HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, November 6, 1963.

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ROAD MAINTENANCE (CONTRIBUTION) BILL.

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

QUESTIONS.

QUANTITY SURVEYORS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Recently in this House I said that I had been informed that professional staff in the Public Buildings Department were free to leave the department and accept employment in a similar professional capacity with a contractor doing work for the department, but that such contractors would not obtain further contracts from the Government. The Minister of Works replied that he was not aware of any such cases. Will the Minister ascertain whether any quantity surveyors have been restricted in their efforts to obtain employment elsewhere, and whether any contractors have been affected adversely by employing such quantity surveyors?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I shall be happy to make the inquiries the honourable member suggests.

TRADE SHIP.

Mrs. STEELE: I understand that in mid-March, 1964, the m.v. *Centaur* will leave Sydney as a trade ship to visit Far East countries and that the Commonwealth Government and the Governments of Western Australia and Queensland will take space and exhibit on this ship with a view to extending trade relations with those countries. I believe that the South Australian Government has been approached to take space and to exhibit, as some South Australian companies will be exhibiting on this ship, but that the Government's answer was not favourable. Can the Premier say whether that is so and whether further consideration will be given to having a South Australian Government exhibit on the m.v. *Centaur*?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The South Australian Government has given every assistance to South Australian industries to help them develop and extend their overseas trade. If honourable members examine the Commonwealth Constitution they will see that overseas trade is specifically a Commonwealth matter: it is not a State matter. True, as the honourable member said, some State Governments have taken space on trade ships, but it has not been this Government's practice because we, as a Government, have nothing to sell. We could only have a general exhibit of some sort. For instance, we could have an exhibit of our pine forests, but all of our pine production is sold in Australia, because it is wanted in Australia. To take space in a trade ship would be simply to subsidize a function that is not a State function under the Commonwealth Constitution. It would be expensive, and Parliament has not provided any appropriation for it. We sometimes criticize the Commonwealth Government for interfering in State functions, and it would be just as right for the Commonwealth Government to say, "This is overseas trade: this is peculiarly a matter of our concern." For those reasons the Government decided not to participate in this matter.

FIREWORKS.

Mr. LAUCKE: Would you, Mr. Speaker, care to comment on last evening's episode concerning the firing of a cracker in the Speaker's corridor?

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I made investigations into the cracker incident immediately after its occurrence last night. This was an irresponsible act, which I deplore. However, I do not wish to dilate upon the event except to exonerate the staff completely and to express the wish that the exuberance of the person concerned might be diverted in future into more profitable channels. I trust that there will be no further indulgence in such irresponsible acts, which only reflect upon the person concerned and Parliament generally. There is a time and place for everything, and the Speaker's lobby is not the place for such a childish display of disrespect for this institution.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Recently I asked the Premier two questions concerning the better control of fireworks, and I received an answer from him on October 8. In this morning's *Advertiser* a headline draws attention to the fact that four people were burned in city fires last night and that fire stations were swamped with about 100 calls as grass fires and similar outbreaks caused by fireworks occurred in the

metropolitan area. I point out that had there been a major fire requiring the services of brigades while these 100 calls were coming in, a particularly serious situation could have arisen in the city. A report also appears regarding crops being burned at Port Pirie, apparently as the result of the irresponsible use of fireworks. Will the Premier reconsider his answer to my previous question with a view to bringing down legislation next session so that the sale and use of fireworks may be strictly controlled?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will have the matter examined. It will not be possible, as honourable members know, to complete anything this session, nor would that have very much effect because the critical time for this year is over, unless, of course, some other honourable member gets an idea about the matter. The only way to stop the celebration of Guy Fawkes' day effectively would be to prohibit the sale of fireworks completely. I think the report in this morning's *Advertiser* contained some significant facts; it was pointed out that in one case, while people were ringing up the fire brigade to put out a fire, they continued to let off their fireworks. This shows that people will not alter their habits very much unless a complete ban is placed on all fireworks, but another aspect is involved. Strangely enough, a ban on the sale of fireworks could involve a contravention of section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution. However, I will have the matter examined and see what steps can be taken. Apart from the matters mentioned by the honourable member, I believe a danger to the public is caused by some high-powered rockets now being used, as the sticks attached to them could, I believe, cause severe personal injury. I believe that many rockets used last night could occasion serious bodily harm. The matter will be examined, but not this session.

Mr. CASEY: Some time ago in this House I said that I thought Guy Fawkes' day was celebrated at the wrong time of the year. Of course, one cannot alter the actual day, but I think fireworks displays should not be held when the bush fire danger is particularly high. I do not think Parliament can do anything about altering the date for letting off fireworks, but I suggest to the Premier that when his department is examining this matter it might consider holding fireworks displays on Commonwealth Day, as in the Eastern States, so as to minimize the fire danger we experience, particularly at this time of the year. I think the Minister of Agriculture would support me, because at this time of the year he is responsible for issuing fire bans. Will the Premier closely study my suggestion when this matter is being considered?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes.

GRANGE HOUSING PLAN.

Mr. TAPPING: On August 13 I asked the Premier a question about a newspaper report that an area of 1,700 acres of land in the Semaphore South and Grange areas was to be utilized for a housing development scheme to cost £8,000,000. At the conclusion of certain details which the Premier gave, he said that he would inform me of the stages as they proceeded. Has the Premier a progress report on this subject?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. The Housing Trust, in association with the Harbors Board, drew up a plan for an artificial lake, an outlet to the sea, certain parks and recreation amenities, and for many blocks of land to be sold, the proceeds of the sale to be devoted to pay the developmental costs. As the honourable member has stated, the total cost involved is about £8,000,000. It was intended that the land would be available for purchase and that development would take place as the land was disposed of. The proposals were prepared in much detail, and the matter was then referred to the Treasury for examination. It was my view that the prices expected for the blocks probably exceeded what could be obtained. Although it would be possible in a favoured site, with beach and recreation facilities of the type planned, to get £3,000 for a block, it would be another matter to sell some hundreds of blocks each at that price. The Treasury therefore reported that we should further investigate the matter to see that the proposals were economically sound and that we were not loading the scheme with costs that would ultimately make the scheme unprofitable. Incidentally, in the first place we would be diverting a considerable sum of our housing money to start the scheme. I assure the honourable member that the scheme has not been dropped: it is being critically examined to see that it is fundamentally sound financially, and that we are not becoming involved in something that would unduly tie up our housing money in an undesirable way. If the honourable member or any other member is interested in the proposals I would not object to his viewing them and the plans associated with them, for there is nothing secret about the matter: it is merely that we are

trying to get the best possible scheme and one that we know will not involve the taxpayer in losses or the home builder in costs beyond his means. I will advise the honourable member of the proposals as soon as any conclusion is reached.

HOUSING STATISTICS.

Mr. COUMBE: Last week I asked the Premier whether he would obtain figures to indicate the record growth in house and flat building recently, especially in the last quarter. Has the Premier any information on this matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD:: Mr. Cartledge, the Chairman of the Housing Trust, reports:

During the September quarter councils granted 3,487 approvals for the construction of houses in South Australia. This is unusually high but it must be discounted to some extent as regards approvals for Housing Trust houses. Approvals were given during the quarter for 2,460 private buildings as compared with 2,425 for the June quarter. Housing Trust approvals for the September quarter were 1,027 as compared with 743 for the June quarter. However, it is the practice of trust builders, prior to commencing building in a paddock, to lodge plans for all the houses proposed to be built there, although it may be many months before some of them are started. Thus, council approvals for trust houses over a limited period can be misleading, as the following table of approvals for the period from April to September will show:

	Trust.	Private.
April, 1963	23	718
May, 1963	7	962
June, 1963	713	745
July, 1963	808	882
August, 1963	11	788
September, 1963	208	790

However, there is no doubt that the present level of council approvals will result in a substantial house production. Approvals for private building have been consistently high and this will be reflected in the completions rate. So far as the trust is concerned, the fact that 964 houses were commenced during the September quarter (quite apart from council approvals granted) as compared with 2,697 commenced for the whole of the year 1962-63, would indicate that the completions rate for this financial year should show an increase on that for the last financial year.

KALANGADOO SCHOOL.

Mr. HARDING: The Minister of Education will recall that, some years ago, after negotiations had taken place, a most desirable site was purchased at Kalangadoo on which to build a new school. Will the Minister obtain a report on conditions at the old school, the number of students, the conditions of accommodation, the playing area and the sporting facilities for the students? Will he also obtain a report on Kalangadoo's priority for the building of a new school?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yes, I shall be pleased to do so.

ELIZABETH HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. CLARK: Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked yesterday about the erection of new buildings at the Elizabeth High School?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes; the honourable member himself co-operated in obtaining the information, which I have obtained promptly. Within three to four weeks, four rooms will be ready for the Public Examinations Board examinations if the Education Department decides to use them for that purpose. The additional six rooms will be ready for occupation at the beginning of the 1964 school year. Gravel will be laid between the two quadruples and the existing tarred area to give reasonable access to students taking examinations.

VEGETABLE GROWING.

Mr. BYWATERS: Recently, in a speech in this House, I referred to the possibility of growing vegetables along the banks of the River Murray in the lower reaches of the river. I believe the Minister of Irrigation has taken up this matter with the department and has obtained a reply. Will he now give that reply?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: This matter has been considered, but there are several complications. It is generally conceded that, for vegetable growing, land should be of the best possible type, as is the case in the "built-over" areas of alluvial land east and west of Adelaide. Reports from investigating officers indicate that the land suggested at Murray Bridge is very shallow above clay and, in some instances, limestone. Vegetable growing as a means of livelihood needs a combination of deep fertile soils and knowledge of horticulture of a very high standard. Failing a combination of suitable land and knowledge, vegetable growing can be a hazardous means of livelihood. Furthermore, there is a need for a copious supply of water to be available at all times, as in the heat of summer such crops require daily watering. This would mean continuous pumping to a high level tank from which the water would be reticulated. Even for a fairly restricted area of vegetables, it will be seen that such an installation must be

of considerable capacity and cost, as all properties would require watering at the same time. Vegetable growing lends itself more to individual pumping of water, but the high lift in this case apparently does not encourage such individual installations.

The land proposed for use is all privately owned under permanent tenure, and it is not Government policy to acquire land in order to promote a scheme as envisaged. It is nevertheless realized that there is considerable scope for vegetable production, and the Government would be prepared to consider the supply of water to a privately sponsored scheme because, as stated, the Government is not prepared to undertake an expensive scheme of land purchase and water reticulation for the growing of vegetables. Compulsory acquisition of land for the purpose cannot be entertained. If the honourable member can present a privately sponsored scheme embracing suitable land, reticulation and financial arrangements, it will be investigated in regard to the possibility of making the water available for what must, of necessity, be a very expensive installation.

STATE BANK ADVANCES.

Mr. RICHES: At the last meeting of the Port Augusta City Council my attention was drawn to claims that the State Bank had reduced its advances for house building at Port Augusta from £3,000 to £2,500 a unit. I understand that whereas the bank formerly was happy to lend up to £3,000 a unit it now seems to have fixed an upper limit of £2,500. Has the Premier any knowledge of this action by the bank? If not, will he ascertain whether there is any substance in the statement and, if there is, what is the reason for this change of policy?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have no knowledge of the reduction stated by the honourable member, and indeed I very much doubt that the claim is correct. I do not know whether the statement has been made because of the difference between the bank advance on a solid construction house and that on a timber frame house. The best thing I can do is to obtain a report from the Chairman of the State Bank so that the honourable member will have the precise information.

ELECTRICIANS.

Mr. LANGLEY: On October 15 I asked the Premier, representing the Minister of Labour and Industry, whether legislation would be introduced to license electricians and contractors as the result of a deputation of both parties to the Minister. Has the Premier an answer?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Although I have not the formal answer here, I know that this matter has been considered several times in Cabinet. Cabinet has always been against the proposal, and I know of no decision that legislation be considered for this session. I have seen the list of Bills which will be introduced and which have been approved for drafting, and this legislation is not included. The position in South Australia is, in many respects, quite different from that in other States as here we have an excellent installation inspection system. This State has an extremely good record regarding installations. Further, fire insurance rates in this State are the lowest in the Commonwealth. The accidents that have occurred on electric installations have been mainly where qualified men have been working. I doubt whether anything is to be gained by introducing legislation, because I believe this would hinder the installation of many extensions and make them more costly. No legislation will be introduced during the current session.

FULHAM GARDENS SEWERAGE.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I have here a petition signed by 216 persons relating to the sewering of an area north of Henley Beach Road in the Fulham area which, *inter alia*, states:

> We, the undersigned people, being present and future inhabitants of the area bounded by Riverside Drive in the north and east, Ayton Avenue in the south and East Parkway in the west, respectfully seek your support to plead our case for provision of sewerage for this area. This area has been subdivided for five years and is almost 75 per cent occupied. We now consider that we are entitled to roads, kerbing and footpaths to facilitate our passage to and from our properties, and for the safety of pedestrians who are at this stage forced to walk on the shocking roads. These roads are dusty in the summer and a mud bath in the winter. Due to the levels of these roads having to be raised 18in. to 2ft. in the future, the council is unable to provide temporary packed surface due to the wasted expense. The West Torrens council will not provide roads, footpaths or kerbing until such times that the sewerage programme promised for this area is installed completely.

I point out that a portion of the area adjacent to this locality has been sewered and has been connected to the system flowing into the Glenelg treatment plant. Sewage from the area I have complained about will flow into

the Port Adelaide system. About 18 months ago I approached the department because some people complained that they could not be connected although they were only a block away from the trunk mains that were being laid for connection with the Glenelg treatment plant. I was informed by the department that as soon as the area developed it would ensure that connections would be made. Apparently people were promised that sewerage would be provided by the end of this year. As I do not know whether there was any truth in that promise, can the Minister of Works inform me of the department's plan for sewering this area? If not, will he obtain a report before the end of this session?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member is only too well aware (the department and I are acutely aware) that large, comparatively low-lying areas in the western suburbs need sewerage, and that the whole programme of sewerage in the metropolitan area is a large one indeed. Only yesterday I was discussing sewerage in the metropolitan area generally with the Engineer for Sewerage (Mr. Murrell), and he said that, in addition to new work, the department was faced with a substantial amount of renewal work to provide and to safeguard the sewerage of areas already served. In other words, some of the old mains, which are large and strategical, are causing concern and will have to be replaced. That work will have to be carried out in addition to the large programme of new work, thus placing an almost impossible demand upon the availability of funds for sewerage generally in the metropolitan area. I assure the honourable member that the department as well as the Government is most anxious to meet these requirements as early as possible, and the Engineer-in-Chief is doing his utmost to ensure that sewerage requirements are met. I believe the City of Adelaide generally is in an enviable position regarding the total area of the city sewered. That does not give much comfort to those people still in need, but it is a fact that, compared with other cities, Adelaide is extremely well sewered. The area to which the honourable member refers is one of many that will be costly to serve. I can assure the honourable member that the department is tackling this problem and will do the best it can to extend sewerage to those areas as soon as possible. If the honourable member lets me have the petition from which he has quoted, I shall refer it to the Engineer-in-Chief, and at the same time I assure him that we will do our utmost to meet the desires of residents.

NARRUNG WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I understand the Minister of Works has a progress report on the planning of the Narrung water supply.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Engineer-in-Chief states that investigations into a water supply combining Point McLeay water supply and the proposed Narrung township and country lands scheme, are well advanced. To date, a plan of the scheme has been prepared, together with an estimate of cost. It will now be necessary to prepare a financial statement showing annual payments by landholders, following which consideration will be given to the proposal and the Engineer-in-Chief will then submit his recommendation.

STURT HIGHWAY JUNCTION.

Mr. CURREN: Where the Morgan Road joins the Sturt Highway at what is known as McFarlane's Corner a dangerous situation is created because the Morgan road, about 50 yards from the junction, bears right and then comes back to the Sturt Highway at an acute angle. Recently a semi-trailer, laden with new motor cars, overturned there. In the past numerous other heavy transports have overturned and motor cars have been involved in accidents there. Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Roads to ascertain what can be done to eliminate this dangerous corner?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

EAST GAMBIER SCHOOL.

Mr. BURDON: On July 31 I asked the Minister of Education whether sunshades could be supplied at the East Gambier Primary School. Subsequently I was informed that their installation had been approved. However, I have been told recently by the secretary and president of the school committee that no action has been taken. They are concerned because the hot weather is approaching when children will become distressed. Will the Minister of Education ascertain when the sunshades will be installed?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The Director of the Public Buildings Department has informed me that it is expected that tenders will be called early in December, 1963, for sunshades to be provided over the windows of the masonry building of the Mount Gambier East Primary School.

SCHOOL CANTEENS.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the total profits derived from high school canteens?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Following the honourable member's previous question, the Superintendent of High Schools forwarded a questionnaire to all high schools in which canteens are operating. From the returns received by him, the information desired by the honourable member may be summarized as follows:

	£
(1) Profits for 1961	15,724
(2) Profits for 1962	19,712
(3) Credit balance as at June 30, 1963	48,249

However, these figures are only approximate. They could be misleading as no account is taken of depreciation of equipment and, in some cases, of buildings. Moreover, an enormous amount of voluntary labour by parents and teachers and much donated equipment are involved. The operation of canteens in high schools is accompanied by a great spirit of service and goodwill between parents, schools' personnel and the administration.

SANDY CREEK SCHOOL.

Mr. LAUCKE: Can the Minister of Education say how far plans have progressed in respect of a new primary school and a headmaster's residence at Sandy Creek?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Negotiations have been completed for the purchase of a new school site of four acres at Sandy Creek and the provision of a new school on this site has been included on the current list of proposed new works. This list is under consideration at the moment but it cannot be stated at this stage when the construction of a new school will commence. A new head teacher's residence, to be built on the new land, will be included, with a high priority, on the next list of recommendations for school residences.

WHYALLA BOAT ANCHORAGE.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Can the Minister of Works supply any information about a recent application by the Whyalla Boatowners' Association for assistance in providing a safe anchorage for their boats?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Earlier this week I saw a report from the General Manager of the Harbors Board setting out an estimate of cost. After examining it I referred it to the Minister of Agriculture for his comments and for the comments of the Director of Fisheries and Game. I know that the Minister will refer it back to me as soon as he has examined it. As his department is involved I sought his comments. The matter is proceeding and is well on the way.

HOMES FOR THE AGED.

Mr. HARDING: As, in many instances, there is ample space in hospital grounds where homes for the aged could be erected, can the Premier say whether such homes could be built in hospital grounds? If not, will he confer with the Minister of Health and ascertain what prohibits the building of such homes on hospital property?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Commonwealth legislation relating to the subsidy for the provision of these homes contains a clause that no subsidy will be provided where finance is provided by any local council or State Government. Most of the hospital grounds are controlled by councils and this, in itself, would debar them from being eligible for Commonwealth assistance. If the honourable member will supply me with information concerning the areas he has in mind I will ascertain the ownership of the property and obtain a more definite answer. Of course, it would depend upon whether approval could be given by the owners to have houses erected on the grounds, and whether any organization would be willing to sponsor the building of such houses.

MARION BY-LAW: BUILDINGS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That By-law No. 25 of the Corporation of the City of Marion in respect of buildings, made on May 28, 1962, and laid on the table of this House on October 1, 1963, be disallowed.

The by-law that is the subject of this motion for disallowance is a zoning by-law for the City of Marion. Hitherto that municipal area has had no zoning by-law; in other words, there are no defined areas for residential, commercial and industrial purposes. I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that a by-law was laid on the table of this House in 1960, but there was so much opposition to it in the City of Marion itself that Mr. Bradley, the then Town Clerk of Marion, gave evidence before the Subordinate Legislation Committee and requested that that by-law be disallowed so that discussions with objectors designed to reach agreement on zones could be held. In fact, that by-law was disallowed in this House, I think in May, 1960.

Unfortunately, since then either those discussions have not been held or if they have they have certainly not been successful, because when the Subordinate Legislation Committee considered this by-law considerable evidence was tendered in opposition to it. That evidence was tendered by Messrs. Peters (representing

Wunderlich Ltd.), McEntee (of McEntee & Williams, the builders) and London (of the London Engineering Company)—three manufacturers—on behalf of a group of manufacturers operating in a certain area of the City of Marion. That evidence in opposition to the by-law was subsequently supported by the Leader of the Opposition, who told the committee that he agreed substantially with the views of the three gentlemen I have just mentioned.

The area of the City of Marion about which there has been opposition—and the Leader will correct me if I am wrong here—is bounded by the Emerson Crossing in the north-east, thence by a line running south-westerly along the railway line to West Street, then south along West Street to Daws Road, east up Daws Road to the South Road, and then north along South Road back to the Emerson Crossing. It is that area, plus the area immediately west of the Emerson Crossing upon which the Wunderlich tilery is situated, about which there is contention, Mr. Speaker. Immediately after the Second World War the Marion council made it known that the area I have mentioned would be regarded as a factory area. We were told in evidence of a letter written by Mr. Bradley, the then Town Clerk, to Mr. C. W. Branson, who was at that time chairman of the Industries Development Committee. (That was not the Parliamentary committee of that name, but another one.) In that letter Mr. Bradley said:

> The comparatively extensive area bordered on the north by Cross Road, on the east by South Road, on the south by Sweetman Road, and on the west by the Willunga railway line and thereafter by West Street, has been set aside by my council as a factory area.

That is the area I have described, Mr. Speaker. I point out that at that time there was no formal zoning by-law to give that area the legal status of a factory area, but it was so regarded by the Marion council, as is evidenced in that letter. As a result of that letter and similar letters written in the years thereabouts —the later 1940's—some industries did establish in the area. Now, however, when the Marion council is making a formal zoning by-law only about half of that area has been included in the industrial zone and the rest of it is proposed to be zoned as residential, thus leaving some industrial concerns in a residential area.

As I explained, the various concerns established themselves in the district because they were told by the council at the time of their establishment that it was regarded as a factory area. Indeed, in one or two cases (I think I am right in saying this, and the other members of the committee will correct me if I am wrong) some factory premises have been left half in the proposed industrial area and half in the residential area. In other words, the boundary runs through certain factory premises. The council has tried to protect those industries already established in the proposed residential area by including in Part 2 of the by-law clauses 6 and 7, which relate to the use of existing buildings and the use of new buildings erected to replace existing buildings. However, the manufacturers who gave evidence before us were not satisfied that it protected their position adequately, and the Leader—the member for the district—supported that view in the evidence that he gave. I think I am not going too far when I say that the members of the Subordinate Legislation Committee also held the same view.

Mr. Jennings: I think even the Mayor of Marion supported it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes; I will mention his evidence in a moment or so. Those clauses do not give sufficient protection because of the uncertainty as to their import, because their provisions are that any new building or altered building shall be used for the same purpose and in the same manner as the existing building is used when this by-law comes into force. Now it is impossible, really, to define what that means. One example was given to us by the representative of Wunderlich Limited. At present, his company makes terra cotta tiles on its premises on Cross Road; if in the future that company wished to make not terra cotta tiles but plastic tiles, the question would arise whether that was the same or a similar purpose as that for which the land is at present used.

Representatives of the council also gave evidence before the committee, to which fact the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) has called attention already. They were Messrs. Edwards (the Mayor of the City of Marion) and McClure (the present Town Clerk). However, I think it is fair to say that their evidence did not strongly favour the present zoning provisions in the by-law and that it was not really conclusive. Messrs. Edwards and McClure did ask the committee for a guide as to what should be done if, in fact, either House disallowed the by-law, and that is something the committee certainly cannot do itself. However, I speak for myself now, and I cannot bind the present committee, let alone future committees, quite apart from the Houses where the final decisions on these matters lie. Speaking for myself, I think it is inequitable to

encourage industries to establish in an area and then to zone that area as residential, thus restricting their activities. On this point the Leader was extremely helpful.

Mr. Clark: He usually is.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am afraid I cannot go as far as that. However, I do say without hesitation, unstintingly, that he was extremely helpful to us on this occasion, and it may help the council in reframing the by-law, if the House accepts this motion, for me to read what the Leader said. On page 23 of the evidence he said:

I believe that Marion should be advised to reconsider the proposal so that Wunderlich's can be included in an industrial or commercial area, which should follow the railway line to the Sixth Avenue crossing, proceed along Adelaide Terrace, turn in a south-westerly direction to West Street, proceed east along Deloraine Road, south into Calstock Street, east up Conmurra Avenue to the proposed building alignment marked in red to Daws Road, east up Daws Road to South Road and then north to the Emerson Crossing.

On page 5 he said:

If the area were drawn on the Wunderlich property, facing South Road, Lindfield Avenue and Railway Terrace, and some imaginary line were drawn across Railway Terrace to connect with the railway line, there would be a reasonably good boundary.

I do not think anyone could be more explicit than that, and I hope that, if this motion is accepted by the House, the Marion council will find that statement a help in its deliberations and in reframing the zones. None of the other zones set out in the by-law have been attacked in the evidence before the Subordinate Legislation Committee; it was simply this area in which several industries have been established on the strength of its being an industrial area, and part of which has now been zoned as residential. In the circumstances, I hope the House will accept the motion.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I have listened to the remarks of the mover of this motion, which relates to an area in my district. I have previously indicated to the Marion council that it is desirable to retain industry in the area, and I will not deny industry my representations on its behalf. When this matter last came before the Subordinate Legislation Committee, I said I was prepared to give evidence. My biggest concern is that the Marion council has previously had no zoning in its area. However the council may look at that, it is a serious matter. I should not like to see a further encroachment, particularly as the area has been residential for as long as the council has been in existence. As a district council, this authority was doing reasonably well, but the district became a city almost overnight because of the upsurge of development in housing and the influx of people and industry.

I have no reason to doubt the contents of the letter produced by Mr. Branson and referred to by the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse). In fact, I know that what it set out was the intention, expressed verbally, of the then District Clerk to get industry to go to the district. I endeavoured to prevail on the South Australian Fire Brigades Board to erect a fire station near St. Mary's church on South Road, and as a result I traversed most of the area. No fewer than 70 industries of various types are established there, including the South Australian Rubber Mills and building organizations. If the area is altered in conformity with the evidence given by representatives of industry and as shown on the map presented by Mr. McEntee, of McEntee & Williams, this should meet the situation. Probably members would like to assist in this matter but the by-law can be only rejected or accepted by Parliament. I hope that common sense will prevail within the council. I want to see zoning, because I do not want a further encroachment on residential areas. However, in fairness to industry, I must oppose the by-law and support the motion. The Town Planning Committee's report indicates that certain established industrial plants should be cut through by boundaries, and when speaking to a motion on that report I said that I hoped councils generally would not ride on the back of the Town Planner, and that I thought they should make their own zones.

I support the motion knowing full well that, although members wish to help councils and ratepayers, they must protect industry. About 7,000 people are engaged in industry in this area. Although I do not say that all these industries would be excluded as a result of this zoning, I suggest that the council submit a revised plan, for which it would have no trouble in getting the approval of Parliament.

Motion carried.

MANNINGHAM RECREATION GROUND ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The SPEAKER: I have examined the Manningham Recreation Ground Act Amendment Bill, which was introduced by the honourable member for Enfield last Wednesday and is set down for its second reading today. It is provided by Joint Standing Order No. 1

relating to private Bills that a Bill not introduced by the Government whose primary and chief object is to promote the interests of an individual person, a company, a corporation or a local body and not those of the community at large shall be a private Bill and can be introduced only in accordance with the provisions of those Joint Standing Orders.

This Bill proposes to amend section 4 of the principal Act, which provides for the development by the Enfield council of certain land at Hampstead Heath as a playground and pleasure ground, and the amendment contained in the Bill authorizes the council to grant a lease of portion of that land to be used for club rooms by the Returned Sailors, Soldiers and Airmen's Imperial League of Australia (South Australian Branch). In my opinion this Bill is a private Bill, as defined in the Joint Standing Orders. The same Bill brought in by the Government would, by definition, be a hybrid Bill. As the Bill before the House is a private Bill and has not been introduced in compliance with Joint Standing Orders (Private Bills), I rule that it cannot be further proceeded with.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill to amend the Manningham Recreation Ground Act, 1936. Read a first time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It has been prepared by the honourable member for Enfield to solve a problem that has arisen in his district. He will explain that problem. I will not go into the terms of the Bill, as it is one that I have sponsored merely to overcome the difficulty of the honourable member. It has to be considered by a Select Committee, and under those circumstances, I suggest that, having heard the explanation, members need not, at this late stage of the session, debate the Bill until the Select Committee has had an opportunity to study it. I have discussed with the Leader of the Opposition the date of adjournment of the House. On November 21 the House will adjourn to a date in February. It will not be prorogued but will adjourn in time for the last week of the election campaign.

I will not explain the details of this Bill. To be candid I have not seen it, and I do not know its contents. The honourable member for Enfield will explain it, and I suggest that it then be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): First, I thank the Premier for his co-operation. He has helped me on a procedural point that I otherwise could not have overcome.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I point out to the honourable member that there are a few vacant places over here.

Mr. JENNINGS: We will all be over there soon and then the Premier may be over here. I shall do my best to explain this Bill, which the Premier has been good enough to introduce on my behalf. It is obvious that the second reading explanation that I prepared will have to be amended as I go along. It deals with what is purely a district matter, but it concerns all members of this House in so far as any Bill must affect every member of Parliament. I have not discussed this matter with my political colleagues except to tell them, out of courtesy, that I was going to introduce it. I have not asked them to support me, but I hope they will. I have not discussed it with any member opposite, but I hope that members opposite, too, will support the measure. I have nothing to gain or to lose whether the Bill is passed or defeated, but surely I would not introduce it unless I had very strong convictions from my knowledge of the issue involved.

On September 2, 1936, the Hon. S. W. (later Sir Shirley) Jeffries, at that time Attorney-General in the Butler Government, introduced the Manningham Recreation Ground Bill. In delivering his second reading explanation two days later (at page 1320 of *Hansard*), he said that the Bill dealt principally with two blocks of land situated in the district council district of Enfield. These blocks had been settled by a Dr. Bennett upon trust to use one of them as a playground and recreation ground, and the other as the site of some residential cottages. As difficulties had arisen in carrying out the trust's of Dr. Bennett's settlement, the only way those difficulties could be overcome was by an Act of Parliament so that the land might be used for the benefit of the public as it was intended to be used. The Attorney-General told the House that the Enfield District Council had announced its willingness to take over the land and develop the block Dr. Bennett intended for a playground and recreation ground in accordance with his intentions. As the Attorney-General (Mr. Jeffries) was introducing the Bill, Mr. Playford interjected and said, "Should not this Bill be a private Bill?" Here today that same person has to help me out by introducing my Bill as a Government Bill.

The original Bill vested the whole of the trust land in the Enfield council so that it would hold the playground and recreation ground as a public reserve under Part XXII of the Local Government Act. Further, the council was to develop the land as far as possible in accordance with Dr. Bennett's design, and to carry out his idea for the erection of a drinking fountain bearing a certain inscription. The Bill also empowered the Enfield council to sell certain residential sites included in the trust land and to apply the proceeds of the sale in developing the recreation ground and playground. The Bill was referred, under Standing Orders, to a Select Committee, which submitted its report on September 22. The Bill was passed without further debate, and forwarded to the Legislative Council, where it was also passed. It became law on assent in October, 1936. I draw members' attention to the fact that the original Bill was introduced by the Government, that it survived the scrutiny of a Select Committee comprising five members of this House, and that it was passed by both Houses, without opposition, to become law. Since then certain things have happened. I now quote submissions I have received from the State Secretary of the Returned Servicemen's League:

The need for an amending Bill arises from a set of circumstances which are unusual because the terms of existing legislation, although designed to protect the intentions of the generous donor of the Bennett Reserve at Manningham are, at the moment, acting contrariwise. In April, 1957, an approach was made to Enfield City Council seeking approval for the Gilles Plains-Hampstead sub-branch of the Returned Servicemen's League to modernize an old stable on the reserve and convert it to sub-branch clubrooms and to secure a lease of five years for its occupancy.

In due course, in May of that year, the Mayor, Mr. T. Turner, caused to be published a notice calling a public meeting of ratepayers to discuss the proposal. The meeting was held in the council chamber at 8 p.m. on June 3, 1957, and lasted for more than two hours. After exhaustive discussion, the proposal was agreed to by the meeting of ratepayers. Subsequently a memorandum of agreement was entered into between council and the sub-branch granting a five-year lease as from August 1, 1957.

Members of the sub-branch then set about the work of rebuilding and modernizing and by dint of voluntary labour and the expenditure of some £2,000 established clubrooms of a highly satisfactory nature on Bennett Reserve. So far, so good; the conduct of the centre was exemplary and with increasing population in this progressive suburban city, it became apparent that the needs of members and the community would best be met by an extension of the facilities available as was intended by the late Dr. Bennett.

With an eye to the future, the sub-branch contacted council in March, 1959, seeking an extension of their lease for a further period of 30 years. In his reply in May, 1959, the then Town Clerk, Mr. Harold Tyler, indicated that the maximum period for which the lease could be granted was 21 years; and that council had approved such an extension in principle. Then came the body blow! It was found, on an objection made by one ratepayer, that council did not have the power to grant a lease; and as a consequence, not only could the R.S.L. be not granted further tenure but also that it would lose the right previously conceded to use the premises as clubrooms. This means that the money and effort put into the clubrooms is completely forfeited; although, and this point is very strongly emphasized, the intention to do what was done was approved by a meeting of ratepayers in conformity with Part XXII of the Local Government Act and by virtue of an agreement entered into in good faith by both council and the R.S.L.

The sub-branch has plans to lay down a bowling green, membership of which would not be restricted to members but would be controlled by that body. Such a scheme does fulfil the intentions of Dr. Bennett. However, the primary desire at the moment is to preserve the clubrooms for the sub-branch. This is desirable and just from whatever angle the position is viewed and it would be grossly unfair, if, because of existing provisions, members should be deprived by law of what is theirs by right.

It is pertinent to observe at this stage just how important the premises are to that section of the community which the R.S.L. represents. In 1957, the sub-branch had a membership of 52; as at December 31, 1962, this figure had increased to 150. Thus in five years, membership has trebled; and as an indication of members' acceptance of their responsibility, it is worthy of note that this small band, in addition to raising its own urgently needed finances and supporting local appeals, has ploughed £150 into league charities such as the War Veterans' Home, Poppy Day and the Distressed Sailors' and Soldiers' Fund. This sub-branch is held in very high esteem by the league; and the State council and the State board are solidly behind the members in this effort to retain the fruits of their labour.

This submission is lengthy and I do not think I need read more now than the summary, which states:

1. The R.S.L. sub-branch obtained its present lease by authority of the ratepayers.

2. Its members observed in full all the obligations it assumed under the lease.

3. Its intentions are consistent with those of the donor.

4. It is able and ready to implement those intentions.

5. The trust is unable financially to go beyond the strict limits of the governing legislation, the framers of which could not, at that time, have foreseen the great increase which

has since occurred—and will continue at an even greater pace, *vide* the Town Planner's Report—in the City of Enfield.

6. Council has stated its willingness to grant a lease for 21 years, evidence of its confidence as representatives of the ratepayers in the intentions and conduct of the sub-branch.

7. Because the ratepayers are unable to approve the lease because of legal strictures it is plainly desirable that in order that the intentions of the donor and the wishes of the ratepayers may be achieved the amendment submitted herein should be assented to.

I have plenty of other material that I could quote, but at this time I think it is necessary for me to quote only from a letter signed by the Town Clerk of Enfield, Mr. L. J. Lewis, dated September 27, 1963:

The council resolved that it support the endeavours of the sub-branch as far as the amendment of the Act is concerned and a copy of my letter to Mr. Heaven under date September 25 is also attached which you will find self-explanatory.

So, as late as September 27, the council supports this Bill. A Bill similar to this, was introduced into the Legislative Council on November 4, 1959, by the Minister of Local Government. That Bill sought to empower the Enfield City Council to lease portion of the Manningham recreation ground for the purpose of a bowling green, the design of which had been set out in a plan made by Dr. Bennett in his lifetime. The Bill was referred to a Select Committee comprising five members of the Legislative Council, and that committee reported on December 1, 1959, that it had heard certain evidence and that it was of the opinion the Bill would defeat the basic principle of the original trust by enabling certain portions of the land to be leased to a person, association of persons or incorporated club, so withdrawing the land from public use. Further, the committee found that the accounts had been meticulously kept. In the final paragraph of its report the committee stated:

The committee feels, therefore, that it has no alternative but to recommend that the Bill be withdrawn.

I have studied the evidence given before the Select Committee in 1959, and that evidence is available to all members. Without reflecting on the committee's recommendation, I nevertheless believe that the decision was wrong in the long term, although it may have been correct at the time. If any member bothered to read that evidence he would see that most of the opposition to the proposal came from the Broadview Bowling Club, the secretary of which, incidentally, is a personal friend of mine. The club was just getting established and it was concerned lest another competitive club be established nearby. The evidence on which the committee recommended against the Bill had nothing to do with the use of the clubrooms by the R.S.L. which, of course, is the principal purpose of my Bill.

I am only concerned to see that justice is done to the people and the organizations in my district in this matter. From what I have said and from what I have quoted, the Enfield council obviously wants this Bill, the R.S.L. sub-branch wants it, and certainly to my knowledge no-one opposes it. It must, however, be referred to a Select Committee, so I hope members will accord me the traditional courtesy of carrying the second reading and allowing the matter to be so referred in order that the committee may inquire into the circumstances and report to the House.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Corcoran, Coumbe, Hall, Jennings and Ryan; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, to adjourn from place to place, and to report on November 12.

BERRI BY-LAW: NOISY MACHINERY.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That By-law No. 51 of the District Council of Berri in respect of the prevention and suppression of nuisances—noisy machinery, made on September 13, 1962, and laid on the table of this House on June 12, 1963, be disallowed.

Honourable members may wonder why this motion has been adjourned from week to week in the last few months. The answer is that the members of the Subordinate Legislation Committee were most anxious to travel to Glossop, where the machine that gave rise to this by-law is situated, to see the machine and hear it for themselves. Because of the adjournment of the House during the Stirling by-election campaign, it was not until last Monday that that visit could be arranged. I know that doubts were cast previously on the wisdom of the committee's carrying out experiments. I hope that the same strictures will not be made on the fact that we had a view on this occasion; all members found it most helpful, and 30 minutes of seeing and hearing the machine in question was better than many hours of description and explanation. The by-law, which is short, states:

If any plant or machinery is so used in or upon any premises within the district council district of Berri, except upon premises set apart or approved in writing or licensed by the council for the purpose, and the noise made by or arising from such plant or machinery is a nuisance to the occupier of any other premises

within the said district, the occupier of the premises upon which such plant or machinery is so used shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty of £20; and in the case of continuing annoyance, to a further penalty not exceeding £5 for every day on which the offence is committed.

In other words, if any plant or machinery emits any noise that is a nuisance to any occupier or resident anywhere in the district of the District Council of Berri, then, in addition to the remedies at common law that a person has for nuisance, it is also an offence under this by-law, carrying a fine and the continuing daily penalty. The explanation which was supplied with the by-law to the Subordinate Legislation Committee set out the following:

In circumstances which have arisen in the district of the township of Glossop, an engineering firm—Murray Valley Engineers—have installed a rumbling machine for derusting and cleaning the interior of agricultural spray tanks. This machine is erected in the open air.

I will not read the next paragraph in detail. We were told in the explanation that the intense noise created by the revolving of the tank was a high-pitched whine and rattle that could be heard throughout the township. The opposition to the by-law (which, as honourable members will see, was directed solely at one particular machine being operated by one man in the district) came from that man—Mr. C. H. Shepherd—who runs Murray Valley Engineers. When he gave evidence before the committee he told us—on page 1 of his evidence—that if the by-law was passed he would have no option but to close his doors. He then explained that he had established in Glossop in September, 1950, and that he manufactured viticultural machinery. So I think it is fair to conclude that his industry is an important one in the river areas where he is situated. At present he employs nine men, but in the season (which, from memory, is from November to about February) his employment rate goes up to as high as about 23. It can be seen that he has a well-established business that gives local employment and is of importance—as you, Mr. Speaker, will know from your own experience—to the primary industries in the district.

Mr. Loveday: Has the rumbling machine been going since 1950?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No. Mr. Shepherd says that the rumbler is a machine that revolves steel barrels when cleaning, and that it makes a noise. He has had the machine, as I think the evidence will show, for about two years now. He told the committee that he was originally encouraged to establish in that area by being told that it was an industrial area. Coincidentally, as in the case of Marion, there is no by-law that zones the area as industrial, but he did tell us that that was the undertaking that had been given to him when he established in 1950. I need not go through the rest of Mr. Shepherd's evidence in detail, but I draw attention to one matter. In reply to my question, he said that his capital investment was £23,000. I then said, on page 4:

Apparently this rumbler is the main cause of complaint?

He answered, "I gather that is so." Well, there is no doubt about it at all. I then said:

Would you be prepared to give any undertaking that you would not operate it except, say, between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. on a week-day?

He said:

I should be only too happy to. There was only the one occasion, and that was 1½ hours on a Saturday afternoon to get an interstate shipment away.

I then said:

You would be prepared to give an undertaking that in future you would not run it at a weekend or except between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. on a week-day?

He replied, "Yes". I should mention that Murray Valley Engineers is situated on the main road at Glossop, with a frontage to the main road. It is not the only works in the area: a firm known as Grant Engineering is at the other end of the town. I think I am right in saying—the member for Chaffey will tell me if I am wrong—that there are other works in the township as well. Evidence was given in favour of the by-law by Mr. R. H. Curren (Chairman of the District Council of Berri) and by Councillor J. V. Uylaki who, besides being a councillor, is resident next door to Murray Valley Engineers and is the man who has most to complain about; we understand he has complained most about the machine. They told us that the noise was clearly audible half a mile away and that there had been widespread complaints in Glossop that it was working on Saturdays and Sundays, and for eight hours at a time. We were handed a petition that had been signed by 23 people who, we were told, comprised 90 per cent of the people in Glossop.

That was the state of the evidence some weeks ago, and I hope members will agree that it was desirable that we see for ourselves what the machine was like, what noise it made, and how far away it could be heard. On the inspection last Monday, the members of the

committee found that the machine was not as noisy as they had expected it to be and that they could not hear the noise as far away as they had been told. The noise was not really piercing or high-pitched, but I imagine it could become rather monotonous if one had to listen to it for long periods. I made a measurement and found it was just audible 200 yards away from the factory. I checked with people living around about. (This is not in the evidence, and I must ask the House to accept what I say here.) I called on Mrs. Uylaki, who lives next door, and asked her if the noise we were hearing at that time was the same as the noise usually heard from the machine at other times. She told me it was about the same as usual, but perhaps not quite as much as she sometimes heard. However, she was a little uncertain about that, and the impression I gathered from her was that it was substantially the same noise as the machine usually emitted. One-quarter of a mile away members of the committee could not hear the noise at all and, on checking at a house next to the primary school, they were told that the noise never worried the woman who lived there. The conclusion arrived at, therefore, was that the noise was not such as to justify the by-law with its attendant inconvenience to Mr. Shepherd. I use the word "inconvenience" advisedly, because I think that is the correct description of what he would be caused if the by-law went through. Although he has been established for about 13 years, he has had the rumbler for only a couple of years, so I do not think that he would have to close his business if he could not use the rumbler.

Mr. Curren: It is only a small part of his business.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It may be, but it is an essential part of his business, he told me, and I gathered it was essential for people living in the district that they have the service he provides by means of this rumbling machine.

Mr. Shannon: Is it a common method to remove rust?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I understand it is a common method to clean off the rust from the insides of agricultural spray tanks.

Mr. Shannon: Then its use would not be confined to this area, would it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, and, although this is not in the evidence, we have been told that it is a common method used in the metropolitan area, particularly at Port Adelaide.

Mr. Ryan: There is no noise in Port Adelaide.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I agree that there is no noise when the honourable member is not there; no noise could be as great as the noise made by the honourable member, of course.

The SPEAKER: He is a rumbler.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: A rumbler, or a grumbler? Anybody aggrieved by the noise has a remedy through the courts if in fact it is a nuisance. In these circumstances, the committee resolved that the disallowance of the by-law should be recommended to both Houses. Speaking for myself, I think that if the by-law is allowed to stand, apart from this one machine, it could possibly discourage industry in the Berri district at a time when I should have thought every opportunity should be taken to encourage industry there in the interests of decentralization. However, that is only my private view. For the reasons I have given, I hope the House will carry the motion.

Motion carried.

EXCESSIVE RENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from October 30. Page 1375.)

Clause 3—"Amendment of section 3 of principal Act."

Mr. DUNSTAN: I move:

To strike out all the words after "amended" and to insert:

(*a*) by inserting after "include" in the ninth line in the definition of "letting agreement" the paragraph designation "(*a*)";

(*b*) by inserting after the word "more" in the eleventh line of the said definition "entered into prior to the passing of the Excessive Rents Act Amendment Act, 1963"; and

(*c*) by adding at the end of the said definition the following paragraph:

(*b*) any agreement in writing and signed by the parties for the letting or sub-letting or for the renewal or extension of any existing agreement for letting or sub-letting for a period of three years or more and entered into after the passing of the Excessive Rents Act Amendment Act, 1963, of any premises whether with or without the use of furniture, goods or services (not being any such agreement made at any time after the commencement of this Act after the giving to the tenant of a notice to terminate an existing tenancy or in consequence of a threat by the landlord to give a notice to terminate an existing tenancy).

I move this amendment because the Premier has suggested that he will agree to the clause if it is altered in such a way so that its

effect is that, while existing agreements for a year or more (those entered into before the passing of this Bill) are exempt from the Act, hereafter only agreements or renewals of agreements for a period of three years or more will be exempt. I agree that this is a reasonable compromise.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The words the honourable member used were "any premises"; should they not be "any dwelling-houses"?

Mr. DUNSTAN: No, any premises the subject of the Act. What has been done here is to maintain the existing exception by limiting it to agreements entered into prior to the passing of this amendment, then to repeat the exception only altering it by providing that in future the period will be three years and not one year. The same wording has been used in the new exception apart from the period of three years, and apart from applying it to extensions or renewals on existing agreements.

Mr. Millhouse: That means raising the one-year period to three years?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes, for future agreements. That is the effect of it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): If I understand the honourable member's explanation correctly, what he intends to do is to maintain the exemption that exists on agreements that already have been entered into. Those agreements were entered into at a time when an exception was provided for in the Act, and the honourable member intends to continue those agreements. He is not going to interfere with any exemption that has previously been effective and to make it ineffective, but he is going to provide that for the future it will be three years instead of one year in which to obtain an exemption. If my understanding is correct, that appears to be similar to what I suggested might be considered as a fair compromise. There has been some difficulty concerning the short period of one year, and an officer reported that it could be extended. Subject to an examination of the drafting I do not oppose the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 4—"No costs to be ordered."

Mr. DUNSTAN: In his second reading explanation the Premier doubted the wisdom of this provision. He was of the opinion, apparently, that the move could harm the applicant in these cases. I remind him that it was found that under the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act it was advisable that no costs be ordered, and that was the position; no costs were given to either side. The reason for that was, and it is a more cogent reason under this provision—

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I am not sure whether we provided in the Act at one stage that there would be no legal representation.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Not as far as I am aware. If such a provision existed it must have been earlier, because for many years I practised in that jurisdiction and on a Monday morning when tenancy cases were called on, it was impossible to get into the Adelaide Local Court because of the number of solicitors. The reason for putting it in here is that in my experience and, so far as I am aware, in the experience of officers of the Housing Trust, it has been found that tenants have not been deterred from bringing applications under this Act by the possibility of having to pay their own costs. Poor people can get assistance from the Law Society or, on the Premier's offer, from the Prices Commissioner. It is not their own costs, other than the valuation fee, that they are worried about. What they are faced with is an Act where the standard to be laid down by the court has not been determined. It is difficult to say what a court is going to find is an excessive rent under the provisions of the present Act. No-one can advise on the conclusion that will be reached by the court. Therefore, people are going into court on a gamble of paying costs, unless we put in a provision of this kind. Costs follow the event if it is left to the court's discretion. It is rarely that the court orders other than that costs follow the event in a case.

If we provided that it was left to the court's discretion, that discretion would be exercised in a way the court normally exercises it, to allow costs to follow the event. If that happens, then the costs are on a sliding scale in the local court jurisdiction and fixed on the value of the property. That means that if a tenant did not get an order that the rent is excessive, he could be facing a bill of costs from the other side of £50 or £60, and most people cannot afford to pay that. Many tenants in my district have not been worried about their own costs, which could be covered, but have been warned by their advisers that if they were not successful—and success could by no means be guaranteed—and the court did not find the rents excessive, they could be up

for a heavy bill of costs for the other side and they did not have the money. So, the view that this provision should be included was arrived at by me and by others after discussing it with court officers and with officers from the trust who saw what was happening with tenants' applications. It is for the protection of the tenant from the possibility of having to pay out a large sum to the other side that this proposal is included. In most cases where tenants are not in a good financial position, provided the valuation fees are covered then they are not in such great difficulties about meeting their own costs. However, they could be in considerable difficulty in meeting possible costs awarded to the other side. This provision was found wise in the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act, and I think we will find it wise in this legislation.

Clause passed.

Clause 5—"Report of Land Board officer."

Mr. DUNSTAN: I move:

After "court" to strike out "shall" and insert "may".

In view of the Premier's remarks when this matter was last discussed and because of my discussions with him today it seems that we can agree on this clause by providing that the local court may get a report from the Prices Commissioner.

Amendment carried.

Mr. DUNSTAN moved:

To strike out "an officer of the Land Board or of".

Amendment carried.

Mr. DUNSTAN moved:

To strike out "who is a licensed valuer".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 6—"Persons not to interefere with use and enjoyment of premises."

Mr. DUNSTAN: I appreciate that the Premier is prepared to accept this clause. Since I introduced this measure information has come to my knowledge illustrating the need for the inclusion of this provision. In Bridge Street, in my district, a landlord objected to the presence of his tenants. The tenancy had not been properly determined so the landlord told the tenants to go. They did not go because they had nowhere else to go, so the landlord walked in and took the roof off. The matter was reported to the Housing Trust.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WEEDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

Second reading.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Before I explain the details of this Bill I should make a few general comments. The Weeds Act was enacted in 1956 and has not been amended until now. It recognizes the principle that the primary responsibility for weed control lies with the occupier of the land or with the landholder himself. No other person can possibly undertake that responsibility. The legislation is administered by local councils. That has proved effective because local councils are close to the properties and are familiar with the problems of their districts. Since the Weeds Act of 1956 was passed council activity has been enormously increased. There was a comparatively slow beginning; the Agriculture Department had weeds officers who went from council to council, first putting the problem before them, suggesting that they appoint officers to undertake weed control work in their districts, and offering technical assistance of every possible kind.

The number of councils that have taken advantage of this advice has increased considerably. For instance, one year after the regulations were proclaimed (in 1958), more than 20 councils had not even appointed an inspector. It is believed that at that time fewer than 10 councils had active weed control programmes that were well-informed and in continuous operation. Twelve months later 22 of the district councils were working actively, and by December, 1961, this number had increased to 36. In these council areas results could be seen in the field, and it was reported at the time that a further 35 councils were getting under way. At this stage weed control officers had spent about 800 days in the field giving direct technical assistance to local councils. To assess the present situation a detailed survey was carried out during July, 1963. The results can be summarized as follows:

Twenty-eight district councils are now rated as active. Those councils are carrying out every phase of weed control needed in their districts; 57 councils are carrying out weed

control, but their programme is at present considered inadequate; 15 councils have been rated as inactive.

The Government appointed staff to deal with the problem and to assist these councils in every possible way, and the result has been that the problem of weeds has become considerably less serious than it was earlier. No-one will say that we have a diminishing problem with weeds; I think we have a continuous problem. However, we are attacking in many directions at present, and at the same time we are protecting the State from the ingress of weeds from outside. I was particularly struck by the comment of two weeds inspectors who came from another State not long ago to study our methods. Their comment, in effect, was:

Your strength lies in the way in which local government is prepared to do the job without sitting back waiting to see how much they can get from the State Government.

That, to my mind, is a genuine tribute to the work of the councils. The purpose of this Bill is to provide for financial assistance to encourage councils in their work. At this stage I refer to some of the more serious weeds, each of which is known to honourable members in one way or another. First, we have heard much about noogoora burr, which does not grow in South Australia to any extent; there has been only one infestation that could be rated as having been known for some time, and it is still occurring. Other infestations have appeared from time to time and have been eradicated immediately they have been detected. These spots are visited again and again in order to see that there are no new germinations. Also, odd plants grow from time to time; these just appear, and do not represent a serious infestation. This burr will stick in the wool of sheep and will greatly lower the value of sheep if it becomes widespread. The problem has been greatly intensified by the tremendous spread of this weed in some of the Eastern States.

Noogoora burr is not the only burr that worries us: other burrs that we have seen in South Australia could also become a menace to this State. As a result, we have spent much money in having inspectors examine sheep and cattle, as well as having others visit properties looking for the weed itself and doing all kinds of extension work in this respect. We have an officer stationed at Jamestown especially for this purpose, and he has visited 150 properties in a tour of inspection and given instruction in the matter. We have regulations which prevent the movement of livestock carrying noogoora burr.

Skeleton weed came into this State not many years ago and has become widespread in certain areas. It occurs in many parts of the cereal-growing areas; it is a particularly serious weed, and possibly it could make cereal growing uneconomic if it were allowed to spread unchecked. That weed is particularly difficult to eradicate. A special committee appointed under the Agriculture Council is doing research into skeleton weed, and the Wheat Industry Fund has provided an officer for that research work in this State.

Other weeds are known to us only too well. Some of them are extremely dangerous and others are not considered dangerous in certain districts. For instance, salvation jane is edible for stock and can be considered to have some value in certain areas, whereas in other areas it is a serious weed. The technical advances lately have made it possible to deal with nearly all of these weeds in one way or another. Salvation jane, cape tulip, and the thistle family can all be readily dealt with in one way or another, albeit at considerable expense. The newest sprays for African daisy consist of a mixture of two chemicals—amitrol and ammonium thiocyanate—and although they are effective they are expensive. Three-cornered jack can be dealt with by a spray that has recently been developed. Another weed of some importance which has occurred on the border of South Australia and New South Wales is called mesquite. This weed has caused us some worry, and we have placed it on our dangerous weeds list. It has established itself over 70,000,000 acres in the United States of America. Every year some new chemical treatment is devised or some other means are found to deal with weeds.

At this stage I turn to the details of the Bill, from which it will be clear what is proposed. Its main objects are to encourage councils (and to provide them with financial assistance) to carry out more regular and intensive programmes of weed control within their areas and to increase representation on the Weeds Advisory Committee. Section 6 of the principal Act provides for the constitution and appointment of the Weeds Advisory Committee. Subsection (2) of that section provides that the committee shall consist of such number of members, not exceeding seven, as the Minister from time to time determines. At present the committee consists of seven members, of whom the Director of Agriculture is Chairman, one is a member of the Pastoral Board and five are primary producers from various agricultural districts in the State.

The Government considers it desirable to increase the number of primary producers on the committee to six, and to enable this to be done clause 3 amends section 6 (2) by increasing the maximum number of members from seven to eight.

Clause 4 inserts in the Act a new section that will empower the Minister to pay subsidies to councils that employ local authorized officers for the purposes of weed control inspections and of enforcing the provisions of the Act. The new provision, it is felt, would encourage councils to carry out more regular and strenuous programmes of weed control in their areas and enable them to secure the services of officers with training or experience in this field. The new provision sets out the limits subject to which any such subsidy would be payable. The subsidy will not exceed 50 per cent of the remuneration paid by a council to its local authorized officer for carrying out weed control work. It will not be paid in respect of any local authorized officer who is also the district clerk or town clerk of the council nor will it be paid unless an authorized officer is employed for at least a period of 60 days or for at least one day in each week of the relevant financial year. This will ensure that a council must carry out a definite weed control programme in order to qualify for a subsidy. It is considered most desirable that authorized officers should be possessed of suitable qualifications. The new section accordingly provides that, after a period of five years, no subsidy will be paid in respect of authorized officers who are not qualified unless they are employed with the written permission of the Minister, who will have regard to the availability or otherwise of suitably qualified persons when permission is sought.

Section 19 of the principal Act sets out the basis on which contributions towards the destruction and control of weeds on public roads are to be made to district councils by owners of land abutting the road, and requires the councils concerned within one month of incurring any expense in this connection to give notice to the respective owners or occupiers of the amount of their contribution. The period of one month does not give councils sufficient time to assess the results of any treatment for weed destruction or control or whether fresh treatment would be necessary, and gives rise to additional work for councils when extra accounts have to be rendered for subsequent treatments. Clause 5 (*a*) accordingly extends this period to three months.

Section 19 applies only to contributions to district councils by adjoining landowners for weed control on public roads. Municipalities were excluded from its application because of the administrative difficulties of recovering small contributions from many thousands of ratepayers in the more closely settled towns. However, the Corporation of the Town of Renmark is responsible for the largest area in the State, which includes much land used for agricultural and horticultural purposes, and the Government feels that this corporation should therefore be enabled to recover contributions from adjoining landowners for weed control on public roads. Clause 5 (*b*) accordingly extends the application of section 19 to that corporation.

At present, district councils are obliged to bear the cost of weed control on roads abutted by Crown lands. Clause 6 enacts a new section that empowers the Minister to reimburse those councils their expenses in that connection. A council will not be entitled to such reimbursement unless the manner and programme of the weed control are previously approved by the Minister

Members will see that the Bill is in accordance with previously established principles, that the responsibility for weed control lies in the first instance with the landowner, and that control is administered through local government. Its provisions are a marked contribution to the work of local government in carrying out its functions, as a subsidy of up to one-half of the cost of its authorized officers will be made. On the other hand, it does not provide for the eradication of weeds, which is left as the responsibility of the landholder. I think the Bill will assist weed control in this State in a significant way. I believe we have made considerable progress in the last few years, and I think we have nothing to be ashamed of by comparison with other States. However, I believe we have a long way to go, and I think the programme envisaged in the Bill will be of significant assistance in reaching our eventual goal.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

RURAL ADVANCES GUARANTEE BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 31. Page 1423.)

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): When the Treasurer foreshadowed this legislation, if I remember rightly it was after he came back from a flight over the United States of America. He was impressed because, as he

said, he noticed that a tremendous area was divided into quite small holdings. On making inquiries—I think he said at Washington—he found that the proportion of small holdings in the United States was extremely high. As a result, he thought something should be done in this State to encourage smaller holdings and that legislation of this type, which guarantees the repayment of loans made or proposed to be made to people to assist them to acquire land for rural production, would assist in this direction.

I think it is open to question whether this Bill, if it is passed, will secure many transactions carried through to their logical conclusion. I say that because I agree with the comments of the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell), who said that he thought many valuations would be turned down under the terms of the Bill. Members will notice that proper and careful provisions are inserted in the Bill to ensure that every application will receive a thorough investigation and that the applicant will first of all be dependent on the Land Board's valuations and report certifying that the amount paid or to be paid for the acquisition of land by the applicant is no greater than the fair value of the land, having regard to the particular business of rural production to be undertaken. Furthermore, no guarantee will be made for a loan that exceeds 85 per cent of the value of the land as stated in that valuation.

I cannot help remarking that there is plenty of evidence to show that much of the land now being sold and used in rural production has a market price that exceeds its economic value. As the Bill contains provisions for both the investigation by the Land Board and a subsequent investigation, or one carried out at the same time, by the Director of Agriculture or some other person nominated by the Minister into the possibility of the land at that price maintaining an applicant and his family, it is questionable whether many of the so-called transactions will measure up for this purpose. However, not the slightest doubt exists that the proposal to furnish this type of guarantee will induce lenders to be more free with their lending, for the good reason that their security will be considerably increased. They will have the State's guarantee on the transaction. I am pleased to see provisions for a complete and careful investigation of every aspect: also, that reports of the Director of Agriculture and the Land Board will be forwarded to the Land Settlement Committee, and that no guarantee will be issued until that committee has made a recommendation in writing to the Treasurer. It would be wrong for the taxpayer, through the Treasurer, to be making guarantees on transactions at values that would be above the natural economic value of the land, under the circumstances as described in this Bill. It would be wrong for inflated values to be propped up, and I am happy about that aspect of the Bill.

Mr. Freebairn: Much reliance will be placed on the Land Settlement Committee.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Yes. Knowing its personnel, I do not think the committee will permit itself to be used as a rubber stamp. I am certain that it will carefully examine the reports and seriously consider every case before making its recommendations. I am sure the committee's members will agree with my point about propping up inflated values.

Mr. Hall: The applications will be fully examined before reaching the committee.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Precisely. Careful investigation will be made before the reports containing the result of the investigation reach the committee, but the committee will have a heavy responsibility when making its final recommendation. The legislation is worth while because we should not oppose anything assisting satisfactory transactions which enable young men with the necessary ability, knowledge and experience in farming to obtain a property. I consider that the inducement given to lenders will enable satisfactory transactions to be made, although I do not expect them to be numerous. The same thought must have been in the mind of the member for Albert because he suggested that consideration should be given to enable a panel of valuers, recommended by the South Australian Branch of the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers, to have properties referred to it in case of dispute, because he said that he could visualize many valuations being turned down. This suggestion does not appeal to me because such a panel would naturally be regarded as a sort of court of appeal when a higher valuation was desired, and it would, in effect, become such a thing. The tendency, in most cases, would be to push the case on to the panel of valuers because of the inflated values being sought, and the panel might give a higher valuation.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It would be an impossible position for the Land Board.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Yes, and the board would be discredited as a body. There might be some value in the suggestion if two sets of valuers gave different valuations at the same time and on the same grounds, but I do not think a panel of valuers would necessarily

approach the subject of valuations from the same point of view as would the Land Board. The board has wide experience in this matter: it will be difficult to obtain a body with wider experience. Let the Bill stand as it is in this respect and, by experience, we can assess the results. The appointment of a panel of separate valuers would make the Land Board feel that it was discredited and it would possibly not be so keen to work satisfactorily under such a set-up.

Mr. Shannon: After all, the taxpayer is finding the money.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Yes, and a panel of valuers of this description would not have the same sense of responsibility to the Government as would the Land Board, and through the Government to the taxpayer. It is essential that this aspect be carefully watched. I have touched on what I consider to be the most important aspects of this legislation. I am sure that today South Australia has many young men with the requisite qualifications for farming, but owing to the situation in this State they find themselves unable to obtain land or sufficient finance to go on the land. This legislation may assist them and we can expect satisfactory transactions to result from it. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): In supporting the Bill I have grave reservations as to its value. With so many protective provisions an individual, if he obtains the money, will not get into trouble and the lending authority or the taxpayer will not come to any harm. With the previous speaker I doubt whether many people will benefit from this Bill. I believe that it is not so much a shortage of money today that keeps people off the land as a shortage of land and the high values placed on it. In South Australia we have not much land with a sufficiently high rainfall to make it of great value, and when it is available the prices offered are such that it is uneconomic for anyone who has to borrow money to buy it. Anyone borrowing money and paying the price of land today cannot earn more than, say, 4 per cent on the money, but he has to pay 5 per cent or 6 per cent on the loan. Therefore, eventually (and it will not take long) he must go into liquidation. The Bill hinges on clause 3 (2) which states:

> A guarantee shall not be given under this section unless—
>
> (*a*) the Board furnishes the Treasurer with a certificate signed by the Chairman or any member of the Board certifying that the amount paid or to be paid for the acquisition of the land by the applicant for the guarantee is no greater than the fair value of the land . . .

What is "the fair value of land"? I do not know what that means.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: The Land Board is called upon to decide that every day.

Mr. HEASLIP: I understand that.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It means the productive value.

Mr. HEASLIP: The clause says:

> . . . having regard to the particular business of rural production to be undertaken or conducted on the land, as stated in a written valuation attached to or incorporated in the certificate.

Knowing the Land Board and its valuations, I say it would not make a recommendation except at a price whereby the land could return at least the rate of interest that the bank would charge. The occupier of the land would have to earn sufficient therefrom to keep himself and his family as well as pay the interest the bank charged.

Mr. Hall: And to repay some of the principal.

Mr. HEASLIP: He would have 30 years to pay that.

Mr. Hall: He still has to meet it.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes. He should not have less than 30 years because as a primary producer he could experience a run of bad seasons and go into the red.

Mr. Lawn: You don't have to be a primary producer to go into the red.

Mr. HEASLIP: A person may borrow 85 per cent of the value of the land from a bank. It is quite possible that for the next three years instead of making enough to pay the interest on that loan, the landholder may not make anything. Fortunately, the Bill provides that the Treasurer has the right to defer interest payments. If a man does not make anything for two or three years he can go into the red for more than 85 per cent of the value of the land. Under clause 3 the Land Board must certify that the land is an economic purchase. I contend that the Land Board will recommend little land.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: A lot of semi-developed land could be available.

Mr. HEASLIP: The Land Board is permitted to guarantee only up to 85 per cent of the value of the land. If a person is going to develop the land he will require more than he can borrow from the bank.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: This legislation will work in conjunction with the Commonwealth Bank's development loans.

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not know that the Commonwealth Bank would come in after 85 per cent of the value of the land had been advanced to a settler.

Mr. Loveday: A buyer would have to devote some of his own resources to developing the land.

Mr. HEASLIP: If he has resources. He would have to retain sufficient to enable him to live until he developed the property and got it into production. I believe that the Bill has strict limitations, but if it results in the settlement of only one more person on the land I am prepared to support it. I do not think it will enable many people to settle on the land because of the shortage of land and the prices land is bringing today. When the Treasurer returned from his trip to America the press suggested that this legislation would lead to closer settlement—to the cutting up of large holdings into smaller holdings. There is no suggestion of that under this Bill. One of this State's biggest tragedies was the cutting up of large holdings before the 1930's, because during the 1930's many good farmers lost everything they had and the Government then had to increase the size of holdings to enable people to get a living from the land.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Marginal lands.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes. The Government would purchase a farm and hand it to the adjoining landholder.

Mr. Loveday: A similar situation applied to the early fruit block settlements.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes. I do not think we shall make those mistakes again. This Bill does not seek to provide for cutting up large holdings. I support the Bill, although I doubt whether it will assist very much.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I agree almost entirely with the previous two speakers. I am sorry that when this legislation was first suggested it attracted so much publicity, because I know from personal approaches made to me that many people gained hopes that will not be realized. I agree that it is necessary to supervise the proposed guarantees carefully, because we are dealing with public money. I think that the operation of the precautions will result in excluding about 90 per cent of the people who apply. This will considerably reduce the number of acceptable applicants. I shall be pleased if the number is greater than I expect, so long as the applicants are not established uneconomically. No matter what we do legislatively in guaranteeing assistance we should ensure that a holding is self-supporting and able to provide an adequate living for the occupier and enable him to pay back his principal and interest over the 30-year period. We are not subsidizing people on a long-term basis but are setting them up in our economic community. They must face up to the current economic forces and to those that may develop.

The more a man borrows the less he can afford to pay for property. The amount that a person can afford to pay will, to some degree, depend on the extent to which he must go into debt. The applicants for the 85 per cent guarantee will need to be carefully scrutinized. Perhaps those who need a smaller guarantee could get it from our financial institutions. Most of the applicants will want the larger percentage guarantee. When we speak of the interest being deferred for several years because of circumstances we must remember that when that interest is added to the principal the total amount owing becomes nearer 90 per cent. I do not know of many instances where a 90 per cent borrowing on a property could be expected to be profitable and provide a living for the people on it. We must be thinking along the lines of intensive production. It is all very well to say that the scheme will apply to all primary producers, but today we have widespread farming operations where there has been high capital investment. If a grazing property had to abide by all the conditions the amount of capital needed would be great indeed. With an 85 per cent borrowing there would be practically no chance of success from operating it. The same could be said about a cereal-growing property and other properties where there is large-scale capital investment. That is why I say we must be thinking of more intensive production, and making use of sidelines. I cannot see this system of borrowing operating successfully on properties with a high capital investment. On some properties the capital problem can be overcome by the use of much family labour, and that is perhaps why it is said that there may be more success with intensive forms of agriculture.

I give a warning against setting up too small a unit under intensive farming. If greater production were needed from an owner-occupier property there could be a lowering of living standards. We have labour available for tertiary industries and it would be a pity to see people working on

a lower standard of living when a higher standard was available in better paid jobs. Although we realize the need to assist people who want to occupy land in their own right, we should not be too optimistic that the Bill will be completely successful. I hope that in establishing intensive agriculture we shall not lower the standard of living of the people who receive guarantees. Diffidently, I support the Bill.

Mr. FERGUSON (Yorke Peninsula): I commend the Government for introducing the Bill, which is long overdue. The primary producers have needed it for a long time. The Minister's second reading explanation contained the following:

> The Bill, if approved by Parliament, would give effect to the Government's policy of assisting deserving persons in overcoming the difficulties, with which they would otherwise be faced, in obtaining long-term loans for the purchase of land for the purpose of setting themselves up in the business of rural production.

In this world many deserving persons do not get what they deserve, and in South Australia many deserving primary producers do not get what they deserve. Some people on the land deserve to get help under this Bill. People engaged in rural production on a share basis have proved their ability to work land. They are entitled to own land in their own right, but they have not been able to get it because of financial difficulties.

Mr. Nankivell: It has been the terms under which they could borrow money that has prevented them from getting land.

Mr. FERGUSON: That is correct.

Mr. McKee: After the Bill is passed they will still experience the same difficulties.

Mr. FERGUSON: Mostly primary producers will come under the Bill, and they have been through the hard school of experience in putting up with hardships. In his second reading explanation the Minister also said:

> Clause 3 authorizes the Treasurer to guarantee the repayment of a loan to an approved borrower. An approved borrower must be a person who, having regard to his ability and experience in the business of rural production . . .

Many of our primary producers have proved their ability, and will come under the Bill. Clause 3 contains a number of conditions. For instance, it says:

> The Land Board must certify that the purchase price of the land in question does not exceed the fair value of land . . .

What is a fair value? In the early twenties in my district land was sold at about £30 an acre, whereas today it brings between £60 and £70. It is suggested that the fair value of land is the value of the production. Are we able to assess what land will produce? In many parts of the State it has not been proved that the maximum production is being obtained from land. The Leader of the Opposition suggested that some of the larger estates should be cut up and brought into more intensive production. The Bill will be an inducement to get more production from land already under production. That same clause contains a proviso that the Land Board must take into account the type of rural production to be undertaken or conducted on the land. It may be that many applications will be made for land where it has not been proved that the maximum desired production can be received from such land, and I think the board must be realistic and make allowances in this respect.

Mr. Loveday: You don't think it could fix a value on the future possibilities of the land?

Mr. FERGUSON: The loan must not exceed 85 per cent of the board's valuation. I think the provisions of the Bill are most generous in this respect. The board must report to the Treasurer that the borrower has the necessary ability and experience, and a report must be furnished by a responsible person nominated by the Minister of Agriculture that the property in question would be adequate to maintain a man's family and enable him to meet the repayments of principal and interest. I would say that if an applicant could come through that screening he would prove himself to be worthy of all that is provided for in this Bill. I consider that this measure will have application in many parts of South Australia; perhaps it may not apply to my own district, although I believe that it could apply in certain parts of it. There will be many parts of South Australia where the Bill will apply, and there will be many deserving applicants who will be able to avail themselves of its provisions.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): I support the second reading. I join with other speakers in expressing my disappointment that this proposal will not work along the lines of the single-unit purchases under the war service land settlement scheme. A few weeks ago I asked a question of the Minister of Works (in the absence of the Treasurer) on this matter, and the Minister said that it would have some similarity to the war service land settlement scheme, but I fail to see any similarity.

I offer some suggestions regarding certain aspects of this proposal. The Treasurer will guarantee up to 85 per cent of the Land Board's valuation. My query on that is: will this legislation preclude an applicant from buying, with a bank loan, under the terms and conditions set out in the legislation, a property which has an outstanding potential for future development? One aspect that must be considered when assessing the value of any property is not its actual value at the time of purchase but its potential for development at not very great expense.

Keen interest has been displayed in this projected legislation since it was announced a few weeks ago, by many young people in my district who wish to obtain horticultural properties. Those people are concerned about the high prices being asked for fruit properties, just as members opposite have been concerned with the high prices of farming properties.

Mr. Shannon: People forget the changed value of money.

Mr. CURREN: In the days of the Chifley Government, a pound was worth a pound; money certainly was worth a lot more then than it is today. These young people have approached me many times in the past few weeks with a request for further information about the proposals in the Bill, but unfortunately I have not been able to give them any definite information. I have dealt with only two banks, one being the Commonwealth Bank which, in my experience, is the only bank that grants long-term loans. I sincerely hope that this provision of a guarantee by the Treasurer will induce some of the trading banks to go into the field of long-term finance, with fixed repayments at stated periods. I trust that the Minister will consider the points I have raised.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support the second reading. There is an urgent need for long-term finance for primary producers at reasonable interest rates, and any measure to overcome this problem must be seriously considered. Long-term finance is becoming more and more necessary as the cost of land, buildings, machinery and stock rises. A single-unit farm now involves an outlay of from £15,000 to £20,000, and a two-man unit from £25,000 to £35,000. At present income-tax rates it is very difficult to amass this amount of money, except by inheritance, so the majority of primary producers must borrow. Unfortunately, there appears to be very little money available on long-term repayment.

In 1950 primary producers owed £227,000,000, made up of £118,000,000 (or 52 per cent) to the major trading banks; £33,000,000 (or 15 per cent) for pastoral finance; £4,000,000 to the Development Bank, £16,000,000 for ex-servicemen's loans, and £49,000,000 for other Government loans, making a total of £69,000,000 (or 30 per cent) to these sources; and £7,000,000 (or 3 per cent) to assurance companies. Comparing the figures for 1961 with what those producers got for their produce in 1950, they represent an increase of some £90,000,000 in actual debt: they were getting further and further into debt during that period. In 1961 they owed £493,000,000, made up of £225,000,000 (or 46 per cent) to the trading banks; £106,000,000 (or 22 per cent)—a big increase—for pastoral finance; £11,000,000 to the Development Bank, £57,000,000 for ex-servicemen's loans, and £70,000,000 for other Government loans, making a total of £138,000,000 (or 28 per cent) to these sources; and £24,000,000 (or 4 per cent) to the assurance companies.

It will be seen that two-thirds of the total amount owing is short-term finance. Under the Reserve Bank's policy, the major trading banks cannot make long-term loans. Admittedly, some provision has been made recently in this matter, but the policy is to keep a certain amount of fluidity in the funds, and therefore it is extremely difficult for the major trading banks to make long-term loans. A big increase has taken place in pastoral finance, which now represents 22 per cent of the existing loans. However, that is only short-term finance, in many instances being from year to year, and it is at a rate of interest beyond what the average primary producer can pay and still hope to get a fair return. Government lending, despite the increase in the amount loaned by the Development Bank, dropped by 2 per cent (of total loans) during the period I have quoted. Insurance companies have increased their rates by 1 per cent and I think this is an avenue where much more money should be directed into long-term loans for the primary producer. Possibly this Bill will give those companies the opportunity to so direct it.

Mr. Nankivell: What about safeguards?

Mr. McANANEY: The safeguard is that statistics show that they get a tremendous amount of their income and funds to lend from the primary producers, many of whom invest heavily in insurance policies. One of the largest insurance companies has been charging 7 per cent and will not lend to people

living in an area with a rainfall of less than 17 inches. Many other insurance companies will not lend to primary producers at all.

Last week I was asked to help find long-term finance for a young farmer. Three years ago he purchased a property for £8,500 and now has a mortgage of £5,000 becoming due in January. He has improved the quality and quantity of his dairy herd, erected a new dairy and extended the area under lucerne. He is unable to obtain long-term finance to repay the mortgage. He has been to the Commonwealth Development Bank and many other places; he is a very worried man. He cannot obtain assistance under this legislation; and the only hope he has is that, if we pass this Bill, its provisions will later be extended to cover young people like this working on an economic proposition. He put some crazy scheme up to me that if he sold the property and bought it back again he would come under this legislation; he thought he could do that.

Mr. Ryan: How will he overcome the Land Board's valuation?

Mr. McANANEY: With the improvements he has made in the three years, it might be acceptable to them if they made a loan. If he could secure a bank mortgage under this guarantee, I cannot see, under the provisions of this legislation, that he would get assistance. Under present conditions very few people will be able to use the provisions of this Act. It is probably impossible to buy a one-man unit farm for under £10,000, so the buyer would have to provide at least £1,500 towards the purchase price. For a £10,000 property it would be necessary to have at least £5,000 worth, and probably more, of plant and livestock. If the purchaser did not have this £6,500, he would have to borrow on stock mortgage or on hire-purchase at excessive interest rates. The development bank would, of course, be a possible source of funds, but I have had personal experience of that bank. Two years ago when I wanted to do some development it took me at least three months to get the money. By that time I had scrounged around and got it from somewhere else to pay for the pipes. It is a very slow process and one may miss out on reasonable opportunities.

Mr. Harding: It is recognized by the War Service Land Settlement Commission that it takes about £25,000 to settle a man on a farm property.

Mr. McANANEY: The fact must be faced that primary production is not a business proposition. I define a business proposition as one in which the operator receives a reasonable wage plus a reasonable return on capital invested. Any owner of a two-unit farm worth, say, £35,000 lives reasonably well if he receives only interest on his capital invested or, looking at it from the other point of view, if he receives only a wage based on the hours worked and the amount of skill and responsibility required. He does exceedingly well if he receives interest and wages and makes a business proposition of it, but how many do? The Bureau of Agricultural Economics quotes about 3 per cent earned on capital and it is hard to work out how the bureau arrives even at that figure. If one asks any taxation consultant about it, his general assessment is that farmers receive 2 per cent at present. A new farmer borrowing 85 per cent of the purchase price of the farm would have to earn interest on his borrowing, plus a reasonable wage, plus interest on his own investment if he is to meet his future commitments. Can he do it? The suggestion is that he may get two years behind in his interest but by that time he will be thinking of getting a better job somewhere else, working for somebody else.

Our productivity for each man engaged in primary production is very high in Australia today by world standards. Fewer persons are engaged in primary production than were engaged in pre-war days, but they have produced an ever-increasing amount, now almost double the pre-war amount. Our real costs, or the amount of effort required to produce, are low, yet for most products we cannot sell on the world markets without loss.

Let us examine the reason why a scheme like this cannot work. Taking the index of prices received by farmers over a five-year period ending June, 1950, as 100, prices received for all primary products rose to 176 by December, 1962. Wool rose to 152, meat to 141, wheat to 227, and dairy products to 199, whereas the index of prices paid rose to 231—55 points above the level that prices received rose to. Equipment and supplies rose to 215, wages to 276, services and overheads to 247, and marketing expenses to 252. This big increase in farmers' nominal costs has not resulted in any increase in the living standards of the general public beyond that derived from improved production methods in industry and increased efficiency generally. If we are to believe some, the standards of those on the basic wage are lower.

It is a national problem as well as a farmer's problem. It is a moral problem, too. If we

can produce foodstuffs cheaply, as a nation we should be concentrating on creating the conditions for maximum production to feed the underfed millions in the world. We cannot ease our conscience by giving large sums to the Freedom from Hunger Appeal, worthy cause though it may be, if we artificially manipulate our nominal costs of production so that we cannot sell on the world markets without loss. Stabilized prices on the home market based on cost of production of primary products are an essential (I emphasize the word "essential") part of our present manipulated cost structure, but the primary producer must be a loser all the time, as they increase the price he receives for only some of his products but they increase the cost of all the things he buys. It is a national problem also because if living costs are increased—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member had better connect up his remarks to the Bill, not talk about the general economic structure.

Mr. McANANEY: I have only four lines to go and I think I am trying to show the reason why, in spite of what the previous speaker said, this Act will not be used much. It is a national problem also because, if living costs are increased, the manufacturers and their employees are in difficulties as our secondary producers cannot compete on the world markets. They lose the opportunity to raise their living standards by exchanging their goods with the rest of the world and to reap the benefits of large-scale production.

So, if we are to have increased development on the farms, the only practical approach to the problem is as follows. I own a fairly large farm and I think that by using an irrigation scheme and increasing the productivity of that area we could maintain possibly five farms, if we used the one lot of plant (for instance, the one baler) in the same way as we use equipment on the irrigation scheme. Five people could be working the place. We should have to develop some scheme whereby each person was responsible for the section of the produce in which he was dealing. The farm could maintain five families without a tremendous increase in capital outlay. But, if we merely cut it up into five smaller farms, with no common use of equipment, there would be five starving families; they could not make a living. That is where future development must come, with people working together more as one unit, sharing the responsibility for development.

I appreciate that, if the Government is to guarantee the amount advanced, it must make every effort to protect itself. Members of the Land Board, admirable persons though they may be, face a very difficult situation in ascertaining the real value of land and in assessing the ability of the person applying for it. It is not always easy to decide whether a man will be successful on a farm. To be successful a person needs certain qualifications, and it is not easy to pick such a man unless one has had practical experience on the land. Shortly after the war, the Land Board turned down a property of 600 acres near my property because it said that it would not provide a living for one man. That place was sold and cut in half; one man made a successful venture on 300 acres, which was half the area the Land Board said would not provide a living. The board has approved other properties, but the settlers have had difficulty in carrying on. I am not pointing the finger at the Land Board; I am merely stressing that it is hard to assess the value of land and the ability of the applicant to farm it successfully. Certain council assessments, when made by outside valuers, are often far in excess of production values. This Bill has merit, and I support it, but I hope that conditions in the primary producing industry will change so that it will be possible to make full use of the provisions of the measure.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I agree with the title of this Bill, but I do not agree one iota with its contents. Like the member for Whyalla, I think it is political window-dressing. After hearing the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) I am sure he is of the same opinion, although he did not say it in so many words.

Mr. Hall: Can you tell us how to make it more effective?

Mr. CASEY: Here is a Government member asking me that, yet it is a Government Bill! Its object is to assist persons to obtain loans to acquire land for rural production. There has never been more need than there is now for money to be made available to enable people to go on the land. We all understand that, and we all want to see it, but I cannot see how it can possibly be done under this Bill. Where will we get the land for closer settlement?

Mr. Nankivell: That is your problem.

Mr. CASEY: The northern parts of this State have a low rainfall, and the only production is sheep. The way to get a valuation on sheep country there is to take the open market value. I have seen land that will run only a sheep to four acres selling for up to £15 an acre on the open market; that is £60 a sheep.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Would you pay it?

Mr. CASEY: I certainly would not, and I have told people who have paid this much that they are mad. Although a Land Board valuation can be obtained, it does not mean a thing, as land must be bought on the open market, and open market values are inflated.

Mr. Ryan: In other words, a man could not get land under this Bill.

Mr. CASEY: An applicant could get 85 per cent of the valuation, but it would buy only one acre for every 12 he wanted. Land can be bought only on the open market, and a Land Board or bank valuation does not compare with the open market value. The member for Stirling mentioned a man who owned a dairy farm who was getting further behind with his mortgage. He said that such a man would say that, as he could not get land under this Bill, he would sell out and buy it back. I have seen the same sort of thing happen in the north, where the land valuation was about £10 an acre but, when the man wanted to buy it back, he had to pay £20 an acre for land that would run one sheep to four acres. This is the type of thing we must contend with, and I cannot see how this measure can possibly work. The following statement by the Minister in his second reading explanation intrigued me:

A report must be furnished by the Director of Agriculture, or some other responsible person nominated by the Minister of Agriculture, that the land would be adequate for maintaining the applicant's family after meeting all reasonable costs and expenses.

With all due respect to the Director, whom I have met—and he is a most responsible man in his job—he could not value all properties in the South-East, on Yorke Peninsula and in the north of this State.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: He does not have to do that; there could be a panel of 20.

Mr. CASEY: In that case, it would be possible, but it would not be possible if one or two people had to be relied on to do this. The report must indicate that the land would be adequate for maintaining the applicant's family after meeting all reasonable costs and expenses. Some people have larger families than others. Somebody asked me the other day what I thought was a reasonable net income for a family, and I asked what constituted a family. I was told perhaps one, two or three children did. We on the land are proud that we have large families, but the more children a man has the more it will cost him. The Treasurer must be satisfied that the terms and conditions of the loan are reasonable. Another part of this measure that intrigues me is that the loan must not exceed 85 per cent of the valuation. Why not provide for 100 per cent? Is there any reason for limiting the loan to 85 per cent?

Mr. Hall: I think it was realized that someone with a equity would tend to behave.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Gouger is out of order. He has made his speech. The honourable member for Frome.

Mr. CASEY: I wholeheartedly agree with the title of the Bill, but I do not think it is worth the paper it is written on. However, I support the second reading.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): This Bill has been widely debated and I wish not to refer to it in detail but only to make a few observations. It meets today's need for adequate finance for a certain category of would-be producers.

Mr. Ryan: You emphasize the word "adequate"?

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes, and anything which will tend to provide this adequate finance is to be commended, encouraged and given a chance to work. I am disappointed that so much critical reference has been made to the provisions of the Bill because I believe it represents the first chance we have had to assist aspiring farmers to become farmers in their own right. In looking at these proposals some members have been prone to condemn them before this scheme has had sufficient chance to show how it can work.

This is good legislation that will stop a gap that has been most noticeable in our financial structure. For instance, there is the case of a farmer's son, or a city boy, who wishes to become a farmer and has a certain amount of money, but the normal lending institutions will not advance all the money needed to enable him to make a start.

Mr. Hall: Why not?

Mr. LAUCKE: In many instances, normal banking practice is to measure the collateral available against the advance required, whereas this Bill seeks to go beyond this practice. It

is the taxpayer, after all, who will foot any bill concerned with advances under this legislation.

Mr. Loveday: Where do you think most of the criticism has come from?

Mr. LAUCKE: I am disappointed by the criticism from both sides of the House and I hope honourable members will not throw cold water on what is now a little fire that will have to be nurtured for a while. Plenty of safeguards are provided for the taxpayer, but it is worthwhile to ensure that borrowers have been completely vetted so as to guarantee the safety of the investment. On the other hand the recipient of a loan is subjected to a close investigation as to his eligibility for assistance under certain conditions. I believe that a successful scheme will flow from those two provisions, and I favour them very much. There should be more constructive approaches towards assisting those who by training, character, and aspiration desire to do certain things. Further, they are prepared to work hard and the assistance forthcoming from the Treasury is an excellent scheme. I commend the Treasurer and the Governent for introducing this Bill and I hope that it will prove a boon for many and open the way for more assistance for those who do not possess the wherewithal to achieve their ambitions. I support the Bill.

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent): I, too, support the Bill. I have listened with much interest to the debate. At first I welcomed this measure but, after having listened attentively to some speakers, I now have some reservations about it. The honourable member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) did much research before speaking on this Bill and, although he supported it, he almost convinced me that if we pass it we will be doing a disfavour to the people who contribute to the scheme, because they will inevitably become bankrupt. I do not know whether I grasped his meaning correctly but that is what his speech indicated to me.

By introducing this Bill I believe that the Government has shown that it is aware of the shortcomings of the financial institutions of this country and their lending policies. This Bill is designed to overcome those shortcomings to a certain extent. The Government is prepared to lend up to 85 per cent of the valuation of a property to a person eligible to participate in this scheme. This sum would not be available normally from other lending institutions. I imagine that the rate of interest available would be comparable with, if not lower than, that offered by other lending institutions.

Mr. Loveday: This is only a guarantee.

Mr. CORCORAN: Yes, but I believe that today the lending institutions would not lend money in this way if the Government was not prepared to guarantee the loan. Probably the rates of interest will be the same. As I have said before, there is a great need for this legislation and I support it because even if it assists only a few it should be tried. If it fails in any particular aspect it can be amended later. Many people in my electorate alone are entirely suited in every way to go on the land but cannot do so because no land is available or its price is prohibitive.

Another point of interest is Land Board valuation and immediately I heard of it I thought that it would make the whole scheme difficult. I believe that, if I asked any member of this House who is a landholder, whether he was willing to sell on the Land Board valuation rather than put his land on the open market, he would answer that he would put it on the open market. The member for Yorke Peninsula (Mr. Ferguson) referred to share farmers and said that a certain allegiance had been built up. In such a case the owner of the land might allow it to go at the Land Board valuation. I can see that this legislation could help a father and son where a father might be unable to make an outright gift of a property but could avail himself of this scheme and help his family. This, of course, is desirable. It does place a suitable person on the land, but I should like to see it go much further.

I should like to see some of the large holdings in my district cut up into smaller holdings; but I do not believe in farms being too small. I believe in a unit on which a good living can be obtained for a family, and which will enable that family possibly to get a son on it, so that it will be eventually handed down to him. I do not believe in the type of subdivision that took place around Moorak, near Mount Gambier, and at Glencoe, where a working man's block was created, and men who were trying to make a living on the blocks had to secure other employment in order to survive. That is not satisfactory. If a person goes on the land he should remain there, and should be able to devote his full time to that labour. I commend the Bill to honourable members; it is worthy of a trial and I hope it succeeds.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I confess that I have been rather concerned that so many members have condemned this legislation before it is given a trial. It follows closely many of the provisions of the legislation that was passed in 1941 concerning secondary industries. In 1941 the Industries Development Bill (as it then was) received the same criticism, and many complaints were made although different people, of course, spoke on that measure. Is there one member of this House who would not say that that legislation has been one of the best pieces of legislation that has been passed in South Australia?

Mr. Hall: The analogy is not very apt.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It has been most effective and some of the biggest industries in South Australia were established because of it, and could only have been established by its assistance. Indeed, some industries in this State that were bankrupt were revived by that legislation, and have become powerful industries of tremendous importance to South Australia. The honourable member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) knows that the cellulose industry in the South-East had the receivers in for the purpose of selling up the industry.

Mr. Hall: Is that industry protected by a tariff?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It was not protected at that time by a tariff, and I believe it has very little tariff protection today, as its product has not been particularly subject to tariff protection. When the Industries Development Bill was introduced in 1941 the Leader of the Opposition, early in his speech, said, "I do not like the title of the Bill." That is the sort of criticism that was made then.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: We like the title.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It appears that honourable members have progressed somewhat since then. The Leader of the Opposition went on to say:

> If this legislation is intended to follow the policy or methods of the other organization I would not spend one moment discussing its provisions. I should prefer, rather, to see it thrown out on the second reading.

That was criticism of the legislation to assist industries. Honourable members on both sides of this House have been associated with the Industries Development Committee. They know the work it does and have seen the tremendous advantages that have arisen from the legislation. All the criticism that has been made today was made in a different form in connection with that previous legislation. What does this Bill set out to do? It fills what I believe is a serious gap in our present financial assistance to primary industries. I know of many instances of a young man capable of going on the land and working a property efficiently. A satisfactory property becomes available but he has to borrow 60 per cent of the total value of the property.

Mr. Nankivell: Of the bank valuation.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: He has to put up 40 per cent of the bank valuation. He can get a loan of 60 per cent of the bank's valuation, but usually the bank limits the total amount to £10,000. The State Savings Bank, which is the best institution for assistance to these people, has a hard and fast rule that £10,000 is the maximum. If the person borrows from a private bank it is on a mortgage for a fixed period, usually seven years. What hope has any young man with limited finance of prospering under those circumstances, because as soon as the period for the repayment of the mortgage expires he is told by every banking institution that it will not lend money to pay off other advances. Our own banks do that: I am not criticizing the private banks. The member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) brought a case to me, which I took to Cabinet, and our own bank has agreed to make some slight deviation from this hard and fast policy. The banks will not advance anything under any circumstances to pay off an existing loan.

Mr. Frank Walsh: You do not make any advance to purchase existing homes.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This legislation provides that the applicant must submit the property for investigation. I believe that will be done in greater volume than honourable members believe. Since this legislation has been forecast I have answered at least 50 applications for properties.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: I have had another 50.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Minister of Lands, who will be in charge of the administration of the Bill, has had another 50. In one application from Jervois the man had been successfully working a property for several years on a share farming agreement. The owner wishes to sell the property, and this means that if the share farmer cannot get any finance he will be turned off a property on which he has been successful: he knows its income, he knows what he can pay and what he

can do. When he approaches the bank, although he has some capital he is told that as he wants more than the £10,000 the bank can advance the bank is not interested. The bank does not dispute the value of the land or question his ability to work it. In another instance, the bank says, "Due to lack of funds we cannot entertain this." If a man can present a property at a valuation acceptable to the Government, prove that it is suitable for the purposes he intends using it and show that he is capable of working it, why should any member deny him the chance of making good.

Mr. Heaslip: I do not think any member would.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Almost without exception members have criticized the Bill and claimed that it will not be effective. If we give this legislation an honest try I am certain that it will prove worth while. No land settlement scheme has ever enjoyed complete success. However, we must guard, in this scheme, against over-valuing land. Some members have criticized the requirement of the Land Board's valuation, but frequently today land prices are inflated and beyond what a person can afford to pay and still make a profit from the land. Would any member advocate that we pay so much for the land that the settler cannot succeed and gets into trouble?

Mr. Hall: I do not think anyone suggested that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: To make the scheme effective we must ensure that the settler is not overcharged for his land. Mention has been made of outside valuations. The Land Board is the authority approved by Parliament to make valuations. We buy and sell on its valuations. It is impartial, competent and experienced. I have every respect for licensed land valuers, but big variations can be found in their valuations for the same land.

Mr. Heaslip: Valuations are frequently based on recent sales.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Exactly, and the sales may have been for special purposes and so did not represent true values. If I have a son and want him to settle on the land and my property is not big enough to accommodate him too, I will pay an excessive sum for adjoining property. Surely we would not accept such a valuation for the purposes of this legislation. We should give this legislation a fair trial. With the oversight of the Land Settlement Committee it should not get off the rails. I believe it will be the means of enabling many people with limited capital to engage in rural occupations. We frequently talk about the need to support the country. I know of no better way of supporting the country than by making sufficient finance available to establish primary industry.

When similar legislation, designed to assist secondary industry, was before Parliament we heard dire prophecies about how ineffective it would be. It was suggested that industry would not utilize the legislation. The comments are all in *Hansard* and available for members to read, but none of the prophecies was realized. All members appreciate the worth of the Industries Development Committee. If that legislation had to be re-enacted it would pass on the voices without one dissenting voice. I hope members will enable this legislation to function, too, because I am sure it will be successful.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): I support the second reading. The Treasurer said that not many members supported the original title of the Industries Development Act. I will support the title of this Bill which I hope will enable some young men to be settled on the land. I have doubts as to how effective this legislation will be. We will have to contend with inflated land values, and we will have to consider how many of the properties that come on the market will be available at Land Board valuations. I do not intend to delay the passage of this Bill. I hope that through the support of members the legislation will be tried to see whether it can measure up to requirements. If it will result in a few men going on to the land it should receive our sanction.

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

Mr. BURDON: There is not much more for me to say on this Bill, except that I give it my approval, as will most members on this side of the House. Clause 3 (2) (*d*) states:

> The Director of Agriculture or some other person nominated for the purpose by the Minister of Agriculture has furnished the Treasurer with a report . . .

In the purchase of land consideration should be given to having a panel of farmers from the area concerned because of their expert knowledge of the land. One important point in selecting land is that it must provide an economic living for the holder. Today land valuations are out of all proportion to the valuation that will be fixed by the Land Board, and because of this I do not think that much

land will be available for the purposes of the Bill. Large holdings should be cut up for closer settlement purposes. Many large areas are not being used to the best possible advantage of the State. Any assistance that can be given towards placing young men on the land must be encouraged, and for that reason I support the measure and hope that after a trial period any necessary amendments to the legislation will be made.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): I support the Bill because it is a step in the right direction and one that has long been delayed. It should have been made 22 years ago. It is a pity that the action was not taken then, but this Bill is a step forward. I join with the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) in expressing regret about the publicity given to the Bill before its introduction, although we have come to expect this sort of publicity being given over the air and in the press. This prior publicity led many people to believe that under the Bill they would get Government assistance, but they will be disappointed. That is a pity, but some people will get an advantage under the Bill, and because of that it deserves the support of all members. At the same time, members would be failing in their duty if they did not point out that the Bill does not measure up to what many people expected from the earlier propaganda. This is not the first time we have had this sort of treatment from the Government.

Mr. Freebairn: You cannot be sure of what you are saying.

Mr. RICHES: I am positive that many people who have approached me will get no assistance under the Bill, yet they felt confident that it was designed to meet the needs of people like themselves. In some instances a share farmer could be assisted, or a person with financial backing, but as I understand it, and as the Treasurer assured us today, the machinery of the measure is similar to that under which the Government gives guarantees to secondary industries. That machinery has worked to the advantage of many industries, but I am led to believe that under the Bill the people who will be assisted will be those whose propositions are really banking propositions now.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: No.

Mr. RICHES: Yes. Unless the banks are prepared to come to the party no propositions will be referred to the Land Settlement Committee.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: No.

Mr. RICHES: I am giving information and if I am wrong I should be glad to be corrected by the Minister later. As I understand it, by the time a proposition reaches the committee for approval it will have to be a banking proposition. There are cases where the bank has been hesitant about a proposition, or has rejected it, because it has been a borderline case, and that is where a Government guarantee could make all the difference. The bank does not help just because the Government gives a guarantee. Although it may not be a proposition fully acceptable to a bank in the first instance, in the final analysis it will become such a proposition. Only those people who are now able to approach a bank, and whose proposition is almost acceptable to it, will come under the Bill.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Are you opposing the Bill?

Mr. RICHES: No. I support it, because limited as it is, it will assist some people. I understand from the debate so far that that is the attitude of members on both sides. The only comment that can be made about the measure is that many people, whom I and other members know, and who thought they would get assistance will not do so. It has been demonstrated over and over again that there is a real need for this type of assistance and that young South Australians are land hungry. However, many of them know—as we know—that they will never have the opportunity. In so far as this Bill makes a step forward, we commend it.

The Treasurer expressed surprise that some other members had commented largely in the same strain as I am commenting, and he said that he thought that the Bill would have been received with more enthusiasm. Surely we cannot have a more enthusiastic reception of a measure than a 100 per cent vote for it. He said he was reminded of a debate that took place on the Industries Development Bill when it was introduced in 1941. The machinery provided in the present Bill, as I understand it and as the Treasurer said this afternoon, is modelled very largely on the machinery that has operated successfully for the promotion of secondary industries in this State. Although I should have liked to see more activity in that regard—and we all should—nevertheless the operation of that legislation has been to the advantage of the State and industries have been established, I believe in some instances where they would not have been established but for the legislation, and that in other instances there is undoubted evidence

that industries have been established some years earlier than they would have been without that legislation.

The Treasurer made another statement to which I took exception, and I know that on reflection he will not mind my taking exception to it. He gave the impression that the Labor Party on that occasion, if it did not oppose the measure, damned the Bill with faint praise. I do not think that is putting a false interpretation on what the Treasurer said this afternoon. He went on to say that members on that occasion objected to the title of the Bill. This time the member for Frome accepted the title of the Bill. I want the House to know that members of the Labor Party have taken exactly the same stand this time as they did 22 years ago, and that the member for Frome (Mr. Casey) was advocating precisely the same thing as the Leader of the Opposition in 1941 advocated; the then Leader said that the reason he was not enamoured of the title of the Bill was that he felt that the legislation (in 1941) should do exactly what the Treasurer is seeking to do today. The legislation in 1941 was to guarantee secondary industries, and Mr. Richards said that the "secondary" should be removed from the title of the Bill and that it should also guarantee primary industries. He was just 22 years ahead of the Treasurer.

Mr. McKee: A good start, wasn't it!

Mr. RICHES: He supported the measure, and every member of the Labor Party supported it. The member who subsequently followed Mr. Richards as Leader of the Labor Party (Mr. O'Halloran) was also in the House at that time, and he hailed the measure in these terms:

> This is probably one of the most important measures we shall be called upon to consider this session—I might go so far as to say the most important during the term of this Parliament.

He gave his support and urged that the Government should concern itself not only with providing guarantees for the promotion of secondary industries but with making guarantees to settle young men on the land. That was in 1941. That presents a different attitude altogether from the one that the Treasurer would have us understand was the attitude of members on this side of the House. I know the Treasurer did not say that the opposition came from here, but that was the inference and I want to correct it. There was opposition; there were a few Independents in the House at the time, and they objected. In fact, one Independent said that he would give a garden party if any industry was established. A vote was taken on the third reading, and there were 28 Ayes and 5 Noes. The Ayes were Messrs. Abbott, Duncan, Dunn, Dunnage, Fletcher and Hincks, Hons. Sir Herbert Hudd, S. W. Jeffries, and G. F. Jenkins, Messrs. Lacey, Langdon, Lyons, McHugh, and McInnes, Hon. M. McIntosh, Messrs. Moir and O'Halloran, Hon. T. Playford (teller), Mr. Quirke, Hon. R. S. Richards, Mr. Riches, Hon. R. J. Rudall, Messrs. Shannon, Smith, Stephens, Thompson, Walsh and Whittle. The five Noes were Messrs. Dunks, Macgillivray, McKenzie, Robinson, and Stott (teller). It is not surprising, therefore, that the member for Frome, although he was not in the House at the time and did not know the stand that was taken in 1941, should have risen in his seat today and said that he was pleased with the title of this Bill, not knowing, of course, that that was exactly the same stand that the Labor Party took in 1941 when it wanted provision for assistance to primary industry. That is past history now, but I did want to put the record straight, because strangely enough the attitude of the Labor Party on this measure has been misconstrued again this time. I was astounded to read in the *Advertiser* last Friday, in black headlines across a double column, an article stating that we were opposing this measure. I do not know to what lengths we have to go to make the Party's position clear. Sometimes we wonder if this is all by misadventure; it is a strange linking of coincidences if it is.

Mr. Loveday: It is stretching it a bit, isn't it?

Mr. RICHES: We hold second place to nobody in our concern for the welfare of the primary industry, and no Party has a better record than the Labor Party, to which I have the honour to belong, in its effort to help establish young men on the land. Those attempts have not all been successful, and it is because the Party has been prepared to make attempts in the past—sometimes those attempts have not been successful—that some people go around pointing to a failure and arguing against closer settlement on that score. With all that we know about primary production and land settlement today, and with all the schemes that are operating in the State, a person can go to any scheme and see the odd failure. We see too many people getting into debt in the Australian Mutual Provident Society scheme in the South-East; that scheme

is not without its failures. A person can go to any soldier settlement scheme and find some settlers who do not make the grade, but that does not condemn the whole scheme. Nothing attempted, nothing done; if this measure will assist some people to be assisted and settled, it has our blessing.

Mr. HARDING (Victoria): Some members who have spoken are not necessarily against the scheme but doubt the possibility of its being a practical scheme. My feelings are somewhat similar. I support the scheme, but I, with others, have many doubts whether it can ever operate in a very big way; in fact, I am sure that it cannot. I consider that the State could not afford to undertake a major land settlement scheme, and I am also just as sure that sufficient land would not be available in the assured rainfall areas. You may rule me out of order, Mr. Speaker, but I am perturbed about another matter that affects the settlement of men on the land: that is, the dummying that is going on in various places. I have in mind one particular case where a partnership, in the South-East in the 20-inch rainfall area, that produces annually approximately 1,000 bales of wool and shears between 30,000 and 40,000 sheep, recently has dummied successfully to acquire developed perpetual leasehold land. That land has now by devious means been brought into this partnership of freehold land. This matter has not been touched on this evening but it is serious because sufficient land in the suitable rainfall areas is not available for settlement by the ordinary person.

In the case I have referred to, some 2,500 to 2,800 acres of this estate has now been brought under this octopus control. This perpetual lease land has now been converted to a freehold title and, of course, can be transferred backwards and forwards at will. There still remains in this estate 1,000 acres. Applications have been made to freehold this property but, so far, the applicants have been refused. I know this matter is still going on and, when it comes to the Land Board for its approval, the persons concerned, who are the dummies, have not other land and are entitled to have this land transferred; but, immediately it is transferred to them, sufficient money is obtained from some source for them to freehold it and, once it is freeholded back, it goes back to the aggregated areas of this big octopus. That is a problem that this Government has to face, and it should be faced immediately.

There is no fear that making sufficient money available for any land settlement scheme will ever happen, because the money is not available; nor is the land. I did interject regarding the war service land settlement scheme in reference to about 1,000 settlers in respect of whom it has cost the State Government and the Commonwealth Government about £25,000 a block. So it would be impossible for any State Government to undertake a closer land settlement scheme on today's values. Therefore, I support this scheme and hope that over the years some good will come from it.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I support this Bill. If it assists only one more family to become established on the land, I feel it will have achieved its purpose. The Treasurer this afternoon mentioned various blocks that are sold perhaps alongside a homestead, and said that an exorbitant price was paid for them from time to time because their acquisition would suit an extension of the homestead and enable it perhaps to carry two families. He also indicated that that price should not be taken as the ruling price for other land. I am afraid that that has been the case in various parts of South Australia.

I agree entirely with the Treasurer that that should not be so but I can go back to a comparatively few years ago in my own district where a paddock of about 120 acres suited the person alongside admirably, to enable his property to carry two families. He paid £45 an acre for this land. I have taken particular note that ever since this price of £45 was paid those who were desirous of selling land in that area were asking beyond this £45, which indicated that the whole set-up was wrong in respect of establishing a fair price for land. A comparatively short time after that sale a similar property of a little larger size was offered for sale, and it was passed in at £43. Only recently another property at Paskeville comprising 463 acres was sold for £63 an acre. So what the Treasurer said this afternoon is correct, that the actual value of the land is not what people are paying for it today if they have to start from scratch. As I indicated earlier, if this Bill allows only one or two families to become established on the land, it will certainly achieve its purpose.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE (Minister of Lands): In introducing this Bill, I think I gave as sincere an explanation of it as it was possible to give and I am gratified that so many members have seen fit to support it.

No-one has opposed it but I am rather surprised that there should be so many people who are like Didymus and so many who are apostles of gloom. This proposal is a complete breakaway from the old established order of things in relation to land purchase. The success of this means, probably, a new start in land values in the country. It could mean that. Whether or not it will be successful is in the lap of the gods; we do not know. But one thing that is certain is that it does not mean that thousands and thousands of young men aspiring to go on the land will be put on the land, for the good and sufficient reason that it is just as impossible to put people on the land in South Australia today as it is to put people on the land in more closely-settled countries like England and France. Every available piece of land inside the good rainfall areas of this State, which is the driest State in the continent, has been taken up, anyway. The Crown lands that are available are, in acreage, very small, and in type not so good.

One has to be in my position in the office to know just what this legislation can mean to so many people. It does not mean anything to people without some money; that must be admitted. Nobody today can be put on the land unless he has some substance of his own. Another thing is that it is not advisable that that should happen, because it is in that category that so many failures are recorded. But into my office come men who are practical and successful farmers, with one or two sons, and who, in addition to their own farms, have some money though not sufficient to put their sons on the land. They want help. This scheme will certainly help them, but first they will have to find the land: nobody will find it for them under this measure. They must bring forward their own proposals and come to us with them. Such people do not ask us to find them land, but they do ask how they can buy certain land. As the Treasurer said, it is possible to borrow £10,000 from a bank for a seven-year term. The fact that a bank will advance this sum is clear evidence that it considers an applicant credit-worthy for the period, but it is not a sufficient term—two bad years and he is down the drain. That is not the way to finance land; it must inevitably be financed over a long period.

Mr. Casey: Especially in this State.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Yes, because, although parts of other States are just as dry, this State, probably more than any other State of the Commonwealth, is up against the vicissitudes of nature. Earlier this year we had a bounteous rainfall, although too much at the wrong time, and then it stopped at the wrong time. The surface of the ground baked like a brick and, but for the rain we received recently, this State would have been down millions of pounds. However, that rain came in the nick of time. Assuming that it had not come, a man who had borrowed £10,000 for seven years could have found it was the year that broke him. We cannot allow that sort of thing, and this measure is designed to enable certain people to go on the land. They must be experienced farmers and prove their capacity for working the land in whatever avocation they wish to take up—fruit-growing, broad acres, grazing or anything else. After they prove their capacity and establish their *bona fides* the Government will find the money on guarantees over a long term. This is the way to break the position that is gripping these people is this tight cincture of loans of £10,000 for seven years. That is a completely unrealistic financial outlook in relation to the financing of primary industries in this State, and it must be broken, not only for people who will come under this Bill but for others who are established on the land. Short-term money in relation to primary production is ridiculous, as it assumes that a farmer will get the same return year after year and can guarantee that he will be able to meet interest charges over a period of seven years.

I can remember the time (as probably other members can) when under adverse conditions 10,000 farmers went broke in Australia—and that is not a long time ago. This measure is designed to see that that sort of thing does not happen again and that the man who goes on the land under this scheme has security; he will know that he has the security of his land for 30 years, in which time he can rear and establish his family. However, remember that, if this is achieved year after year the number of people who can go on the land is getting appreciably smaller, for the good and sufficient reason that the land is not available. Some members have said that the answer is to break up the big estates. Possibly some could be broken up, but the passing of time and the payment of succession duties are working against some of the big estates, some of which I would not like to see broken up. Some of these have famous merino studs on them, and they carry as many individual families as would be carried if they were subdivided and allotted to

individual farmers. It has been decided in other parts of Australia that no good is done to the State if some properties are subdivided. In saying this, I am not referring to all large estates. The member for Victoria (Mr. Harding) has referred to some, the capacity of which has not been fully utilized, and there is no excuse for that. However, in the main the land that could be gained by breaking up the big studs would not bring much individual gain to many people, and it is doubtful whether more men would be employed than are being employed in those estates today.

Mr. McKee: But there would be better distribution of the wealth from those properties.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I have grave doubts about that. The member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) gave figures obtained from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics that showed that the final net return from those properties was only about 2 or 3 per cent. Of course, 2 per cent on £100,000 is a handy income, but these properties cannot be broken up into several components so as to give a distribution that is worth very much to many people. In any case, these things will iron themselves out.

I thank honourable members for the way they have supported this measure. For those who have expressed themselves as apostles of gloom, I trust that their gloom will disperse and that out of this measure will come some radiant families that would not be on the land but for the full operation of the legislation, which I am happy to have been able to introduce.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Interpretation."

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I wish to refer to the expression "suitable person" in paragraph (*b*) of the definition of "approved borrower". I was most interested to hear the Treasurer discussing the case of the applicant from Jervois who was a share farmer. I ask the Treasurer, who is the person with the final financial responsibility in this matter, to define a suitable person? Is a suitable person to be a share farmer only, or will the term include persons engaged in rural industry, stock and station agents, and other classes of persons?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): Obviously "suitable person" covers many qualifications in rural production, which is not work that can be taken up at a moment's notice. There are many sides to rural production and considerable experience is necessary. That is one reason why the applicant will go before the Land Settlement Committee so that it may see the person concerned and, on his experience in farming, judge whether he has the ability and willingness to work. I do not regard it as necessary that he be a share farmer. I know many young men who have been brought up on farms and who I would regard as suitable persons. I believe that it will be necessary for suitable persons to have experience in the type of production to be undertaken, and that this qualification would be insisted on. I would prefer a young man to an older man. The same qualifications as apply to soldier settlement would probably apply in this case.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I take it that this measure will apply to land that has not yet been allotted to applicants. Under the soldier settlement scheme, land has been set aside for various purposes and sometimes it is not used for the purpose for which it was originally allotted. What conditions will operate under this Bill in that regard?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The land originally purchased must obviously be suitable for the purpose for which it is to be used. If, for instance, a person intended to use land for agricultural purposes and the land was in a 7-in. rainfall area, obviously he would not be considered. No restriction would be placed on a man's diversifying his activities if he so desired. The person concerned must be qualified as a suitable person in the type of production he is to undertake and the property must be suitable for that production. I have no broad definition, but I think the Leader will realize many properties in the Adelaide Hills could be changed from dairying to potato growing or *vice versa*.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—"Treasurer may guarantee repayment of loan."

Mr. HEASLIP: Under the Land Settlement Act has the Land Settlement Committee the power to comply with the provisions of paragraph (*e*) by furnishing a recommendation to the Treasurer?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This Bill gives the committee that added responsibility and the power required. The committee is herein required to see that the applications referred to it are in order and to make recommendations upon them.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: As a member of the Land Settlement Committee who has some interest and responsibility in this matter, I refer the Committee, and especially the Treasurer, to the words "fair value". Do those words mean productive value and a certain capitalization rate, or the market value?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The value I hope would be regarded as fair value would relate to the productive capacity of the block. The value must relate to production. If an element of subdivisional value is placed on it obviously the system will break down quickly. It must be a fair value also in relation to the type of work to be undertaken.

Mr. NANKIVELL: What rate of interest will be applied? Will it be current bank interest or a special rate?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The State Bank will obviously be a principal lender under the Act and I believe the Savings Bank will also be a lender. Other financial institutions are not excluded from participating under the provisions. The member knows the policy always followed by the Government: that is, when we make money available for housing, primary production or rural settlement we are interested only in covering our costs; we do not set out to make a profit. There are administrative costs. At present, I believe the money being made available for housing is repayable at the interest rate of about 5 per cent or 5¼ per cent. Under this Bill I believe we could make money available through State instrumentalities at a lower rate. Further, the Government guarantee will mean at least another half per cent reduction even if the advance is from a private institution. If the advance is from a Government institution the rate would probably be 1 per cent lower than the lender would be able to get in other circumstances.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Under the definition of "bank" there could be many lenders, as we hope to attract other than State instrumentalities. Insurance companies at present lend at 7 per cent. Will they be asked to consider a special rate or, if these companies are to be lenders, will the rate be adjusted?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I would not sanction a loan at 7 per cent with a State guarantee behind it. Loans with a State guarantee today at bond rate are at 4½ per cent, or £4 15s. for semi-governmental loans. We would not contemplate a 7 per cent loan under any circumstances because that would defeat the object of the Bill.

Mr. HALL: Can the Treasurer say how far we will load the repaying capacity of a farm? Will present-day prices without contingency for a lowering of future prices be considered, or will there be a margin of safety available in the return from the proposed property purchase?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Much common sense and good judgment will have to be used. Anyone can say theoretically, that a farm will produce so many bushels of wheat and the price of wheat will be so much, and market variations and dry seasons can easily be forgotten. Officers of the Agriculture and Lands Departments are experienced in these matters, and the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics issues reports for rural industries. If a property can produce at a cost lower than the statistical average cost of production then it could be regarded as a good proposition. However, if the costs are over the average statistics, it would probably be ruled out. I know of instances where one person failed on a property but another took it over and under identical conditions, made a success of it. Not only the property but the person and management practices must be considered.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Application for guarantee."

Mr. NANKIVELL: A procedure will be set down for applicants to follow. Will the applicant approach the bank for an application form or will he apply to the Treasurer? Can the Treasurer say what this procedure will be and whether it will be provided for in the regulations?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: When the legislation has been passed, as I hope it will be, a set of general rules will be set out for the information of applicants. The Lands Department will be responsible and full information will be obtainable from it. If the applicant is financed by his own bank, so much the better. If he is not, we will do our best, as we do in the case of industry, to assist him with the necessary bank or lending institution. I doubt whether more than 5 per cent of the applicants under the Industries Development Act have their own bank. We have arranged not only for the guarantee but also for the institution to take the guarantee.

Mr. CURREN: Can the Treasurer say when the regulations will be available, following the passing of this legislation?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: After the Bill has been passed and assented to, the Government could probably take applications within a fortnight or three weeks.

Clause passed.

Clause 9 passed.

Clause 10—"Financial provision."

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Treasurer say whether any limit will be placed on the loan? The Bill makes no mention of the size of block or of the limit of the loan.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No limit is placed on the amount of the loan. One reason is that this matter must be referred to a Parliamentary committee, which will ensure that the Bill's purpose is not misused. This legislation is not designed to make a big farmer bigger but, on the other hand, it may be necessary on occasions for a small farmer to purchase additional land to give him a living area. The purpose of the legislation is to guarantee a loan to allow for an ample living area, but no more. If a person wants to buy property other than that, then he should do it out of his own resources and not the State's. If a large sum is provided for one person then a worthwhile applicant may not be able to get the necessary finance. Frequently in the past land has been cut into areas that have been too small. This has encouraged the re-aggregation of land. One man does not do well, so he sells out to his neighbour.

Mr. Casey: That is what is happening today.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. It is the Government's intention to provide for an adequate area to enable a man to follow agricultural pursuits. No limits are prescribed in the Industries Development Act, but before a guarantee is given an applicant's resources are examined and we ensure that we do not provide more than is necessary and that the sum is reasonable in relation to the ability of the industry to bear the interest charges and principal repayments thereon. It will be the duty of the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) as Chairman of the Land Settlement Committee to report to Parliament if he believes that the loans being provided are more than ample, that the area of a farm is excessive or that the area of a farm is inadequate.

Clause passed.

Remaining clause (11) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

RIVER MURRAY WATERS AGREEMENT SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 5. Page 1481.)

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): I support the Bill. I am a temperate man and a moderate man. I am moderate in all things—in speaking, eating, drinking—

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Don't give us the whole story.

Mr. Ryan: You aren't moderate politically.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, I am moderate politically, too. I am moderate in my pleasures.

Mr. Jennings: The honourable member is also modest: he has a lot to be modest about.

Mr. Clark: He is completely unbiased.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, as much as a man can be, because I do not think that any man can be completely unbiased. I listened attentively to the speeches made last night. I was interested in the remarks of the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters). I respect his views, but he frankly opposed any extension of the hours during which liquor could be served. He intimated that he would support the second reading but would, if necessary, oppose the third reading. The member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) who is generally a moderate and temperate man like me, expressed distinctly prohibitionist views. He certainly was not moderate or temperate. Much of his material comprised quotations from speeches.

The SPEAKER: I hope the honourable member is not going to repeat them, because I will not allow it. We had enough of it from one side of the House: we do not want it from both sides.

Mr. HEASLIP: The quotations appear in *Hansard*. I will not repeat all his quotations, because I am moderate, but I will quote one of them. He said that the Reverend Mr. Westerman, from Victoria, who was guest speaker at a convention last year said that on

the basis of readily available, well-attested evidence it was a reasonable statement—and I emphasize those words "reasonable statement"—to make that liquor was killing more people, ruining more careers, causing more accidents, crime and divorce, costing more money and creating more sheer human misery and degradation than any other factor in the life of this country.

The SPEAKER: Whom is the honourable member quoting—the member for Wallaroo or whom?

Mr. HEASLIP: I am repeating a quotation the member for Wallaroo gave.

The SPEAKER: I am going to rule these quotations out of order in this debate on a Bill that deals with licensing fees and hours. I allowed the member for Wallaroo a little latitude, but I am not going to allow the debate to continue in this way. It must be continued within the four corners of the Bill.

Mr. HEASLIP: I was talking about the extension of liquor hours. I believe it to be a moderate extension, but I do not believe that the views quoted by the member for Wallaroo were moderate. They were intemperate and the views of one man: they cannot be borne out.

Mr. Riches: Can you suggest another factor? This gentleman said that liquor was the outstanding factor. Can you mention a worse one?

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not know to what the honourable member is alluding.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member does not have to. He must address the Chair.

Mr. HEASLIP: I believe in moderation, and I do not think they were moderate views. I repeat that they were the views of only one man. The Bill deals with two matters—the tax on the turnover of liquor, and the extension of drinking hours. The Bill provides for a tax on liquor purchases of 3 per cent. That is a moderate proposal. In other States the tax is 6 per cent. In 1959 I first began asking questions about this matter and speaking on it in the Address in Reply debate. I said that too many small country hotels were being penalized and paying far too much in proportion to what was being paid by large hotels in the metropolitan area. Under the present Act the maximum to be paid by a hotel is £450. Some small country hotels sell only four barrels of beer a week.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Tens or eighteens?

Mr. HEASLIP: Eighteens. Some of them pay £110 a year, which is one quarter of the amount paid by a large metropolitan hotel, and that is not equitable. We hear much talk about decentralization, but what is happening in connection with these hotels will result in centralization. Everything favours the metropolitan area, and is against people who go to the country. Unfortunately, under the Bill small country hotels will have to pay more. Whereas they are paying about £110 a year now, they will pay about £150 or £160 under the Bill. However, the metropolitan hotels will pay much more proportionately.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Will it be all right for the country hotel?

Mr. HEASLIP: No. Under the Bill the country hotel will have to pay more. Although it will have to pay perhaps another £50 or £60 a year, the metropolitan hotel might have to go from £450 to £1,000.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Will it kill the metropolitan hotels?

Mr. HEASLIP: No, but the small country hotels will be affected. A country town has a church, store, hotel and recreation area.

Mr. Hutchens: You can get a meal at a country hotel.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, and it is in the country hotel that people get together and talk. If we take that away it will lead to centralization. In 1959 there was a query on whether the Victorian Government had power to impose a turnover tax on hotels, and a High Court judgment upheld the tax, which the Victorian Government then fixed at 6 per cent. I am pleased that our Government has introduced the turnover tax, but it is to be at the rate of 3 per cent only.

Mr. Frank Walsh: It will not be long before it goes up.

Mr. HEASLIP: I would not say that. It depends upon the Government in power. If a moderate Government remains in office I should think the rate would be about the same. In all things we are temperate. The Bill also extends the drinking hours in hotels, after the purchase of a light meal. The member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) opposes that. South Australia and Victoria have the most restricted drinking hours in Australia, more restricted than in practically any other country in the world. No harm can be done by allowing a little more latitude in this matter, and letting people use their own judgment as to how much liquor they should consume. Restaurants are not permitted to serve wines on Christmas Day, but that was never intended, and the anomaly is to be corrected. I cannot see any harm in a person paying 7s. 6d. for a light meal and being permitted a longer period in

which to have a few drinks. It would certainly be an improvement on the present position. Perhaps we have not gone far enough in amending the legislation. I believe in legalized drinking. I mean drinking within the law, and frankly in South Australia we are not doing that. I know of many places where I can get liquor on a Sunday morning, and we should either legalize the practice or stamp it out. We want tourists to come to our State, so let us be civilized and have a position somewhat similar to that operating in other parts of the world. We should not say that we are right and the rest of the world is wrong, which is almost what we are saying. Let us come into line with the rest of the world; let us drink in moderation and be like most people elsewhere. Surely to goodness we as South Australians can be modern and temperate.

Mr. FRED WALSH (West Torrens): I support the second reading. Three or four members of my Party differ from most of us in our approach to extending the hours for the consumption of liquor. I do not want to take my colleagues to task for what they have said in the debate, although I feel that I could do so because I consider that they went quite outside the provisions of the Bill. I have due regard to the fact that you, Mr. Speaker, have said we must keep within the four corners of the Bill. I have heard the expression "four corners" a number of times lately, but I do not think there are any corners in this Bill regarding its very meagre approach to the extension of liquor hours.

Personally, I believe in moderation. I think that all members, with the exception of those two or three who may oppose the licensing laws in every shape or form, subscribe to the principle of moderation, and I believe that that applies to every influential body within the liquor industry: they believe in moderation, and they like to see the trade kept as clean as possible. They do not subscribe to overindulgence to the extent that it inconveniences other persons or endangers the lives or property of other persons or themselves; I know from many years of experience.

I suggest that nobody in this Chamber has a longer experience in this industry than I have had; my introduction into it goes back to 1912. For nearly 20 years, in the course of my duties associated with the organization of which I was an employee, my business took me in and out of hotels, wine saloons, breweries, and wine and spirit establishments, and I know something of what goes on in those places and the manner in which they are conducted. It is true that one will strike an occasional place where the licensee is concerned not with the convenience of the public, or the amenities that should be provided in the general interests of the public, but with profit, but they are very few indeed. We must have in mind all the time, of course, that people have to make a profit to remain in business, but at the same time they must consider the interests of the general public in the provision of amenities that go hand in glove with licensed premises and the question of keeping the trade clean generally.

Like the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip), I believe that the proposed legislation does not go far enough. It is my opinion that the whole question of the liquor industry in this State could be inquired into by a Select Committee. I am not so much concerned about Royal Commissions; I believe that a Select Committee could be established by this Parliament to study every aspect of the liquor industry and report back to Parliament. This is a common practice in other countries where Parliamentary committees are set up and is one that has been followed very satisfactorily indeed. We have only to take notice of what happens in America, where committees are appointed to look into all sorts of matters of national importance. Therefore, I suggest that this question of the liquor industry could be dealt with by a Select Committee of Parliament. I believe that such committees could be set up more often.

The proposed change in the formula used regarding licence fees is a good one, because I consider that the system we have followed for many years—I suppose since the inception of the legislation and the control of the liquor industry and licensed premises—has become outmoded and that it is essential to change it. I have always believed that it was unjust to charge a standard fee for a hotel licence, and that there should be different classes of licences for hotels and perhaps restaurants. I believe it is wrong to stipulate (as the present Act stipulates) that before a licence is granted or before it is renewed provision must be made for at least two sitting rooms and two bedrooms in the metropolitan area and one sitting room and two bedroms in the country. I know that in some hotels in and around Adelaide—and possibly in the country too—there is no demand at all for accommodation for the travelling public, and never has been to my knowledge, yet by law those hotels are required to provide this accommodation. Section 59 (2) (*b*) of the Act states:

If the premises are situated more than ten miles from the city of Adelaide—

I. that they have not at least one sitting room and two sleeping rooms, properly ventilated and furnished, constantly ready and fit for the accommodation of travellers, and separated from any bar by a space of at least 12ft., with a separate entrance:

II. that there is not a stable on the premises, capable of containing at least four horses, with a sufficient quantity of hay and corn (but want of stabling accommodation shall not be an objection to premises within the limits of a municipality whose population numbers 2,000 or over):

Members can see how archaic these provisions are. Few people travel by horse coaches or by horse and buggy these days. However, that aspect does not worry me at present. The fact remains that even if we eliminate that part of the legislation (which does sound ludicrous in the light of present-day circumstances) we should concern ourselves mainly with the provisions which force hotel licensees to provide accommodation for which there is never any demand and never likely to be. I believe that where there is a demand the accommodation should be provided. I go further and suggest that every bedroom in a hotel or other licensed premises where accommodation is provided (it is suggested that clubs should be included) should have running water, hot and cold. There should be provision in the Act for that to be compulsory, because it is surprising how many hotels there are, not only in South Australia but in other States, and especially in the metropolitan areas, which would normally be called second-class hotels yet do not provide hot and cold running water in their bedrooms. That should be a "must" in every hotel, whatever its nature. That is an aspect that the Government will have to look at soon because there is the question of keeping it in a proper condition so that it can be used by any person if there is a demand for it. That means that extra staff will have to be retained and everything needed for its maintenance.

Mr. Shannon: Would you give the Licensing Court power to decide?

Mr. FRED WALSH: I should be prepared to do that because I believe that the licensing courts should have greater powers than they have today and should do much more in administering the Act. I should leave the issuing, cancelling and renewing of licences to the Licensing Court and not to a local option because, now that we are on that point raised by the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon), a local option is wrong in principle. In West Torrens, if a local option is being held and some persons want to establish a hotel in North Glenelg, people as far away as Trimmer Parade, Findon, who are not directly interested could record a vote for it or against it. The Licensing Court should be the body to determine that because it would be competent to make all the necessary inquiries before a licence was issued. I do not think that anybody, irrespective of his views on liquor, should oppose that.

The extension of hours has been accepted by all sections of the trade and even by the restaurant people. In the case of the latter, I am not altogether happy about the permit system whereby restaurants are granted permits to sell liquor between the hours provided for in the Act, and in accordance with the extension granted by the Bill. I refer to Mr. Geleneser, who is the Secretary of the S.A. Restaurant Association and who has made repeated attempts to pressurize members of Parliament. He has gone so far as to threaten the Government with pressurization in regard to increased trading hours. If anybody starts to pressurize me, I am just as likely to take up the opposite attitude because I will not be shoved around by anybody, no matter who he is. I do not like people using threats, and Mr. Geleneser has said his members will renew their pressure on the State Government to allow liquor to be sold with meals until at least 11.30 p.m. They also want brandy to be added to the list of drinks allowed to be taken with meals. They go on to say that they approached the Premier but he did not fall in line with their views and they are going to renew the pressure. I am of the opinion that, so far as these people are concerned, their premises should be licensed in the same way as any other premises—not every one of them, of course, but according to the views of the Licensing Court, which should be the body to determine the matter. Those selected restaurants should be licensed and permits should not be issued more or less indiscriminately. Then, if licensed, they would come under the same control and administration as the hotels do.

There should not be any position created wherein an unfair advantage is taken of those people (I am now speaking of the hoteliers) required to build, in some instances, palatial hotels—and everybody will agree that the type of hotel being built in and around the metropolitan area and the country centres is something to be proud of from the point

of view at least of the travelling public. We know that, if someone takes his wife or a friend or even if he goes himself to one of these nightclubs (some go by the name of bistros in Melbourne and Sydney, I believe), the exploitation that takes place is wicked.

Mr. Clark: You need to take a cheque book; they are very costly.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Yes. These people with those restaurants have the advantage in that their employees in many instances get paid on a string because they supplement the wages they receive by tips from customers. The average person who goes to these places visits them only occasionally; he does not make a regular practice of going there, despite what Mr. Gelencser has said. I have a report which reads:

> The secretary of the association, Mr. J. Gelencser, presented to the Premier a petition signed by 2,800 people who had visited six restaurants in Adelaide that weekend.

That means that an average of 460 persons visited each restaurant, according to the signatures of the customers attending them. That is over a weekend, but how many were there during the day? When I say "over the weekend", that means only on a Saturday, virtually, because there is no trading on a Sunday, or there is trading only under restricted conditions. It depends how one looks at this sort of thing, but my main point is that these people carry on their businesses under these conditions and have an unfair advantage over the hotel people, as they are not observing the same award wages and conditions. Very few of them are members of a union. My union does not cover them, but once their premises become licensed it would, as licensed premises are within the constitution of the union. This does not concern me, however, except that these people should not be allowed any unfair advantage over others in the same line of business. If their premises were licensed instead of their being granted permits, there would be far greater control over them to the advantage of the public.

The inclusion of mead and perry has been suggested, but I do not know that this means very much, as I do not think there is a great demand for either. As the Premier pointed out, mead is made from fermented liquor, with honey as a base, and perry is fermented liquor made from pears. In my long experience, I have not heard of much call for either of these drinks, so I do not think their inclusion means much although, if there were any sort of demand, a new industry would be created or an existing industry would be extended. I would not object to the inclusion of brandy, but I think we should go a little further and cater for the people who do not want either wine or brandy. My comments should appeal to the people who are always saying that we should provide for the sale of light ales in restaurants. If the foreshadowed amendment is accepted, customers will be able to drink only wines or brandy. Let me indicate the proof spirit content of some of these liquors. Various types of beer and stout sold in Adelaide, Melbourne or Sydney have a proof spirit content of between 5 per cent and 15 per cent. Brandy that is broken down has a 75.3 per cent content.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: That is proof?

Mr. FRED WALSH: Yes, which is the only way to measure it. Wine varies from 21 per cent to 34.1 per cent.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Not all wines.

Mr. FRED WALSH: That is true. Many people like to have a glass of wine with a meal, and I do not object to that, but many others like to have a glass of light ale. I do not indulge in liquor to any great extent, but I like to have a glass of ale, yet, if I go to any of these places with my wife and some friends, we are all restricted to drinking wine.

Mr. Shannon: Beer does not cost as much as wine or sherry, either.

Mr. FRED WALSH: That is so. Although I have not ascertained the opinions of hotelkeepers about the serving of light ales at restaurants, I do not think they would object.

Mr. Shannon: You are speaking for the public now, and I agree with you.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I am thinking about the public. Light ales would be provided in glasses, as suggested by the Premier.

Mr. McKee: Ale is sold in small bottles now.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Yes, but one does not drink it out of a bottle through a straw. People who have a glass of ale enjoy it just as the people who have a glass of wine enjoy it. I make these points because I believe that people who spend an evening at cafes should be able to enjoy this privilege. These people do not, as has been suggested, want to have a big night out; they go just to spend a quiet social evening with friends and make up a party. If they over-indulge—as was mentioned by the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes)—there are other provisions to deal with them.

Mr. Shannon: The licensee should attend to them.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I agree, and in many instances he does; this would apply more particularly under a licence system than it does under a permit system. During this debate the tourist trade has been mentioned. I think this subject is overdone, as I do not think there is as much tourist trade in this State as there is in other States. Frankly, I do not think we have the attractions, although some will criticize me for saying that. However, if others think we have tourist attractions, I should like them to enumerate them; I will then enumerate the attractions of other States. Remember that people have to come to the centre of the southern part of Australia to get to what attractions we really have, and whether many people can be enticed here by tourist attractions alone remains to be seen. I have my doubts about the potential of the tourist trade in this State. While on this subject, I should like to point out what Alderman Gerard, a member of the Adelaide City Council, said when he returned recently from an overseas trip to the United States, Europe, Asia and Great Britain. I suppose in his Asian trip he visited Japan, Hong Kong and Djakarta, and perhaps he got to India. I have often heard Continental Sundays referred to in this House in relation to tourist attractions. One must remember that Continental Sundays could not possibly be a success in this country as they are on the Continent.

There is no Continental Sunday in England. I know a lot about London, but I do not know of any places there that have tables on the footpaths, as on the Continent. Remember that only in certain months of the year people in Europe are out of doors indulging in these activities and taking advantage of the better weather from towards the end of April to the beginning of October. For the remainder of the year few people move about for social purposes in Europe. During the winter few people can be seen, because it is snug at home and people remain there. It is impossible to compare Australia and the Continent, because it is only in certain periods of the year that Europeans can take advantage of those facilities, hence their popularity. Employees in those restaurants are virtually employed on the retainer system. In Geneva, Lausanne and Berne workers are provided with board and accommodation, but for the rest they depend on tips from customers. I have been told by waiters, both male and female, that they must make enough from tips during the summer to tide them over the autumn and winter periods. I travelled across America and through Canada and never saw anything comparable with these Continental Sunday activities.

Mr. Shannon: You could not have been in Texas!

Mr. FRED WALSH: I went through it but did not stay there. I do not agree with this talk about a Continental Sunday and suggestions that conditions on the Continent be adopted in this country, because here we have a general period, almost throughout the year, when all the pleasantries and social activities can be enjoyed, whereas countries to which I have referred have a limited time for them.

I agree with the provision in the Bill relating to measures. I can remember that over 40 years ago I suggested to influential people in the trade that measures should be made standard. This would be fair to the public and to the trade generally, as there would be a proper understanding about prices and sizes of the measures. The member for Murray quoted from the terms of reference that were being submitted to the Royal Commission in Victoria. It appears that no limits apply to the matters that can be inquired into. The reference states, *inter alia*:

(*a*) Having regard to changes in the community including the methods and habits of travel, is it necessary or desirable for all hotels to provide residential accommodation and dining room facilities?

(*b*) If some hotels are not to be required to provide the facilities referred to in paragraph (*a*) should a higher licensing fee be payable in respect thereof?

(*c*) Should any and what changes be made in the law requiring the provision of accommodation facilities or amenities at licensed premises or clubs?

In general the terms of reference seem almost unlimited. I do not know whether members have studied them but if an inquiry were held on a fair and just basis (and I presume that that would be so), I should like to know and be assured that those people who subscribed to such a commission or committee of inquiry would accept without reservation its recommendation. If they did then I should believe they were sincere in the views they were advancing on the question of the liquor industry.

I hope the matter of light ale will be considered in Committee. I do not know my position because I have not placed an amendment on the file, and do not know whether it will be competent for me to move one in Committee.

The SPEAKER: A contingent notice of motion is required.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I have not given that. The whole question has been fully aired. The amount of 3 per cent for the licensing fee here is lower than that in other States and I should like a guarantee that this will not be increased progressively and advantage taken of the trade as a trade for the purpose of increasing the State's revenue, as this would unfairly react against the consumers. It is the consumers who will pay. Whatever fees are charged to the licensees, the brewers or the wine-makers, they will eventually be paid by the consumers of the commodity. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): Practically everything that can be said for and against this Bill has been said. I agree with the previous speaker that the Bill falls a long way behind the provisions made in other States. However, after listening to honourable members opposite I believe that if they were now in a position to make up their minds regarding this social matter they would support my beliefs. Changes are necessary in our liquor laws. Many of our citizens migrated here from Italy, Greece and other Continental countries where they enjoyed virtually unrestricted drinking hours. I doubt whether there is any other place in the world where more liquor is consumed between 5 and 6 p.m. each evening than in South Australia. Overseas visitors regard our liquor habits as unique—and deplorable. The rapid consumption of alcohol between 5 and 6 p.m. is almost unbelievable. It is childish that customers should have to drink while watching the clock. Our system is unknown in most countries. Visitors can hardly believe that they are not permitted into a hotel bar to enjoy a drink during the evening.

Mr. Freebairn: Aren't they used to taking liquor with their meals?

Mr. McKEE: Yes. They have been accustomed to virtually unrestricted drinking hours in other countries. Elsewhere one does not see such a consumption of liquor between 5 and 6 p.m. each evening as one sees in South Australia.

Mr. Hughes: Don't you think they knew that before they came here?

Mr. McKEE: No. They were told it was a land of milk and honey: they never thought of the booze. Between 5 and 6 p.m. our hotel bars are overcrowded. As the deadline approaches for the call, "Time, gentlemen, please", one can hear men saying, "Give us three pints".

Mr. Nankivell: "Line 'em up again".

Mr. McKEE: Yes. Of course, these extra pints are consumed during the permitted period of grace.

Mr. Ryan: What is the period of grace?

Mr. McKEE: I do not know what it is in Port Adelaide. I have not had a drink down there lately.

Mr. Hughes: To what time do you suggest hotels should remain open?

Mr. McKEE: I will come to that later. Most of the day there is ample room in which patrons can enjoy a drink in comfort, but after 5 p.m. the position changes. Men then stand three and four deep, handing glasses over the heads of one another, and the congestion in some bars is intolerable. It is almost inhuman. This situation leads to the rapid consumption of liquor and reduces the maintenance of proper hygienic standards.

Mr. Hughes: If the bars remained open until 7 p.m. you do not think that would happen?

Mr. McKEE: No, I do not think so. If they remained open until 10 p.m., it would not happen. Our drinking conditions are referred to as "pig swill conditions", and that is an accurate description.

Mr. Corcoran: That only applies at 6 p.m.

Mr. McKEE: Most people can get to the hotel only between 5 and 6 p.m., because they have to work. Our trading hours are the most backward in Australia, and certainly the most backward in the world. I believe that our 6 p.m. closing is responsible for most of our road accidents. As 6 p.m. approaches men rush to the hotels to indulge in drinking. If one tries to park a motor vehicle near a hotel then, one finds that the closest he can get is about a mile away.

Mr. Ryan: And you get thirsty again on the way back to your car.

Mr. McKEE: Most of our road accidents occur just after 6 p.m. I believe that the rapid drinking of alcohol is responsible for that.

Mr. Hall: Do you think it is better to drink than to drive?

Mr. McKEE: The honourable member—

The SPEAKER: —is out of order.

Mr. McKEE: He is definitely out of order.

Mr. Loveday: He is under the "affluence of incohol".

Mr. McKEE: We have heard members opposite who represent country districts—but most of whom live in the city—claiming that men engaged in rural industry find it difficult to get to the hotel after they have completed

their daily work. The member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) does not believe in a 48-hour, 40-hour or 34-hour week. He works a 60-hour week, so there would be no hope of his employees' getting a drink before 6 p.m.

Mr. Freebairn: They can drink in their own homes.

Mr. McKEE: These people are deprived of the privilege of enjoying a drink in the hotel. I believe that evils are associated with 6 p.m. closing—evils that should not be tolerated in a civilized community.

Mr. Hughes: To overcome these evils, to what time should hotels remain open?

Mr. McKEE: In the metropolitan area the conditions, with 6 p.m. closing, are deplorable.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will realize that there is no reference to 6 p.m. in this Bill. I hope he will come back to the Bill.

Mr. McKEE: I am speaking about trading hours and the proposed extension of hours, and am advocating that the hours should be extended beyond what the Bill proposes. Not only are conditions deplorable, but they encourage "sly grogging"—after-hours trading—at black market prices.

Mr. Corcoran: Hotels wouldn't do that!

Mr. McKEE: Wouldn't they!

The SPEAKER: We will be here all night if members do not keep quiet.

Mr. McKEE: I have spoken to many people about the matter and I agree with them that 6 p.m. closing imposes an undue restriction on the rights of people to obtain liquor when they require it. People attempt to satisfy their desire for alcohol, and no one can deny that.

Mr. Hughes: I want to know to what time the hotels could remain open.

Mr. McKEE: People satisfy their desire by having drinks quickly, which leads to many abuses. There is also a great demand for liquor to be taken home for consumption later. I believe that our citizens are old enough to be responsible and sensible about the quantity of liquor they consume, and when it should be consumed. The Bill refers to the purchase of a light meal at a cost of 7s. 6d., but to my way of thinking that is a farce. Pay 7s. 6d. for the privilege of having a drink!

Mr. Ryan: What is a light meal?

Mr. McKEE: At that time of the night it would probably be an onion sandwich. I defy anyone to say that the provision can be policed.

Mr. Ryan: Who is going to defy you?

Mr. McKEE: Who would be able to say that someone had not had an onion sandwich: there would be no doubt about it. This part of the Bill is typical Government legislation and it can be regarded only as class legislation. It provides for people who can pay the 7s. 6d. The average working man cannot possibly pay 7s. 6d. in order to have a few drinks before going home. By the retention of 6 p.m. closing we are keeping our people in a position where they will be unable to claim that they have a mature approach to alcohol. I am convinced that the hours should be extended and that 10 p.m. would be a suitable closing time. I support the Bill as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough.

Mr. FERGUSON (Yorke Peninsula): I support the second reading, which attitude no doubt will surprise some members, and many people outside. I remind the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) that what is childish to some people is not childish to all people.

Mr. Speaker, you may not allow me to speak in the way I intend to speak, but if you do object you may call me to order. I have never claimed to be a prohibitionist. Although I have interested myself in the cause of temperance, I have always tried to appreciate the viewpoint of the other fellow. I sometimes think that our time would be more profitably spent if we tried to legislate for beverages to contain a much lower content of alcohol, rather than try to prevent people from drinking. It has been said by some members that the matter of licensing and the extension of drinking hours should not be coupled together, but some things are better tied together than allowed to run loosely all over the place.

It has been suggested that the new proposals on licensing may be detrimental to some country hotels. Without having gone into the details, and I do not profess to know very much about the licensing of the hotels, I believe the Bill will not be an embarrassment to country hotels, but it will provide a more equitable way of imposing a licence fee. Although the proposed extension of the time for drinking with meals may be favoured by some people I cannot think that it is absolutely necessary. There are reasonable limits in all things and perhaps we have reached the reasonable limit in this matter. The member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) said that he supported the Bill because he believed in temperance and moderation, but it all depends on the interpretation placed on the word "moderation". I believe that if people universally applied the principle of moderation in drinking we would not have so much opposition to the legislation before us.

I regret that it is proposed to allow people to obtain a light meal at night and then to be served with liquor until 10.45 p.m. I have stayed at hotels and have seen what has been done in providing a light luncheon at mid-day. It has been carried out successfully and I have heard people commend what has been done. However, the circumstances are different from those dealt with by the Bill. After having been served with a light meal at mid-day the people concerned have gone back to their places of work. Mr. Heaslip said that the Bill presents an opportunity for men to have a few more drinks and I believe this would be an inducement for fellows to stay instead of going home to their families for the evening meal. I support the Bill with certain reservations.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I support the Bill, and intend to speak only briefly on it. It has engendered much interest since its introduction. I have been interested in hearing the opinions expressed by members, but the Bill caused much interest, even before it was introduced, amongst people on both sides of the question. Other members, besides me, received many letters from people concerned about drinking hours being extended and from others who thought the legislation would not go far enough. I do not know the experience of other members but since the Bill was introduced I have received no reaction at all, either by letter or verbally, from people who have opininions about it. I believe that other members have had the same experience. I am interested to find that I am the only metropolitan member on this side of the House to speak on the Bill, and I think this is the second time within a week that that has occurred. Before I got to my feet I was trying to reckon up how many hotels were situated within the boundaries of my district, and I have come to the conclusion that we are a fairly abstemious crowd, because I think I have only three hotels in the entire area. Considering there are 32,000 people in my district, that is not bad for a metropolitan area.

Mr. Coumbe: I have 20 hotels in my district.

Mrs. STEELE: I think probably my district has about the least number, and I do not think there are many restaurants either. Although restaurants are increasing in my district, there are not as many as in other parts of the metropolitan area. I consider that the amendments contained in the Bill are quite realistic and obviously they have not given offence to anybody in particular. I think the Bill has gone a long way to meeting the objections which some sections of the community put forward, namely, that our Licensing Act is enough to keep tourists away from South Australia. Sometimes I go out to dine with my family. My experience is that even if people start dinner at about 8 o'clock and dine in a leisurely fashion, with drinks to go with it (which I think is far the best way of drinking and the nicest form of entertainment I can think of anyway), by 10 p.m. the majority of people have drunk all they want to drink, and I think that this extension, till 10.45 p.m. to sell wine and 11.15 p.m. for it to be removed from the table, is more than adequate to meet the needs and desires of most people. Surely, we are educated and adult enough to be more sophisticated in this day and age when I think, with the advent of so many New Australians, our drinking and eating habits have changed.

There is, of course, a minority of people who drink to excess; we know that these people are in the community. However, I would say that generally speaking we are a fairly moderate community, and I think that most of us know when we have had enough. I think everybody agrees that it is quite fair that restaurants should be given the same conditions as hotels on Christmas Day. I consider that the provision in this respect was anomalous, and I am certain that most of us are glad to see that it has been rectified. The present proposal obviously has met with the approval of those people who have their restaurants open on Christmas Day.

I was interested in what the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) had to say about fees charged to hotels. Although I realize from what he said that some small country hotels probably will have to pay more, at least they will now be assessed for fees on the same basis as city hotels, and in relation to the amount of alcoholic liquor that they sell they will be paying a fee which is on some kind of parity with that of city hotels. I think that probably here in South Australia—and this was borne out by what the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) had to say—where we produce 78 per cent of Australia's wine, it is quite natural that we would expect people to be more interested in drinking wine which is available to them in places other than hotels. I say that my own experience—which is a fairly limited one—is that people drink in moderation in those places. Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): The only part of this Bill I want to discuss is the provision relating to the extension of hours, and I propose to reserve my comments on that matter for the Committee stages.

Bill read a second time.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): I move:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the Whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider amendments relating to beer-gardens.

The original motion included the words "sitting rooms and". I ask leave of the House to move my motion without those words because they could be too restrictive. My attention has been drawn to the fact that sitting rooms are sometimes used by hotel guests with children for viewing television, and if those words remained it would restrict that activity, which I do not wish to do. My attention has also been directed to the position at Mount Gambier, where the only way people can get into the dining room at one hotel is through the sitting room. I should hate to be responsible for anything that would prohibit people going to the dining room with their children.

Motion, as amended by leave, carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 22 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.3 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, November 7, at 2 p.m.