannot be legitimated by the subsequent marriage of its parents if there is a legal impediment to their marriage at the time of his birth. The Government considers that it is desirable in the public interest that offspring of children who are prevented from marrying only by their youth should be capable of being legitimated by their subsequent marriage after attaining the prescribed age. The Bill accordingly provides for this.

Mr. DUNSTAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

MAINTENANCE ORDERS (FACILITIES FOR ENFORCEMENT) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. M. McIntosh for The Hon. B. PATTINSON (Minister of Education)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its principal purpose is to enable a provisional maintenance order forwarded to the State to be forwarded for confirmation and enforcement elsewhere if the defendant has left the State before proceedings can be commenced against him here. As members are aware, the Maintenance Orders (Facilities for Enforcement) Act is part of a British Commonwealth scheme for the enforcement of maintenance orders.

There are two procedures under the scheme. First, where a maintenance order is made in favour of, say, a deserted wife, and her husband subsequently leaves the country for another part of the British Commonwealth participating in the scheme, the order may be forwarded to that part, registered there, and then enforced against the defendant without any further hearing. Second, where the husband leaves the country where his wife is before an order for maintenance can be made against him, a provisional order can be made there and forwarded for confirmation and enforcement to the part of the British Commonwealth to which he has gone. When the order is received in that place, a court of summary jurisdiction determines whether or not the order should be confirmed after serving a summons on the defendant and hearing him if he wishes to oppose the order.

Under the present legislation of the countries participating in the scheme, there is no simple way of dealing with the situation which arises where the defendant to a final or provisional order leaves the country to which the order is sent for registration or confirmation before the order can be registered or confirmed there. Though this has not caused any serious difficulty in South Australia, it has caused concern in other States, particularly in Tasmania. Last year a conference of State officers was held in Sydney to discuss the enforcement of maintenance orders in the Commonwealth, and this question was one of the principal matters dealt with at the conference.

The conference decided that where an order was forwarded for registration, it should be registered notwithstanding the absence of the defendant, and if the defendant had gone to another part of Australia, subsequently enforced under Inter-State Destitute Persons Relief legislation. The conference thought that where, however, a provisional order was forwarded and the defendant had left the jurisdiction, the legislation should provide for the documents to be forwarded without further ado to the places where the defendant had gone for confirmation and enforcement there. The Government has decided to adopt these recommendations. The first does not require any alteration of the South Australian Maintenance Orders (Facilities for Enforcement) Act. However, the second does require several amendments.

Clauses 4 (*a*), 5 (*a*) and 6 make the necessary amendments to the Maintenance Orders (Facilities for Enforcement) Act to enable a provisional order received for confirmation and enforcement in South Australia to be forwarded elsewhere for enforcement, and similarly, a provisional order made in South Australia to be confirmed in a place other than that to which it was originally sent. The Bill provides for these provisions to come into operation by proclamation. The Government intends to bring them into operation on being advised by other States that they have enacted similar provisions.

The Bill deals, in addition, with several minor matters.

Clause 4 (*b*) makes a drafting amendment to the principal Act.

Clauses 4 (*c*) and 5 (*b*) fill two minor omissions in the provisions of the principal Act relating to the variation of maintenance orders which are being enforced under the legislation.

Clause 7 makes a drafting amendment to the principal Act.

Clause 8 amends section 13 of the principal Act to make it clear that the section applies to orders varying maintenance orders.

Section 13 provides for the proclamation by the Governor of a person in lieu of the Governor of a reciprocating State to whom he may send and from whom he may receive maintenance orders. The section does not clearly apply to orders varying maintenance orders and it is desirable that it should so apply.

Mr. DUNSTAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. C. S. Hincks for the Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It contains the provisions which are considered necessary to enable uranium and thorium mining to be carried on by private enterprise, and some incidental amendments. Clause 3 enacts a new section 110a of the principal Act, which will empower the Minister of Mines to conduct research and investigation into problems relating to mining, minerals, and other substances obtained by mining. Such work may be done both for the Government and for the general public, including persons in other States. When any such work is done for a member of the public the Minister is empowered to make a charge for it. The development of uranium mining in this State has necessitated a good deal of research, which has been undertaken and paid for out of money voted by Parliament, but the power of the Government to do this work has been questioned by the Auditor-General, particularly in cases where the work has been done at the request of persons in other States. It is, of course, desirable that when facilities for research are established they should be used for the benefit of the Commonwealth as a whole and it is therefore proposed, in this clause, to place beyond doubt the legal power of the Government to conduct researches for persons either in or outside the State.

Clause 4 empowers the Governor to grant mineral leases for the mining of uranium and thorium. Under the present law mineral leases cannot be granted for this purpose. The existing provisions of the Mining Act applicable to uranium and thorium were passed solely for the purpose of enabling the public to prospect for these minerals and the only leases which can now be granted for uranium or thorium mining are special mining leases which have a term of not more than two years. Under clause 4 it will be open to the Governor to grant ordinary mineral leases, which have a term of 21 years with rights of renewal. The Bill will enable such leases to be granted to any approved person whether he does or does not hold a mineral claim or a special mining lease. It is desired that the Government shall have a discretion in the matter of granting uranium or thorium mining leases, and that a person shall not be entitled to such a lease solely because he has pegged out a claim. Under the clause as drafted the Governor will be in a position to ensure that uranium or thorium mining leases are granted only to competent persons having adequate financial resources.

Clause 5 deals with the terms and conditions of the proposed uranium and thorium leases. It re-enacts section 111b of the principal Act. This section at present applies only to special mining leases. Clause 5 extends its operation so that it will apply to the proposed 21-year mineral leases. The clause lays it down that a uranium or thorium lease may require the payment of rent and royalty at rates different from those applicable to an ordinary mineral lease. The rent for an ordinary mineral lease is 1s. an acre and the royalty is 2½ per cent of the gross amounts realized from the sale of the metals and minerals. These rates might not be suitable for a uranium or thorium lease, particularly if the Government has, before granting the lease, expended money on exploration and development. It is therefore proposed to enable the Governor to fix special rates. It is also proposed that in a uranium or thorium lease the Governor will have power to specify the developmental and other mining work which the lessee is obliged to perform and to require the lessee to perform that work with skill and efficiency and within a fixed time or any extension thereof granted by the Minister. Uranium and thorium leases may also contain provisions providing that the Government shall purchase any uranium and thorium won by the lessee in the mining operation. Clause 6 empowers the Governor to purchase, sell, dispose of or use any uranium or thorium obtained from mining operations conducted within the State. The money required for any such purchase will be paid out of money voted by Parliament. The other amendments made by the Bill are consequential.

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

METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from October 4. Page 973.)

Clause 3—"Permits as to carcasses and meat from country abattoirs"—which Mr. Hawker had moved to amend by deleting "country" in new section 78b (1) and inserting "private."

Mr. HAWKER—In reply to my amendment the Minister of Agriculture said that much public money had been invested in the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs and that my amendment would open the way wide open for private abattoirs to swamp it. I had no intention to do that. The Minister still has the power to fix a quota for meat, and to that extent could limit the operations of other abattoirs. Because of increased costs the erection of new abattoirs would cost more in proportion than for the Metropolitan Abattoirs, and in addition they would have to pay rates and taxes and make a profit. Under those circumstances, how could any additional abattoirs swamp the Metropolitan Abattoirs? The Minister also said that he would not anticipate the finding of the Privy Council in the Noarlunga meat case.

Western Australia is comparable with South Australia and there the main abattoirs for Perth are situated at Midland Junction and Fremantle. The W.A. Meat Works, near Fremantle, a Government concern, kills for export and also the local trade. Its main business is the storage of food, although it does some freezing and exporting of crayfish. There is also Anchorage Butchers Ltd., near Fremantle, which is privately owned and exports and kills for local trade. The Western Australian Meat Works kills 40 per cent for export and 60 per cent for local trade and Anchorage Butchers Ltd. 60 per cent of lambs for export and 40 per cent for local trade, and about the same number of sheep for local trade and export. During 1954-55 the stock exported by these two works amounted to:—Western Australian Meat Works 78,000 lambs and 30,000 mutton; Anchorage Butchers Ltd. 48,000 lambs and 35,000 mutton. On full time, the capacity of the Midland Junction works is 15,000 sheep and 2,000 cattle a week, the Western Australian Meat Works 40,000 sheep and 600 cattle, and the Anchorage Butchers Ltd. 6,000 sheep and no cattle. These works are doing a good job for the State.

If the Minister fears that private enterprise will swamp the Metropolitan Abattoirs here, there must be something radically wrong with the abattoirs. Victorian operators are now coming into South Australia and buying considerable numbers of lambs and sheep and taking them back for treatment, some for export and some for local trade. Last week 34 bogies of sheep and 38 of cattle went to Victoria. One private exporter (Smorgons) bought 5,000 sheep and 500 cattle. The week before there were 16½ bogies and the week before that Smorgons took over 22 bogies of sheep and lambs. The cost of taking a lamb to Victoria to be slaughtered by private enterprise is about 7s. a head, and yet these people can still buy in the Adelaide market and pay that freight, and allowing for certain wastage, still make a profit of 2s. or 3s. a lamb. There has been an attempt to get them to kill their export lambs at the Gepps Cross abattoirs but they will not agree as they say it is more profitable to send them to Victoria. If we are losing in this way we must be losing in other ways as well. When consideration was given to the legislation establishing the export killing at Gepps Cross abattoirs it was said that within 10 to 15 years there would be no lambs for export as the local trade would take them all. Recent developments have shown that prophecy to be false. Last year we exported 700,000 lambs. When those abattoirs were first commenced it was not thought that our export trade would be worth much, but it has expanded, and will expand more. We should allow private enterprise to establish at least one abattoirs in the metropolitan area and another within coo-ee of it so that we can cope with the expansion.

Mr. JENNINGS—I oppose the amendment. The Minister said that the numerous amendments mooted would open the door to all sorts of things. Despite the eloquent plea by Mr. Hawker the door will be opened and the public money invested in the metropolitan abattoirs will be affected. The Minister mentioned that big overseas concerns would be likely to operate at a loss for the time being and then gradually gain a monopoly. These overseas people have a tremendous foothold in the cities in other States in which they operate. Despite the names under which they operate I do not think many are far away from the Vestey and Angliss group. The other States have no better abattoirs than South Australia. Long ago we were far sighted enough to establish public abattoirs and the investment will be in jeopardy if the amendment is carried. Mr. Hawker said there was something radically wrong with the Gepps

Cross abattoirs. There may be something radically wrong with its administration, but why not attempt to remedy the position instead of completely ruining it by carrying the amendment and allowing a private monopoly to be established?

Mr. SHANNON—Mr. Hawker does not seek a monopoly. His amendment will do the reverse of what Mr. Jennings suggests. In any case we already have a monopoly and we are not happy about it. I suggest to Mr. Jennings that the way to combat inefficient administration is to have healthy competition. It is obvious from Mr. Hawker's remarks that we are losing trade and not getting the benefit of the slaughtering of the lambs that are being sent to Victoria. If the amendment is carried it seems that fat lamb producers will get keener competition. Mr. Hawker said that it costs the producer 7s. a head, apart from the loss to the animal suffered as the result of the long journey, to send them to Victoria. If the Victorian operators could have their fat lambs slaughtered here it would provide healthier competition.

Mr. Pearson—They could do it for local trade but not for export.

Mr. SHANNON—If all the stock going to other States were destined for local consumption, would it not be better for the traders there to transfer the carcass rather than meat on the hoof? No doubt the Government feels that privately run abattoirs would provide a competition too keen for the present abattoirs, but any new works established would have to pay rates and taxes and that would provide a protection for the Gepps Cross abattoirs, which does not pay rates and taxes. There is a widespread view that the Metropolitan Abattoirs are not efficiently managed, and if that is so should we not try to improve the position? It appears to me that we could take a risk in this matter. I think Mr. Pearson has a fear that "private" excludes the Port Lincoln abattoirs, but I do not know that that is so. The Port Lincoln works are too important to be excluded from participation in the metropolitan meat market. The Bill as introduced suits me better than a Bill with all the proposed amendments in it, and it may be wiser to leave the measure as framed. Now the whole position has been opened up. If we do not provide adequate opportunities for private enterprise in this field we shall continue to suffer our present ills. Producers have to pay too high a charge for the services rendered, and the present set-up results in the consumer paying too much for his daily joint. Private enterprise could lower those charges considerably. In my home town I can buy meat killed at the Noarlunga Meat Works at a price lower than that paid in King William Street. I am a strong believer in private enterprise.

Mr. O'Halloran—I thought you were a strong believer in co-operatives, too.

Mr. SHANNON—I am, and that is the best form of private enterprise. I do not think that by inserting "private" instead of "country" we shall prevent co-operatives from entering this field.

Mr. BROOKMAN—I support Mr. Hawker's amendment and regret that the Government opposes it. The Bill opened the door a little for private enterprise, but the Minister's amendments slam it shut. The Government had an opportunity to improve present facilities for slaughtering meat, but it is failing to take advantage of it. In the second reading debate I said that the Bill would not be of much use, but the further we go the less use it becomes. Mr. Hawker's amendment is a sound one and ample safeguards are provided. The Bill states in subclause (2) of proposed new section 78b, "The Governor may . . ."

Mr. Shannon—It is within his discretion all the time.

Mr. BROOKMAN—Yes. Many of our lambs are being sent to Victoria for slaughtering. Last week I saw Victorian buyers bidding against local buyers for lambs, so we should give private enterprise an opportunity to slaughter in this State. Although many attempts are made to discourage private enterprise these people, through their energy and initiative, seem able to prosper. We do not want to protect private enterprise, but merely to give private persons an opportunity in this field. Considerable criticism has been levelled at the Abattoirs Board, but I believe it has done well considering it has had many difficulties to contend with. It was suggested by interjection that Port Lincoln would be adversely affected by Mr. Hawker's amendment, but I cannot see why. If it will be seriously affected we should be told why.

Mr. HEASLIP—In the second reading debate I supported the Bill, but the Government amendments nullify any good in it. Mr. Hawker's amendment probably goes to the other extreme, but as a breeder and seller of sheep I prefer it to the Government's amendment. We have sunk over £3,000,000 in the Gepps Cross Abattoirs, but it is uneconomic. The producer and the consumer are both paying, though mainly the producer because from year

to year disputes seem to occur just when our lambs are ready for slaughter. I cannot see why there should not be competition in this industry. It would not be unfair competition. If there were anything unfair about it, it would be unfair to the people trying to build up competition against a monopoly. There are plenty of safeguards in proposed new section 78b, for the word "may" is used in many places. Perhaps Mr. Hawker's amendment goes too far, but I want to see competition in lamb slaughtering. I am not afraid of the effect the amendment will have on Port Lincoln, because section 78 takes care of the position.

Mr. PEARSON—This Bill was a simple measure designed to do a simple thing, but as usually happens, everyone jumped on the band waggon and wanted to have something added or taken from it. The purpose of the measure was to provide a facility for the Port Lincoln Abattoirs to get dead meat into the metropolitan area, a facility we have not previously enjoyed and which I think is essential to enable that centre to extend as a meat-producing area. The Bill as drafted provided for these requirements satisfactorily. The position is not as has been made out by the sponsor and the supporters of the amendment. I have much sympathy for the Noarlunga Meat Company. I hesitate to oppose the amendment because of the effect it will have on that organization. However, opposing the amendment is not necessarily a negation of the principle of supporting private enterprise, because there are other concerns interested in the meat business that have indicated they require certain spheres of operation, and if meat works are to be set up all over the State they will not be interested.

The Hon. Sir George Jenkins—They want protection just as the Abattoirs does.

Mr. PEARSON—That is so.

Mr. Macgillivray—Who are you speaking about?

Mr. PEARSON—The honourable member knows, because they have been referred to quite often. To open the door wide for everyone will probably be the ruination of all. Years ago the Port Lincoln abattoirs was a private business and many people invested money in it. Its history is well-known; it got into an impossible financial position, the shareholders lost heavily and the Government came in and saved the ship.

Mr. Macgillivray—And it is still a failure.

Mr. PEARSON—The honourable member likes to scoff at things he is not interested in. He said that all fat lambs are produced on the mainland, but that is not so. The best fat lambs in South Australia have been regularly produced on Eyre Peninsula.

Mr. Macgillivray—Is Eyre Peninsula not part of the mainland?

Mr. PEARSON—It is not when it suits the honourable member. He knows the inference in his remark was a slight on Eyre Peninsula, which I resent. The honourable member for Rocky River said the amendment provides that the Minister may or may not issue permits, but if the Minister is not going to grant them, why put him in the invidious and difficult position of having to refuse. I oppose the amendment.

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—The Premier announced the Government's policy when he said, before the introduction of this Bill, that it believes in the application of the 80-mile radius on ecomonic grounds. It is easy to get into a lot of trouble if the units of public utilities are multiplied. If that is done it is easy to have a capacity greatly in excess of requirements, but somebody has to pay the overhead and all the other charges for the public utilities. For that reason an economic area has been determined, and the Government believes in the 80-mile radius. With regard to bringing in private enterprise in the metropolitan area, I remind honourable members that when the Metropolitan Abattoirs was established all metropolitan local government bodies were in agreement and were promised that there would be only the one abattoirs functioning in the area. That was a definite undertaking and understanding, and the fundamental reason for it was that it would be in the interests of public health. To throw open the gates and allow other enterprises, whether private or public to establish themselves alongside the existing works would be a breach of faith. We have had a great deal of argument about the sanctity of contracts and how we should stand up to our undertakings. The Government stands by the original undertaking that it will not allow other enterprises to be conducted in the metropolitan area in active competition with the existing public undertaking.

The honourable member for Burra referred to the conditions in Perth, but I do not think he could have chosen a more unfortunate example because the Western Australian Government only last year asked us to send over our experts to advise on what they should do about the very unsatisfactory situation that had arisen in that State. While I agree that the definition as it would read under the amendment could include the Port Lincoln works, I believe it could lead to a great deal

of confusion and doubt. The Port Lincoln works it a public undertaking, so there could be a great deal of legal argument whether they could participate in any quota for the metropolitan area. The Parliamentary Draftsman is definite that that undertaking could be included in the definition, but there are often wrangles resulting from the phrasing of the various Statutes.

It has been said that it is desirable that Melbourne interests should come here. The Melbourne interests that compete in our abattoirs markets today provide healthy competition, and that is desirable, but they can do this because they have available a far greater metropolitan market than we have where the prices are often more attractive than here, but the moment they slaughter here the slaughtered meat can only be sold in the Adelaide metropolitan area in competition with our abattoirs. The value of the Melbourne market would then completely disappear. We are deriving greater benefits from the present conditions. Melbourne probably is protected in the way Adelaide is protected under the existing legislation. I ask the Committee to support the Bill as framed by the Government.

Mr. HAWKER—The Committee does not seem clear on the definition of "private," but my amendment makes it clear what that word means. The word does not exclude any Government or semi-Government works at all. The Parliamentary Draftsman has pointed out that clause 3, as amended by my amendment, provides that "abattoirs" means any abattoirs other than the Gepps Cross abattoirs.

Mr. FLETCHER—I support Mr. Hawker's amendment. I cannot see that private enterprise would compete with a Government abattoirs unless it were on a sound economic basis, which would necessitate its being able to employ labour all the year round. Some years ago abattoirs were established in the country districts of Victoria and New South Wales, but they eventually failed because they could not hold their key men from one killing season to the next. The amendment will not interfere with the working of the Metropolitan Abattoirs. I understand that the Port Lincoln abattoirs has never had the opportunity, except during a strike at Gepps Cross, to dispose of its meat in the metropolitan area. Why should not that abattoirs, which is operated by the Government, be able to supply the city with lamb or mutton unfit for export? We should not allow the Gepps Cross abattoirs a monopoly of the metropolitan meat market.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—At one time when an amendment such as this was before the Committee the Minister knew how Government members would vote on it, but today, apparently, there are some members of independent thought—

The Hon. A. W. Christian—Mr. Chairman, shouldn't the honourable member discuss the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN—I ask the honourable member to keep to Mr. Hawker's amendment.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Although I have only spoken for a few seconds, the Minister seeks to restrict debate, and debate is a fundamental of democracy. If he were in another place no doubt he would probably use the gag.

The CHAIRMAN—Order! I ask the honourable member to deal with the amendment.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Very well, Mr. Chairman, but I will deal with it in my own way and not in the way decreed by a Minister of the Crown.

The CHAIRMAN—The honourable member must discuss the amendment.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Are you, Mr. Chairman, here to protect the rights of the Minister or my rights?

The CHAIRMAN—I am here to see that Standing Orders are obeyed.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—In that case, Mr. Chairman, protect me, because private members are more important than the Minister. The principles at stake in this case are more important than the amendment itself. In the metropolitan area there is a privately-owned abattoirs licensed to kill pigs. Why should people be able officially to kill pigs, but not lambs for export? I understand the purpose of the amendment is to enable private enterprise to compete with a Government abattoirs, but the Minister wants to prevent it from doing so. True, the Government has invested large sums in its abattoirs, but Governments often invest money in a most stupid way, and there is a vast difference between Government and private investment. The Minister said that "someone has to pay." True, when private enterprise invests the individual must pay.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—What private enterprise would have put water on to the river blocks?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—With the Minister in charge of the Bill against me and the Chairman entirely in his corner, I am not permitted to answer that question. If Mr. Hawker's amendment becomes law and a private company functioning under it loses

money, private investors will have to bear that loss, but when a Minister in charge of a socialistic concern enters a business that subsequently loses its money the taxpayer must pay.

Mr. Riches—Who bore the loss at Port Lincoln?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—That project was initiated by private enterprise, and the people who invested their money in it lost. Socialists oppose anybody but themselves being given a chance to fail.

The Hon. M. McIntosh—The Port Lincoln project was sold by vested interests at a huge loss, and the people, through the Government, rescued it.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Rightly or wrongly, private enterprise started the abattoirs there and failed. Private investors lost their money and the Government came in, with the best intentions, good hearts, but weak heads, and lost more money. When the Minister asked members to assume that Port Lincoln abattoirs had functioned successfully, the ex-Minister of Agriculture (Sir George Jenkins) interjected that that concern also lost money. Port Lincoln may be one of the few places where such a socialistic undertaking is justified because it renders a service to the farmers of that district who are entitled to some return from the taxes they pay. But what has that to do with the metropolitan area? Why should the Minister, having introduced a Bill to enable meat to be supplied to the city, then seek to amend it by making it null and void? I fear that the Government will defeat the present amendment, not with the support of Liberal members, but because the Socialists, as usual, will rally 100 per cent behind this Socialistic Government. It has often been said that the Playford Government is the best Socialistic Government in Australia, and its opposition to this amendment is merely another instance of the truth of that statement.

(*Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.*)

Mr. QUIRKE—I support the amendment because I believe that for State instrumentalities to operate efficiently it is necessary to have private organizations in competition with them. The amendment simply means that if the Minister thinks it advisable he can grant a private abattoirs a licence. Is the Minister afraid of the obligations and responsibilities he would have of refusing applications? I realize that the amendment would throw a great responsibility on him but as a Minister of the Crown he should not baulk at that. Why should not a privately-owned organization function alongside a State instrumentality?

Mr. Corcoran—What about the radius of 80 miles?

Mr. QUIRKE—The best fat lamb producing area of this State is within a radius of 80 miles of the city. The member for Flinders (Mr. Pearson) referred to Eyre Peninsula as divorced from the mainland, but it is part of the mainland. Where does Eyre Peninsula finish? How far north does it go? If it is not part of the mainland, what is it? It is playing with words to suggest it is not. Because there is no railway connection the people of that area believe they are isolated from the mainland. Port Lincoln is outside the 80 mile radius and therefore abattoirs can operate there. I point out that lambs from the South-East in the main do not come to the Metropolitan Abattoirs but go to Victoria. The Bill contained no zone limitation, but an amendment suggests that a radius of 80 miles should apply. The Minister's amendment will exclude another organization, that is fighting for its life, from supplying the metropolitan area. Mr. Hawker's amendment will allow that organization to continue operating its business and because of that I support the amendment.

Mr. HAWKER—The Minister said that Western Australia came to South Australia to find out how to run an abattoirs. I point out that they represented a Government show, not a private show. The Government works has a capacity six times that of the private works and yet is not killing double the quantity. After investigation in South Australia the Western Australian Government still could not compete with private enterprise. Sometimes I wonder whether there is anything in all the talk we hear about helping the Government to increase our exports. We should permit the establishment of abattoirs anywhere people think they can operate successfully. There have been sufficient failures in country abattoirs operations to safeguard against any firms putting money into a meat works that will not operate successfully. The amendment can do nothing but good for South Australia and it will greatly assist our export trade.

Mr. DAVIS—I oppose the amendment. Port Pirie has been mentioned. I point out that, when operating, the Port Pirie abattoirs will have no desire to send meat to the metropolitan area in times of dispute. The member for Chaffey (Mr. Macgillivray) said much about private enterprise. I know that when Port Pirie applied for its area to be declared an abattoirs area there were offers from private

enterprise, but had such an offer been accepted our meat would not have been killed at the same price as we expect under the present set-up which will be controlled by an abattoirs board. Meat cannot be killed as cheaply for export as for home consumption and it is difficult for any works to operate at a profit on an export basis only. It has been suggested that the Port Pirie abattoirs should be able, at a later date, to enter the export trade. I believe that would not pay and that Port Pirie consumers would have to pay for the export overhead charges. We had offers from organizations which intended to establish abattoirs at Kadina and Port Augusta but the meat would have had to be railed about 60 miles to either centre and we decided to build our own abattoirs. I believe this legislation was introduced because of the recent dispute at the Metropolitan Abattoirs. If another dispute took place in the metropolitan area other abattoirs could be operating elsewhere but I believe there would be discontent, for the people living in abattoirs areas outside the metropolitan area would be affected because the men would refuse to kill meat for the metropolitan area.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—But for the extravagant remarks of Mr. Davis I would have said nothing further. He contended that the cost of killing meat for home consumption was lower than for export. That has nothing to do with the amendment. I take it that he was not speaking as an individual, or even as a representative of a prospective abattoirs district, but simply as a member of the Labor Party. There has been more betrayal of primary producers in this session of Parliament than in the last 18 years since I have been a member. We know what happened with the abattoirs strike and we know that the Minister of Agriculture was trying to get his dumb followers to support him. Any loss is borne by the primary producers. Last week I heard that the weight of export lambs had already been increased beyond that required by Britain. Every pound of increase means a loss to the producer. No Government has ever betrayed the farmers more than the present Government has and the facts prove it. It allowed the abattoirs strike to continue because it was not prepared to intervene. The Minister has assured the House that there will be no loss to the fat lamb producers.

The Hon. A. W. Christian—Where did I give that assurance?

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Look up *Hansard*. The workers knew they were being framed. When passing the abattoirs one day I picked up one of the workers and I asked, "Is the abattoirs strike finished?" and he said, "Yes, thank goodness. No Government will ever make a success of any business. The workers are never satisfied." He condemned the whole abattoirs set-up. The strike continued to the discomfiture of citizens, and we are now faced with this emergency legislation. Can any country representative of the Liberal Party tell me why he will not support Mr. Hawker's amendment so that there would be two places for killing stock in the metropolitan area? The abattoirs employees always go on strike when farmers need their help most. I challenge Government members to explain to me how having two abattoirs in the metropolitan area will be a detriment. If one Government member can give a logical reason why the amendment should not be supported I would be glad to hear it. I am a firm believer in private enterprise. I can see no future in socialistic concerns. I could take members to many places where it could be proved conclusively that in the main socialism has been a failure, as has been the monopoly in the metropolitan area for the killing of stock. I hope Labor members will forget their allegiance to the socialist tiger and remember the primary producers.

Mr. WHITE—I supported the second reading because I felt the Bill would mean the establishment of abattoirs in country areas with capital provided by private enterprise. At that time no amendment had been indicated. Now a number of amendments are to be moved and if accepted they will alter the Bill considerably. As the State develops so will the fat lamb industry, and to handle the lambs properly there must be more abattoirs. In the second reading debate I said it was not advisable to have a large number of them because to be successful those established must be able to operate continuously during the year. We have had examples in other States to show that things can be overdone, but I do not think that will happen here. There is a committee moving for the establishment of an abattoirs at Tailem Bend, which is a logical place for one because a number of railway lines converge there. Tailem Bend is within the 80-mile radius mentioned by the Minister. For these reasons I support the amendment.

Mr. DAVIS—I listened attentively to the wanderings of Mr. Macgillivray. I tried to fathom what he was saying, but all I could

get was that he was criticising the Government for assisting the primary producers and criticising the workers at the abattoirs. He accused the Government and the Labor Party of having no interest in the country people. The policy of the Labor Party is to help the primary producers, and it is a policy of which the Party is proud. Mr. Macgillivray wants to have a large number of private abattoirs in the State and to oust the present abattoirs.

Mr. O'Halloran—He supports another abattoirs in the metropolitan area.

Mr. DAVIS—I did not know what he was talking about and I don't think anyone else did. I have never known him to say one good word about anything established by the Government. If we followed his views we would not have a railway line. He wants to deprive the producers of every transport facility. He would like to see the producers pay exorbitant rates for having their goods carted by road. I am not opposed to the establishment of country abattoirs, but there should be proper investigation into the matter. Facilities should be available for abattoirs to be established at suitable places. The amendment is a move against the workers in the industry.

Mr. QUIRKE—It was extraordinary to hear Mr. Davis speak as he did. He has always joined with members of his Party in deploring the lack of decentralization by the Government. How does he reconcile that attitude with what he said tonight? Mr. Hawker wants to do everything the Labor Party criticises the Government for not doing. Every primary producer would welcome another abattoirs in the metropolitan area. We had a strike at the abattoirs and the workers were up against a compact body, the board. No-one in the metropolitan area went short of meat during the recent strike at the abattoirs because master butchers did the slaughtering. The decentralization of abattoirs will do more for the worker than retaining the existing facilities, which is what the Opposition wants to do by supporting the Government against the amendment. Mr. Hawker has suffered under the unified control at Gepps Cross, for on many occasions he could not get his fat lambs slaughtered because that one authority could not cope with all lambs offering. If there were more abattoirs in the metropolitan area the employees would have greater bargaining power, so Opposition members are doing a disservice to workers by opposing Mr. Hawker's amendment. I ask Labor members to forget for once their hidebound support of Government control. Mr. Davis and Mr. Riches are doing a disservice to primary producers in the hinterland of their electorates by adopting their present attitude.

Labor members often speak in favour of decentralization, but how can they reconcile that with their present argument? Mr. Hawker wants private enterprise to have the opportunity to establish abattoirs to supply meat to the metropolitan area, with the consent of the Minister. The Minister said that he should have the authority to see that meat was slaughtered under hygienic conditions, and he could exercise better supervision within a radius of 80 miles of Adelaide than outside that radius. He admitted his responsibility in this regard when he introduced the Bill, but apparently he met the Abattoirs Board later and then decided to amend his Bill. The only point to be considered is whether we should allow another organization to compete with the Metropolitan Abattoirs; and competition produces greater efficiency.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Mr. Quirke has completely misrepresented the Opposition's attitude towards decentralization and this Bill. He said that we give lip service to decentralization, but that when an opportunity is presented to us we vote against an amendment to bring it about. We have also been told that we do not really represent country interests, but I think I can speak on behalf of more sheepowners than can any other member in this House. I have lived amongst sheepowners for a long time and I know their views. They do not want a few privately-owned metropolitan abattoirs but abattoirs as near as possible to the areas where fat lambs are produced. That is the main purpose of the Bill, and that is why I support it. Mr. Hawker, and those who support his amendment, are in favour of establishing private abattoirs in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Hawker—And in the country, too.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—The honourable member could not say that country abattoirs had been established in Western Australia under legislation there, but said there were three abattoirs in the metropolitan area of Perth. He also said that Victorian buyers competed at the sales at Gepps Cross, but because of this South Australian producers have been able to get higher prices. By our enabling private enterprise to establish abattoirs in the metropolitan area lamb producers will not get such high prices because competition from another State will be abolished. Mr. Hawker's amendment to strike out "country" will kill any possibility of having abattoirs established

at Riverton, Tailem Bend or Gladstone. Although I am not entirely happy about the way the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board has functioned I believe it has done a good job over a long period, and its employees have done magnificent work. I therefore say there is no sense or reason in this amendment for those who believe in the interests of country people and decentralization. If we on this side of the House were representatives of the workers only and wanted cheaper meat we should have both hands up for this amendment, but because we take the wider view that the interests of the whole community will eventually benefit, we oppose it.

Mr. HAWKER—I wish to correct one of the misunderstandings of the Leader of the Opposition. He ignored the latter part of my amendment that would naturally be moved if the first part were carried. If my amendment is carried, private abattoirs will mean "any abattoirs other than the abattoirs established by the board under this Act," and that could mean anywhere in the country or the metropolitan area. To say that it is against country abattoirs is completely wrong. I would expect the Minister to give country abattoirs a fair go if they start, but we had a sorry spectacle when we tried to start one two years ago. If abattoirs cannot be established in the country there will be only one centralized abattoirs. That is the sole reason for the amendment.

Mr. RICHES—The members for Stanley and Chaffey can say that there has been a greater betrayal of primary producers this session than in the last 18 years, and if unchallenged the responsibility for that indictment rests with the Government. The onus of answering that falls fairly on the shoulders of those who sit behind the Ministers. However, when the member for Stanley says that I am doing a disservice to the people I represent and to the State by supporting the Government measure, I take umbrage at his remark. The interests of fat lamb producers would be best served by making the existing Abattoirs even more efficient than it is today, although I am not criticizing it. The aim of the honourable member for Burra and the Independents is to do anything to undermine the present abattoirs. They are not concerned about establishing abattoirs in the country.

Mr. Macgillivray—Are you supporting the Government?

Mr. RICHES—Of course I am. I am supporting the Bill and the amendment moved by the Minister of Agriculture. Undermining the Metropolitan Abattoirs would be the worst thing that could happen to the fat lamb industry. The very fact that Melbourne buyers can come to South Australia and bid successfully at our abattoirs is a tribute to the market that is available in Victoria. To undermine the Adelaide market would put our abattoirs at a serious disadvantage. The arguments that private enterprise can handle meat works more successfully than Government enterprise falls down because of the history of the Port Lincoln abattoirs. That was established by private capital, and although the directors were not incompetent, there were so many difficulties that the Government had to take it over. Although that works may show a loss, that must be balanced against its worth in the settlement of the Peninsula. The settlement of Cummins and the district beyond would not have been possible but for it.

Mr. Macgillivray—Do you think that, if the company had as much support as the Government enterprise has had, it would not have been a success?

Mr. RICHES—When the Government has to come in and bolster up an industry it should control it; if that is Socialism then I am a Socialist. Government supporters could not speak long without harking back to the recent dispute, and their fond hope was that something would be set up as a strike-breaking measure. Strikes happen in private enterprise, and the relationship between men and management at the abattoirs has always been good.

Mr. Heaslip—The strike was most unfortunate for the producers.

Mr. RICHES—Did the honourable member's attitude during that strike help to settle it or did it help to prolong it? If his advice had been followed the strike would probably be still going. The honourable member for Rocky River said that if it paid South-Eastern producers to send their sheep interstate they would not want to slaughter them here, but supporters of the amendment condemn the workers if they try to get the best price for their labour. I trust that the amendment will not be carried.

Mr. LAWN—I would not have participated in this debate but for the speeches of some members this afternoon and this evening. Apparently some members are concerned not with the interests of producers and consumers, but merely with those of private investors. I prefer the Bill in its original state. I see nothing wrong with the establishment of more abattoirs in the country; indeed, decentralization has been Labor policy for many years.

The Bill provides that the Minister may permit meat killed in the country to be brought into the metropolitan area, but Independent members, and some Government members want to mutilate it. It has been said that there should be more private abattoirs in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Macgillivray—And the country.

Mr. LAWN—Yes; the Bill, in its original state, stipulates country abattoirs, but this amendment enables the establishment of more private abattoirs. What would happen if these were established in the metropolitan area? The member for Chaffey (Mr. Macgillivray) is concerned only with private enterprise.

Mr. Macgillivray—There is nothing to be ashamed of in that. You believe in Socialism; we believe in private enterprise.

Mr. LAWN—The member for Stanley (Mr. Quirke) said that if private abattoirs were established in the metropolitan area the worker would have a better choice of employers. That is true, but if an employer can prove that an industry is over-capitalized the Arbitration Court will decide a case against the worker. The housewife does not need an extra abattoirs, because it would mean dearer meat.

Mr. Wm. Jenkins—Much cheaper meat.

Mr. LAWN—The honourable member must prove that.

Mr. Wm. Jenkins—How about the competition?

Mr. LAWN—The proprietors of private abattoirs would get together and fix prices, as they do in other industries. They would buy their labour on the cheapest market, pay the primary producer the lowest prices, and sell to the housewife at the highest figure; after all, they would expect to pay a dividend of at least 10 per cent after providing adequate reserves each year, whereas if the Government abattoirs makes a loss by providing a service to the consumer, it is shared by all South Australians.

Mr. QUIRKE—It has been said the poor housewife will have to pay more for meat from a private abattoirs, but there is nothing in that argument. There are some peculiar features about these amendments. The Bill was introduced on August 31, and the Minister's amendment is dated September 29. Mr. Hawker's amendment is dated October 4, subsequent to the Minister's. Members who have the interests of primary producers at heart must support Mr. Hawker's amendment. Is there any connection between the two amendments? I think there is, because Mr. Hawker's amendment is dated after the Minister's amendment, which limits the Bill to country abattoirs outside the 80 mile radius, thereby excluding the Noarlunga Meat Company. But for the Minister's amendment Mr. Hawker would not have introduced his; he introduced it merely because he could see the implications of the Government one.

Mr. Pearson—Mr. Hawker foreshadowed his amendment in his second reading speech on September 27, before the Minister's amendment was submitted.

Mr. QUIRKE—It was introduced after the Minister's amendment.

Mr. Pearson—Wasn't the Minister entitled to accept Mr. Hawker's reference to it in his second reading speech as an indication that an amendment was to be moved by a private member?

Mr. QUIRKE—The Minister is entitled to do anything he sees fit. We know nothing about the Minister's intentions.

Mr. Pearson—You knew about the member for Burra's intentions.

Mr. QUIRKE—His amendment came in after the Minister's.

Mr. Pearson—He foreshadowed it.

Mr. QUIRKE—But he introduced it when another amendment was already on the files. However, whatever prompted it, he was justified in introducing it in the interests of country people. I am amazed at the attitude of the member for Flinders. He supports Government enterprise as against private enterprise in primary industry.

Mr. Pearson—What about the private enterprise that wants to set up works at Kadina?

Mr. QUIRKE—Does the honourable member support that?

Mr. Pearson—Yes.

Mr. QUIRKE—Then the member should support this amendment. The Minister's amendment will make it impossible to establish an abattoirs within a radius of 80 miles from the metropolitan area. Within that radius is the finest lamb-raising area in the State. It will render sacrosanct to the Metropolitan Abattoirs all fat lambs raised within that area. Can Noarlunga, for instance, supply the metropolitan area? Every member who supports the Minister's amendment, which will exclude Noarlunga from the metropolitan area, is striking a blow at private enterprise. The member for Flinders knows that.

Mr. Pearson—And so will you if you set up conditions which make it impossible for private enterprise to operate at Kadina.

Mr. QUIRKE—How will the amendment affect Kadina?

Mr. Pearson—By reason of the fact that there will be abattoirs situated all over the State and none will be economic.

Mr. QUIRKE—If the honourable member believes that, he has no faith in the Minister. Does the member believe that the Minister is so irresponsible as to permit the establishment of abattoirs every five or six miles throughout the country? Government members are supposed to support private enterprise. The Labor Party does not believe in private enterprise and admits it, but when we vote on this amendment the opponents of private enterprise and those who are supposed to sponsor private enterprise will be sitting side by side. It just does not make sense. The amendment will permit the establishment of abattoirs anywhere in the State if the Minister's consent is given. We frequently pass legislation which reposes certain powers in the Minister. Why should we be different now? It is futile to suggest that the housewife will have to pay more for her meat and that by some mysterious means the proprietors of the abattoirs will be able to agree on the prices consumers will have to pay. Before the Minister consented to the establishment of an abattoirs those making the application would have to present a good case. If we cannot repose any trust in the Minister on this occasion we cannot in the many other measures which pass through this Chamber.

The Committee divided on Mr. Hawker's amendment—

Ayes (10).—Messrs. Brookman, Fletcher, Goldney, Hawker (teller), Heaslip, Jenkins, Quirke, Shannon, Travers, and White.

Noes (19).—Messrs. Christian (teller), Geoffrey Clarke, Corcoran, Davis, Dunstan, Hincks, Hutchens, Jennings, Lawn, McAlees, McIntosh, Millhouse, O'Halloran, Pattinson, Pearson, Riches, Stott, Tapping, and Frank Walsh.

Pairs.—Aye—Mr. Macgillivray. No—Hon. T. Playford.

Majority of 9 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

THE Y.W.C.A. OF PORT PIRIE INC. (PORT PIRIE PARKLANDS) BILL.

Committee's report adopted.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILIZATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 29. Page 924.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—The main purpose of the Bill is to make it clear that the Wheat Board may collect certain charges on behalf of the Bulk Handling Company and pay same to it. Under the Wheat Industry Stabilization Act, 1954, the Wheat Board already has authority to deduct its own charges from the proceeds of the sale of the growers' wheat. That authority is not being amended by this Bill. Section 12 of the Act prevents the board from assigning moneys payable to growers and as some doubt existed as to the meaning of this provision in respect of the collection of tolls and special charges proposed by the company, the Bill provides that the board shall have power to act as the company's agent in this respect.

Although we do not know sufficient about the constitution of the company—for example, we do not know anything about the agreement between it and a member—there does not appear to be anything to object to in the Bill. I would have been much happier had I seen a copy of the agreement between the company and its members before I was asked to speak on the Bill. Members will recollect that I raised this question in the original Bill establishing the charter. Although I was told there was such an agreement I have had no opportunity to peruse one. I would think it would have been in somebody's interest, seeing that the Bill is of some import to the company, if copies had been made available to honourable members. However, that is no reason for opposing the Bill. We are asked to sanction something already agreed upon between the directors and members of the company. The Bill covers the collection of tolls in order to pay for installations provided by the company. It would be interesting to know how a member is going to give the board authority to collect tolls. Unless some method has been evolved, administrative difficulty could be encountered. Are we to assume that the company will ensure that the necessary authority is submitted to the board, or that it will be left to individual members? Or, will the difference between the non-members' handling charges and members' tolls ensure that this problem will solve itself? We still have no information as to the difference between the tolls to be charged to members and the handling charges

to be imposed on non-members. Will individual members give the Wheat Board the authority to collect the tolls? If so, will the members in the districts where there is only a remote possibility of their deriving a benefit from bulk handling for many years be willing to give the necessary authority? My remarks are a criticism of the lack of explanation of the machinery provisions. With these reservations I support the second reading.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 26, at 2 p.m.