HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, October 23, 1956.

The SPEAKER (Hon. B. H. Teusner) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

RESTRICTIVE TRADE PRACTICES.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—During the course of the William Queale lecture—an excellent lecture—delivered by him at the Adelaide University last Thursday evening, the Premier said that certain traders' associations in South Australia were indulging in unfair practices to the detriment of the public. Has the Premier considered taking action under the Fair Prices Act of 1924, which was designed to deal with such practices, and if not, will he consider taking it?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The restrictive trade practices I mentioned would not come within the scope of the 1924 Act, which deals with monopolies. A monopoly is something owned or controlled by one person, so a trade arrangement that embodies two or three organizations would not be a monopoly under the Act. The practice in South Australia is to have these matters examined by the Prices Department and to determine prices that are fair and reasonable to the consumer. The point I made in the lecture was that under the Commonwealth Constitution it is very difficult to provide overall legislation that can automatically regulate these matters. Although the South Australian practice has been criticized, I believe the results have justified the means. We fix prices and if there is any difficulty about supplies we have always, through that power, been able to see that supplies are maintained.

Mr. JENNINGS—The Premier said the Fair Prices Act, 1924, dealt only with monopolies, and not with associations. Section 2 of the Act defines "combine" thus:—

> "combine" means any contract, agreement, or arrangement, by or between two or more persons carrying on separate businesses which exists for the purpose of, or has, or is designed or likely to have, whether directly or indirectly, the effect of increasing or fixing the price of any article . . ."

The Act further provides for an application to be made by the Minister. Is the Premier aware of that and, if so, will he reconsider the answer he gave the Leader of the Opposition?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I am quite aware of the facts stated by the honourable member. I have carefully studied the Act and obtained the best advice upon it, and am informed that because of the nature of the Federal Constitution the Act cannot be satisfactorily implemented in this State. Provisions that operate in other States cannot be taken into account here. In any case, we have a much more readily adapted instrument in our Prices Department, which does, I assure members, seek to protect both traders and the public in every possible way.

PUBLIC SERVICE SALARIES.

Mr. HAMBOUR—In view of the urgency for the stabilization of salaries and wages I believe that the recent announcement of increases ranging from £10 to £350 for senior State public servants has shocked the South Australian public. I have always advocated helping those who help themselves, but—

The SPEAKER—The honourable member cannot debate his question, although the question he intends to ask may be explained. I ask him to be brief in the explanation.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Will the Premier say whether it is a fact, as reported in the press, that the Government opposed the increases? Does it follow that the Public Service Commissioner, who is chairman of the Public Service Board, and certain other officers mentioned in the press will also receive an increase? How many members of the board are public servants? Will the Government consider appointing an independent authority to determine these salaries?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Government opposed the proposed increases and, under the provisions of the Public Service Act, referred the matter back to the board for further consideration. In the first place, the recommendation of the board was not unanimous. The representative of the Public Service Association said that in his opinion the increases were not sufficient, but that he signed the award with the object of getting what was recommended. The Public Service Commissioner agreed that they were the proper amounts, but the representative of the Government did not sign the award and dissociated himself from the recommendation. The matter was examined by other Government officers, who advised the Government that the increases should not be given, and as a result the Government opposed the proposal and referred it back to the board. Having considered the matter further, the board filed a return upholding its previous decision and the Government, in accordance with the Act, gazetted the award.

The Government has very firm views on the question of upholding awards of courts that have been established. The Government disagreed with the decision because, quite apart from the increases recommended, it believed that any piecemeal decision always leads immediately to further dissatisfaction, and the fact that only one class of officer was reviewed was in itself a wrong decision. As soon as appropriations can be arranged the increases will be paid retrospectively from July 1, and I think I can get a Governor's warrant through in time to pay them on the second pay day in November. In reply to the honourable member's other questions, speaking from memory I believe that the Public Service Commissioner's salary is fixed by special Act. All members of the board are public servants and come within the scope of the Public Service Act. The matter raised in the last part of the question is being examined by the Government.

RAILWAY SIGNALLING SYSTEM.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Railways, a further reply to my recent question concerning the railway signalling system?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The Minister of Railways has supplied me with the following report from the Railways Commissioner:—

The question of a revision of automatic train stops for the line between Adelaide and Woodville is being investigated.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—With a view to ensuring greater safety on suburban railways, will the Minister of Education obtain, through his colleague, a report from the Railways Commissioner on the possible introduction of an improved signalling system that would prevent two trains from being on the same section at the same time?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I shall be pleased to ask my colleague for a report.

KANGAROO ISLAND SOLDIER SETTLEMENT.

Mr. BROOKMAN—I understand that senior Commonwealth public servants recently visited Kangaroo Island to inspect the pastures and examine the financial position of settlers. Has the Minister of Repatriation a report on any decisions made?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The Federal Deputy Director of Land Settlement (with his local officer) and officers of the Lands Department visited Kangaroo Island last week following upon representations by myself for a further review of the pasture position there. I am pleased to be able to say that a number of recommendations I had made are being supported by the Deputy Federal Director, and he has agreed to send another officer to Kangaroo Island to investigate the financial position of settlers and also the position of their pastures with a view to giving them further assistance. I have asked for a speedy reply so that this can be given at the earliest possible moment.

DIFFERENTIAL RATING.

Mr. LOVEDAY—I ask the Minister representing the Minister of Local Government whether a council has any power, under the Local Government Act, to strike a differential rate in respect of an allotment occupied by an old age pensioner, or an allotment occupied by a ratepayer in a business area but used solely for residential purposes.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I shall be pleased to refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and let him have a reply in due course.

DRAINAGE OF DISMAL SWAMP.

Mr. FLETCHER—On September 19 I addressed a question to the Minister of Lands about the drainage of Dismal Swamp, and he replied that his officers would attend a conference to be held in Melbourne. Can he now say what was the result of the conference and is there any likelihood of the Governments of South Australia and Victoria co-operating in the drainage of the area?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The conference was held on October 20, and a report I have states:—

The South-Eastern Drainage Board had a conference with the State Rivers and Water Supply in Melbourne on October 20, 1956, when it became evident that Victoria was not anxious to participate in the major scheme proposed by South Australia on the grounds that they considered they could get sufficient benefit in Victoria by a less comprehensive scheme. As a result, the South-Eastern Drainage Board is now investigating an amended and considerably smaller proposal than the one originally submitted to the Victorian Government, and following this, further discussions will be held.

KIMBA HIGHER PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. BOCKELBERG—Because of the increasing number of children attending the Kimba Higher Primary School the playing area is becoming somewhat congested. I understand that the school committee has money available to put down tennis courts and that it has applied for a road to be closed and part of

the park lands allotted to the school as a playing area. Can the Minister of Education say whether anything has been done in this direction? Some land of about eight acres has been set aside for another school at Kimba. Can the Minister say whether a school will be built on that land and, if so, when?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Without notice of that question I cannot give the honourable member precise details, but I will refresh my memory and let him have a reply later.

HENLEY BEACH RAIL SERVICE.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Some weeks ago I addressed a question to the Minister representing the Minister of Railways about the diesel train service to Henley Beach and pointed out that often there was not sufficient seating accommodation for passengers. In my absence the member for Semaphore (Mr. Tapping) addressed a further question to the Minister on my behalf, and he replied that it was not unreasonable to expect a few to stand during peak periods. On Thursday evening I travelled home on that train (the 5.43 p.m.) and counted roughly 120 people standing, which meant a most uncomfortable journey for them. In view of the statement that when sufficient trains were available improvements in the service would be made, when will it be possible to effect this improvement and, if that cannot be done in the near future, will the department consider running steam trains to provide extra seating accommodation at peak periods?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I shall be pleased to ask my colleague to obtain a report from the Railways Commissioner for the honourable member.

HARD-OF-HEARING SCHOOL.

Mr. COUMBE—Can the Minister of Education say when the hard-of-hearing school at the rear of North Adelaide school will be completed, and can he give an assurance that sufficient specially trained staff will be available when it is opened?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I cannot say offhand precisely when the building will be completed, but I shall get up-to-date information from the Architect-in-Chief for the honourable member. I assure him that we shall be able to train all the children who are deaf or hard-of-hearing.

FISHING EQUIPMENT LICENCES.

Mr. JENKINS—The tuna fishing season commences on November 5, and the coming season will be a trial of the commercial value of the industry following on the experiments conducted by the Jangaard Bros. last season. Both the *Tacoma* and the *Fairtuna* need squid hooks valued at about £30, and 500 poles worth £85. These supplies come from Japan, and import licences have been applied for in Sydney, but in order to obviate any delay in the commencement of fishing, if I give particulars to the Minister of Agriculture, will he try to expedite the granting of the licences so that there will be no delay in the start of the tuna season?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I shall be pleased to take up the matter with the appropriate Minister.

DRUNKEN DRIVING.

Mr. TAPPING—It seems from press reports that there has been a steep increase in the number of people driving under the influence of liquor. Will the Premier ascertain from the Commissioner of Police whether the number of cases has increased and whether the present law is adequate?

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

FRUIT FLY CONTROL.

Mr. KING—During the last fruit harvest the Department of Agriculture set up receptacles on the main highways leading to Renmark—one on the Murray Valley highway and one on the Wentworth road—to receive fruit coming from other States. I understand discussions took place about the advisability of stationing a traffic constable at Renmark to supplement this service. In view of the fact that the fruit harvest is again approaching, can the Minister of Agriculture say whether further consideration has been given to appointing a traffic constable at Renmark for this purpose?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Receptacles are established at the various points of entry by road into South Australia. They are accompanied by hoardings which explain that the entry of fruit from other States into South Australia is prohibited. So far as I am aware this system has been reasonably successful, although I do not know so much about the receptacles on the eastern boundaries of the State. I am not able to supply any information on the desirability or necessity of appointing a person to supplement the present arrangements by personally guarding the highway and

intercepting incoming traffic. The importance of keeping infected or possibly infected fruit from entering South Australia is fully appreciated by my department and I will ascertain from the officers concerned their views on this subject in view of the nearness of the coming harvest.

STEELWORKS IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr. RICHES—Has the Premier considered the request I made last Thursday concerning the laying on the table of the Director of Mines' submissions to the Minister relating to the establishment of a steelworks at Whyalla?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have had a look at the report. I personally do not agree with it and do not propose to lay it on the table.

MURRAY RIVER FLOOD RELIEF.

Mr. BYWATERS—Has the Premier any reply from the Federal Government as to what financial assistance it is prepared to give towards rehabilitating the Murray Valley?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have had no advice additional to what I have already reported. A cheque for £50,000 was received from the Prime Minister, together with a statement that the State's further claim would be examined and we would be informed of the result in due course. I understand—and this may account for the delay in the matter—that the Federal Treasurer, Sir Arthur Fadden, has been to the United States of America, presumably on high level financial matters, but that he will return to Australia this week.

Mr. KING—Can the Treasurer say how much of the £800,000 that was set aside for flood protection and rehabilitation has been spent, and how the money has been allocated?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I did not have notice of this question, so I can only give the honourable member approximate figures. Parliament voted £800,000, of which £50,000 was allocated to the Lord Mayor's Fund. About £230,00 has been allocated to district councils for the work they have undertaken, and of the total amount of £800,000 about £630,000 has been allocated. The balance has been spent by Government departments on flood protection work.

Mr. BYWATERS—On October 10 the Treasurer said in the House, in answer to a question by Mr. Stott, that if a decision on flood relief was not received from the Federal Government that week he would ask a State Treasury official to confer with the Federal Treasury officers. Has an official gone to Canberra for this purpose yet?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—As I pointed out previously, a decision has been held up because the Federal Treasurer has been in the United States of America, but I hope a decision will be reached this week. I have been informed that the matter has gone far beyond departmental level, and is now before the Federal Government itself.

COUNTRY WATER RESTRICTIONS.

Mr. LAUCKE—Has the Minister representing the Minister of Works any reply to the question I asked recently concerning the imposition of water restrictions during the coming summer in the Warren water district west of Nuriootpa?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The imposition of restrictions on the use of water in the Warren District during the coming summer has not been considered and the Engineer-in-Chief reports that so far as can be predicted, none will be necessary at present. However, the necessity or otherwise of imposing restrictions will be determined by such factors as consumption and weather conditions experienced in the district during the summer months and it would be obviously impossible at this juncture to make a reliable forecast of these influences.

BURNING-OFF PERIOD.

Mr. HEASLIP—Under the Bush Fires Act the closing date for burning off is October 15. Councils have discretionary powers whereby they can shorten and extend that period by a fortnight. Because of the phenomenal growth and the lateness of this season, even if councils extended the period by a fortnight, it would still be almost impossible to burn off. Burning off is a great protection. A fire under control is better than one out of control. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether it would be possible to extend the period for another week or more?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The provisions in the Act in regard to this matter are specific and those referred to by the honourable member are availed of by district councils almost every year. This year I have already approved a number of variations of the period set out in the Act, but only, of course, to the extent permitted by the Act. I have not had any request from district councils for extensions beyond the time at present permitted; therefore, the question raised by the honourable member has not been considered. If the honourable member can bring specific cases to my notice something may be done, but I do

not think that, unless we amend the Act, it would be possible to give extensions beyond the time at present specified.

MOUNT BARKER ROAD.

Mr. SHANNON—Has the Minister of Education a report from the Minister of Roads following on the questions I have asked about the difficulties experienced on the Mount Barker Road because of interstate road hauliers travelling close to each other and making it difficult for other vehicles to pass, and in regard to following the Victorian example of prohibiting the use of such vehicles on certain sections of our highways on Sundays and holidays?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I have no report from the Minister of Roads but I referred the honourable member's questions to him and discussed the matter with him this morning. The Government is reluctant to restrict the use of the Mount Barker Road by road hauliers whose practices are complained of by the honourable member, but unless there is more co-operation from them it may be necessary to limit the hours of the movement of the vehicles. I will take up with the Minister the suggestion of enforcing regulations as is done in Victoria, with regard to restricting the days and hours of travel, as well as close travelling by the vehicles.

HOSPITAL AT ELIZABETH.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—The following is an extract from a letter to the editor in this morning's *Advertiser* regarding the proposal to construct a new hospital at Elizabeth:—

> Leading hospital architects throughout the world have condemned pavilion-type planning for a hospital of this size for many years and every up-to-date textbook on hospital planning illustrates the pavilion plan merely as an historical example of out-of-date uneconomical and inefficient planning.

Can the Premier say whether that criticism of the proposed pavilion-type of hospital suggested for Elizabeth is well-founded, and as about £200,000 of public money is to be spent on it should not Parliament be given an opportunity to consider the proposed plan, or is it practicable to have the whole proposal referred to the Public Works Committee?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I think it is fair criticism to say that we have not built in South Australia any hospital or nurses home that has been approved by all authorities. No matter what proposal the Government puts forward there are always super-authorities with a better proposal. In connection with the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Architect-in-Chief was a long time in drawing plans and the Public Works Committee investigated the matter, but when it finally presented its report we were told that the plans were no good and should be re-designed. We had the same trouble with the nurses home at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The project was examined on a number of occasions and after the committee presented its report we still had criticism from members of the medical profession that the plans were unsatisfactory in every way. In all these matters there will always be differences of opinion. There is always a good deal of criticism when the Government undertakes the architectural designing of an important building, and I believe that much of the criticism mentioned by the honourable member is due to the fact that the plans and specifications were drawn up by a Government department. I read with interest the criticism of the proposed Elizabeth Hospital, but I think it would have been of more value if the letter had been signed. We would then have known who was responsible for it.

Mr. SHANNON—In the *Mail* of October 20 an article headed, "£360,000 Hospital Planned for Elizabeth," states, "South Australian Housing Trust will begin building a £360,000 hospital at Elizabeth in about four months if a poll of Salisbury ratepayers approves." The article further states:—

> They would vote on November 17 on a plan to raise a loan of up to £75,000 to help finance the building. The Health Minister, Sir Lyell McEwin, said today the South Australian Government would contribute £200,000.

In the Estimates, £100,000 was provided for a new Salisbury hospital. Can the Premier say whether it is the Government's policy to commit large sums to such projects without reference to Parliament? Is the Housing Trust to be the authority to plan hospital buildings in this State? Is it not a fact that the plan being prepared for the new hospital at Elizabeth provides for a pavilion type hospital? I point out that when the proposal for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital was considered by the Public Works Committee it rejected the pavilion type hospital and ultimately approved of the erection of a multi-storey building. Can the Premier say whether any attempt has been made to assess the ultimate hospital requirements for Elizabeth, particularly as evidence tendered by the Housing Trust indicated that the population within the forseeable future would be 50,000? Has consideration been given to what would be the most economic form of hospital for this area and is the plan being prepared taking all these factors into account?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It has been the Government's policy for many years to assist organizations rather than to undertake the full responsibility for providing certain services. The Government has made large grants for hospital purposes. For instance, it has generously assisted the finances of the Queen Victoria Maternity Hospital, the Children's Hospital and other institutions which are prepared to accept the responsibility of providing hospitals in their areas. That is the position at Elizabeth. If the people there are prepared to accept the responsibility, the Government will provide adequate financial asistance. Concerning the honourable member's other questions, the plan has been closely examined by the Health Department and is satisfactory. It will provide for a modern hospital with good accommodation. The Housing Trust is undertaking large building operations in the area and would, under ordinary circumstances, arrange the contract for the hospital construction. It is recognized that Elizabeth will ultimately grow to a town of 30,000 inhabitants.

Mr. Shannon—That estimate has been increased lately.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The plan provides for several stages of development. The initial costs for the hospital will be high because services greater than are necessary at the moment must be provided for.

Mr. Shannon—How big a hospital is ultimately proposed?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not know, but the plan provides for a number of stages, taking into account estimated population increases.

EUDUNDA AREA SCHOOL.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Can the Minister of Education say if it is a fact that plans for new classrooms at the Eudunda area school have been in the hands of the Director of Education for two years? Will the Minister do his utmost to hurry on their construction?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The reply to the first question is "No," to the second "Yes."

SEAGULL OUTBOARD MOTORS.

Mr. JENKINS—Seagull outboard motors have been classified as a luxury item by the import licensing authorities, and I have been approached by fishermen concerning the shortage of these motors. Further, I have found that one firm that was previously allowed a quota of £2,500 for these motors, costing £80 each, has had its quota reduced to only £750, although this has been recently increased on a monthly basis to £1,500 following on the River Murray floods, and no amount is allocated for pleasure craft. One order alone from Wilcannia was for 10 Seagull motors for use in the rescue of sheep marooned on islands in the vast area of water. Further, many were supplied to the flooded areas along the River Murray and used for all kinds of water transport. This has resulted in a waiting list of applicants requiring 80 Seagull motors and *bona fide* fishermen cannot get their requirements for at least nine months. Will the Minister of Agriculture examine this matter in the interests of the trade and the fishermen concerned?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—If the honourable member will give me details I shall be pleased to follow it up with the proper authority.

EYRE HIGHWAY.

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

Increasing traffic overland between South Australia and Western Australia is directing the attention of more and more people to the condition of Eyre Highway, and it is apparent that until the highway becomes recognised as a national utility, it will never be kept trafficable all the year round. Because the surface is not sealed, and because the construction was never intended to carry some of the huge loads that pass over it, the highway becomes a bog in winter and a dangerous dust trap in summer. Upkeep is beyond the resource of the local governing bodies through whose districts the highway runs, and the occasional hand-outs made to them are sufficient only for patching.

Has the Premier seen that report?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No, but the problem raised is an important one. At present roads are paid for by direct and indirect taxation on the motor industry in the form of petrol taxation and registration and drivers' licence fees, and as long as that position obtains the motorist will require the money to be spent on roads that are used most. The taxation of motorists in Adelaide, Sydney and Melbourne for the purpose of constructing a bitumen road from Adelaide to Perth to be used by traffic on a restricted scale would raise a problem. It has been the Government's policy to provide sufficient moneys to maintain roads outside district council areas in as good a condition as possible; indeed, such allocations are much more generous than those to inside areas. Some district councils receive about three times as much from outside sources as they raise themselves; in fact, I believe one derives from the

central authority all the money it spends on roads and itself raises only sufficient to pay its administrative expenses. I shall, however, have the question referred to the Highways Commissioner for investigation.

MOUNT GAMBIER TECHNICAL SCHOOL.

Mr. FLETCHER—Can the Minister of Education inform the House of the plans for the Mount Gambier Technical School?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Following on deputations introduced to me by the honourable member, from the Mount Gambier Corporation, the technical school committee and other interested parties, it was decided to transfer a number of portable classrooms from the old Wehl Street primary school to land at Olympic Park adjacent to the new Reidy Park primary school. Further, extensive alterations and additions to the old Wehl Street property will be effected and that school will become the new Mount Gambier technical school. Those changes are taking place at present and no doubt when the honourable member and I visit Mount Gambier during the next week or so we shall see the considerable changes that have been and are taking place.

UNSIGHTLY CHATTELS AND STRUCTURES.

Mr. COUMBE—Earlier this year certain by-laws relating to unsightly chattels and structures were disallowed. Does the Government intend to introduce a model by-law on this matter?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I will refer the matter to my colleague and get a considered reply.

FILM *ROCK AROUND THE CLOCK.*

Mr. HUTCHENS—Did the Premier read press reports of unseemly conduct by a number of irresponsible youths after they had seen the film *Rock Around The Clock,* and will he ask the Chief Secretary to use his powers to prohibit the screening of this type of film that gives an excuse to irresponsibles to create disturbances and cause discomfort to citizens and cost to the State?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Chief Secretary's powers of censorship have been provided by Parliament mainly for the purpose of ensuring that undesirable matter is not exhibited on the screen. Before the film was exhibited in South Australia the Chief Secretary had a preview of it to decide whether there was anything to justify his prohibiting its release to the public, but he came to the conclusion that there was not. The trouble arose not from the film itself, but from the publicity given to it. I have had private reports on this matter indicating that there were no demonstrations by anyone until photographers went to the theatre to take photographs of people who were supposed to be acting in an unseemly way. Of course, the kids proceeded to play up to the photographers and that was the origin of this publicity. It was inspired to a certain extent by the fact that the people concerned realized that if they played the giddy goat they would get publicity, but the Chief Secretary took his responsibility about the film seriously. It was discussed in Cabinet, and as a result he spared the time to attend a preview, but he came to the conclusion that there was nothing salacious in it that would warrant prohibition.

ROADS IN GREENACRES.

Mr. JENNINGS—The roads in the new Housing Trust settlement of Greenacres are in such a bad condition that most of the Adelaide taxi companies will not serve the area, private cars cannot get in, and postmen cannot deliver letters. I realize that the Premier may say that the provision of satisfactory roads is the responsibility of local government, but will he ask the Housing Trust, as he has done in other instances, to provide some assistance to have these roads put in order?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I presume this settlement is in the Enfield council's district. The Housing Trust has recognized that the establishment of a large housing estate in any council area, although it confers long-term advantages on the district, creates many immediate difficulties, and it has tried to assist councils to the limit of its financial ability. We have had excellent co-operation from all councils in establishing housing areas, but not one has stood up to its obligations better than the Enfield council. I will have the honourable member's question investigated.

PORT AUGUSTA WATERWORKS OFFICE.

Mr. RICHES—Has the Minister representing the Minister of Works obtained a report on the request for a new waterworks office at Port Augusta?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I have received the following report:—

The proposal for alterations to the District Superintendent's house and the provision of a new office building at Port Augusta was first raised in 1945, and following investigations an amount of £1,700 for a new office was included in the Loan programme for 1947-48. The

Engineer-in-Chief has reported that it was considered inexpedient to carry out the work at the time, however, and no provision has been made in subsequent Loan programmes for the new office building. It is considered that the first essential at the Port Augusta depot is the construction of additions and alterations to the District Superintendent's house and a revised estimate for this work has recently been prepared. The proposal is at present being re-examined in the light of the Loan Funds available during the current financial year. In view of the rapid expansion now taking place at Port Augusta, office accommodation at the departmental depot will also have to be increased in the near future. This matter will receive consideration when the Engineer-in-Chief's report thereon has been received.

PORT PIRIE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. DAVIS—During the Budget debate I asked a question about harbour improvements at Port Pirie, and the Treasurer promised to bring down a report on the progress made on the £1,500,000 programme for the deepening of the harbour and the renovation of the wharves. Has he yet received the report?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—That report is being prepared for the honourable member.

HENLEY AND GRANGE SEWERAGE.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Has the Minister representing the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on October 4 relating to the sewerage of Henley and Grange?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—A proposal to extend sewers to serve the area in North Grange north of Terminus Street and east of Military Road was last examined in May, 1955 when a deputation from the Henley and Grange Council waited on the Minister of Works in regard to sewers for several parts of the municipality. At that time, the estimated cost of the necessary sewers, together with ejector station and pumping main, was £13,500. The revenue to accrue from rates was £75 per annum, representing about one-tenth of 1 per cent on the outlay and requiring a State subsidy of approximately £600 per annum to meet statutory charges. The Minister pointed out that there were then only 24 houses with 25 vacant building sites and that the cost of sewering the area would be prohibitive. A survey of this locality will be undertaken to acertain whether further building activity has taken place.

Following the deputation to the Minister, further investigations have been made in regard to sewerage schemes to serve the following areas:—(1) 123 allotments lying between Viaduct Avenue and Hughes Avenue, Henley South. (2) 108 allotments situated on each side of the Henley Beach Road west of Tapleys Hill Road at Fulham. The Minister will reply to the honourable member by letter hereon during the next two or three days.

ELECTORAL ACT AND REGULATIONS.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Minister representing the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question concerning the re-printing of the Electoral Act and regulations?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The Attorney-General has advised me that the Government Printer is holding relatively large stocks of Electoral Acts and regulations and that, under those circumstances, it is not proposed to reprint them for the time being. The matter will be further considered as soon as existing stocks are depleted.

NORTH ADELAIDE RAILWAY CROSSING.

Mr. COUMBE—Several roads converge on the crossing at the North Adelaide Railway Station. They carry a great amount of traffic and the crossing provides one of the main outlets from the city to the Port Road and surrounding areas. At times the traffic is held up for five to ten minutes. Will the Minister ascertain from the Minister of Railways whether automatic gates can be installed to assist the movement of traffic? The present fixed gates are responsible for unnecessary delays.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I will refer the question to the Minister of Railways.

CLOVER AND RYEGRASS SEEDS.

Mr. JENKINS—Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked last week concerning import duty on New Zealand clover and ryegrass seeds?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The Customs Department has advised me that there is no import duty on New Zealand clover and ryegrass seeds. A small charge is made for the routine quarantine inspection of these seeds but it is only a fraction of a penny a pound.

FUEL TRANSPORT ON EYRE PENINSULA.

Mr. BOCKELBERG—Has the Minister representing the Minister of Railways a reply to the question I asked recently concerning the cartage of fuel on Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The Minister of Railways has supplied the following reply:—

The Railways Commissioner reports that he cannot trace any previous question asked by the honourable member referring specifically to

the carriage of oil in 44-gallon drums by the railways, but that the honourable member did ask a question on September 27 as to whether it would be possible for the Railways to speed up the carriage of fuel on Eyre Peninsula, and perhaps he is referring to this question. The Railways Department does carry oil in drums on Eyre Peninsula and it is their desire to increase the traffic to the greatest extent possible. It is to be remembered, however, that the train services are sparse, being limited to two per week between Port Lincoln and Minnipa, one per week between Port Lincoln and Kimba, and one per week on the other lines. There is insufficient business to justify any additional service other than that which is given in connection with the handling of grain for shipment.

LIGHTING OF HEAVY VEHICLES.

Mr. KING—Has the Minister representing the Minister of Roads a reply to the question I asked on October 18 concerning warning lights on heavy vehicles on highways?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Cabinet is now considering the introduction of similar cautionary measures to those already adopted in Victoria.

WEST TERRACE CREMATORIUM.

Mr. DUNNAGE (on notice)—

1. How many cremations took place at the West Terrace Crematorium during each of the months of June, July, August and September, 1956?

2. When is it intended to close the West Terrace Crematorium?

The Hon. B. Pattinson for the Hon. Sir MALCOLM McINTOSH—The replies are:—

1. June, 9; July, 6; August, 7; September, 7.

2. This matter will be examined.

DRAPER EMERGENCY HOUSES.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice)—

1. How many emergency houses are vacant in the Draper area?

2. How long have these houses been vacant?

3. What is the cause of these houses not being occupied?

4. Is it the intention of the Government to have these houses moved to another area? If so, when?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. 19.

2. From three months up to about fourteen months.

3. The rising water table from the Port River accompanied by the seepage from a large number of septic tanks and sullage pits have brought about conditions under which the tanks and pits will not function properly.

4. Yes, as soon as practicable.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The SPEAKER laid on the table reports by the Public Works Standing Committee on the Salisbury High School (woodwork and domestic art centres), and the Barossa Reservoir to Sandy Creek water main, together with minutes of evidence.

Ordered that reports be printed.

BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON 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 Barley Marketing Act, 1947-1952.

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

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Agriculture)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its principal object is to extend the life of the Australian Barley Board. If the Act were not altered, the board would have to cease operations and go out of existence after disposing of next year's barley harvest. It is proposed by the Bill to extend the life of the board for another five seasons, so that the principal Act will apply to barley grown up to the season of 1962-1963. An organization such as the Barley Board has to plan ahead and in the interests of efficiency it is desirable that the board should know a reasonable time in advance whether it is to expire or continue. For this reason the board asked that the question of extending its life should now be considered. The Government decided to seek Parliamentary approval for an extension of the board for a further five years. Clause 7 contains the amendment required for this purpose.

The Bill also proposes some other amendments of the principal Act which the Barley Board has asked for. Clauses 3 and 4 deal with illegal purchases of barley from growers. One of the basic requirements of the barley marketing scheme is that barley growers must sell their barley through the board. The Act places an obligation on the grower not to sell or

deliver barley to any person other than the board, except with the approval of the board itself. However, in recent years, the board has found that in some cases merchants have approached the growers directly and bought barley from them without consent of the board. It is clear that if a grower sells his barley to such persons he commits an offence; but the legal position of the buyer is not so clear. Some judicial decisions are to the effect that a person who buys a commodity from a person who sells it illegally is himself guilty of aiding and abetting the offence and punishable accordingly. In other cases the contrary view has been taken. It is proposed by clause 4 to place the responsibility for illegal sales on the buyer as well as the seller. The clause makes it an offence for a person to buy barley from a grower without written consent of the board. Like the other provisions in the Bill, this provision will not apply to barley sold in the course of interstate trade. Frequently a question arises as to the transfer or sale of seed barley as between grower and grower. During its term of operation the board has not attempted to hamper the legitimate transfer of barley from grower to grower for seed purposes, and the amendment in no way interferes with that custom.

Mr. O'Halloran—What about barley for feed purposes?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—It is handled through the board. Any tranfer or sale of barley for feed purposes should have been done in the past with the board's concurrence.

Clause 5 provides that all offences against the Act or the regulations can be dealt with summarily. At present the Act does not provide for summary procedure. This omission occurred in the preparation of a uniform Bill for both Victoria and South Australia. The provision in question was not required in Victoria. But it is, of course, desirable in this State. It could be included in the regulations, but it is preferable to have it in the Act. The board has another year to run, but because it desired to know its position and because of repeated requests throughout the State for its term to be extended, the Government has considered the matter this year. It is pleasing that the board appears to have the confidence of the growers to the extent that organizations of growers have said by resolution, sometimes unanimously, that its life should be extended. The Government is pleased to extend the board's life for the period mentioned in the Bill and to do it a year ahead of the required time, which will assist the board in its administration and future planning.

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

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Having obtained leave, the Hon. G. G. Pearson introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Fisheries Act 1917-1946. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Agriculture)—I move:—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This is a short Bill the sole object of which is to enable the Minister of Agriculture to provide accommodation for fishing boats. In recent years some amounts of loan money have been voted for this purpose. In 1953 the vote was £20,600; in 1954, £15,000; and in 1955, £24,800. These amounts were allocated to the Harbours Board which has acted as the constructing authority for fishing boat accommodation. The Government, however, has recently given special consideration to this question and has come to the conclusion that the proper authority to direct and control the provision of such accommodation is the Minister of Agriculture, who is in charge of the Fisheries Department. The Harbors Board is an efficient constructing authority and no complaint at all is levelled against its work as such; but in the opinion of the Government it has not the close contact with the fishing industry that is desirable for an authority which has to decide what accommodation should be provided for persons engaged in this occupation.

It is proposed, therefore, to confer on the Minister of Agriculture power to provide harbour facilities for fishing boats and to make charges for the use of them. As, however, the Minister of Agriculture is not equipped to carry out construction work, the Bill provides that he may, with the approval of the Governor, arrange with any other Minister or authority of the Crown for the construction of any works which he desires to provide. If necessary the services of the Harbors Board may be engaged. The cost of doing work under the Bill will be paid out of money voted by Parliament for the purpose. Pursuant to the money being provided in the Loan Estimates, the Chief Inspector of Fisheries and Game has been consulting various groups of fisherman along the South Australian coast. At my request he has formulated priorities and a policy in connection with the expenditure of the money. It is hoped that before the end of the financial year some real progress will have been made

in the establishment of slips and fishing havens at some of the fishing places along the South Australian coast.

Mr. TAPPING secured the adjournment of the debate.

FORESTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON, having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Forestry Act, 1950. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Forests)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Section 6 of the Forestry Act, 1950, provides for the constitution of the Forestry Board. The section provides that the board is to consist of three members, that one of the members is to be the Conservator of Forests, and that the other members are to be appointed by the Governor on the nomination of the Minister. With the increase of the business of the Forestry Department, it is considered by the Government that provision should be made permitting the increase of the number of members of the board. Clause 2 of the Bill therefore amends section 6 to provide that the board is to consist of such number of members as the Governor from time to time determines but that the number of members is to be not less than three nor more than five. The present Act makes no provision as to the number of members necessary to constitute a quorum of the board. If the membership of the board is increased, a provision of this nature will be necessary and clause 2 therefore provides that the Minister may from time to time fix the number of members necessary to form a quorum of the board.

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

STOCK DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON, having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Stock and Poultry Diseases Act, 1934-1954. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Agriculture)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes a number of administrative amendments to the Stock and Poultry Diseases Act. Subsection (2) of section 5 of the Act defines as infected stock, stock which have, within the preceding three months, formed part of a lot of diseased stock or have been in contact with diseased stock. The Chief Inspector of Stock has pointed out that this period of three months is not appropriate for some diseases, the incubation period for which is much longer than three months. The Chief Inspector has recommended that the period of contact should be fixed according to the disease and the incubation period for that disease. Accordingly clause 3 provides that, in lieu of the period of three months mentioned in the subsection, the period shall be that prescribed by regulation for the disease. Paragraph (*a*) of clause 4 extends the regulation making power of the Governor accordingly.

Paragraph (*b*) of clause 4 provides that the Governor may make regulations prohibiting artificial insemination of stock except under the prescribed conditions. The Chief Inspector has pointed out that artificial insemination can be a considerable factor in the spread of diseases such as trichomoniasis and vibriosis and has recommended that provision should be made for some control of its practice. Section 8a of the principal Act was enacted in 1954 and it empowers the Governor to make regulations dealing with measures to be taken to combat foot and mouth disease and other proclaimed diseases. Among other things, the regulations may provide for the quarantine of infected stock. Clause 5 extends this provision to enable the regulations to provide for the removal of infected stock to quarantine grounds in addition to providing for the quarantine of stock upon the land where they are kept.

Sections 11 and 12 of the principal Act empower inspectors to enter land. It is proposed by clauses 6 and 7 to extend this power of entry to premises and fittings. "Fittings" is defined by section 5 to include such as stalls, stables, horse boxes and so on. Obviously, the power of entering should extend to these structures. Section 13 of the Act provides that if an inspector believes stock to be diseased, he may, for the purpose of deciding whether or not the stock are diseased, kill one head of stock, or if the stock forms part of a lot exceeding 100 in number, two head of stock. The section goes on to provide that if there are more than 100 head of stock in any lot, the inspector may, in addition, kill two head of stock in any 100 or part of a hundred of the excess. It is proposed by clause 8 to substitute 200 for the figure 100, so that the number of head of cattle which may be killed for examination will be one for every 100 instead of two as now provided.

Section 14 provides that if pleuro-pneumonia is discovered in a lot of cattle, the Chief

Inspector may cause the cattle to be inoculated and the inoculated cattle are to be marked in manner prescribed. Clause 14 provides that this marking is to be as determined by an inspector. The usual manner of marking is to bang the tail, that is, cut off the hair at the end of the tail, although this has not been prescribed. However, if the tail has been banged for some other purpose, as frequently occurs, it is necessary to use some other identifying method. Thus, it is considered that it is better to leave the method of marking flexible and to the decision of the inspector rather than prescribing marks by regulation.

Section 15 provides that an inspector may employ any person to assist him and may pay him reasonable remuneration. It is considered that this provision is too wide and clause 10 provides that the Minister may authorize the Chief Inspector to employ such persons and to pay reasonable remuneration. Section 16 empowers an inspector to seize and destroy diseased travelling or straying stock. Clause 11 extends this power to include infected stock.

Section 19 provides that if an owner of stock discovers or suspects them to be diseased, he must, within 24 hours, send to the nearest inspector and to the Chief Inspector at Adelaide a notice in the form in the third schedule. It is provided by clause 12 that, in lieu of filling in the form set out in the schedule, the owner of the stock is to notify the inspector and the Chief Inspector by the quickest practicable means which, of course, could be by direct oral communication, telephone, telegram or letter. The third schedule containing the form which is now required is repealed. Early notification of disease is necessary, but it is considered unnecessary to insist on the information being given on a particular form.

Clause 12 also provides that if a veterinary surgeon or similar person is called in to attend to stock and he is satisfied or suspects that the stock are diseased, he must notify the nearest inspector and the Chief Inspector. However, it is provided that this provision is only to apply to such diseases as the Minister from time to time notifies in the *Gazette*, and it is not intended that it should apply to the whole range of diseases to which the Act applies.

Section 23 provides that if diseased stock are introduced into the State, the Minister may direct that they be destroyed. Clause 13 provides that, in lieu of this, the stock may be returned to the owner on conditions determined by the Minister including a condition for payment of any expenses incurred with respect to the stock and the condition that the owner will remove the stock from the State. Section 24 provides that where land which has been quarantined is declared to be clean, a certificate to that effect of an inspector is to be published in the *Gazette*. Clause 14 provides that, in lieu of publishing the certificate in the *Gazette*, a copy is to be given to the proprietor of the land.

Section 28 prohibits the introduction into South Australia of diseased stock. Clause 15 extends this prohibition to infected stock and stock suspected to be diseased or infected. Section 31 provides that the Chief Inspector may exempt an owner from the duty to dip sheep in any case where he is satisfied that, by reason of drought conditions, shortage of water, the weakness of the sheep or for any other like cause, it would be impracticable or burdensome to dip the sheep. Clause 31 deletes the word "like" and inserts "other," thereby extending the discretion of the Chief Inspector.

Section 32 provides that where sheep are dipped in compliance with Part V of the Act, the owner is to send a return to the Chief Inspector. It is considered that it is unnecessary to require these returns in all cases and clause 17 provides that, instead of the obligation to furnish returns being general, it will be necessary to send a dipping return only when the Chief Inspector requires the owner of the sheep to furnish the return. Part VI of the Act provides for the inspection of poultry. The Chief Inspector has recommended that this Part be repealed as "poultry" is included in the definition of "stock" in section 5 and all poultry inspectors are also stock inspectors. Clause 18 therefore repeals Part VI. As the consequential amendment clause 2 deletes the words "and Poultry" from the short title of the Act.

Sections 42 and 45 give rights to travel stock over land within hundreds which is leased from the Crown or is Crown lands. Similar rights to travel stock over pastoral land is contained in section 99 of the Pastoral Act. Clause 19 provides that the rights given by sections 42 and 45 are not to apply in any case where the stock are suffering from or infected with any disease to which the Minister by notice in the *Gazette* declares the section is to apply and clause 20 provides that failure to comply with clause 19 will be an offence under section 42.

At first sight the Bill may appear involved, but it is not. It applies no new principle, but

it does much to tidy up the Act. Further, it will assist in dealing with deadly diseases such as pleuro-pneumonia and in the work to begin on foot-rot in this State. Many of the old provisions were frequently not completely complied with; for instance, a return was required from all persons after they had dipped their sheep. I think that this law was honoured more in the breach than in the observance, and in this respect the Bill makes a realistic approach to the matter.

Mr. O'Halloran—Why is it necessary to notify both the inspector and the chief inspector in all cases?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I cannot just say at the moment.

Mr. O'Halloran—One would think one notification would be sufficient.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—After all, the chief inspector is the authority, and I presume that is why he has to be notified. It is provided, and it will be enforced, that where an inspector has reason to order the dipping of sheep, whether they have been dipped or not, after the sheep have been dipped a return must be furnished so he will know whether his instructions have been carried out. It may be thought from my explanation of the Bill that it attempts to restrict the artificial insemination of stock, but such is not the intention. It is certainly not my intention, for I hope that before long we shall be able to extend this practice so that a man with insufficient cows to warrant the purchase of a good quality bull will be able to take advantage of this modern service. This would result in the standard of our cattle, particularly dairy cattle, being raised even beyond its present good standard.

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

METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

On the motion for the third reading,

Mr. BROOKMAN (Alexandra)—The Bill extends the defined Metropolitan Abattoirs area. I do not oppose it, but it calls for a few comments on the general position relating to the killing of stock in the metropolitan area. Most people do not realize what a huge home market has grown up in South Australia, especially in the metropolitan area. The Bill will extend the monopoly of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board. It cannot be denied that this abattoirs operates under hygienic conditions. It might be difficult to control the operations of a number of small butchers, and that is why the Metropolitan Abattoirs has become so popular with local government and health authorities, but that does not overcome the need for some competition in slaughtering.

I often wonder whether the Metropolitan Abattoirs is not coasting along under its protection. We do not know whether it is being overworked, but in the last few years we have had some conflicting views in Government circles on this matter. If we asked whether the Metropolitan Abattoirs was able to cope with the enlarged area laid down under the Bill I am sure the answer would be "Yes," but there were some negotiations on the establishment of an abattoirs at Kadina, and the company concerned was offered attractive prospects about a quota in the metropolitan area. However, the company decided not to go on with the project, and the Metropolitan Abattoirs area is now being extended under the Bill. I think it is obvious that this abattoirs would still be in a position to carry on if it had a competitor in the metropolitan area. I realize that private abattoirs can sell meat in the metropolitan area, but only under the most rigorous conditions governed by regulations, for inspections must be carried out at certain specified points and the carcases must have a good many of the organs attached to them. This makes the regulations difficult to comply with. The number of carcases that could be sold would be much fewer than if private abattoirs were allowed inspectors on their own premises.

Mr. Shannon—Don't they already have inspectors?

Mr. BROOKMAN—The inspectors in private abattoirs have qualifications equal to those of our State inspectors, and those inspectors are accredited by the Commonwealth Government as competent to inspect meat killed for export. However, they are not permitted to inspect meat to be sold in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Shannon—Good enough for people overseas, but not good enough for us!

Mr. BROOKMAN—Exactly, and there is a strong case for some revision of this practice. It is time there was some competition in the slaughtering of stock for the metropolitan area. The Act lays down that every three years the Minister shall call for a report on the efficiency of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs, but I do not know whether that has been done until recently. I know that the present Minister is carrying out that provision, and I congratulate him, and I hope to

be able to peruse the report when he gets it. I think there is justification for extending the area of the Metropolitan Abattoirs, especially in view of the rapid growth of Elizabeth. I understand the Mitcham Council wants the area extended to include the whole of its municipal area. Perhaps that is too small a point to argue, but it is time Parliament examined the question of slaughtering in general to see whether we can offer private enterprise an opportunity to establish abattoirs to supply the metropolitan market. After all, we should not dissociate the home market from the export market. Many country abattoirs provide a good service to people in their areas, but they should be given an opportunity to supply the metropolitan market. An abattoirs established to kill for export has a flush season, and it must have proper facilities capable of handling large numbers of stock. Such an abattoirs would be in difficulties if it did not have a quota for the metropolitan area because it would have to close down for much of the year. Its plant would be lying idle and it would lose its employees.

The SPEAKER—Order! I point out that on the third reading of a Bill any debate must be strictly limited to the measure before the House. The terms of the Bill are contained in clause 4, which deals with an expansion of the area of the Metropolitan Abattoirs. The honourable member must confine his remarks strictly to the terms of the Bill.

Mr. BROOKMAN—I have no opposition to the Bill, but I have made some observations on its general application. I support the third reading.

Bill read a third time and passed.

TRAVELLING STOCK WAYBILLS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

LIMITATION OF ACTIONS AND WRONGS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

LAW OF PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 10. Page 1000).

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham)—It is with much hesitation and diffidence that I rise to speak on this Bill. My feeling on this subject has not changed since I spoke on a similar measure last year. It seems to me that both the Landlord and Tenant Act and the Prices Act are precisely the same in principle; both are legislative enactments which grew out of the war-time emergency. That emergency ceased about 11 years ago, yet we still have these restrictive Acts. Both should have been abandoned long ago. The Party to which I belong claims—I believe justly—that it is not a class Party and that it legislates in the interests of all sections of the community. That is a proud boast and I believe it is true, bur I cannot help feeling that this is class legislation of the worst type because it undeniably penalizes one section of the community—it is said for the benefit of other sections.

Last year I advanced five arguments for the abandonment of landlord and tenant control; firstly, that it was war-time legislation; secondly, that it interfered with what I believe —I know members opposite do not agree—to be the undoubted right of a property owner to choose his own tenant and to name his own rent; thirdly, that because of this legislation the Housing Trust has now become the largest landlord in the State. I do not want to be taken as criticizing the work of the trust or its officers, because I have nothing but admiration for them. However, I think it is a bad thing that the largest landlord in any community is a Government instrumentality because that is one of the surest roads to socialism and I am totally opposed to that. My fourth argument was that I believe this legislation has definitely discouraged private investment in house property for rental purposes. In other words, I believe it has, in fact aggravated the housing situation that it is designed to help. My fifth argument was that because of the control on rents which may be charged, even with the allowances made under our present arrangements for maintenance costs, etc., our older type houses are not being kept in good repair. They are deteriorating because there is no encouragement to owners to keep them in good repair.

I will welcome any refutation of those arguments because it affords me no pleasure to oppose legislation which I know all members opposite and most members on this side favour. Last year I suggested it was time another inquiry was held into the question of landlord and tenant. Members will recall that in 1951 Mr. Gillespie, S.M., inquired into the position and made an excellent report, but conditions have changed since that time, and we have no up-to-date, expert information on the

matter. My suggestion of a second inquiry was entirely ignored by the Government. I was not told that my suggestion was poor, or that it was good, or that anything should be done. I point out that such investigations have been frequently made in other countries. In Great Britain between 1919 and 1950 there were seven inquiries into the question of rent control. They were held in 1919, 1920, 1923, 1931, 1937, 1945 and 1950; yet although conditions have radically changed in South Australia in the last five years, no inquiry is proposed.

Last year I said I was prepared to support the second reading with great reservations. I felt that I did not have sufficient information then. I still feel that I have not sufficient information, but I am not prepared to support the second reading now. One of the objects of this legislation is to control the level of rents and it is rather ironic that on the day the Minister made his second reading speech and said that no rent increases would be made this year, the Housing Trust sent out letters to its tenants announcing that their rents were to be increased. If that does not mean that there is one rule for a Government instrumentality and another for private home owners, I do not know what does. From the Government's point of view that announcement, to say the least, was most ill-timed. I do not criticise the Housing Trust for increasing its rents, because no doubt that action was perfectly justified, but if it is justifiable for the Housing Trust it is abundantly justifiable for private owners to be permitted an increase over the rent they are now allowed to charge. This Bill has two purposes—firstly to continue the *status quo* for another 12 months, and secondly to guard against what may be described as the "agency racket." The Premier referred to this evil. I have never heard of this racket, but obviously it is a bad thing. However, I am not happy about the Government's attitude that it is its duty to protect people from themselves. I am not prepared to argue about that, but if people are stupid enough to pay exorbitant sums of money for nothing at all they should protect themselves. People should be encouraged to stand on their own feet as much as possible and not to look for Government support at every turn.

I hope no member will think I am not sincere in my efforts to improve our housing position. I am aware that we have a housing problem and that many people are living in dreadful conditions, and I hope that in due course we will be able to alleviate them. However, I do not believe that this is the way to do it. I have said that we can improve the housing position by abandoning the present controls and encouraging private investment in home building. We can see a good deal of support for that when we remember what happened in connection with office building when the control of business premises was abandoned. The immediate result was an almost unparalleled upsurge in new buildings. We have about half a dozen new buildings now in course of erection. If business premises were still controlled there would not be the incentive to go in for these new buildings, but because business premises are no longer controlled the shortage of office accommodation that was apparent when the control was abandoned is rapidly being overcome. The abandonment of the control has led to an easing of the position and the same thing would happen if we abandoned the control of dwellings as well.

Mr. Lawn—You don't know the Act.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Maybe I don't, but I said earlier that I spoke with some diffidence in this debate, and that I would like members opposite to put me on the right track. I look forward with interest to Mr. Lawn's remarks.

Mr. John Clarke—With an open mind?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Yes. I have always admired the histrionics and debating ability of Mr. Dunstan. I have heard him speak in many public debates and at public meetings during the last 10 years—ever since we were in the same debating society at school, and I have always admired his ability in this direction. I enjoyed his speech on this Bill although I profoundly disagreed with his point of view and the argument he put forward. The only thing about the speech I did not like was his imputation of base motives on the part of members on this side. Mr. Dunstan has been here long enough to know that that is not true. All members, irrespective of Party or whether they are Independents, are here to do the best for the State. We all have widely different views as to the way we should perform our duty, but it is undeniably the aim of all members to do the best for the State. I may go about it in one way and Mr. Dunstan in another, and I believe I am right and he is wrong, but I also believe he is sincere, and I hope I am always sincere. I believe all members in this Chamber are sincere in their efforts for the State. It ill becomes a member to make such imputations. Mr. Dunstan tackled the problem with his heart and not his head. He talked a lot of emotional fiddle-faddle, as he put it, on this

matter. Instead of working out the best solution of the housing problem he was obsessed with the principles of socialism to such an extent that he went to the most obvious solution, restriction and control. I do not believe that is the best way to overcome our housing shortage. We should ease controls and then abandon them altogether, so as to encourage private investment in house building.

Mr. Lawn—To extract its pound of flesh?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Not at all. There were three points in Mr. Dunstan's speech that I feel I must answer.

Mr. John Clarke—What about the other 86?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I could not find them in his speech, although they may have been there. Mr. Dunstan spent much time whipping up our emotions by talking about people suffering from tuberculosis and people living in tumble-down dwellings in King Street, Norwood. He said:—

The people went to semi-detached premises in King Street, Norwood, which is not one of the more select residential areas in my district. They went to some tumble-down houses out of which the landlord had been able to get the tenants, not by an order of the court, but by other processes sometimes followed by landlords. The landlord had a coat of water paint put on the walls inside and had something done to the sanitary arrangements outside.

Then he mentioned that the premises were let at £6 6s. a week. If we did not have this legislation landlords would not be able to do such a thing. There would be no need for them to do it. There would be a greater supply of private dwellings.

Mr. Dunstan—Why haven't we got them? There is no control of rents of new dwellings for letting purposes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—There may not be, but so long as we have this legislation it will be a serious discouragement and threat to people who want to build new houses.

Mr. Lawn—What about business premises?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—They have ben de-controlled

Mr. Lawn—And so have new houses.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Yes, but not old houses. People who think of building houses for rental purposes will be influenced by what happened to the people who built houses before the war and now find themselves pegged to a mere pittance in the matter of rent. Mr. Dunstan asserted that the rate of house building in this State *per capita* of the increased population was the lowest of any State in the Commonwealth. He has said that before but has never given any figures to support the statement.

Mr. Dunstan—I will supply them to you, and I have given them before.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I regret the honourable member did not give them in this debate.

Mr. Dunstan—You are not interested now.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I am interested and I shall be glad if the honourable member will supply them. It is irrelevant unless we consider the ratio of houses per person at the close of the war. It may be that the figures in South Australia were better than the Australian average, and that has to be noted when considering the building *per capita* of the increased population. That is a matter that the honourable member never goes into. He mentioned 1945. I made some inquiries but I could not find any figures for that year. I found figures for 1947 and 1954, both census years. I have had some figures prepared for me by the staff of our Parliamentary library. I did it that way so that no one could say I had cooked the figures or had relied on my arithmetic, which is notoriously bad. The *Commonwealth Pocket Year Book* shows that in 1947, as near to the end of the war as we could get, the ratio in South Australia of people to houses was the best in the Commonwealth, 3.89. Victoria was next with 3.97. The figure for New South Wales was 4.07, Queensland 4.14, Western Australia 4.12, Tasmania 4.18, Northern Territory 4.19 and the Australian Capital Territory, 4.75. We must start off with this figure if we are to follow the assertion made by Mr. Dunstan on several occasions. By 1954 there had been no drop back in South Australia. In that year we had the best proportion in the Commonwealth. The relevant figures in 1954 were: South Australia 3.76; Victoria 3.77; New South Wales 3.80; Queensland 3.96; Tasmania 3.96; Western Australia 4.01; Northern Territory 5.09; Australian Capital Territory 4.31. In other words, in spite of Mr. Dunstan's assertion, immediately after the war the ratio of houses to people in South Australia was the best in the Commonwealth and it remained so at the time of the next census. Statistics may be misleading but these figures cannot be denied. Mr. Dunstan wildly asserted that throughout the metropolitan area many homes containing 13 and 14 rooms were occupied by only one or two people. True, there may be one or two such homes, but nobody can possibly prove that there are more than a handful in the metropolitan area. Indeed, Mr. Dunstan's statement is entirely unsupported by even a shred of statistical evidence.

Mr. Dunstan—Your statistics say nothing about the distribution of houses among the population.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—No figures are available to support the statements of either Mr. Dunstan or me on that subject, but I claim that his assertion was entirely without foundation: it was merely emotional fiddle-faddle. Mr. Dunstan made great play on the legislation passed last year. I supported that amendment and am glad I did so, but despite Mr. Dunstan's statement I believe the Government has not gone far enough. Section 55c states:—

(1) Notwithstanding section 42, but subject to this section, the lessor of any dwellinghouse may, at any time after the passing of the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act Amendment Act, 1955, give notice to quit to the lessee thereof, on the ground that the dwellinghouse is reasonably needed for the occupation as a dwellinghouse by the lessor, or by a son or daughter, or the father or mother of the lessor.

(2) Notice to quit shall not be given under this section except subject to the following provisions:—

I. With the notice to quit, there shall be served on the lessee by the lessor, a statutory declaration by the lessor declaring that the dwellinghouse is reasonably needed for occupation by the lessor, or by a son or daughter or the father or mother of the lessor, as the case may be, and setting out the full name and particulars of the accommodation then occupied by that person:

II. The notice to quit given to the lessee shall be for a period of not less than six months.

Mr. Dunstan had much to say about the statutory declaration, but he ignored the provision requiring that six months' notice to quit be given at the same time. In other words, a lessee has six months' notice of what will happen to him before any action can be taken for his eviction and within which to look for alternative accommodation. Of course, in practice he has more than six months because not until that six months has expired can action be taken for eviction, and from the date of the issue of the summons for eviction another month usually expires before the case comes on for hearing; thus it is seven months from the time the notice to quit is first given. Further, on Mr. Dunstan's own admission, the courts have been granting up to two months from the date of the order for the eviction of the tenant, which means that a tenant has up to nine months to find alternative accommodation from the time he is first given notice to quit. I cannot believe that anyone who genuinely tries to find alternative accommodation in this State cannot find somewhere to go within nine months. Of course, most people who are unwilling to get out do nothing until the case comes into court. Although that may not be true in all cases I believe it is true in most, yet under the legislation passed last year the tenant has up to nine months.

Mr. Lawn—Not all tenants.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Yes, under this provision a tenant must have at least nine months, because in addition to the six months' notice to quit, he has the period of the action (about a month) as well as the two months' extension granted by the court in many cases. Mr. Dunstan, however, glossed over that aspect. Any normal reasonable person should be able to find alternative accommodation within nine months. There may be the odd exception, but we will always have weaker brethren unable to look after themselves. Mr. Dunstan made great play on the statutory declaration and its effectiveness, but I believe that the making of the statutory declaration is an effective deterrent to anyone who may desire to obtain possession of premises to which he is not entitled under the Act, for section 27 of the Oaths Act states:—

Any person who wilfully and corruptly makes any declaration by virtue of this Part, knowing that declaration to be untrue in any material particular, shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, and shall be liable, upon conviction thereof, to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding four years, with hard labour.

If the thought of imprisonment for a term of up to four years is not a deterrent to a person about to make a false declaration, I do not know what would be. I can find nothing in the Bill to induce me to vote for it: indeed, I believe the time has long since passed when we should have abandoned this control and so eased the housing situation. That is the way to overcome our housing shortage. In Great Britain, where the housing shortage has been aggravated by war damage, it is proposed to gradually abandon controls over premises, and if that is the considered opinion in that country, as it has been the experience in so many other communities that have already abandoned controls, it could be our experience in South Australia. I believe that is the correct solution to our housing shortage and therefore I do not support the second reading.

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore)—I support the Bill and express my grave disappointment at some of the sentiments expressed by the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse). His speech was characterized by inexperience and lack of

knowledge of the true housing position in this State. Of course, I realize that he was able to speak in such a strain because there is no housing shortage in Mitcham, but if he represented an industrial district he would know the desperate position of many people requiring homes. I ask other members to dismiss his statements because they were based on wrong premises. One of his contentions was that rent control was wrong merely because it did not give the landlord a just return on his outlay. No doubt the honourable member had in mind that over the last few years Parliament had decreed that landlords might increase rents by 33⅓ per cent on 1939 rentals, but he overlooked the fact that the real increase has been more like 50 per cent.

Mr. Coumbe—How do you make that out?

Mr. TAPPING—I know of numerous cases in my district where in 1939 the rent was £1 a week, but where the Housing Trust has decreed that the increase shall be based on 27s. a week because that was the amount that should have been charged rather than £1. Any member doubting my statement may contact the Housing Trust and he will find that it is true. This afternoon's *News* contains a reported statement by Mr. H. H. Hayes, president of the South Australian Real Estate Institute, who apparently agrees with Mr. Millhouse that only a 33⅓ per cent increase has been granted, but that is not the case.

Mr. Hambour—Does your statement apply in all cases?

Mr. TAPPING—Yes, increases have been based not on the rents actually charged, in 1939, but rather on what the trust says should have been charged.

Mr. Hambour—What if the rent paid in 1939 was too high?

Mr. TAPPING—It never works that way in practice. Because of the pre-war economic position and the number of houses available then, landlords had to accept less than a reasonable rent; therefore the Housing Trust has based the increases on a higher sum than the actual rent paid. This Bill extends the operation of the Act and I support that extension. The Act gives the landlord some advantage over the tenant in many cases, but in this respect we should consider the population and the number of homes built over the last three or four years. The *Statesman's Pocket Year Book* for 1956 shows that the number of completed homes built by the Housing Trust in the metropolitan area and in the country was 3,714 in 1953-54, and 3,480 in 1954-55, but in 1955-56 only 3,161. Those figures show that the trust is building fewer homes, but the population is increasing, so the demand will be greater. In 1955 South Australia's population increased by 24,392: the natural increase was 10,958, and the increase from migration 13,434. That shows how necessary it is to extend the operation of the Act and to repeal sections such as section 55c. Because of the State's unsatisfactory financial position I believe fewer homes will be built this year.

Mr. O'Halloran—And it is becoming more difficult for people to build privately because the banks have limited sums available to advance.

Mr. TAPPING—That is so, and as a result the demand on the trust will be greater. Members representing industrial areas are inundated by people who are being evicted and want trust homes, but the trust usually replies that it would like to help these deserving cases but it has hundreds of applications from others who deserve help. I understand that applicants now have to wait six or seven years before qualifying for a house of solid construction, so the position is desperate, and it has been aggravated by sections such as those relating to holiday flats. If a landlord lets a house as holiday flats he may let them to tenants for no more than eight weeks, and he can charge any rent he desires. To evade the Act many people are reserving their homes for holiday purposes, and at the end of the seventh week the tenant has to find other accommodation. The flat may be vacant for a few weeks, and then it is let to another tenant at an exorbitant rent. Many tenants have to pay high rents for flats let ostensibly for holiday purposes because they have no alternative. This provision should be repealed.

About eight years ago the Zinc Corporation of Broken Hill decided to build a camping area to accommodate 1,000 people at Largs Bay North to enable its employees to enjoy a holiday under decent conditions instead of being exploited by people charging exorbitant rents. We are not encouraging tourists by enabling landlords to charge high rents for holiday flats. Much of the Housing Trust's activity is being centred on Elizabeth. I do not condemn that project, but it will result in fewer homes being built in the metropolitan area for people desperately in need of them.

The war between the oil companies is aggravating the housing shortage, for they are buying land and homes for the purpose of erecting service stations. Two months ago a major oil company bought a house at Largs Bay for

£8,000, but a valuator told me it was worth not more than £3,000. That house will be demolished and a petrol station will be erected. We find service stations being erected on every highway and byway. Some lessees of service stations cannot afford to pay the rents charged, and after three or four months they have to give up the business because they cannot make ends meet. The capital cost of erecting a service station is enormous and the companies try to recoup themselves by charging high rents. The number of motor vehicles is increasing rapidly, but if there were a recession many lessees of service stations would be in a serious financial position.

Mr. Brookman—Don't you admit that these service stations do some good?

Mr. TAPPING—I have said before that I hate to interfere with the freedom of the people, but we should not deprive people of homes by allowing them to be demolished for the purpose of erecting service stations.

Mr. Jenkins—The person who received £8,000 for the house at Largs Bay could build two homes for that sum.

Mr. TAPPING—The owner was glad to get rid of the house for that sum, but he might be satisfied to buy another house for £3,000. The point is that when a house is demolished some family is evicted. There are many cases such as that. Another company bought three shops, with dwellings, about two years ago, and soon they will be demolished. The tenants will be out on the street, and the Housing Trust will not be able to accommodate them. We should try to prevent people from being evicted and also safeguard the interests of lessees of service stations who cannot afford high rents for them. During the war, and for some years after, houses could not be demolished for industrial purposes unless the appropriate Minister granted permission, but that provision was repealed. If it were reintroduced many families would not be evicted. On December 31, 1955, there were 381 service stations in the metropolitan area, but on September 28, 1956, there were 423.

Mr. Lawn—Didn't the oil companies give a certain assurance to the Premier?

Mr. TAPPING—The Premier told us that the oil companies had assured him they would not operate more service stations. He said that some service stations were going out of business, and that others being erected would take their place, but the figures supplied by the Premier himself in reply to a question on notice proved that the number of service stations had increased. Recently the Liberal Government of Victoria considered this matter because service stations were increasing in every State. In the interests of the people all members should support this Bill, otherwise the housing situation will become chaotic.

Mr. HEATH (Wallaroo)—I support the second reading, but believe that some amendments are necessary. Landlords have been singled out and have been deprived of incomes to which they are entitled. The man who invested money in bricks and mortar is not able to receive the return he would have got had he invested his money in gilt-edged securities. Admittedly the rent of a house may be adjusted by an officer of the Housing Trust, but what basis is used for adjusting rent? Does the adjustor assess the rent on the value of the house in 1939 or does he take into account the present value of the property? Some landlords, because of the small returns from rent, have not been able to maintain their houses in the state of repair they desire. Is it right that their rents should be restricted?

The member for Semaphore (Mr. Tapping) said that a landlord could receive 7s. a week over and above the rental charges before the 33⅓ per cent adjustment, but I point out that by the same token he could lose 7s. a week. I believe that any man who has invested in real estate should be entitled to receive at least the lowest rate of interest he could obtain from investing in Government bonds. Last week we passed legislation authorizing the imposition of 6 per cent interest on loans for homes. In 1941 the interest was 5 per cent and it dropped by one-half per cent between 1941 and the present time. If any person has money in real estate and has to pay 6 per cent on loan he should be entitled to 6 per cent for his share in the estate. The same should apply to a deceased estate. Death duties are calculated on the current value of a property and not on the 1939 value, and the Government should permit a house to be valued on today's values for rental purposes.

In 1939, when rent control was first introduced, the basic wage was £3 3s. Today it is £12 1s. and may increase. One of the main factors in calculating the C series index is the rental charged for accommodation. If the basic wage is to be increased, one section of the community should not be penalized; the landlord should be permitted to receive as rent that to which he is entitled. One section should not be responsible for keeping the basic wage down. At present a man can erect shops or office accommodation and the

rent he charges does affect the basic wage and, consequently, costs of production. If landlords were enabled to charge equitable rents, more homes would be built for letting purposes. The Housing Trust has a monopoly on house building at present. People can receive greater returns from building for commercial purposes than from building for domestic purposes.

Some members have referred to the practice of leasing homes. If a man erects a home and leases it, at the expiration of the lease if the tenant refuses to sign a fresh lease the owner can do nothing until he gives six months' notice to quit, waits a further month before the court proceedings, and then has to rely on whether the court orders the tenant to vacate within one or two months. A man has no incentive to build for letting purposes. The Housing Trust is mainly building purchase homes at present. In my electorate where rental homes are required for the working man, 26 homes were built at Wallaroo for renting, but in Kadina 20 were built for sale and none for renting. Because of present financial conditions the Housing Trust is constructing houses for sale in order to recoup money to enable it to erect more houses, but that is not assisting the working man who wants to rent his home.

Most landlords who own homes built prior to 1939 are not receiving more than 2½ per cent on their investments. The member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) referred to a landlord who is receiving a return of 30 per cent, but that probably represents a return on the capital he invested in 1929 and does not apply to the present value of that home. A man is entitled to a return on the current value of his property and not on the 1939 value. Mr. Dunstan referred to the wealthy barons who are depriving working men of homes, but those men have brains and are investing in gilt-edged securities and not in real estate. Twenty years ago it was recognized that real estate was the best means of investment, but the position has changed because of rent control. A man cannot get a fair return on any house he builds today.

Mr. Lawn—Why not?

Mr. HEATH—Because he cannot get the return he would get if he invested in Commonwealth bonds or other similar securities. If he erects a new home and leases it, immediately the lease expires the tenant can go to the Housing Trust and have his rent adjusted.

Mr. Jennings—You don't know what you are talking about.

Mr. HEATH—It is all very well for members opposite to quibble, but I can cite cases. I know of two elderly women who were living in a double house and they let one half. They had an oral agreement with the tenant, but the tenant appealed to the Housing Trust about the 15s. rent he agreed to pay and these ladies were threatened with court action unless they returned the rent they had charged. That happened in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Dunstan—When was the house built?

Mr. HEATH—Before 1939.

Mr. Lawn—Why cannot people build houses for rental purposes today?

Mr. HEATH—If a man builds a new home and leases it for one year, at the expiration of that lease he has no right to evict his tenant unless he gives six months' notice. The tenant can apply for an adjustment of his rent and the trust can reduce it. I know of a man who bought a home in Adelaide in 1939 for £1,000. He spent £300 in renovating it, but when he was transferred to work at Whyalla he leased it to migrants and received £10 10s. a week. At the expiration of that lease another group of migrants moved in and they are paying £8 8s. for it. Members opposite may claim that certain things cannot be done, but they can and are being done. Members opposite are prepared to accept things when it suits their pockets, but not otherwise.

Mr. Lawn—Do you know that there is no control over houses built since 1953?

Mr. HEATH—I know as much about it as the honourable member and probably more. At Wallaroo there are homes for letting, but none for purchase, whereas at Kadina there are homes for purchase but not for letting. Homes are required in the country the same as in the metropolitan area. Unfortunately, we cannot get houses built in the country for rental purposes. They must be built for sale. If private investors could build homes for letting purposes the position would be more satisfactory. We hear much about people not being able to get homes, but boys in my area are making cement bricks and building their own homes. I have three boys working for me. One is 23 years of age and another 29. The third is 44 years with a number of children and he is building his own home. Any man with a little nous who is prepared to work for himself can get almost anywhere in this world. The Wallaroo boys are prepared to work. I could tell the honourable member of another case. It concerns a boy of 23 with a wife and children at Paringa. They were washed out of their home. He saw Judge

Paine and has now gone back prepared to build another home following on the promise of assistance. Mr. Davis knows that in his district there are community efforts in the building of homes. It is also happening in the city. If people are prepared to save and work together homes can be built. There is no incentive now for a lad to work for himself. He knows that there is no future security while controls exist. We have read in the press in the last few days of what is happening in Poland. It has been said that a monopoly operates to the detriment of socialism. Mr. Dunstan said he supported a democracy, but then said that if he were a member of the Government he would commandeer all the available housing accommodation and if necessary amend the Act so that he could go to the court for a decision.

Mr. Dunstan—That is in the Act already and your Government put it there to protect people. Have you read the protected persons section of the Act?

Mr. HEATH—I have not read it but I am sure no Government could commandeer any section of my home. Does Mr. Dunstan deny that he made that statement last Wednesday? It is not in *Hansard*. If he did that Mr. Dunstan would destroy democracy and the Party to which he belongs. Fifty per cent of members opposite would not agree to the commandeering of a man's home.

Mr. Lawn—Would you commandeer labour?

Mr. HEATH—I have always paid for the labour I have hired.

The SPEAKER—I ask honourable members to refrain from interjecting. The honourable member is entitled to be heard without interruption.

Mr. HEATH—I am concerned about the future security for the boys in this State. I want the Wallaroo boys to be looked after in the same way as city boys. Whilst there is control I will tell them that there will be no homes for letting. No private investor would spend his money in this way. If the Government will make certain amendments to the Bill I will support it, but as it is at present I will not vote for it.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield)—I support the Bill, and hope my views on it will be more clear than Mr. Heath's. If we could have understood him as he apparently understood himself we might have been swayed one way or the other by his argument, but all members found themselves in the same predicament as myself—completely unable to understand what he was talking about. I assure Government members that we on this side appreciate the fact that rent control exists. If private landlords must have an amendment of the Act in order to increase their rents, the approval of Parliament should be obtained when the Housing Trust wants to increase its rents. It is unfair to have South Australia's largest landlord as the arbiter of rents for private people whilst it can increase its own rents whenever it wants to. Mr. Dunstan spoke about the effect of rents on the C series index figures. He said that certain selected homes were considered when the matter was reviewed, but he did not mention that homes built by public housing authorities are specifically excluded from the review. South Australia controls the rents received by private landlords, with which I agree, yet the trust can bump up its rents at any time, knowing that it will produce more revenue for itself and lessen the burden on the Government, and not have the increase reflected in any way in the C series index figures. When Mr. Dunstan was speaking about the realities of the housing situation in South Australia there were a number of interjections, and Mr. Hambour said in effect that he believed the rate of house building in South Australia was infinitely better than in any other State because our Premier had said so. Mr. Hambour has not yet realized, as have most members, that the Premier is the greatest statistical stuntster a.m. By "a.m." I mean ante-Millhouse or ante-Mitcham. In his second reading speech the Premier said:—

> During this quarter the commencement rate of new houses and flats fell by 3.9 per cent throughout Australia as compared with the March quarter for 1955. It fell in every State except South Australia, the fall being as high as 25.8 per cent in Tasmania. In South Australia, however, the commencement rate increased by 9.3 per cent.

It was made clear that the statistics were obtained from the current bulletin of the Department of National Development. They do not mean anything when considered by themselves. We must know where we stand in comparison with what was done by the other States prior to that. Then we would know whether we were gaining or losing. I want to refer now to other distorted statistics given by the Premier during the Address in Reply debate in 1955. He then said that the latest figures he could get on the number of houses completed for each 1,000 of population, for the year 1954, was New South Wales 1.67, Victoria 1.61, Queensland 1.53, South Australia 4.33, Western Australia 3.78 and Tasmania 2.15. These figures showed South Australia in the

favourable light that the Premier intended, for he would not have given them if South Australia were not shown as the supreme State in this regard. We then got proper figures from the Government Statist, and they showed an entirely different position. They showed that in 1953-54 the South Australian figure for homes completed per thousand of population was 9.7 Western Australia 12.4, Tasmania, 8.5, Queensland 7.0, Victoria 9.0, and New South Wales 8.1. On those figures South Australia was second and not easily first as pointed out by the Premier. Taken over the period from 1947-48 to 1953-54 South Australia was twice sixth of all the States, three times fourth, once third and once second. That story, which is over the signature of the Government Statist, shows an entirely different picture from that given by the Premier. The next statistical stunt was the adoption by the Premier of the procedure adopted this afternoon by the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse). In the debate on the Address in Reply last year Mr. Playford gave the following figures as the number of persons per dwelling in each of the States: South Australia, 3.70; Victoria, 3.71; Queensland, 3.88; Western Australia, 3.92; Tasmania, 3.92. We were told that in Queensland there were about four people to every dwelling, but I cannot see that it matters very much whether there are 3.75 or four people in a home. The startling fact is that in Queensland, which has a population only one-third greater than that of South Australia, three times as many houses were built in 1948 as in this State; therefore, if there are more people per house in Queensland at present it could easily be because nature has been taking its course and families have been increasing.

Mr. Bywaters—Good housing conditions will help that.

Mr. JENNINGS—Yes, and it should be encouraged.

Mr. Hambour—What was the number of houses built in 1948?

Mr. JENNINGS—I will not gloss over any facts. It is only necessary to do that when you have got no information or information that does not help your case, but when the correct information is available it will always be given by members on this side for the edification of members opposite. The rate of house building in the various States over the years is interesting. During 1948 nearly 15,000 houses were built in New South Wales, and each year since then the number built has increased until in 1955 it was just under 29,000. In Victoria the number rose from just under 12,000 in 1948 to 24,000 in 1952, slipped back during the two following years to 21,000, and then rose to 23,500 during 1955. In Queensland, where the population is only one-third greater than that in South Australia, 9,204 houses were built during 1948, and the number rose to 11,803 during 1952 without falling below the 1948 figure over the intervening years. It then slipped back to 10,500, to 9,000, and finally to 8,000 during 1955. Members opposite may say that Queensland is slipping back, but I point out that in 1948 Queensland built three times as many houses as South Australia, and that ratio continued for the next three years. It may be assumed, therefore, that the reason for the drop in house building in Queensland since 1952 is that the demand has dropped. Indeed, we have that on the authority of the Premier himself, for when he attended a certain function in the company of the member for Mitcham he was reported as saying that a grave housing problem still confronted the South Australian Government, whereas in Queensland the problem had been overcome. It was overcome, I suggest, in the years from 1948 to 1950 when Queensland built three houses for every one built in South Australia.

I do not know whether the statistics given by the Premier in his second reading speech on this Bill were accurate or not, for I have no means of checking them, but I point out that over the last three years in South Australia we have built progressively fewer homes each year. In 1948 we built only 3,009; in 1953, 8,940; in 1954, 7,522 and in 1955, 7,323. Over that period we have been slipping back, and last year Western Australia, which has about 150,000 fewer people than South Australia, built 8,792 homes compared with the South Australian figure of 7,323. These figures, which come from the same publication as that quoted by the Premier in his second reading explanation, prove that the South Australian home building record is not all that the Premier would have the press and the people believe it is.

The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) asked for some figures on the number of houses built per additional thousand of population during the period 1945 to 1955. Possibly he hoped that they would not be forthcoming, but I have those figures, which have been prepared by the lecturer in statistics at the Melbourne University. The numbers of homes built between 1945 and 1955 per additional thousand of population in the various States are as follows:—New South Wales, 326; Victoria,

322; Queensland, 334; Western Australia, 287; Tasmania, 369; South Australia, 282. These figures prove that South Australia has the lowest ratio of homes per thousand of population built between 1945 and 1955, so by any yardstick by which we measure our housing programme we fall far short of what the other States are doing. It has been mentioned in favour of the Government that it is building flats for widows, pensioners and others, but the figures per thousand of population in the period 1945-55 are:—New South Wales, 13; Victoria, 7; Queensland, 3; Western Australia, 8; Tasmania, 3; and South Australia, 1½.

Mr. Hambour—What does that prove? That workmen in other States are building their own homes?

Mr. JENNINGS—As housing is a matter over which the States have sovereign powers, the other State Governments since the war have done a much better job in providing housing than the Government of this State. The member for Light (Mr. Hambour), speaking with his usual authority, said that in New South Wales there is no price or rent control.

Mr. Hambour—I did not say there is no rent control. You are distorting my statements to suit yourself.

Mr. JENNINGS—The member said that in New South Wales there is no rent control, but I point out that there is a fair rents court there which fixes rents effectively and fairly. I only wish there were a similar system here, as has been advocated on numerous occasions by members on this side of the House. The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) made the rather astonishing statement that the housing emergency in this State has passed, so the need for legislation of this nature has also passed. I think that indicates fairly effectively how little he comes into contact with people living in the metropolitan area. The figures given in this debate should be sufficient, without considering the rapid increase in population, to show him that he is wrong.

I have no hesitation in saying that the housing situation in this State has never been worse than it is today; in fact, it is now tragic. The member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) quoted some pitiful cases, and I could quote many others. The other day I interviewed some people trying to obtain a Housing Trust home. This family, consisting of man, wife and four children, are living in one wet, windy and dirty room—eating, sleeping and washing in it—and they have been living there for months. I asked the trust to make an emergency home available, and received the stock reply that no emergency homes were vacant, that there were only 2,200 of them, which were all full, and that 5,000 applicants were waiting. I was also told that when one of these homes became available the trust would take this case into consideration with the other 5,000 still waiting. This family might continue living in these conditions for months and months, and their case is a disgrace in what we call a civilized community. Theirs is only one case; there are many more, and they are becoming more prevalent because, under last year's amendment, which was opposed by members on this side of the House, there is virtually no protection for tenants, and people who have been renting homes for 20 or 30 years can be given six months' notice and be kicked out into the street.

I will admit that the operation of this legislation may have inflicted hardship on some landlords, but what about the tenants who have paid for homes over and over again in rents, yet at the end of 20 years can be given six months' notice to quit? The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) said that the notice could be extended to nine months, so these people would not have anything to worry about, but the wait for a trust home is seven years, and the only way people can obtain other homes is to sign a lease for a rent of £8 or £9. They could live in a caravan and shift around from one part to another or they could pay £8, £9 or even £12 for a flat to be occupied for a maximum period of eight weeks, and then have to move out. I know of cases in which people have moved out for one night to break the period, and they then come back for another eight weeks at the same rent. This goes on in the metropolitan area all the time because of our inadequate housing position.

Mr. Jenkins—What wages would these people be getting to pay that rent?

Mr. JENNINGS—They have to pay it, whether they can afford it or not, or take their families into the streets or parks. What is the alternative?

Mr. Hambour—Build a house.

Mr. JENNINGS—Then why is not the State building houses? The member says that people should be able to build houses for themselves. I do not doubt that some people could do so, but those who could are building houses; however, many people, because of financial circumstances or other reasons, have not the slightest hope in the world of building them. The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) and the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Heath) both put forward the old argument in favour of private enterprise: leave things free and

unfettered and private enterprise will look after the job for us. The member for Mitcham tried to illustrate his point by referring to the number of new office premises that have been erected. Certainly, since the rents of office premises have been decontrolled investors have built a great number of them, but I am sure members would not like to see the rents of houses increased as greatly as the rents of these offices have been. I do not know whether the member for Wallaroo knows, but I am sure the member for Mitcham does, that the rents of new houses are not under control. However, even since the Act was amended in this respect, we have not seen, as the member for Mitcham said we would, many people investing in homes to let. As a matter of fact, the very thing he is deploring—lack of private investment in houses—is the answer to his own argument.

Mr. Dunstan—The rents of new houses have not been controlled since 1953.

Mr. JENNINGS—No, yet in the last three years there has been no increase in the private building of houses to let, but the member for Mitcham forgot to mention that. I support the second reading, and the only fault I have to find with the Bill is that it does not go far enough. In Committee I shall support the amendment to be moved by the member for Norwood, which I have no doubt will be carried in the interests of the homeless people of this State.

Mr. BROOKMAN (Alexandra)—The member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) put some figures before the House, but it was hard to sort them out. However, he missed the point by lumping the number of houses built by Government authorities with those built by private people. He referred to the total number of houses built in the various States, but his figures were of little value in this debate. We should realize that as long as the Act is on the Statute Book investment in housing will be at a low ebb. In spite of what the member for Enfield said, that new houses are not under rent control, it should be obvious that people have had a severe lesson in regard to building houses for rental, and their confidence in this matter has been shattered. The Government has continued landlord and tenant legislation for 14 years, and the Opposition has wanted to make it even more severe, but I am disappointed that this Bill does not provide any material relaxation of controls.

In some years the Government relaxed controls considerably, and it is important that we should aim at progressive relaxation every year, otherwise it will be a long time before this legislation is repealed. Most thinking people realize that laws of this nature have a bad effect on the confidence of people throughout the State, and they should be abolished if possible. I do not know when the Act will be repealed, but it has been continued far too long. Greater relaxations should have been provided in this Bill, and I urge the Government to seriously consider setting a time when the Act will be rendered unnecessary.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—I support the second reading. I was surprised at the shortness of the speech delivered by the member for Alexandra (Mr. Brookman) after he had criticized some of the remarks of the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings). He said that the member for Enfield lumped together figures of the number of houses built by the Government with those built by private enterprise and that they were of little value to the House. Whether houses are built by the Government or by private enterprise does not matter, for people either enjoy the advantages of a home or suffer the disadvantages of no home. He also said that people had no confidence in building houses as an investment, but the greatest authority in South Australia on house building holds an entirely different view.

[*Sitting suspended from* 6 *to* 7.30 *p.m.*]

Mr. HUTCHENS—In South Australia we have the Housing Trust building homes to meet a need, and that spirit should be cultivated and not the profit motive. I am pleased that it is proposed that this legislation should continue for another 12 months. I noticed with pleasure that the Treasurer has said there is still a great need for home building. Some honourable members said that the housing position in this State has never been worse. One would think that to be the case considering the number of cases one has to handle as a member representing an industrial area. Those not associated with such districts are not in a position to appreciate the real difficulties associated with housing. It is all very fine for honourable members to ask why people do not build their own homes. Some people possibly believe this would be easy and Mr. Millhouse, in making this point, said the war is over. If a father is dead, do we forget the family? The conditions created by the war are still with us and are more acute than many people appreciate.

Many men who have a son or daughter of marriageable age had little chance to build a home for themselves. I take honourable members back to 1927 and onwards to the early

30's and then again on to 1939. During portion of that period we had an acute depression, thousands of our men and women were unable to secure employment and many received only a pittance and had nothing to spend on the real necessities of life. They only existed. Then came the war and many young men who were unemployed joined the fighting forces, and not long afterwards took unto themselves a wife. Those who returned after giving the best years of their lives were faced with family responsibilities almost immediately and found they were unable to build or buy a home, because the little they did have had to be retained to enable them to enjoy a reasonable standard of life. They had to educate their families, many spending freely to provide their children with the highest possible standard of education. Under those conditions they found it difficult to build a home of their own. Therefore, it is unfair to criticize them.

Because of the number of applicants to the Housing Trust it is often necessary for a person to wait from five to eight years before he is allocated a permanent home. No one knows better than honourable members representing industrial areas what the position is. Every day they have to act on behalf of someone and plead with the trust to assist. On an average day I have to take up the case of at least four people in my constituency. Often they have waited for a number of years and many are returned soldiers. One has been waiting for seven years to get a trust home. His case is by no stretch of the imagination any worse than that of a number of other applications I have had to handle. I have been into his home, for which he pays a rent of 29s. a week, and it has not one wooden floor. In three rooms the floors are brick. That gives some idea of the age of the house and the conditions under which he has to live. The other three applications which I dealt with today were of people who are suffering as a result of the operation of section 55 (c) of the Act, which was criticized by the member for Norwood.

I say quite frankly and sincerely that I subscribe to the views expressed by the member for Norwood, who put the case fairly and squarely with regard to the operation of that section. Under the Act, a person who believes that he needs a house for his own use can give six months' notice, and the tenant has no option but to vacate the house in accordance with the notice. The member for Mitcham said that a tenant has nine months in which to vacate premises. I submit that only one who has never seen what is happening under the present conditions would say that nine months is sufficient time for a person to make the necessary arrangements.

One particular tenant I dealt with was a person who had been a member of the Air Force. After joining the Air Force and before his departure for overseas he married. He then spent five years in the services and on his return took a house and commenced raising a family. That couple have three very brilliant sons, and they have spent a large amount of money in giving those boys an education. They have been in the one house for 20 years, but recently the house was purchased by new Australians who, with the assistance of their legal adviser, made a statutory declaration that they needed the premises. I would be surprised if they knew what they signed, but they made a statutory declaration and printed their signatures. In their opinion they need the home more than the tenant, but I am convinced that it is not so because this tenant had war service, worked hard and gave everything for the education of his sons. Unfortunately, he met with an accident some 15 months ago and since that time has not been able to work because of a head injury. The poor mother has no support from the husband other than the invalid pension he receives, and she will lose her home because someone has made a statutory declaration accompanied by six months' notice.

I submit that there are many more cases like that. I believe this section was put into the Act prematurely and that it has created a great deal of hardship. The honourable member for Mitcham made much of what the member for Norwood had said with regard to statutory declarations. I can only conclude that the member for Mitcham had not listened to or examined the remarks of the member for Norwood, who said that in fact and in principle a statutory declaration of this type was wrong because it was not made on fact, but on opinion. I believe it is breaking down the intention of a statutory declaration and is quite wrong.

The member for Mitcham stated that it was the undoubted right of an owner to select his tenant and to determine what rent he should charge. At this stage I wish to say that I believe that some owners have suffered some injustice and hardship because of the existence of this legislation, but I submit that they are few. To those people I express my sorrow and regret, but there are injustices in any man-made law. By comparison I suggest to

the member for Mitcham that probably a hundred times more people would be suffering hardship had the Act not been in existence. Is it the undoubted right of a person during a time of extreme shortage and difficulty to exploit the have-nots? In moral justice I do not think a person has that right.

Mr. John Clark—That is what makes Communism.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Yes, it is the incubator for Communism; it is the very attitude which germinates Communism and has done so in some countries. Members on this side of the House believe that the biggest landlord in the State should not be the rent-fixing authority, but that is the position today. We believe a fair rents court should be established where every case could be determined on its merits, with no general rule with regard to rent or the conditions of tenancies. It was said that the very existence of the Housing Trust discourages private enterprise, but I doubt whether that is so, and I doubt whether people who had money to invest have suffered by the operations of the South Australian Housing Trust.

In conclusion, I want to say that in my many dealings with the trust I have found it very reasonable. I have not always received a favourable answer to requests, but my experience of the trust has given me a good deal of satisfaction. It has a policy and sticks to it rigidly. Every case submitted to it is considered sympathetically, and I am confident that it assists those needing houses as soon as it possibly can in the extreme difficulties under which it operates.

I am most concerned, as is the Housing Trust, with the position that many aged people find themselves in today. I understand from a high official in the trust that it has 900 applications for pensioner flats. The applicants pioneered this country and gave their sons and relatives in two wars, but because of the economic position and the grave shortage of homes they are unable to pay the excessive rents demanded of them by some home owners. They are rendered homeless and are forced to beg for shelter with other people. They have been of an independent nature all their lives and are the best type of Australian. They are paying far more than they can afford, for what is in most cases unsatisfactory accommodation. I have had the unfortunate task of pleading with the Housing Trust for accommodation for these people. I have also had the unforgettable pleasure of witnessing the happiness of some when they have been allocated homes. I applaud Miss Crosby of the Housing Trust for the sympathetic and kindly manner in which she deals with these people. I remind the members who oppose this legislation that, through some unfortunate circumstances, it may one day be their parents who are seeking accommodation, and I ask them not to commit our aged people to the open winds of a cold street, but to accord them a sympathetic understanding.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—I support the Bill which continues the operations of the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act for a further 12 months. I regret that the effects of the Act have been whittled down to such an extent that today it contains little apart from rent control provisions. Section 42 lists the grounds upon which an owner can issue notice to quit to his tenant. There are 19 grounds, any one of which is sufficient for an owner to claim possession of a house. To illustrate how easy it is to obtain possession I need only refer to one ground, namely "that the premises are reasonably needed by the lessor for reconstruction or demolition."

The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) opposed the Bill this afternoon. The member for Wallaroo (Mr. Heath) made it quite clear he did not understand the legislation we are discussing and he said that he didn't know whether or not to support the Bill. When one realizes that there are 19 grounds upon which an owner can claim his house—including his desire to knock it down—it is hard to understand the opposition of members opposite. Like other members I could cite many instances of people who come to me with notices to quit. I could recount their stories. Mr. Millhouse suggested that the majority of these people did not try to secure other accommobut almost every person who has approached me has had cards he has received from land agents setting out the dates of his visits. The people have always been told that there is no accommodation available. Almost daily I make representations to the Housing Trust on their behalf. Let me relate the case of a man who approached me today. He showed me a summons he had received under this legislation. He had lived in the house concerned for 30 years and had never owed one penny rent. He said, "I have worked hard all my life. I am 71 years of age and have retired. My wife and I both have less than two years to live. I have never shirked any job. Five of my sons served in the war, but this is what my country offers me during the last few

months of my life. We will be thrown out. We have nowhere to go. We have visited all the land agents and it is just useless. We went to the Housing Trust but because our application for a home was only of recent date —since I received notice to quit—I have been told that I have no hope of getting a home through the trust. It makes one very bitter.''

I mention this case because it fits in with what the member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens) said, that these things make for Communism. If we cannot offer people a decent standard of living we are fermenting the seeds of Communism. This man and his wife occupied the home for 30 years, but the owner claimed it for demolition purposes, but he told the tenant verbally that when the rooms were empty he would be able to let them to foreigners at a much higher rental. Whether or not that happens, the landlord will be successful in his move. People come to me every day about getting houses but it is useless to go to the trust because they have submitted recent applications. The landlords had told them they had no intention to sell, but because of the huge increase in values they had changed their minds and sold the houses and the new owners had taken action for possession and obtained it. There are two instances of reputable officers of the Minister of Works being included amongst these people. One man had been in his house for about 27 years but the trust told both the Minister and myself that nothing could be done for him as he had not submitted a recent application and that he would have to wait his turn along with the thousands of other applicants.

The ex-member for Torrens said last year that people should go out and build their own houses. When I suggested that that included pensioners he denied it. He did not erfer to people between 20 and 40 years of age but all people. Mr. Hambour and Mr. Heath want people to buid their own houses, but surely the State can do better than that. In discussing this Bill Mr. Heath showed that he had absolutely no knowledge of the position. Mr. Millhouse, who said he would not support the Bill, suggested that if we removed the present control there would be an increase in home building. He said that it was the only way to solve the problem. He pointed out that when the control of business premises was removed people began to erect new buildings in Adelaide, with the result that more office accommodation became available, and that whilst the present controls remained there would be a shortage of dwellings. Mr. Heath still thinks that houses built since 1953 are covered by the legislation. Apparently he did not read or listen to the Premier's remarks when explaining the Bill.

I will give some figures from the document quoted by the Premier in his second reading speech, which refute the argument put forward by Mr. Millhouse. Since 1953 there has been no control over new dwellings. The *Quarterly Bulletin Statistics,* No. 32, for December, 1955, shows that in 1955, 7,323 were built in South Australia and 7,522 in 1954. Therefore, in the two years since the removal of control 14,845 houses were built, or an average of 7,422. In the two preceding years, when controls operated, in 1953 the number built was 8,940, and in 1952 it was 7,711, or an average of 8,325.

Mr. Shannon—How many of those would be temporary?

Mr. LAWN—An insignificant number, for most of the temporary homes were built long before 1953. Mr. Millhouse said that if controls were completely lifted more homes would be built, but I point out that since controls were eased in 1953 fewer homes have been built, and we know that fewer will be built this year. The member for Wallaroo (Mr. Heath) had much to say about controls not being lifted.

Mr. Heath—I said that some controls have been lifted, but that controls were still imposed after the expiration of a lease.

Mr. LAWN—Possibly, but the honourable member also said controls had not been lifted on any homes. Section 6 (2), however, states:—

> The provisions of this Act shall not apply—
> (a) with respect to any lease entered into after the passing of the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act Amendment Act, 1953, or any dwellinghouse the erection of which is completed after the said passing and which or any part of which has not been used for the purpose of residence at any time prior to the said passing.

The honourable member will therefore see that no dwellinghouse built since 1953 is subject to the provisions of this legislation. If the honourable member does not understand that section, I refer him to the Premier's second reading explanation, wherein he states:—

> As will be apparent from an examination of the Bill, the Government also does not propose any alteration to the degree or extent of the control provided by the Act.

That statement contains no suggestion that the present controls will be discontinued, so section 6 will remain in its present form and have the effect I have mentioned. Further, any

house not let as a residence between 1939 and 1953 will not be subject to rent control. The Premier continued:—

During the past few years, there have been very substantial relaxations of the controls created by the Act.

There have been 19. The Premier continued:—

Business premises have been completely freed from control. Similarly, there is now no control as to rents or evictions over dwelling-houses completed since December 3, 1953, over premises which were not let between the beginning of the war and December 3, 1953, or over dwelling-houses let under a lease in writing for two or more years.

If Mr. Heath cannot understand section 6, does he believe the Premier's statement? The Premier continued:—

Where the premises consist of a shop and dwelling this exemption from control relates to a lease for one year or more. Again, where the parties to a lease agree in writing to a tenancy for a fixed term, there is no control over the rent payable under the lease. As regards rents to be fixed under the Act, the law has been progressively altered to give increases in rent and the present position is that the rent of a dwelling is fixed on the basis of the standard rent prevailing at September 1, 1939, plus 33⅓ per cent, whilst full allowance must be made for increases in rates, taxes, costs of maintenance and other outgoings. As regards control of evictions, the Act has been progressively altered in favour of landlords. At present, if a landlord needs his house for himself, his son, daughter, mother or father he can become entitled to possession by giving six months' notice to the tenant. In a number of other cases, possession can be obtained with six months' notice without the court having power to examine the relative hardships of the parties. In cases of breach of tenancy by the tenant, the Act gives no protection to the tenant.

I draw attention to clause 3 of the Bill, which deals with illegal commissions and to which the Premier addressed himself. I have, however, heard no other member discuss this provision.

Mr. Millhouse—Did you listen to my speech?

Mr. LAWN—I left the Chamber while the honourable member was speaking and returned later. If he referred to clause 3 I withdraw my statement, but very little has been said in this debate concerning illegal commissions. On this clause the Premier said:—

Clause 3 deals with a matter which, in the opinion of the Government, requires legislative enactment. A number of agencies are now operating in Adelaide which, for a fee, will supply to an inquirer the address or addresses of premises which are available for letting. The fee may be as much as £10 to £12. After payment of the fee, the addresses are supplied. The rents of the premises at the addresses supplied are usually high and the accommodation is often poor. It is obvious that this practice can lead to extortion from persons unfortunate enough to be in need of housing. Similar practices in the United Kingdom led to the enactment of the Accommodation Agencies Act, 1953, and clause 3 is substantially similar to the relevant provisions of that Act.

As I have said on previous occasions, it is bad enough to be out of work; I know of only one thing worse for a family man, and that is to be homeless. It is worse because, even if a man has a job, he cannot give of his best if he knows his family is sleeping on the banks of the Torrens or living under the conditions mentioned by other members. Can any member imagine people indulging in the practices to which the Premier referred? I fully subscribe to the insertion of these provisions. I had no knowledge of the practices, but if I had I would have drawn the Premier's notice to them.

Mr. Jennings—Do you think it is in some way related to the practice of the Housing Trust of asking for a deposit and keeping it when the people are in their homes?

Mr. LAWN—I do not know, but I do not like this practice. I cannot understand why the trust should keep that deposit money. The actions of the people who made it necessary for the Government to introduce this provision can only be described as absolutely despicable. I support the Bill, and hope that the figures I have given will refute the argument of the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse), that freedom from controls would result in greater home-building. I regret to say that cases are still brought before my notice that prove that it is necessary to retain this Act although, apart from rent control, there is very little left in it. I could give instances of breaches of rent control provisions some of which would astound members, but I do not propose to do that. Instead, I will mention cases that I have sent along to the Housing Trust, and it will astound members to know what some landlords are demanding of tenants, not only in terms of money. I know of a young widow, born in this State, who went to Queensland but, when her husband died, came back to this State with her three young children. She came to me and told me the rent demanded of her, and because of the provisions of this Act I was able to send her to the Housing Trust and the Police Department. It was only because of the protection offered by this legislation that I was able to offer her something. If this Bill were abolished, the little value it contains would not be available to people in dire circumstances. I commend the Bill to the House, and hope that the member for Wallaroo has now made up his

mind to support it, and that the member for Mitcham will withdraw his opposition. I would like to see it amended in Committee to give greater protection to those who need it, because I believe we should provide the greatest good for the greatest number.

Mr. JOHN CLARK (Gawler)—I am delighted to have the opportunity to support such humane legislation, but I am rather disappointed at the need for it, not for the reason given by members opposite, but because I believe there should be permanent legislation to safeguard the people we are endeavouring to help. It has been said on several occasions that it is a good and noble thing for people to build houses for themselves. I agree with that, and I would be happy if more people would build their own homes. I know of many people in my district who have built substantial homes of which they are proud. I know of one member on this side who has built with his own hands a home of which he can be proud. He is probably one of the most eloquent and enthusiastic supporters of this legislation and I mention him because I would not like anyone to think that members on this side do not support the contention that people should build their own homes. I am referring to the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings). However, not everybody has the ability, energy or experience and technical knowledge to do such a thing. We cannot expect aged, infirm or sick people to build homes, although I wish everybody could. Let me carry this argument to its logical conclusion. I wonder what would be the reaction of private enterprise and the capitalistic system if everyone built his own home and building contractors were put out of business.

I compliment the member for Mitcham on at least saying what he thinks. He said he was sincere, and I know he is, even if I thought that much of what he said was illogical. I think that what he said was typical of what other Government supporters would like to say but are afraid to. He began by saying that his Party was a no-class Party and that he was not in favour of class legislation, and he said he was not in favour of penalizing one section of the community for the benefit of the rest. However, I do not think those remarks are logical. We are not penalizing one section in my opinion, but if so we are doing it to prevent penalizing another section in a much less favourable position. If landlord and tenant legislation were repealed we would penalize one section for the benefit of another. We would not then be penalizing the section towards which the honourable member is particularly sympathetic.

It was obvious to me that the honourable member favoured one class and would penalize another class less capable of bearing any burden, even though he did not realize that implication. I do not like to talk of class at all. After all, what is class in any democracy but a negation of democracy? When the honourable member was speaking I was reminded of some remarks he made in a similar debate last year. He was referring to rent controls, and said:—

> Firstly, it has meant that the Housing Trust has become our largest landlord. I am not for one moment decrying the achievements of the trust, for I applaud them sincerely. I submit, however, that it is a very bad thing when a State instrumentality becomes the largest landlord in the State.

In my innocence I interjected, "Why?", and the honourable member in his innocence or exuberance replied:—

> For the very good reason that the logical conclusion of that process is out and out Socialism.

The honourable member applauded the Housing Trust in one sentence and then expressed his fear of this dreadful Socialism. It is almost a phobia with him, because he drags this fear and dread of the dire consequences of Socialism into almost every speech he makes. Surely he does not wish us to assume that he would prefer people to be homeless to continuing the activities of the Housing Trust.

Mr. Jennings—He would have to decide which is the lesser of the two evils.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—If the honourable member had to make such a dreadful decision it would take him only a second to make up his mind. He said if the Housing Trust was justified in increasing rents it would be justifiable for private owners, too, to do so. The important word in that statement is "if." Many members, including myself, do not think the increase in trust rents was justifiable, and there is no justification for private owners doing it either. Therefore, the honourable member did not have a sound argument; in fact, that shows why we have this Bill once again this year to continue controls, such as they are.

We have heard many peculiar statements from some members in this debate. The member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) has used all his energy and powers of persuasion to let members know the provisions of the Act, but apparently some members doubt that there is no control over the rents of new houses. The member for Mitcham made much play on the

fact that office premises were being built and business premises were being extended. That is true, but few houses are being built for letting. Many office premises are being erected because more money can be made from them than from dwellings. The sympathetic supporters of the honourable member would prefer to provide office space rather than dwellings for this reason. I am not suggesting that any do this because they are cruel or grasping, but they are just being business-like. I am certain that if there were more money to be made out of dwellings, they would be built in plenty. If there is no profit in it, then human beings do not enter into it. To most people engaged in private enterprise, flesh and blood do not mean much. In saying that, let me except their own families.

New houses are not being built because there are better income-making sources. I believe that Mr. Dunstan made this point and that Mr. Heaslip interjected "It is the money of private enterprise." Of course it is. According to that comment, profits alone come into it. Therefore, money is invested in hire-purchase, because it gives better and bigger returns. Government members would say that that is right and proper. Let us grant that, even though we do not believe it. If that is the case, someone must build houses, and that someone must be the State—in this case the Housing Trust. Someone must safeguard those who are seeking to rent houses, and we must provide under our capitalistic system that the Government safeguards the position as it attempts to do, even if only in a small way, under this Bill.

Mr. O'Halloran—The State has brought many migrants here and there is a duty on it to house them.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—That is so, and so are our own people entitled to be housed. It is the State's duty to protect those who rent homes, not only now, but for all times. I would not like the member for Wallaroo to be disappointed because I made no mention of his remarks, but it appeared to me that he began by supporting the Bill and then finished by opposing it. If that is so, obviously the honourable member during the course of his eloquent remarks convinced himself. Therefore, I will make no attempt to convince him. Unless one is wilfully blind, surely one must admit that it is obvious that some measure of protection should be given to those who are not able to protect themselves. I do not think the Bill goes far enough. I was rather interested in the early remarks of Mr. Brookman when he said he believed in progressive relaxation of the legislation every year. I would prefer not progressive relaxation every year, but something permanent which would have a permanent influence on the welfare of our people. We all believe that probably the most important thing in the life of our nation is our family life. I am sure every honourable member will join with me when I say that if a man, through no fault of his own, is uncertain of the roof over his head and can find no other quarters than a caravan at exorbitant prices or some other form of makeshift dwelling, it will have a grave effect upon his family life. The security of the home means the security of our nation. The Bill does something, even if not enough, to safeguard that security for those who most likely are unable to safeguard it for themselves. I am pleased to support this legislation.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—Great difficulty must always be associated with legislation of this type. It is an attempt by Parliament to come between the rights of certain persons. When Parliament starts to adjudicate in such matters, the position will always be subject to difficulty and to a variation of opinion. This legislation is not popular on this side of the House and we have never made any attempt to conceal that fact. It is against the philosophy usually expounded by my Party. We believe that this legislation became necessary because of the circumstances of war, and believe that those circumstances have left an aftermath from which we could not get away. That we have never accepted this legislation in its entirety is shown by the fact that it is brought forward each year. We have never attempted to make it permanent, it having operated for only one year at a time. The reason for that is that broadly speaking we do not accept this type of legislation as being desirable in the interests of the State. We believe that when the State comes between the owner and the tenant and brings in a code which is restrictive to one to the benefit of the other, that code must necessarily always be subject to certain strictures.

I gave figures of the number of houses built in South Australia and the number in the whole of Australia. Those figures were prepared by very competent officers and I believe them to be correct. I made them available from no other motive than to show what the position is. If I am wrong, and if my officers are wrong, it only proves that the arguments advanced by members opposite with regard to this legislation are also wrong, because if the number of houses are not being built there

must be a reason for it, and the logical reason is that restrictions have been imposed between the landlord and the tenant.

I am under no delusion with regard to the law on this matter. I know that for a number of years new houses have been freed from restrictions on rents, and if that had not been so no new houses would have been built, except those built by the Government. The Government has maintained and will continue to maintain a programme of building.

Mr. Riches—Have you any knowledge of rents charged where there are no restrictions?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes, and there is no doubt that the rents charged are high. I point out that a person can get 5 per cent for gilt edged securities such as Commonwealth bonds, and when he has the obligation of paying rates and taxes and maintaining a house it would be impossible for him to get 5 per cent net on his investment unless he charged at least 8 per cent overall of his capital.

Mr. Riches—That is where the whole system breaks down.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—In the course of this debate there have been some strictures on the Housing Trust, but they have been made mainly by members opposite who have criticized the trust because there has been an increase in rent. I make two observations on that. This State would not be in a position to continue building houses for rental purposes unless it could secure sufficient to pay interest on the money it has to borrow to do the job. That is what the Housing Trust is doing, and it has no profit motive. My socialistic friends opposite talk about the capitalists and claim that they are at fault, but as far as the trust is concerned there is no profit motive in it; it does not pay any income tax and it is relieved of other obligations in the interests of the tenants of the houses. On three or four occasions when the Government has been able to influence some cheap money to be invested in some State enterprise, that money has always been allotted by the Government to the trust for the purpose of getting houses and keeping rents as low as possible for the people who occupy them. That is not acceptable to my friends opposite because they still criticize the trust if it even charges enough to cover its expenses.

Are we to arrive at the stage when we will have some people living in Government owned houses and getting preferential treatment, and the rest of the people who do not live in Government houses having to pay additional taxes? If that is what my friends opposite want, I say quite frankly that they will not get it from my Government. We will do everything we can to see that houses are made available, but we are not prepared to penalize the man who has set out to provide his own home by charging him additional taxes in order to make a concession to the people who have not provided for themselves. I take the matter further than that. When the Federal Arbitration Court was last hearing the basic wage case, my Government submitted that it did not support the C series index in its present application because it was not an accurate measure of what was taking place, and the very matter we are discussing tonight was cited. The Commonwealth Statistician has always excluded Government housing rents from his index. The employers throughout the Commonwealth bitterly opposed our submission, and the unions supported the employers. That is an astonishing fact. The Government of South Australia wanted Housing Trust rents included in the C series index, and it found that the Commonwealth Statistician supported the case and admitted that the weight of Government housing was so significant that it was a factor that had to be considered.

Mr. Lawn—Why did the unions oppose the application?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not know the reason. I was not at the hearing, but I do know that when the case was submitted by my Government it was not supported by either the employers or employees. South Australia, to some extent, is in the same position as Great Britain. If Great Britain is to maintain her economy and prosperity she must import raw materials and manufacture goods for export. She has to live on the margin between the cost of her imports and the proceeds of her exports. In respect of its industries, South Australia is in exactly the same position. About 80 per cent of our manufactured goods is sold in other States. The raw materials for our manufacture and the fuel for generating our industrial power are imported. With the exception of our small Leigh Creek coalfield we are devoid of natural resources. Our industries have to be sufficiently efficient to compete with articles manufactured in New South Wales and Victoria, and in addition must meet transport costs, which are sometimes heavy. If members study the position they will realize it is obvious that South Australia's economy cannot get out of hand. If it does we shall have unemployment and if there is no work for a worker it does not matter to him what arbitration court awards provide or what

adjustments should take place under the C series index. If a man hasn't a job he is in a hopeless position.

The Government introduced this legislation because it believes it necessary in the same way that it believes prices legislation necessary. It is essential to maintain the equilibrium which is so vital if our industries are to be maintained and the State to progress. The member for Mitcham opposed this legislation and stated his arguments clearly and precisely. However, he suggested it would be a good thing if this legislation were reviewed and said that in other places the legislation had been reviewed; but in point of fact this legislation is being considered annually by the highest authority in this State. Parliament, which comprises representatives of every district and of every political complexion, considers its implications. With all respect to Royal Commissions and other reviewing committees, I suggest that the experience of some 700 to 800 years of British institutions proves that whilst Parliament may not always be a thoroughly effective machine, by and large it is the most effective machine yet devised.

Mr. O'Halloran—A great deal depends on the nature of the Parliament.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes, and a great deal depends on the nature of a Royal Commission. I could appoint a Royal Commission tomorrow, which would condemn this legislation out of hand and before I appointed it I could tell members what its report would be. On the other hand, if members wanted it the other way, I could appoint a Royal Commission that would find this legislation did not go half far enough. A Royal Commission or other commission of inquiry is not necessarily as effective as Parliament, which is appointed by the people. The matters contained in this Bill received the closest attention before being submitted to this House. During this debate members opposite have suggested that the rent levels are too high and some on this side have maintained that they are not high enough. What is the actual position? I have obtained some information on this point and the authority I will quote is the Commonwealth Statistician. These figures were collated by Mr. Seaman, a man of the highest qualifications and reputation. The figures are taken from the *City Rental Index* of the Commonwealth Statistician and contain a comparison between September, 1939 and June, 1956. In September, 1939, the Sydney index was 1,039 and in June, 1956, 1,359. In other words, a house that was rented at 23s. 4d. in 1939 was rented at 30s. 6d. in 1956, an increase of 7s. 2d. In Melbourne the respective figures were 957 and 1,192. The rent of a house increased from 21s. 6d. to 26s. 9d., an increase of 5s. 3d. In Brisbane the figures were 855 and 1,044, the rent increasing from 19s. 3d. to 23s. 5d., a rise of 4s. 2d. In Adelaide the figures were 890 and 1,338, the rent increasing from 20s. to 30s. 1d., a rise of 10s. 1d. The Perth figures were 881 and 1,962, the rent increasing from 19s. 10d. to 44s. 1d., a rise of 24s. 3d. For Hobart the figures were 927 in 1939 and 1,684 in June, 1956, the rent increasing from 20s. 10d. to 37s. 10d., an increase of 17s. For the six capitals the average figure for 1939 was 967 and 1,320 for 1956, the rent increasing from 21s. 9d. to 29s. 8d., an average increase of 7s. 11d. These figures show that the South Australian increase of 10s. is above the average increase. They took into account the position in the States where rents were decontrolled for a time and when control came again it was done at the higher figure. The figures which materially concern Adelaide are those for Melbourne and Sydney, where our industries have to compete. We do not have to compete to the same extent with Perth and Hobart. In connection with Perth there is an advantage in transportation costs and the Hobart market is only a relatively small one, but we have the trade because of certain peculiarities. One of the two eastern capitals showed an increase of 7s. 2d. and the other an increase of 5s. 3d., a total of 12s. 5d., or an average of 6s. 3d.

I am answering the statement by Mr. Millhouse that the matter should be considered by a competent Royal Commission. Far too much politics has been brought into this debate. I am not introducing it because if it is brought in it will ultimately destroy the legislation. In South Australia rents have been examined from time to time, which is only right. If they were pegged too much the building of houses would be restricted. The increase in Brisbane was only 4s. 2d. In South Australia we have not been unmindful of the position of landlords. The legislation is necessary and if we do not continue it there will be a severe rise in rents. In those States where for a period rents were decontrolled there were undesirable and unjustifiable increases, and they were inflationary in their effect. Undoubtedly in this legislation we are restricting some of the rights of landlords; therefore it must be analysed critically in the best interests of the State. Also, if we do

not continue it there will be mass evictions, which will not be desirable.

Bill read a second time.

Mr. DUNSTAN moved—

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the Whole House that it has power to consider a new clause relating to notices to quit pursuant to section 55c of the principal Act.

Motion carried.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD moved—

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the Whole House that it has power to consider a new clause relating to the definition of "protected person."

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

New Clause 2a—"Recovery of possession in certain cases."

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move to insert the following new clause:—

5. Section 55c. of the principal Act is amended—

(*a*) by adding at the end of subsection (1) thereof the words "or on the ground that possession of the dwelling-house is required for the purpose of facilitating the sale of the dwelling-house";

(*b*) by adding at the end of paragraph I of subsection (2) thereof the words "or, as the case may be, declaring that possession of the dwelling-house is required for the purpose of facilitating the sale of the dwelling-house."

Section 55c sets out the conditions under which the owner of a house may give notice to quit in order to secure possession, and the new clause contains a further ground to be included in that section. Numerous cases have come to my notice in which the present law is unjust and harsh. In many cases it benefits not the tenant, but only the purchaser at the expense of the seller of a home. As soon as a person purchases a home which is occupied but which he wants for his own occupation he can, by giving notice to quit, secure possession in six months, whereas a person who has owned a home for years is not in that happy position because he does not want that house for his own occupation and therefore cannot sell it with vacant possession. He must sell it to a restricted field and subject to tenancy under the Act. Under the present provisions a person may buy an occupied house at a comparatively low price, secure possession of it in six months, occupy it for a few months, and then sell it with vacant possession at an enhanced price. This Act is not designed to benefit the purchaser at the expense of the seller of a home, and if an owner has no legitimate reason to secure possession of a house he should have the right to sell it with vacant possession at a fair price. Under those circumstances the present provision does not assist the tenant: it assists only that person who desires to get a bargain at the expense of a landlord who has paid a fairly stiff price over the years to help maintain the country's economy. My amendment is not directed against the tenant.

Mr. O'Halloran—It will have the effect of dispossessing him.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No, because at present no person buys a tenanted house that is subject to the Act unless he wishes to occupy it. He does not buy it as an investment as it gives a lower rate of return than bonds.

Mr. Geoffrey Clarke—He buys it and immediately gives notice to the tenant.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes, as soon as it becomes his he gives the tenant notice to quit and obtains possession in six months. He may then occupy it for a limited period and sell it with vacant possession.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I oppose the amendment. The Premier spoke of the necessity of retaining this legislation. He said that if restrictions upon evictions were lifted, great hardship would result to many people in the community, which is perfectly true, yet if this amendment is carried it will be an end to the Act.

The Premier outlined the course available to people who buy houses. He said they could give notice to the tenant, move in at the end of the six months' notice, and after a few months' occupancy sell the house at a profit, at the expense of the original owner. That, however, does not happen, because it places a very heavy burden on the person buying houses. People do not buy houses for speculation in that way, because it would involve going into the houses, but under this provision we will destroy not only the basis of control over recovery of premises, but rent controls, because the present owner, who has been holding the house to get a return on his investment, could give notice and obtain possession, or if he did not obtain possession immediately he could go to the court which, on the basis of the notice, would award him the house within a short period. He would not have to sell it; he could re-let it. He would then be in a position to demand a lease in writing from anyone going into it. There is no restriction under this legislation to prevent him from doing that. There was a restriction

in section 60 of the original Act which provided that if there was a recovery of premises on grounds specified in section 42, if the person then let or sold the premises in contravention of the grounds upon which he obtained them, he committed an offence, but that section does not apply to section 55 (*c*). There would be no restriction whatever on anybody getting out of the provisions of the Act by giving six months' notice, getting the house, and saying to anyone wanting to go into it "You pay what I specify, and you sign on the dotted line to take the house out of the provisions of the Act." That would mean that in six months every house under this Act would be removed from control. I am aware that that would please the member for Onkaparinga immensely.

Mr. Shannon—It would amaze me if you were right.

Mr. DUNSTAN—The honourable member will have the opportunity of showing me where I am wrong. I would be happy to be reassured about this provision, but I have heard statements from members opposite about this legislation that have shown abysmal ignorance of it. Nobody in this House has had the practical experience of this Act in the courts that I have had. If there is any restriction upon people following the course I have outlined, I would be glad if members would point it out. Of course, there is no restriction; a landlord could simply give notice and get an order under this amendment, and the house would be his to do exactly what he liked with it. Having taken possession, he could then let it and avail himself of the provisions of the Act that would enable him to demand that a tenant enter into a lease or not get the house. This amendment would mean that at the end of six months rent control would go, and we would have the runaway spiral that exists in other parts of Australia. The Premier said that the owner of a house should be able to have the benefit of its market price at the moment. However, the market price is grossly inflated because of the acute scarcity of houses. In my district there is a small, tumbledown house in bad condition in Scott Street. It was sold a short time ago for £1,950, and the present owners are paying off the mortgage at £4 10s. a week, but a few years ago the same house was offered to a man across the road for £70 or for the exchange of an old piano. Today houses with vacant possession bring greatly inflated prices.

Mr. Millhouse—And this amendment will cure that position because they will not be so scarce in the future.

Mr. DUNSTAN—This amendment will build a colossal lot of houses! It will build as many as the last release from controls that took place in 1953. The honourable member then said that it would result in more houses being built, but it has not. This is a most ill-timed and ill-considered amendment. The original provisions of section 55c were bad enough, but this amendment finishes the Act completely. The Premier has another proposed amendment that will be of no use if this provision is carried. A protected person will be out in six months because the proposed amendment to section 55c will put paid to landlord and tenant controls for good.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The honourable member has overlooked one significant fact. Section 55c was considered carefully before it was brought down because the Government did not desire to have the situation that a person could merely say he wanted to occupy a house and, having dispossessed the tenant, then do something else with it. Obviously, that would lead to a complete frustration of the Act. The law is that the owner must support his notice to quit with a statutory declaration, but if he does not carry it out he will suffer certain consequences. That enables the Act to be properly policed.

Mr. O'Halloran—In what Act are those consequences laid down?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Oaths Act. The owner must state for what purpose he requires the house. That legislation has been in operation for some time.

Mr. O'Halloran—How many prosecutions have there been?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—None, so far as I know, because no cases of infringement have been reported, but anyone who knows the consequences of violating a statutory declaration would think twice before doing so. If members will look at the amendment they will see that the statutory declaration provision will also apply to the selling of a house. Do members mean to tell me that the court would not examine the matter before ordering an ejection? So that the member for Norwood may study the law and become acquainted with it I move that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.50 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 24, at 2 p.m.