

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, October 30, 1958.

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

ASSENT TO ACTS.

His Excellency the Governor intimated by message his assent to the following Acts:—Mining Act Amendment, Police Offences Act Amendment, and Road Traffic Act Amendment.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL.

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

QUESTIONS.**POLICE OFFICER FOR TEROWIE.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—A gentleman from Terowie, speaking on behalf of local residents, has drawn my attention to the fact that for more than three months there has been no resident police officer stationed there. As the Premier knows, this is a rather important town with a break-of-gauge station with much through traffic. Some vandalism has occurred there, and residents feel that the stationing of a police officer in that town permanently would have a good effect on the morale of those passing through the town. Will the Premier take up this matter with the Chief Secretary and see that an officer is stationed at Terowie as soon as practicable?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I shall be pleased to take up the matter with the Chief Secretary and see that the honourable member gets a prompt reply.

BULK STORAGE OF BARLEY.

Mr. GOLDNEY—About three years ago some small experimental silos were erected for the bulk storage of barley in certain areas in South Australia. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether any conclusion has been reached regarding these silos for the experimental storage of barley in bulk over a period?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I have received the following report from the chairman of the Australian Barley Board:—

The results of the test by the Australian Barley Board with the long-period storage of barley in galvanized-iron silos, without disturbing the grain, as undertaken at three separate localities in South Australia were quite inconclusive, due to the impossibility of adequately controlling the condensation which

led to water dripping from the inside of the conical roofs into the grain. Because of this the Barley Board decided that these tests would be valueless as a guide as to how long barley would retain its viability if left undisturbed in concrete silos. On the other hand where the barley was transferred monthly from one silo to another, as was done with a pair of silos at Port Adelaide, the germination power of the grain remained as good in 12 months' time as it was when it matured to reach its maximum germination capacity some three months or so after it was harvested.

BETTING SERVICES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Today's *Advertiser* contains an article written by "Tracery" on betting services by teleprinter, and Mr. Alexander, secretary of the Betting Control Board, is reported to have praised this type of service. The article states that Mr. Cleland, the board's chairman, is also in favour of it. It further states that bookmakers at the Gawler races next Saturday will have to make their own arrangements for a betting service on Melbourne races and that this service will not be regarded as official. Can the Premier say whether either Mr. Alexander or Mr. Cleland is in favour of this type of service? Will the service to bookmakers be available only to individual bookmakers or to bookmakers collectively, or will they have to get their information from various sources? As the Betting Control Board controls betting, what can be done in the interests of the racing public about the official prices on Melbourne racing?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—As far as I know, the chairman and secretary of the Betting Control Board are not in favour of the present proposals of the Victorian Racing Club. They have been discussing the proposals with the club, and I hope that some agreement will be reached. As regards the period during which an agreement may be canvassed with the Victorian Racing Club, they asked me whether I had any objection to their making arrangements for a service to be provided in another way to bookmakers, and I said that provided they were satisfied with the service I would not object.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Would it be officially recognized by the board?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I am not certain of the method by which the service will be provided, but it will be only an interim service pending some agreement with the Victorian Racing Club about the service to be provided to South Australia. I believe every member desires the service provided to South Australia to be the best possible and to be

absolutely reliable in all circumstances; otherwise, it is no good. I assure honourable members generally that the only matter concerning the board—and I know it because I have discussed the matter with it—is to see that the service provided is good in the interests of racing generally. We are not particularly concerned about the method of providing the service, so long as it is good.

SUPERPHOSPHATE ORDERS.

Mr. HEASLIP—I have been given to understand that a much less quantity of superphosphate is being ordered by primary producers this year, possibly due to the decreased prices received for their products. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether this is correct and what effect the reduced application for superphosphate will have on the production of wheat?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I understand that the honourable member's statement is correct and that about 25 per cent less superphosphate has been ordered so far this year than last year. I will get a report from the Director of Agriculture on whether it will have a harmful effect on production because it is a technical question. Broadly speaking, there is no substitute for superphosphate, but I will get a report from the Director indicating what he considers to be the overall effect on South Australian production.

FRUIT FLY COMPENSATION.

Mr. RICHES—As it is not generally known locally, will the Minister of Agriculture indicate the procedure to be followed by Port Augusta householders who desire to claim compensation following on the fruit fly eradication campaign in that area?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—Compensation claim forms are being prepared for the last season and, when ready, a number will be sent to Port Augusta. There will be adequate publicity and information will be given in the local press so that residents will know what to do, and where to lodge their claims. This will occur fairly soon and I do not think there is a chance of anyone missing the information in the local press before the closing date for claims.

PAYNEHAM PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. DUNSTAN—Has the Minister of Education any further information regarding the improved toilet accommodation at the Payneham primary school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I have a report which states:—

The work necessary to put the lavatories in proper order has been authorized by the Architect-in-Chief but is of such an extensive nature that it cannot possibly be done while the lavatories are in use. Arrangements have therefore been made to have the major work done during the Christmas holidays. A plumber will be sent out immediately to see what can be done to effect some improvement pending the tackling of the whole job during the Christmas vacation.

WARREN-NURIOTPA TRUNK MAIN.

Mr. HAMBOUR—Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked recently about the completion of the work on the Warren-Nuriotpa trunk main?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Contracts have been entered into for the supply of pipes for the full length of the Warren trunk main from the reservoir to Nuriotpa, a distance of about 19 miles. The Engineer-in-Chief states that it is anticipated that all pipes will be delivered this financial year and that the department will be able to lay the first 12 miles by June 30 next. The whole length of the new main as far as Nuriotpa should be completed and in service by the end of December, 1959.

LONG FLAT RAILWAY BRIDGE.

Mr. BYWATERS—Has the Minister of Works obtained a reply from the Minister of Roads relating to the proposed bridge across the railway line at Long Flat?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The Minister's reply says that the plan for the construction of this bridge is completed and the preparation of a specification for the purpose of calling tenders is in hand. It is expected that the tenders will be called in the near future.

SANITARY DISPENSERS.

Mr. FRED WALSH—I was approached recently by a prominent constituent of mine who is interested in the installation of sanitary dispensers. Probably I will have to explain the matter more privately to the Minister because I cannot make a public statement without having the fear of being misunderstood. I understand these things are installed in such places as airport buildings, railway stations and leading hotels in some other States and render a successful service, particularly to women. I believe there is a desire for them to be installed in South Australia but the question arises whether their use outside ordinary trading hours would conflict with the Early Closing Act. I am not sure of the position. Will the Minister ascertain whether their use would

be contrary to the provisions of the Early Closing Act and, if so, will consideration be given to exempting them from its provisions. The fact that chemists' shops are now closed from midday Saturday to 7 p.m. Sunday makes their use all the more essential, particularly during the summer at the local beaches.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Yes, I will make inquiries.

BROKEN HILL-PORT PIRIE LINE.

Mr. STOTT—In his policy speech last night, the Prime Minister announced that £50,000 would be made available for work on the Broken Hill-Port Pirie railway. This matter has been held up for some time because the Commonwealth has not been prepared to co-operate. Has the Premier received official advice on this matter? If so, when will a start be made?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The purpose of requesting the Prime Minister for £50,000 to be provided this financial year was to enable the Railways Department to make the necessary surveys so that, on the completion of the work being carried out now on the line from Naracoorte to Kingston, the workmen engaged there could be transferred to the work in the northern sections of the State, and possibly this work could be speeded up by the employment of additional labour. Much survey work has to be undertaken before this work can commence, and as the work in the South-East was to finish this financial year it was desirable to have the survey during the year to enable a start to be made on the northern line next financial year. I was advised by the Prime Minister, quite apart from the statement in his policy speech, that the £50,000 is now available and the Railways Commissioner can undertake immediately the surveying of that line, so that we will be ready to go ahead next year when additional funds are provided.

Mr. Frank Walsh—That is not the £50,000 you promised to lend him, is it?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I said at one time that there was a little diffidence about making this sum available, and that if the Commonwealth was in financial difficulties at that time we could advance it so that they could lend it to us. However, the money is available now and the survey can be commenced immediately.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Regarding the survey of this line prior to unification of the gauge, is it intended that there shall be a resurvey of

the existing line with a view to its conversion to 4ft. 8½in. gauge or an entirely new survey and a new line laid, the same as a new line was laid by the Commonwealth Railways from Stirling to Marree?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I cannot give the Leader precise information on this matter. I can give him some general information, however, which I think will probably answer his question, although perhaps not completely. The route will follow substantially the same route as the present line, but there will be one or two important deviations to secure a better grade. I fancy that most of the money will be spent in surveying for the deviations. I do not contemplate that any township on the line will be by-passed. The deviations will be made because the grades are bad in one or two places, and I believe the Commissioner feels that he can get a better grade.

This also brings up another important question—the line from the South Australian border into Broken Hill. I understand that recently a deputation from the combined unions and, I fancy, some business interests in Broken Hill waited on Mr. Cahill (Premier of New South Wales) asking for his support for the standardization proposals submitted by South Australia. Although I have not had any official communication, the report published on this matter was that Mr. Cahill had stated quite definitely that he was in favour of the proposals, and that the New South Wales Government would give all the necessary support for the standardization of the line from the South Australian border into Broken Hill. That opens up another consideration upon which I have not yet received full information. Under the original agreement approved by this Parliament and the Commonwealth, the suggestion was that the Commonwealth would pay, that South Australia would take the line into Broken Hill, that the South Australian terminus would therefore be in Broken Hill, and that the existing small portion of railway between the two systems would be purchased and become South Australian property. That will now have to become a matter for negotiation between the New South Wales and South Australian Governments. Whether the Silverton Tramway Company is prepared to sell its assets or whether those assets are located where we want them would be a matter for some negotiation, but I assure the House that on the completion of Parliamentary business this session I will, as a matter of urgency, visit

Mr. Cahill, taking with me the Railways Commissioner and the Minister of Railways if necessary, so that we can get the necessary co-operation between the two States on this programme.

Mr. RICHES—Can the Premier say whether the South Australian Railways or the Commonwealth Railways will carry out the work on the Port Pirie-Broken Hill line? I understood him to say that the State desired to do this work after the completion of the broadening of the south-eastern line, but there has been a rumour in the north that the Commonwealth Railways will be the constructing authority.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The South Australian Railways will be the constructing authority. Under the agreement the Commonwealth will make available certain funds the same as it has made available considerable funds for the modernization of the south-eastern line. We requested £50,000 from the Commonwealth Government because we wanted to get the survey work done so that we would be in a position to go ahead. With the provision of this money there should be no reason why the work could not proceed as soon as the South-Eastern work has been completed. I have not yet received a full communication from the Prime Minister on this subject: I have only had a telegram.

TRUST HOMES AT TANTANOOLA.

Mr. CORCORAN—A few days before the Premier returned from his visit to the United States I asked the Minister of Works to bring before the Premier's notice the request of the district council of Tantanoola that some of the Housing Trust homes to be erected at Millicent could be erected instead at Tantanoola. Can the Premier state whether the trust intends to build at Tantanoola?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have seen a report on this subject but cannot remember its details. From memory I fancy the Housing Trust considered the request and agreed to meet it to a certain extent. However, I must check before I give a final answer.

BUSH FIRE DANGER.

Mr. LAUCKE—Particularly good seasonal conditions with an exceptional growth of feed will lead to major fire hazards in the country this year. Country folk generally are concerned that the public should continue to be educated to the dangers of grass and bush fires. Can the Minister of Agriculture say

whether all possible steps will be taken this year through press and radio and by other means of publicity to alert the public to the grave danger of bush fires?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—Much is done to publicise the dangers of bush fires. I am fully in accord with the honourable member's suggestions. We get support in our publicity work from a number of organizations. The press is particularly helpful, as are the commercial broadcasting stations and the Australian Broadcasting Commission. Yesterday I received a letter from the Apex Club of South Australia offering assistance. The Woods and Forests Department is erecting indicators on the roads leading from Adelaide, and these cannot fail to catch the eye of motorists travelling into those country areas most seriously menaced by fire. The Motor Vehicles Department assists by stamping on its correspondence a reminder about the danger of fires. I shall be pleased to receive suggestions from any person as to how to improve the position because any worthwhile ideas can be adopted. Generally speaking, I think the best defence of country people is their own vigilance in watching the grass around their houses and properties and by ploughing or tilling the land where possible. The use of a mower is also valuable. It is easier to mow than to till and in many cases a mower can be used to ensure the safety of farm houses and property. If the honourable member has anything further to suggest I shall be pleased to confer with him and take it up with the committee.

RIVERTON-SPALDING LINE.

Mr. QUIRKE—The railway line from Riverton to Spalding has been out of action as a passenger carrying medium for a long time; only slow lumbering goods trains can safely use that line, the rails of which were secondhand when laid in 1918. They were reversed then and they are now worn out on both sides. It has been suggested that when the standardization of the gauge from Broken Hill is completed the 80 lb. rails from the old Broken Hill line could be used on the Riverton-Spalding line, provided they were not worn out on both sides. An 80-lb. rail with one good side would be a good rail. I do not know to whom the rails will belong under the standardization agreement but will the Premier ascertain whether some effort can be made to reserve the best of those rails for use on the 50-odd miles of track between Riverton and Spalding?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will see that the honourable member's suggestions are placed before the Railways Commissioner. Under the agreement with the Commonwealth the State has the right to the salvaged materials. For instance, the surplus equipment from the South-East has been used to strengthen the rolling stock on Eyre Peninsula. We had to make an appropriate payment into the fund for that salvaged equipment, but I have not the slightest doubt that a similar arrangement will apply when the Broken Hill line is altered. I agree that instead of disposing of the 80 lb. rails as scrap it would be infinitely better to strengthen the existing lines. I point out, however, that the agreement goes much further than the standardization of the line between Broken Hill and Port Pirie, because ultimately all South Australian lines will be standardized and the question may arise whether it would be worthwhile to change our lines in view of that. However, I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

PINUS INSIGNIS.

Mr. SHANNON—In Meadows recently I saw some *pinus insignis* posts and rails that had been treated with a process which, I believe, originated in Germany but which is now approved by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization as a simple method of preserving this type of timber for use for various purposes. It renders it almost as long lasting as our hard woods that are used by the Highways Department for signposts and direction posts and for various purposes in our irrigation areas. *Pinus insignis* is light, strong and apparently extremely durable. The Minister probably knows as much as I do about the lasting qualities of this preserved timber. I have been advised that softwood is usually uneconomic for commercial purposes, but under treatment I understand it becomes more resistant to the various types of infestations—white ants and dry rot being two—than hard wood. Will the Minister take up with the Minister of Roads the possibility of using soft woods from our own forests for sign and direction posts on our highways rather than hard woods which cost almost twice as much?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I know the process referred to by the honourable member and the firm that produced the posts at Meadows, and there are other such firms in other parts of the Commonwealth. One great advantage of this method is that it uses timber which is not normally of any value

to the timber industry. Tree tops of 4in. to 6in. in diameter are used, and they are of little value for milling, and the process used preserves the posts. I will ascertain from the Minister of Roads the attitude of the Highways Department towards this matter. The Woods and Forests Department is anxious for all types of timber products to be sold, even those not produced by the department. Railway sleepers made out of *pinus radiata* by a treatment plant in the South-East have been proved to be durable after processing.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT SERVICES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked recently about the Ascot Park and Dover Gardens bus service?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I referred the question to my colleague, the Minister of Railways, who has now furnished me with the following report from the Railways Commissioner:—

With reference to the attached question asked by Mr. Frank Walsh, M.P., vide *Hansard*, October 21, I have to report as follows:—On 6/6/58 I received a letter from the General Manager of the Municipal Tramways Trust advising me that the Ascot Park-Dover Gardens-Paringa Park bus service had applied to the trust for an extension of their service from the junction of Kent Street and Diagonal Road, Paringa Park, southwards along Diagonal and Morphett Roads, west along Sturt Road, and thence along Lawrence Road, Lewis Road, Quintus Avenue, Folkestone Road and Neath Avenue to Seacombe Road, Dover Gardens. I was advised that the alternative of serving the area in question would be to extend a branch of the existing Dover Gardens route at the Sturt Road-Tapley's Hill Road junction, along Sturt Road and south as proposed above.

I was asked for my reaction to the proposal. After full consideration, I informed the trust on September 29 that I opposed the extension because it would traverse the area already served by the Adelaide-Marino railway. The primary object of the extension is to provide a passenger service for residents in the Dover Gardens area, and I can see no substantial reason why the existing Seacombe Gardens service could not be bifurcated at the junction of Sturt and Tapley's Hill roads, or that the Seacombe Gardens area could not be served by means of a return route *via* Seacombe Road, Neath Avenue, Folkestone Road, Quintus Avenue, Lewis Road, Lawrence Road and Sturt Road, rejoining at the junction of Sturt and Tapley's Hill roads.

SOUTH-EASTERN PINE FORESTS.

Mr. HARDING—Can the Minister of Forests say whether any of the State pine forests in the South-East have been treated with fertilizers after the trees have been

planted; if so, how is this carried out; and what type and quantity of fertilizers are used per acre?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—It has been proved that the use of superphosphate is valuable for growing pine trees. The Woods and Forests Department has much information on this subject and I will get a full report for the honourable member on the methods of application and at what stage the fertilizer is applied.

STEEL SUPPLIES.

Mr. BYWATERS—On September 25 I asked the Premier to assist a constituent of mine to get a supply of autoflex steel. I was informed last week-end that this man was having difficulty in carrying on his work because of the shortage of this steel. Has the Premier a reply to my previous question?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—It has not yet come to hand. I had to take up this question with a private company, and a supply for this man will depend upon rolling schedules and the production of the type of steel he requires. I understand there is a shortage of this steel as it has come into keen demand because of its excellent qualities. I will do my utmost to expedite a supply so that the industry referred to can be maintained in full production.

BULK HANDLING OF WHEAT.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—It has been pointed out to me that as we shall probably have a bountiful harvest there will be some difficulty in the Wallaroo division with the bulk handling installations. The local installations may not be sufficient to handle crops from that area, and it has been suggested to me that the advisability or practicability of delivering wheat direct from farmers' vehicles to rail trucks at points where there are no bulk handling installations and railing it direct to the Wallaroo installation should be considered to overcome any difficulties. Will the Minister of Agriculture take up this matter with the Co-operative Bulk Handling Co. Limited and the Railways Commissioner to see whether the suggestion is practicable and to what extent it could be used?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—Yes.

PORT AUGUSTA EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES.

Mr. RICHES—There is concern at Port Augusta regarding the future policy of the

Education Department in teaching technical and craft subjects and training apprentices in that centre. The Combined Unions Council approached the Minister of Education on this matter and discussions have taken place with the Adult Education Centre, the High School Council and also the primary schools. The Minister sent the Superintendent of High Schools, Mr. Richards, to Port Augusta to investigate the position and in the discussions he had with the various committees general agreement was reached on several points. One was that there was insufficient ground at the high school to cope with any further building, and another that a definite policy should be reached regarding the future of technical training at Port Augusta. The general feeling seemed to be that there should be a separate technical school with special provision for apprentice training, and the appointment of a full-time registrar. This would release buildings already established for the teaching of woodwork to primary school children, which is another problem, and it would solve a number of difficulties. The corporation co-operated by offering to make land available. I understand that the recommendations the Superintendent brought back are to be the subject of a top-level conference between the Director and the Superintendents of Technical Schools and High Schools. Can the Minister say whether the conference has been held and, if so, what decision has been reached? If the conference has not been held, will the Minister see that a decision is reached at the earliest possible date?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—There is a division of opinion between the different branches of the Education Department regarding the special matters mentioned by the honourable member. I received both verbal and written reports from the Superintendent and the Deputy Director of Education which were conflicting on several aspects. Therefore, when the Director of Education returned from abroad about last Monday week I asked him to peruse the whole docket, confer with the Deputy Director and the Superintendents, and then arrange a conference between them and myself. Up to the present I have not heard anything from the Director on the matter. I will ask him tomorrow if he is ready to meet me, the Deputy and the Superintendents either tomorrow or early next week. I will let the honourable member have more information on the matter later.

STANDARDIZATION OF NORTHERN RAILWAY LINES.

Mr. HEASLIP—I was pleased with the satisfactory information given by the Premier regarding the standardization of the Broken Hill-Port Pirie railway line. Earlier I was told that soon it was hoped to have all the railway lines in the State standardized. Can the Premier give any information regarding the standardization of the Wilmington-Gladstone-Adelaide line and the Port Pirie-Snowtown line?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—For many years the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner has been urging that the standard gauge line be brought to Adelaide. We had some doubts as to the feasibility of this and I agreed with the Commonwealth that the State would thoroughly investigate what would be involved in bringing to Adelaide a standard gauge line from Port Pirie, which would cover portion of one line mentioned by the honourable member. The survey has been made, but I have not had a full report on it. I had one or two verbal communications and they are pleasing. The latest information was that some technical difficulties contemplated would not be so formidable as at first thought. I would think that line would be the one most suitable for negotiation between the Commonwealth and the State, because the Commonwealth Government desires to bring the Transcontinental line from Kalgoorlie into Adelaide. I will get a report for the honourable member.

CAPE TULIP.

Mr. QUIRKE—That prettily flowered weed, Cape Tulip, which infests the Adelaide Hills and Clare, and which is now spreading around Adelaide in all directions, should be stopped because of its effect on pastures in high rainfall areas. It has been proved conclusively that the weed can be checked. It has been done on two properties, on one by Mr. Richard Hawker at Bungaree and on another by Mr. Oscar Rondahl at Clare. These men spent much money on the matter. At Bungaree 700 acres of land that were infested with Cape Tulip have now been practically cleared by the use of a spray 242D. It is expensive and costs £6 13s. a gallon in 44-gallon drums, and when two pints to 20 gallons are used per acre in a low-volume spray the cost runs out at about £2 2s. 6d. an acre. One spray has proved effective if it is done at the right time followed by spray spotting. This is an urgent matter. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether it would be possible to supply the spray under

the Noxious Weeds Act, not free of cost, but possibly in bulk at a reduced cost to the landholders, so that a definite scheme could be put into operation to check the spread of what is an extremely dangerous and poisonous weed?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—The honourable member spoke to me about this matter a few day ago, and I made preliminary inquiries as to the cost, but so far I have no encouraging news about getting this spray cheaper by bulk buying. However, my inquiries were only preliminary, and I want to give the matter full consideration to see whether something can be done, because I agree with the honourable member's statement about the alarming spread of Cape Tulip and the importance of checking it as soon as possible.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: MR. DAVIS.

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

That a further one month's leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Port Pirie (Mr. C. L. Davis) on account of ill health.

Motion carried.

SAVINGS BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) 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 Savings Bank of South Australia Act, 1929-1953.

Motion carried.

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

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It has been introduced, at the request of the Trustees of the Savings Bank, to make some alterations of the law relating to that bank. The explanation of the clauses is as follows:—Clause 3 enables the trustees to arrange for a superannuation fund for the employees of the bank. It is complementary to a clause in the Superannuation Bill which enables the Superannuation Board to enter into arrangements for granting superannuation pensions to employees of public authorities. The Savings Bank Act at present contains no provisions for pensions but provides that allowances

based on salary will be payable to employees on retirement, or to the representatives of employees who die before retirement. This system is probably not so suitable for employees as a pension scheme of the kind applicable to the Public Service, because it does not provide the same cover for the wife and children of an employee during the early years of his service. It is possible that the trustees may desire to make an arrangement with the Superannuation Board for bringing employees of the bank into the Government Superannuation Fund, and in the event of such an arrangement being made it would be necessary to provide that rights under the superannuation scheme would in future be substituted for rights to retiring allowances. It is not proposed to require any present employees of the bank to enter the superannuation scheme, which, in general, would apply only to employees appointed after a future date determined by the trustees. It is, however, necessary to amend the Savings Bank Act to provide that the rights to retiring allowances will be modified or excluded for officers who come into the Superannuation Fund, and amendments for this purpose are included in clauses 3 and 4 of the Bill.

Clauses 5 and 7 deal with the maximum amount of money which may be deposited in any one account at the bank. This was fixed at £2,000 in 1947. The trustees have asked that the limit should be removed. Such limits are of no particular significance today. They were first imposed in the early days of Savings Banks, probably for the purpose of restricting the growth of such banks. However, the Commonwealth Savings Bank is not now restricted by any limit nor is the Savings Bank of Victoria. If the general limit on deposits is removed as proposed it will be open to the trustees to fix the interest-bearing limit at any amount which they deem appropriate from time to time. There is no sound reason why State law should restrict the trustees' discretion in this matter. The removal of the limit applies both to ordinary deposits and to the amount of deposit stock which may be issued to a depositor.

Clause 7 also alters the notice required for the withdrawal of money represented by deposit stock. This matter is dealt with in section 60a of the Act. This empowers the bank to issue transferable deposit stock to depositors and provides that money represented by deposit stock may be withdrawn on giving notice. The notice varies from one week to six months according to the amount involved. It

is proposed to abolish these different periods of notice and to provide that any amount of deposit stock may be withdrawn on one month's notice. Clause 6 deals with the power of the Trustees of the Savings Bank to pay balances in depositors' accounts to widows or widowers of depositors or other persons entitled in cases where a depositor dies without leaving a will or where there is a will but it is not intended to take out probate. The maximum amount which can be paid without probate or letters of administration at present is £200. This amount was fixed in 1942. In order to allow for the decreased purchasing power of money it is proposed to increase the amount to £600.

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

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 29. Page 1483.)

Mr. KING (Chaffey)—I support this Bill, which is another step forward in the long-established policy of the Government towards assisting the development of industries in the country. The restricted application of the Bill indicates that it is specifically for the assistance of country industries. The Government's policy on decentralization is something that has been quietly carried into effect over many years, as indicated by the establishment of the Secondary Industries Committee as long ago as 1941.

In dealing with this measure yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition referred to a precedent that he implied had been created in England by the establishment of factories by North-East Estates Limited in Newcastle-on-Tyne. He was referring to a position that had arisen in the coal-mining and ship-building industries where unemployment was rife and there was actually a depression. The steps taken were to provide employment for people living in those areas and to keep the other ancillary wheels of industry turning. That is not quite the same thing as we are doing by passing this Bill. In that case a depression was met by a rather revolutionary method, but we are providing an additional fillip to what is already a flourishing state of affairs. Consequently, what we are doing is entirely the opposite—it is not to cure a position that is causing anxiety but is to give an additional boost to something that has already had a good effect in this State.

The Leader referred to the Murray Valley Development League and the motion it passed at Murray Bridge which purported to support the idea of establishing a planning authority on secondary industries. In a booklet issued by the league and circulated just prior to that conference the various points that would assist the country in decentralization were fully set out. The publication stressed the value of local effort, and said that the movement must come from people within the area or township that desired an industry to be established.

The Leader referred to country secondary industries committees and said they had no finance, no secretarial facilities, and no one to whom they could turn for reference or advice on the establishment of an industry. I suppose he is not at all familiar with the set-up of secondary industries development committees in country areas, particularly in the area I have the honour to represent. For his information these committees were not set up merely to hold a few meetings and then dissolve. They have assumed the responsibility for making a complete analysis of their districts. They have conducted a census of their districts; tabbed population movements; listed raw materials available, council rates, other rates and taxes and calculated distances from the principal markets. They have ascertained the cost of electric power and have also tabulated existing industries, churches, social amenities and all other information that might attract industries to their districts. This is all done without cost to the State.

There are many sources from which authoritative information can be gained. The principal questions that concern industry are transport, water supplies, power, raw materials and cheap land. Cheap land is an attraction in many country centres. In addition there must be a suitable supply of labour with the necessary skill and some relationship to markets to enable the expeditious disposal of produce. Industries cannot be shifted to country districts merely to suit the whims of people, because unless they can compete with other industries they will not survive. If an industry starts in the country and succeeds even though costs are high, it will only continue to prosper until another competitor establishes himself in a more favourable situation. People do not always recognize that price is not the main factor. Easy access to markets and to raw materials is essential.

During this debate reference was made to a planning authority. We should consider

what "planning authority" means. In the first place it implies that somebody has sufficient information to be able to "plan" something and, secondly, if there is an "authority" it must be vested with particular powers and control.

Mr. Bywaters—Do you think the Murray Valley Development League was wrong?

Mr. KING—In this case it spoke with two voices. I believe that all members in this House have a common objective. We want to see as much of the development of this State as possible take place in country areas, but we differ somewhat on the method we believe should be used. I believe we have sufficient facilities available now and that the superimposition of a planning authority would slow down development. It would take a long time for plans to be formulated and longer for them to be implemented. I think it is well-known that big planning authorities can become unnecessarily cumbersome and bureaucratic and they tend to bog down after a while. Planning authorities and bureaucratic control are never a substitute for initiative. I think that is the fatal flaw in the thinking of members opposite. Apparently they are not confident in their ability to solve their own district problems and they think that Mr. X—a nebulous person possessed of magical powers—could do it.

What industries should we expect to be able to attract to the country—overseas or local industries? They might be either or both. Do industries come seeking to establish themselves in this country or do we look for them? History reveals that both situations apply, but as a general rule industries are attracted by markets and sources of raw materials. Industries can get all the information they want from our various Government departments. They can go to a district committee initially to ascertain the basic information, but if they are particularly interested in any aspect they go to the relevant Government department. The Department of Mines is a mine of information on our mineral resources; the Lands Department has specialists who know the types of land, its productive capacities and the various types of tenures available; the Engineering and Water Supply Department has all the necessary information on water supplies; and the Railways Department has information concerning transport. Just imagine trying to get all that information crammed into the ponderous files of a planning authority.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—The Government departments give specific answers to specific questions.

Mr. KING—Exactly, and they would not be dealing with generalities. The Industries Development Committee has been of great assistance in helping industries wherever they have been established. A planning authority might experience some difficulty in deciding where to recommend the establishment of an industry and there is always the danger that political pressure might be brought to bear. District committees are doing their best to sell their districts. In respect of the co-operative cannery being built in my district at present a specialized committee was set up composed of experts who knew the canning industry of South Australia. That committee could be reconstituted if a similar industry desired to establish. If it were another type of industry then experts on that subject could be formed into a committee. These committees would be far more flexible and efficient than any permanent body.

The Housing Trust has already erected houses to assist industries in 20 country towns and the whole history of the State's development was ably demonstrated by the Minister of Works recently. In Victoria there has been a Development of Victoria Committee for some years and that committee has stressed repeatedly that the initiative must come from the people who sell the virtues of their district in attracting industries. Some industries have established in country towns but have failed because they could not meet competition. There is a saying in respect of fruitgrowing to the effect that one cannot make a graft take if it is not on the proper stock. It may grow for a while but ultimately it dies. The same could apply to industries. They must be established where the means exist to enable them to function successfully.

Some years ago South Australia had an industries committee but the trouble was that nobody would recommend an industry that would compete with his own industry or with an industry belonging to one of his friends. It is far better to have this subject dealt with by smaller units with the means of procuring authoritative information from Government departments. In my district we have realized that it pays to process fruit in the area. We have certain natural facilities. We can grow fruit cheaply because we can get a good production from our acreage. That has encouraged the establishment of a cannery and

it will encourage more canneries because it is believed that fruit processed locally will turn out better than fruit carted 150 miles to a cannery. Although we have to transport our sugar and tinplate into the area and pay freight on the finished product back to Adelaide, that is counterbalanced by the saving on the freighting of the raw fruit to the city with the unavoidable waste. Locally processed fruit does not deteriorate. Because of the establishment of a cannery two can making plants have now established within the area. That results in additional families coming to the district, which means that the Housing Trust and private builders have to build more houses to meet the situation. More land is being thrown open and the town is growing rapidly as the need grows to cater for all the ancillary services which go into building up an industry. The local printer has to increase his plant, and the local hotel is doubling its accommodation to cater for the increased travelling public attracted by the expansion going on from one end of the river to the other.

The policy of this Government has helped tremendously to develop the river districts. In the last 10 years the population of the river areas has increased by 20 per cent and power consumption by 400 per cent, and that is a result of the initiative of local people who have solved their own problems. When we established our cannery we formed a special committee in co-operation with the fruit-growers' organization. It carried out much research and did much organizing before asking for a co-operative cannery. If that work had been left to a body with only a nodding acquaintance with the industry we would still be waiting for our cannery. The machinery set up by the Government and the initiative of the local people resulted in the establishment of that cannery, and that has been followed by the establishment of other industries up and down the river. It seems that what benefits one district serves to stimulate benefits for another, and I should say that during the last year capital improvements worth more than £2,000,000 have been effected in the three large towns in my electorate. The time is coming when we shall have to import people to service our industries.

There is much room for further development along the Murray. We now have adequate supplies of water as a result of the River Murray Waters Act Agreement legislation and an adequate source of power on both sides of the river. Power consumption in my district

is so great that we have been able to keep power costs down although they have increased in other parts of the State. Our primary industries have justified the establishment of large secondary industries for processing production in the river areas, and that is the normal and natural way for industries to develop. We feel there is no reason why the river districts should not continue to prosper. I should like some clarification of proposed section 25 (1), which states:—

The South Australian Housing Trust, with the consent of the Governor and upon the recommendation of the committee, may build factory premises upon any land of the said trust which is situated outside the metropolitan area.

That means that any factory must be built on Housing Trust land. If the trust persists in building on freehold land in irrigation areas, where all the land is leasehold, there may have to be some conversion of land from leasehold to freehold. I understand the trust likes to get freehold land, and I should like that point to be considered later. Also, the new section will make it difficult for the trust to build a factory on land already owned by the person requiring assistance. Apparently he would first have to transfer the land to the trust. There may be some minor complications that will have to be examined as this scheme develops, but we shall have time to see how it works and then make any necessary adjustments.

I should like to see the same provisions advocated now for factories granted in respect of houses for employees. Alternatively, employers could perhaps rent the houses provided to assist any particular industry. I understand that at present the houses are let to the tenants and the employer has no rights in the matter. If an employer said to the Housing Trust, "I want to expand my industry and would like you to build two or three houses for my employees," he would be in a better position if he got the houses than if the trust let them direct to the employees, for if they left him after a few months they could remain in occupation and he could not offer accommodation to new employees.

Mr. Bywaters—Do you suggest that if the employees got the sack they should get out of the houses?

Mr. KING—Not necessarily, but if we wish the industry to prosper the employer should be in a position to give accommodation to his employees. The general purpose of the Bill is to give assistance to country industries, so I think it will have the support of all

members. We all have the common objective of developing this country to the utmost, and to the extent that the Bill will be a step towards that end, I wholeheartedly commend it to the House.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray)—I support the Bill and use the words of the member for Barossa, "I am delighted with this measure." I have drawn the Government's attention on previous occasions to the fact that it is desirable for the Government to assist industries by building factories for them, but unfortunately some of my remarks have been misconstrued. Some members opposite have seen fit to read into what I have said something to suit their own ends. On one occasion the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) seemed surprised that I should even suggest granting assistance to industries in the manner proposed by the Bill. However, he has been consistent during this debate and has made himself clear that, although he supports the Bill, he does not want factories to be built indiscriminately unless there are tenants for them, but I do not think any responsible Government would build factories unless there were tenants for them. The member for Light (Mr. Ham-bour) said I would build factories anywhere in country areas and have shelves of factories without tenants, but I have never suggested any such thing.

When speaking on the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition last year for the appointment of a Royal Commission to investigate the decentralization of industry, I said we should follow an English plan for decentralization. I read from a British handbook stating that industries were being moved from one area to another as a result of the provision of factories and houses, but I believe there was a guarantee that the premises would be occupied. No-one would suggest that the Housing Trust build factories unless there were industries to occupy them. During a debate recently I said the Government should build factories for interstate or overseas industries interested in coming to this State. Members opposite should not put a false construction on my remarks, but it is convenient for them to do so because when the Opposition previously suggested proposals such as those put forward under this Bill they were ridiculed by Government supporters. However, when the Government brings down such proposals it is a different matter, so they try to justify themselves by reading into my remarks something that is not there.

The member for Chaffey (Mr. King) said I would build shelves of factories all over the country, but I assure him I have never had any such intention. When His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor opened Parliament this year he said that a Bill of this nature would be brought down, and I was not far wrong in my forecast of the type of measure we would get. The member for Chaffey referred to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition yesterday on the Murray Valley Development League's plan to set up committees to encourage the establishment of secondary industries. The honourable member may know something about this plan, though he was not present at the conference when the resolution was carried. The recommendations of the committees were carried unanimously by the league, and they were to the effect that a committee be set up by the Government for the purpose of advising the local committees when an industry was available or interested in coming to South Australia. The member for Chaffey is not the only one who has local committees in his district.

I have two live-wire committees in mine, and they have carried out much research and contacted various Government instrumentalities regarding the possibility of establishing industries in their districts. They have collated much evidence and have often stressed the advantages of their districts, but having done that they are at a loss to know what to do next. That is why it is felt necessary to have someone to whom to take all this evidence to be collated. When an industry wanted to come to South Australia it could be pointed out that there might be a country district that would perhaps suit it. If that were done local committees could contact representatives of the industry who would assist them to make inquiries.

Mr. King—Isn't that done now?

Mr. BYWATERS—Perhaps in some instances, but not as widely as it should be. I do not know of anyone in this State who is prepared to say to an industry that, for instance, my district or the district of the member who interjected is suitable for it. I can remember when two young men came to this State from England some years ago and apparently were not received enthusiastically. They came and went, and nobody seemed to know they had been here. I believe they approached certain people, but they subsequently went to New South Wales where they established a clothing industry that has developed into something

worthwhile. I am referring to the firm known as Anthony Squires. Had some committee known these men were here, another industry might have been established in this State, but if it had not at least the committee would have been able to show the advantages of coming to its particular area.

It has been said that transport costs come into this matter, and that is perfectly true. Recently I brought to the Premier's notice the position of a small industry at Murray Bridge that had articles brought by rail from Melbourne and off-loaded at Murray Bridge before the train came on to Adelaide, but when freight charges had to be paid it was found they were for carrying the goods from Melbourne to Adelaide and then back to Murray Bridge. We were told that nothing could be done because concession rates had been charged.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—What would have been the result if the ordinary rate had been charged?

Mr. BYWATERS—It might have been more.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—You should consider that.

Mr. BYWATERS—We did, but if there is a concession rate between cities, it could apply to places along the route—I do not mean sidings, but at places where the train normally stops.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—The honourable member knows the train does not shunt there, and that there is a special rate between capital cities.

Mr. BYWATERS—In this case there was no need to off-shunt but just to unload parcels, which is a normal thing. I do not intend to say much more, as I have expressed my opinions on decentralization before, but I feel this legislation could put into effect suggestions I have previously made in this House. I know of two young people who started industries in Murray Bridge without seeking assistance. One industry is now employing three or four men, and the proprietor commenced operating by selling his home to build a factory. That, of course, absorbed much of his capital, and as a result he has been battling against financial commitments. Under provisions such as these it might have been possible for him to conserve his capital to build up stocks.

This afternoon I mentioned a man who started making car springs but had difficulty in obtaining autoflex steel. He also built his own factory, but he did not have much money and could not build up supplies, which should

have been done with an article in short supply, as this was. He could have been helped and enabled to conserve some of his capital to buy stock. I feel that this legislation has possibilities, and I hope it will be treated in the way in which we on this side would like it to be treated—not only to build up factories at Elizabeth, but to establish them in other areas. I have confidence that this will be done, so I support the Bill.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa)—This Bill is a little beauty! I am pleased that the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) joined with me in my expression of delight at its introduction. Its provisions are clearly defined, to the point, and provide a practical means of encouraging the establishment of industries in country areas. This legislation is a further step forward in the orderly and practical approach to decentralizing industry, which practical approach has marked the expansion of industrial activity in this State. It is well to recall that a couple of decades ago we were on the outer in regard to secondary industries; the more populous eastern States seemed to be the happy hunting ground and to have the close preserve of secondary industry when we were just onlookers. Then we saw determined bids by the then Government, and by the Premier in particular, to ensure a place in the sun industrially for this State, and those efforts, as we all know, met with real success and the first great need—decentralization of industry as between States—was achieved. I emphasize that at that stage we were losing 20,000 people a year to the eastern States because we could not offer them the advantages those States offered. Today, however, industry after industry is being set up here, giving increased living standards and providing primary producers with an increasing local market, which is the best market of all.

We now move into a further phase of development and the wider dissemination of industry by virtue of the provisions of the Bill now before us. These provisions appeal to me: above all, they will be a major help to the small man. In this I am concerned at a trend that tends to close a door to the aspirations of the individual operator trading in his own right. Lack of capital is the usual bugbear and limiting factor to excellent men of business achieving their ambition of becoming proprietors in their own right. This Bill will remove the need for capital outlay in the first instance on buildings, and will thereby enable very efficient machinery to be installed. The

most efficient machines are usually the most costly, and lack of funds often forces the installation of cheaper and less efficient plant which, of itself, immediately places the little man at a disadvantage as against his big and powerful competitors.

Under the terms of this legislation the intending manufacturer has the choice of renting premises built by the trust or of purchasing them on conditions fixed by it. If the premises are rented, the rent would be a business charge against profits. This could well be of real appeal to a newly set-up industry, as it is a weekly or monthly charge that could be made *ex* current income. There is little danger of factories being built under this Bill that could turn out to be white elephants. The safeguard lies in new section 25 (1) which provides that the trust, with the consent of the Governor and upon the recommendation of the Industries Development Committee, may build factory premises upon any land of the said trust which is situated outside the metropolitan area. It will be noted that the facilities offered are exclusively for country areas to encourage industries to establish there.

I congratulate the Government on introducing this Bill. As I have already said, it will be particularly helpful to the small industrialist and it embodies a vitally important Liberal principle of encouragement to private enterprise and especially to the individuals. I believe that all possible encouragement should be given to the little man at all times. We have excellent application of this principle in the Federal taxation law, notably in company taxation. Private companies are taxed at the rate of 4s. 6d. in the pound on the first £5,000 profit, and 6s. 6d. in the pound above £5,000, whereas public companies, which are usually much stronger than private companies, pay 7s. in the pound on profits up to £5,000 and 8s. thereafter. The principle of assisting the small man is preserved in taxation legislation, and it is good to see that this Bill similarly seeks to give advantage or assistance to those who, I feel, will be in the main the small men. I trust that the Bill will achieve all it seeks to do, and I have pleasure in supporting it.

Mr. RALSTON (Mount Gambier)—It is a pleasure to support this Bill, which extends to country areas a privilege enjoyed by the metropolitan area for some time. The main factors to be considered when industrial expansion and development are being contemplated in any given area are whether ample

supplies of raw materials are available at a cost that would make it a practical economic proposition; whether a sufficiently large labour force is available; whether the housing of an expanding working population is satisfactorily provided for; whether the goods produced would supply an existing market, or whether they would be goods of a type new to the Australian public but for which a public demand has already been proven in overseas markets; whether available markets would be sufficiently large to absorb the goods produced; and whether transport costs of either the raw material or the finished article would seriously jeopardize the economic development of any industry wishing to establish.

I have not the slightest doubt that the Lower South-East—and especially Mount Gambier—can meet all the requirements I have mentioned in expanding the timber industry and other industries that produce goods that can be manufactured from the softwood timber that grows so profusely in the area. We should examine some other production costs that also affect industrial expansion and development. These are ever recurring costs and beyond the control of the industry that must pay them. Where there is a serious variation in such costs in one area compared with another it is obvious that any industrial expansion will occur where the costs are to the advantage of the industry. It is interesting to compare costs in the metropolitan area with costs at Mount Gambier. There is a considerable advantage, without it being excessive, benefiting the metropolitan area. In respect of water rates the metropolitan area is greatly favoured, enjoying an advantage of almost 50 per cent. If Mount Gambier were sewered—and it will have to be sewered before much industrial expansion can take place—the rate would be 2s. 6d. in the pound compared with 1s. 3d. in the city. The retail price of petrol in the metropolitan area is 3s. 5½d. a gallon, but at Mount Gambier it is 3s. 10d. This affects transport costs.

Although this Bill is good and enables the Housing Trust to give to industries in country areas the same assistance as applies at present in the metropolitan area for their development, until the Government is prepared to further consider the impact of high basic production costs on industry in country areas, very few firms will be induced to establish in such areas except where ample supplies of raw material are freely available at low cost. That will be the magnet to attract their attention.

The corporation of Mount Gambier has done everything possible to keep its rates as low as possible by careful costing of all services and projects under its control, whilst still maintaining a service second to none in the State. The present rate of 7d. in the pound on unimproved land values is adopted from the State land tax assessment. No other rate is charged. Members will appreciate the mighty job being done by this corporation to keep costs down and to induce industries to establish there. In Mount Gambier 230 children are leaving school this year. They will seek employment. This number will increase each succeeding year at the rate of about 20 per cent. This is a matter of concern to me. I appreciate that many other country members are faced with this problem.

This Bill will no doubt legalize what has already happened at Elizabeth, but in addition I hope it will have a beneficial effect on other country towns and assist to some degree the establishment of industries in those areas. It is in agreement with Labor's announced policy of decentralization of industry and I support it.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra)—I support the Bill, but with some misgivings. Among other things it states:—

The South Australian Housing Trust, with the consent of the Governor and upon the recommendation of the committee, may build factory premises upon any land of the said trust which is situated outside the metropolitan area.

That pre-supposes that in addition to building factories the trust would have to purchase land. One cannot visualize it having land scattered throughout the State at present. Why is it necessary for the trust to do this in order to promote industries? An industry has to go before the Industries Development Committee and if it has a good chance of success it can secure premises that are built by the Housing Trust. Where are all the great financial organizations that are so wrapped up in the progress of this country if, in order to promote small secondary industries in the country, we have to fall back on a State instrumentality set-up for the express purpose of building houses?

Mr. Riches—It is a case of a State instrumentality doing a better job than private enterprise.

Mr. QUIRKE—I do not accept that. That does not follow by any means. The Premier in his speech said it would not make much impact upon the Housing Trust because it had ample reserves; there was ample scope for building houses, too. The position is that,

whilst honourable members have put this forward as a marked advance in the decentralization of industry, I think that the call upon the Housing Trust reserves will be very small indeed. The honourable member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Ralston) touched on this and the honourable member for Chaffey (Mr. King) said much the same thing: there have to be many things leading up to the provision of a building for an industry. However, I do not like the idea that a State instrumentality, something brought into existence for building homes, has to provide the wherewithal for putting up a factory as well. The homes around a factory are an entirely different matter; I am prepared to accept that. I will not vote against this measure because I accept anything that makes for decentralization of industry, but I take exception to the necessity in a country like this, where millions of pounds are put out by the people who control its finances, of industry falling back on a State instrumentality to buy land and put up a factory.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—It does not have to. The industry may get its money from some other source, such as a savings bank, to build its own factory.

Mr. QUIRKE—I appreciate that. In this case the only places that will be built are those in some doubt whether they will make good or not.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—Not at all. You have completely missed the point of the Bill.

Mr. QUIRKE—I have not. The Bill simply says this in clause 2 (2):—

The said trust may, for such term and upon such conditions as the said trust thinks fit, let any such premises together with any land occupied therewith or may sell the same . . .

My point is: why is it necessary for the trust to do that for industry?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—Anybody else can do it and let the premises to industry.

Mr. QUIRKE—If anybody else can let it to industry, why is it necessary to put this in the Bill? Why cannot the money be found outside?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—It is an additional facility if they desire to use it.

Mr. QUIRKE—Why will people desire to use it? Simply because they cannot get money anywhere else.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—Not at all.

Mr. QUIRKE—Of course it will be; that is what it will come to.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—It is a question of the employment of their capital for buildings, plant or other purposes.

Mr. QUIRKE—If it is a question of the employment of their capital, they have not enough capital to set the industry going and provide the buildings at the same time. Did the Minister say that?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—I said they would prefer to lease it and charge the cost of the lease to the business.

Mr. QUIRKE—Under these conditions it should be possible for outside finance to do the work without there being any necessity to call upon the Housing Trust to do it. I will not vote against the measure, but I have serious misgivings about it. I do not like to see the State being called upon to use its resources that spring from housing for the installation of buildings for private industry. It simply assumes that the only reason why they will be called upon to do it is that they cannot get money elsewhere. If I am wrong, time will show it. Although I will not vote against the Bill, I have serious doubts on this point. I sincerely hope that in course of time my doubts will not be realized—but I still have them.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

ADVANCES FOR HOMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendment:—

Page 3, line 10 (clause 3)—Leave out "exceeds" and insert "does not exceed."

HOMES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

IRRIGATION ON PRIVATE PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 28, Page 1416.)

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray)—I support this Bill, because I believe it provides a facility for people other than those covered under the Act. I refer to the highland irrigators because the private swamps in the lower River Murray area have been functioning well under this Act since 1939 when some settlers along the River Murray deemed it fit and necessary to come under an Act to give them protection.

I believe it all started when a man named Hannaford realized that some swampholders were endangering the income of others by not looking after the banks needed to protect others who were enjoying the reclaimed areas. Because of that it was felt legislation should be passed to allow them by majority rule to govern their own affairs. This system has worked satisfactorily in the past. If more than half the people concerned desire to come under the Act all they have to do is to apply to the Government by petition. If some settlers do not desire to come under the Act they can put their case by petition too, and that is a democratic system and has worked well.

One reclaimed area may have five settlers, with four of them doing the right thing with their banks, but the other man may not be pulling his weight, so the whole of the settlement could be inundated because one portion of the bank was not consolidated. That state of affairs can be overcome under this legislation. Those applying to come under the Act must own over half the acreage of the settlement, and I understand that people in the highland areas, especially upriver, have asked that the Act be extended so that they can be covered by it.

I am concerned that the Bill says settlers have to be unanimous in their request to come under the Act. This may be an experimental provision, but it seems that one person standing out could upset any scheme to come under the Act. Conditions in the Upper Murray may not be the same as in the lower reclaimed areas, but I am concerned that one person standing out could adversely affect the interests of all other settlers in an area. One settler could perhaps make it impossible for the others to carry on because of seepage problems. That is hardly fair, and I believe the same conditions should apply in the highland areas as in the lower swamp areas, and a majority decision should be sufficient to determine whether an area should come under the Act. If any settlers did not desire to come under the Act they could petition the Government and give their reasons, and I believe it may be necessary to amend this legislation for that purpose later.

The Bill gives small settlers with not much capital the opportunity to form a company or a co-operative to provide a watering plant to serve them all. A board would administer the scheme, which would save them much money. Any board established for this purpose would function democratically, but it would need some

protection under the Act. I understand there has been some concern upriver, as a result of a misunderstanding, that big companies can come into areas along the Murray and cut prices or adversely affect growers in Government controlled areas. I see no cause for fear on this account because companies can now purchase land adjacent to the river and put all the water they want to on that land. This legislation will not alter the position because big companies would not want to come under the Act. I do not think people in the Upper Murray districts need fear anything from this Bill. In practice, it will apply only to small settlements in which the settlers want to co-operate and govern their affairs by the wishes of the majority. I support the Bill because it will enable small settlers to get together and cut their costs in developing their areas.

Mr. STOTT (Ridley)—This is a good Bill and represents an attempt to provide assistance for many upriver districts in particular by enabling an authority to be established to work in the interests of small settlers. The Act sets out particulars, which practically amount to articles of association, under which trusts can operate. Much agitation has come from the river districts for legislation such as that now before the House. The Chaffey brothers established the Renmark irrigation settlement just before the turn of the century, and it was necessary for Parliament to give them authority to manage the area and charge water rates. Many large Government irrigation settlements have been established, such as Berri and Loveday, but other smaller settlements, such as Lyrup and Pyap, have also been established. The larger areas do not come within the purview of this Bill, but it will be of great help to places such as Pyap. It will also be of great help to small settlements in pockets along the river that are eminently suitable for irrigation. They will be able to take advantage of this legislation by forming a trust.

Near Loxton, and adjacent to the Loxton soldier settlement scheme, is an area called Media, which has been under irrigation for some time. It was established long before the Loxton soldier settlement scheme was carried out. That scheme at Media started many years ago, and subsequently the rights were taken over by private people. These people could not previously come under the scope of the principal Act because it was land that had already been irrigated and was not new land.

It was necessary to have an amendment to bring places like Media within the scope of

the Act, hence the definition of "irrigable land" in the Bill which is as follows:—

Land adjacent to or near the River Murray which is—

- (i) reclaimed or partly reclaimed from being swamp land; or
- (ii) being irrigated or otherwise supplied with water from the River Murray; or
- (iii) capable of being irrigated or otherwise supplied with water from the River Murray, and of being used for primary production.

That definition now enables a place like Media to create a trust and lay down all the conditions in the Act to the people within that area. This amendment suits the people at Media, and enables them to create a trust to give powers of management and control over the whole scheme.

I am seriously concerned at the distinction between the reclaimed areas mentioned in this Bill and the higher lands. New section 5 provides in effect that the Minister shall not consider any petition to come within the scope of the principal Act unless he is satisfied about certain things. This amendment, in effect, says that the Minister shall not consider a petition in the case of a reclaimed area unless it is signed by one-half or more of the owners of such lands. That is all right. If sufficient signatures can be obtained the Minister is empowered under the Act to go ahead and grant those owners permission to come under the principal Act.

Mr. King—That is only in respect of reclaimed areas.

Mr. STOTT—Yes. The Bill further provides that the Minister shall not consider any such petition unless he is satisfied that the area of such land owned by the persons by whom the petition is signed is more than one-half of the total area of such land within the part of the State proposed to be constituted a private irrigation area, and that in the case of irrigable land other than land which is reclaimed or partly reclaimed from being swamp land, the petition is signed by all the owners of such land.

The latter provision is the weakness in this Bill. Why should we require 100 per cent of the people within that area to sign a petition before the Minister will give them approval to come within the scope of the Act? That particular clause is not satisfactory to me, and I foreshadow an amendment to it. If that clause is passed as it stands it will defeat the whole purpose of this Bill.

Mr. Quirke—Would you say a man who had his own private plant should be coerced into joining such a scheme?

Mr. STOTT—No, but where we have a new piece of land, such as is visualized at Murtho or Rameo, a provisional trust may be created for the purpose of establishing land as an irrigation area with the idea of coming under the scope of the Irrigation on Private Property Act. Under that trust certain conditions must be observed before an applicant is granted land. There is no trouble there.

Mr. O'Halloran—Isn't the Bill intended to apply to new areas?

Mr. STOTT—Yes; I am speaking now of a new area. The Minister will probably reply and say, in effect, that before a trust is created certain conditions with which an applicant must comply before he can be considered are laid down, and therefore 100 per cent of signatures are obtained anyhow. That may be so, but what I am concerned with is this: it is not a new area at Media; it has been under grapes for many years. The people are on their blocks today planting grapes and using the water, but the trust that has been set up has not the necessary authority—and they have been given to understand this—to go ahead as they would wish. A legal doubt exists whether they can properly charge for water, and that is why Media desires to come within the principal Act. Some smart Aleck—and there are some about—could wake up to the fact that if he signed the petition it would give the trust power to charge him for water, and he might say to himself, "I am doing all right, so I won't say anything." He would then prevent all the others from coming under this Act and getting the benefit of it. The Bill goes too far and abrogates the right of a majority to come under the Act.

Surely this House is not going to lay down such rigid conditions that it will prevent public spirited people, who can see the benefit to be derived, from coming within the scope of the principal Act, which is a good one. It is too rigid to require that they must all sign before they can obtain the benefit for the majority. I cannot see the purpose of that provision. A simple majority of the people who want to come within the scope of the Act should be sufficient. The member for Burra asked, by interjection, whether we were going to coerce a person to come in if he did not wish to do so. However, I point out

that it works both ways, because, after all, we have to have some authority for these irrigation areas. We have to have an authority to pump the water from the river, and we have to cover administrative and other costs, and therefore it is necessary to have the management and control of an irrigation area vested under some proper authority such as is visualized. If we cannot accept a simple majority, perhaps 60 per cent of the owners would be sufficient. The Minister should be able to accept a petition from that percentage of owners and put them under the scope of the principal Act.

I welcome this amendment, for which there has been an agitation in the Upper Murray areas. These people want this Bill, and I commend the Government for introducing it to allow these proposed areas in the Murray districts to come under the scope of the Act for control and management. It is an excellent measure. Without the principal Act and this Bill, as more areas are coming under vines in the Murray area, this Parliament would eventually have to have a private Bill for every area that wishes to come under irrigation in the future, such as Ramco and Murtho. I do not think it is good legislation to have a Bill for each area.

The principal Act allows sufficient scope for all these areas to come in provided we accept the amendment of the definition of the land where water can be brought. This will mean that when schemes which we do not know about at the moment come to fruition in the future all that will have to be done will be to sign a petition and, when that is accepted by the Minister, the people can come under the Act. The Act lays down that it is necessary to have an amendment to cover all contingencies such as reclaimed areas, new areas, and land that has already been placed in production and is growing grapes and other fruit. I commend the measure to the House; I hope the second reading will be carried, and that in Committee I shall have an opportunity to move an amendment to clause 4, because I do not think it is necessary to have unanimous consent before these people can come under the provision of the Act.

Mr. KING (Chaffey)—I support this Bill, which is in line with the trend of developing along the River Murray pockets of land which do not justify an extension of Government facilities or a large irrigation scheme. This measure will give a number of people who wish to group together and construct a com-

mon pumping plant, the right to establish themselves; their rights, as agreed among themselves, will have legislative authority; and they will be able to conduct their affairs according to rules that can be made under the Act.

We should not lose sight of the fact that anyone who has, or may acquire a river frontage may obtain a licence to pump water and so develop an irrigation scheme of his own. There are several ways to do this. For instance, a co-operative of people may be formed to operate a plant, which is another way of doing practically the same thing. In group schemes, which are using pockets of valuable land, this is one way in which further development of the Murray areas can be carried out. I am referring to the part of the Bill relating to private irrigators on high land. This applies particularly to some new schemes that have been planned with the idea of developing these small parcels.

Reference has been made to the wine industry. In this morning's *Advertiser* I noticed a report that an obviously misinformed Labor candidate, who was reported to have been speaking in river districts recently, said that a combine had opened a big winery at Waikerie and was apparently opening up 6,000 acres despite Government policy on more plantings. He referred to this Bill as a measure inspired by wine makers. He was obviously misinformed. In fact, when he made that statement the Bill had only just been brought before us. I know on good authority that the wine makers did not even know the Bill was contemplated, and had nothing to do with it. The only big winery at Waikerie is that which has been owned by a well-known firm for a considerable time.

I do not know whether the man was misinformed or just trying to make political capital out of the situation. He mentioned an area of 6,000 acres; this has grown from the original estimate of 4,500 acres about which I heard rumours. If anyone owns a river frontage and wants to develop it, there is nothing we can do about it. Even if we could do something here, I do not know that the same development could not take place in another State to the detriment of this State. On one hand people advocate the development of the Murray, but as soon as someone shows interest in doing this, they criticize him.

This Bill has my full support, and I shall be glad to see it in operation. I do not think the case quoted by the member for Ridley (Mr. Stott) really applies under this Bill. A

few people at Media are occupying a remnant of an old settlement that once had a pumping plant owned by the family which owned the land. When the family broke up, a few people bought the land, and found it uneconomical to operate the plant, so they now receive water from the Government. Consequently, I do not think the question of this land's coming under the Act will ever arise. As Mr. Stott said, all the conditions have been set out, and when the people subscribe to the object of the scheme, make contracts, and satisfy the promoters that they can fulfil their obligations, they will then present a petition and come within the scope of the Act. I cannot see anything wrong with that, or any need for an amendment to meet the situation mentioned by Mr. Stott, because I do not think the case he mentioned needs any amendment. I support the Bill, and hope that it will encourage the further development of our natural resources.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Petition for constitution of area."

Mr. STOTT—This is the clause to which I referred during the second reading debate. Paragraph (b) provides:—

(b) that in the case of irrigable land other than land which is reclaimed or partly reclaimed from being swamp land, the petition is signed by all the owners of such land within the part of the State proposed to be constituted a private irrigation area.

I cannot see the need to have 100 per cent of the people sign a petition before an area can come under the Act. Can the Minister assure me that the point I raised during the second reading debate will be considered and, if necessary, the Bill amended in another place?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS (Minister of Irrigation)—The Government has seriously considered the point raised by the honourable

member. Mr. Quirke rightly said that it would be possible to bring in a settler who had made a private arrangement to water his block, but we do not want to do that.

Mr. Riches—Could one man hold up a scheme?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Yes, but it would be highly improbable.

Mr. O'Halloran—Could not a reticulation scheme go around his property?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Yes, but it would be difficult because of the seepage problem. Before a petition is presented inquiries would be made and if it were necessary to leave out one settler it would be done, but it would be far better to have a 100 per cent supported scheme. I will consider the matter should a similar position arise in other areas, but I do not think there is need to consider it in connection with the area mentioned by the honourable member.

Mr. STOTT—We could do what Mr. O'Halloran suggested in a new area, but in this instance channels have been put down and there would be difficulties. I cannot see why one settler should be allowed to hold up a scheme.

Mr. Hambour—Are there any objectors in the area?

Mr. STOTT—There is a doubt about some and it is not certain that there would be 100 per cent support. I want Media to come under the Act, but under this clause one nark could upset the scheme. I accept the Minister's assurance.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 18 inclusive), schedule and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment; Committee's report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.01 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, November 4, at 2 p.m.