LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Wednesday, September 17, 1952.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

LEASING OF CARAVANS.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked yesterday relating to the leasing of caravans?

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL—The position is that whilst the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act enables the maximum rents of caravans to be fixed by the Housing Trust, the Act does not otherwise regulate the legal position of owners and hirers of caravans. The Act, of course, restricts the right of a landlord to evict his tenant but these provisions do not apply to caravans. Consequently, the rights of a hirer of a caravan are those to which he is entitled under the term of his contract with the owner of the caravan.

MIGRANT HOSTEL KITCHENETTES.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Some months ago there was an agitation by British migrants at the Gepps Cross Hostel for kitchenettes to be provided and the Premier made a public statement that the Housing Trust was prepared to erect kitchenettes if the Commonwealth Government made funds available. In the press recently the Hon. P. McBride intimated that no request had been made by the Premier for funds. Can the Chief Secretary say whether the Premier proposes to do so and, if so, when?

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—I understand some interest has been taken in this matter by both Federal and State members for the district but I am afraid I am not in a position to explain the position at the moment. I believe there have been discussions but I have not discussed the matter with the Premier. I will get the information for the honourable member.

PERMITS FOR ROAD HAULIERS.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY—Arising from a letter received this morning from the Interstate Transport Association in regard to the refusal by the Transport Control Board to grant permits to drivers or hauliers . . .

ol

The PRESIDENT—Order. The honourable member will either have to ask his question or obtain leave to make a statement.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY—Will the Chief Secretary clarify the action of the Transport Control Board in regard to the granting of permits to hauliers for the purpose of carrying goods to and from the State?

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister concerned.

WOMEN POLICE SALARIES.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I understand that Cabinet has decided, upon the recommendation of the Department of Industry, that the recent alteration of rates payable under the Police Officers' Award is not to apply to women police and that no future award or basic wage increases shall be so applied until such time as the total rates payable reach 75 per cent of the total male rates. I believe a deputation has waited on the responsible authorities. Can the Chief Secretary indicate the result of that deputation?

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—There is no suggestion of the Government not paying award rates. I assume the question refers to the salaries of women police who are in receipt of remuneration considerably above that which would apply under any award. In the early history of the police force the women police were on the same basis as men, but the salaries were then much lower. The matter under discussion at present is whether that procedure should continue or whether salaries should be based on awards. The Police Association conferred with the Police Commissioner and the Public Service Commissioner last Thursday and the result is that the Police Commissioner is to set out the duties of women police and the matter will then be considered by the Public Service Commissioner and a report made.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 20. Page 450.)

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland)—I am pleased to speak on this measure because I realize that it was brought forward by the Leader of the Opposition seriously and conscientiously. In the closing portion of his speech he said:—

I introduce this Bill conscientiously believing in the importance of this branch of the legislature.

I accept that statement and some of his comments, although I cannot agree with everything he said. He said:—

> In giving the second reading speech I ask members to treat it as a non-Party measure and to discuss it free from any bias.

I hope the Bill will be discussed on that basis, particularly by the members of the Opposition. The Attorney-General made it clear that, with our existing franchise, from a practical point of view it would be almost impossible to have compulsory voting. In other words, by agreeing to the Bill we would be enacting legislation which could not be policed or enforced and which would be of no use. If that is the position it behoves us to oppose the Bill. I draw attention to another statement of Mr. Condon which, to me, is most important. He said:—

> I do not advocate the abolition of our Legislative Council or the extension of the franchise but I urge members to approve this Bill and to provide for compulsory enrolment and voting.

I have not been able to ascertain exactly what the rule of the Labor Party is about the House of second thought as it seems to vary from time to time.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—That is not what I said.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I am glad to know that Mr. Condon does not advocate the abolition of this Council or an extension of the franchise. I take it that, as Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber, his statement represents the opinion of the Labor Party in South Australia.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—You will have an opportunity of altering the franchise before this session is over. The abolition of the House is not an extension.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I am reading what the honourable member said as it appears in *Hansard*.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—It does not convey exactly what I intended to mean.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I am reading the statement as it appears on page 195 of *Hansard*. However, I accept the honourable member's assurance. My next point is whether the Bill is not intended to be the thin end of the wedge in order to bring about reform of this Council. His remarks still leave my point clear—that it is the thin end of the wedge and that ultimately it will achieve something that the Bill does not set out to achieve.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Wouldn't Parliament be the deciding factor?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I am only too happy to let Parliament be the deciding factor. I have already mentioned that, from a practical point of view, there is no use our placing compulsory enrolment for the Legislative Council on the Statute Book, because it cannot be policed. Anybody who failed to vote could not be satisfactorily prosecuted because it could not be proved that he was entitled to vote at the relevant time. Because of the points made by the Attorney-General in his speech the Bill must fall to the ground.

My second point is that we must distinguish between theory and practice. In theory it may be argued that everybody should be compelled to vote, but in practice my approach is, "What has been the result in this State of the present franchise?" In the first instance, even if we argued it from a theoretical point of view, it is wrong to compel a person to vote. It is wrong to ask a person to express an opinion on a matter on which he may have no opinion. If I am not interested in medical science what is the good of compelling me to express an opinion on it? There are people in the community who do not take an intelligent interest in Parliamentary proceedings and our democratic institutions and it is quite ludicrous to ask them to express an opinion on a matter to which they have given no thought and about which they have no knowledge. As one writer clearly put it:—

> Forcing the performance of a right degenerates the act into an odious obligation not valued by the doer for which he therefore does not take the trouble to fit himself.

Asking people to do something compulsorily which they do not want to do is compelling them to perform an odious obligation which they do not value and when they have not taken any trouble to fit themselves with Parliamentary knowledge.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Do you say that the right to vote is odious?

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Why compel people to vote for another place?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I did not say that the right to vote was odious, but to ask a man to express an opinion on something on which he has no opinion and no interest would obviously be odious to him. As regards theory and practice, the test of any Parliamentary system is whether it meets the wishes and needs of the people and gives them the kind of legislation they require. We have ample evidence, in considering the history of the South Australian Parliament over the last few years, that the people have got the kind of Government they

want, that their interests have been properly represented and that everybody, from the highest to the lowest in the land, has felt he has had a fair deal. That is the best test whether our present set-up is working satisfactorily. The test is not a theoretical argument whether A or B or X or Y should be entitled or compelled to vote, but whether, in fact, his interests in this State are being adequately and properly represented.

When we consider what has been done in South Australia, compared with other States, nobody can say that the electors have not had a fair crack of the whip. I can give some specific instances. Savings Bank deposits in this State are higher than in any other State. If, in fact, the efforts of the present Government mean that people are enjoying a larger degree of prosperity and a greater sense of freedom, then our system must be right and there is no need to interfere with it. It is undisputed that we have more motor cars per head of population and freedom from industrial unrest than the other States. When the Playford Government came into power in 1938 the State was losing 20,000 people each year to other States. That matter has now been rectified and our population is increasing. The fact that we have been able to order our affairs so that strikes and shortages are practically unknown in South Australia is in marked contrast to a State that has no Legislative Council. All these things show that our system is working satisfactorily and I am loth to interfere with it in any way. Another point of interest is a statement made by Mr. Bardolph on the Address in Reply debate, not by way of interjection, but after due consideration. He said that this Parliament had implemented the popular planks of the Labor Party.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—That is so.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—On that argument, does he suggest that it should be interfered with and that people should be compelled to do something which, apparently, they do not want to do? I am approaching this subject from a practical and not a theoretical point of view. We have already been told this session that after the next elections the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues will be on the Treasury benches. That is the theory; I am very anxious to see what the practical result will be. What I have said I think proves that we would not be enhancing the rights and privileges or improving the position of the electors by agreeing to this legislation and for that reason I feel I must oppose it.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1)—First may I be permitted to say that I am pleased to see the Chief Secretary back in harness again and hope that he has fully recovered his health. The Bill provides only for compulsory enrolment and compulsory voting for the Legislative Council. Mr. Rowe's contention appears to be that because the economic position in South Australia is very sound the legislature should not be interfered with, but I cannot subscribe to that view. In answer to a question by Mr. Condon the Attorney-General supplied the following figures showing the number of names added to the Legislative Council roll since last elections:—

Central No. 1	12,191
Central No. 2	13,151
Southern	5,177
Midland	2,879
Northern	3,257

The Hon. E. Anthoney—They are not net figures.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—They are enrolments since the last State elections, and do not take into account the number of names removed from the rolls for various causes. I consider that those figures prove that something ought to be done to remedy the situation. We all realize that the franchise is restricted, and that because enrolments are voluntary and very little is said about qualifications there are quite a lot of people having no say in the administration of the affairs of the State; quite a number do not exercise their franchise simply through ignorance of the fact that they are entitled to be enrolled. As pointed out by Mr. Condon yesterday the old formula that the Legislative Council is only a House of review will not stand examination, for I think that all members will concede that the Legislative Council in this State at least is more than that. I feel therefore that the Bill should have the careful consideration of members and that it should be passed.

The only objection raised in this debate against the legislation is that it could not be adequately policed, but I cannot subscribe to that view. It was suggested, for instance, that many persons entitled to be enrolled today might not be so entitled tomorrow through change of circumstances, but that situation exists today, so I do not think that the implementation of the Bill would have any bearing on that aspect. We have compulsory voting for another House and the argument is advanced that that can be more readily policed. If compulsion can be policed in one instance it can be in another, in support of which I instance the compulsory notification

provisions of the Health Act dealing with tuberculosis. A person not complying with that law can be prosecuted. I suggest that the majority of the people of this State are law-abiding citizens and if it became law those not now enrolled would find out whether or not they were entitled to be enrolled and, if so, would immediately take steps to comply with the law. I say therefore that that argument falls to the ground. The onus is upon everyone, on attaining the age of 21, to become enrolled on the House of Assembly roll. That is also the case in respect of the Federal rolls and my only objection to this Bill is that it does not go far enough, because it ought to provide for adult franchise for the Legislative Council. We have seen what that means in another State, for we know that in Victoria the number enrolled has doubled or more than doubled since the passing of similar legislation there. Because of our restricted franchise, Legislative Council representatives do not truly express the views of the people. If this Bill becomes law they would express the opinion of considerably more people than they do at present. It would not be a retrograde step as suggested by some members but an advancement of the democratic rights of the people. Mr. Rowe suggested we should not interfere with something which apparently the people consider to be correct, and that we have a Government which has been operating for many years and elected by the people under the present system. He suggested that was a reason for not making any alteration to the Legislative Council franchise but I point out that this Government was elected by compulsory enrolment and compulsory voting for the House of Assembly and the question of fear psychology does not enter into it. If the Government is satisfactory to the electors there would be no change if people were compelled to enrol and vote for the Legislative Council. Have not voters the same right to express their opinions concerning Legislative Council members as they do House of Assembly members? This Bill would be a definite improvement and I support it.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE secured the adjournment of the debate.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Having obtained leave, the Hon. A. L. McEWIN introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Friendly Societies Act, 1919-50.

Read a first time.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 16. Page 529.)

The Hon. C. S. BEVAN (Central No. 1)—Last year's Public Purposes Loan Bill was for £41,000,000 but this year the amount has been reduced to £29,000,000 from which we have to endeavour to continue our public works, which is an impossibility. We have £12,000,000 less and therefore important public works must be curtailed.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—We spent only £31,000,000 last year.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Yesterday Mr. Perry deplored the fact that we have less loan money. I also feel concerned at the curtailment of loan expenditure. Mr. Perry assumed that we would have only £29,000,000, but if suggestions by the Commonwealth Government materialize it may be possible for us to receive £43,000,000. At present we have £29,000,000 out of which we must carry out important public works, complete those already commenced, and maintain the high regard in which this State is held. In the *Advertiser* of September 16, under the heading "Country in a Sound Position" Mr. C. S. Bertram, the president of the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures, is reported to have said:—

> The steady increase in the value of retail sales in Australia over the last five years was a definite indication that the country was in a sound economic position.

Yesterday Mr. Perry said that the economic position of Australia had never been better. Other authorities have expressed the same opinion but the Commonwealth Government has considerably restricted loans to all States. We are to receive less money notwithstanding that our economic position is more sound. If our economic position is more sound it appears that the people have lost faith in the Commonwealth Government and will not subscribe to loans floated by that Government. It was suggested yesterday that the people best fitted to subscribe to loans were not doing so because the rate of interest was not high enough. People in that category could not fairly be described as patriotic because it is only by our own efforts that our economic position can be maintained. In yesterday's *Advertiser* in an article headed "Migrants Unable to Find Farm Work" it was stated that two young British migrants came to Australia with hopes of being able to find employment on farms but after a fortnight's fruitless searching they were disillusioned.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—Did you read this morning's paper?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I did.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—Then you are a bit out of date.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—No, I am not. In this morning's paper were four offers of employment on farms in widely spread districts. At least one offer was conditional upon the employee being prepared to learn the work quickly. In other words he must immediately become experienced because a mere farm labourer would be of no use. We will not encourage young people to accept employment on the land unless we can extend the conditions of the Industrial Code to country areas. I think that is why there has been an influx to the city.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—Have you any idea of wages in the country?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I knew what they were because I worked on a farm for 10s. a week and keep and lived in a galvanized iron portable room 8ft. by 10ft. built on iron wheels 5ft. high with ¾in. cracks in the floorboards through which a hurricane often blew. After I had finished walking behind a team of eight horses, clearing scrub, I had to bring them back to the homestead, water them at a bore, feed them for the night, and then prepare my evening meal.

The Hon. A. J. Melrose—That is out of date now.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—That might be so, but the position is that men who were in the same position as myself were not prepared to continue under those conditions and came to the metropolitan area where they could obtain better working conditions.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—If there is so much unemployment shouldn't we be able to find work for some men at the Metropolitan Abattoirs?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—The abattoirs can get as much labour as it requires. If the honourable member desires further proof and will accompany me to the Trades Hall tomorrow morning I will prove that there are plenty of workers available for that undertaking. I cannot understand the increased unemployment figures that are published from week to week, especially after reading statements that Australia is in a sound position economically. It puzzles me why there is any unemployment under such circumstances. Unemployment exists only when we are not in a sound economic position and industry is suffering. Then manufacturers cannot sell manufactured goods and there is a glut. Everything goes back to the manufacture of goods. Australia is in a sound economic position today and there should not be any unemployment.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Menzies) made certain statements about future hostilities. I understood him to mean that under an agreement between the Commonwealth and the Governments of other countries, such as England and America, Australia's first fundamental duty would be to supply food to them. I understand that to mean that Australia will be defended by American and British armies and other allies if another World War occurs and will, in return, see that not only the armies of those countries but their civil population are supplied with food. Our rural industries, however, are declining. Today there is a tendency on the part of the Commonwealth Government to spend millions of pounds on what I term heavy armaments for the defence of Australia. If we are committed to food production and the supplying of foodstuffs to our allies our first fundamental will be to increase food production in order to fulfil our obligations. The Commonwealth should make a greater allotment available to the States for food production. The money could be taken from the millions of pounds that have been set aside for heavy armaments. If an allocation is made for increased food production we will be able to carry out our commitments and continue heavy armament production afterwards.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—What do you suggest the money should be used for?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Food production. There should be a definite increase in wheat acreage, instead of a decrease, and a definite stepping up of the dairying industry in order to manufacture foodstuffs. If that is done we can provide food, but if not we will be unable to meet our commitments.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Put our spare land under cultivation.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—The wheat acreage in South Australia, like butter production, has definitely declined.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—They are on strike for a higher price.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Employees engaged in butter production are adequately safeguarded, and have been for years, because of an industrial award covering their conditions of employment. The Industrial Code should be extended to cover all rural workers.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—Once you do that you will definitely reduce production. What happened when efforts were made to obtain an award for harvest labour?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—There was considerable opposition by employers collectively to any extension of the Industrial Code. If an attempt was made tomorrow to extend it to cover rural workers there would be considerable resistance because employers would have to give their employees a fair go, which they have not had previously. According to statements made by representatives of employers in the Federal Arbitration Court, we are on the verge of bankruptcy. A statement which I term "buck passing" by a prominent official of the metal trades industry appeared in this morning's press. It was to the effect that the metal trades were forced to take action because no Government would do so. I am not decrying the metal trade's action because they have the same rights as unions to apply to the Arbitration Court to fix wages and conditions. I do not say it is wrong for them to do what they have, but the statements made to the court regarding the economic position in this country definitely conflict with those made by authoritative persons.

I now turn to timber milling and afforestation. In 1951-52 the expenditure was £1,161,000. This financial year expenditure is set down at £1,110,000, a decrease of £51,000. During the past 12 months approximately 136 million super feet of timber was milled at the Government mills and receipts were £200,000 greater than the previous year. I understand that a large sum will be spent on a new boilerhouse at Mount Burr and the construction of a new mill at Mount Gambier.

The Hon. J. L. S. Bice—Is the Mount Gambier mill included in the £1,161,000?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—If a proportion of that amount is not to be spent on those projects where is this expenditure to take place? Are we going to come back later for another vote for this purpose? I reiterate what I said some time ago in this place that it is very pleasing to see the advancement in afforestation and timber milling under Government control, for it is frequently said that any project controlled by the Government loses money. Apparently this is one which does not and which is an asset to the State. I think we can look forward to this asset increasing in value year by year because of the improvements to the Nangwarry mill, which this year will be in full production and will considerably increase the output of fruit cases and the like.

The sum voted for the Engineering and Water Supply Department last year was £5,807,000 and this year it is reduced to £3,500,000, a drop of over £2,000,000 despite the fact that water supplies are far below our needs. Each year we are forced to use bore water, which is pumped into the mains in an effort to conserve reservoir supplies. This year will be no exception despite the fact that the reservoirs are now full, and this situation will continue until the completion of the Mannum-Adelaide main, which will considerably augment supplies for the metropolitan area and country lands through which the main passes. When Mount Bold reservoir was completed we were informed that our worries about water would be over for some considerable time, but because of the increased demands by industry and the ever-increasing population it was soon found that Mount Bold was not the answer and that we were still short of our requirements, so it is with some little concern that we face the next 12 months with an expenditure of £2,000,000 less on this most important public works than was available last year. A considerable amount of work still has to be done to complete the Little Para reservoir and I understand that quite a lot of manpower has been transferred from that work to the Murray River main, mainly, I understand, because of the curtailment of loan money. It seems, therefore, that completion of the Little Para reservoir will be retarded and that it will be some time before it will be completed, let alone full.

For improvements to existing school buildings and new buildings a sum of £1,150,000 is provided. The need for this can be readily understood when we realize that to June 30 last the number of pupils at primary and secondary schools had increased to 101,199 and it is expected that the number will increase still further. With each new area opened up a new school is required and we can realize that a considerable sum must be expended for this most important work. Schools are absolutely essential for the advancement of the State. One of the main needs of the community is adequate education of the rising generation, for without education the State would retrogress instead of advancing steadily. The new State of Pakistan has realized the position and has introduced a national educational plan extending over a period of six years. It is described as follows:—

A six-year national plan of educational development has been undertaken by the Central Government of Pakistan. The total cost is expected to be Rs.1,153,900,515

(approximately £A157,000,000) of which Rs.431,679,360 (approximately £A58,000,000) will be recurring expenditure.

Evidently that Government has realized that education is one of the main essentials for the advancement of the State. With this I fully agree, and we should have no regrets that our expenditure upon education this financial year will increase and not decrease.

The South Australian Housing Trust is to receive £2,890,000 compared with £5,150,000 last year. A shortage of houses still exists and this curtailment of expenditure by the trust will hamper the State's building programme and leave us with a shortage of houses for some time.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Why cannot private enterprise bridge the gap?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Private enterprise has failed miserably in the past and cannot carry out the job.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—It cannot compete with the Housing Trust.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—When Housing Trust homes cost about £2,750 I cannot see why the private builder cannot compete. Finally I would like to mention uranium and Radium Hill, one of our State's greatest assets. Yesterday Mr. Perry placed three propositions for control before us and said that he favoured the third.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—I tried to make it clear that I favoured the third but not the first.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I understood the honourable member to say that he favoured the third which is identical with what is being adopted by the Federal Government in connection with Rum Jungle where, I understand, the Zinc Corporation, a wealthy mining company, will undertake the management and development of the mine at a management fee. I do not subscribe to the view that a Government cannot adequately and profitably work a project such as Radium Hill. If private enterprise is able to supply technicians with the necessary knowledge to carry out a project of this nature why cannot the Government secure the services of equally competent persons? Although Mr. Perry stated that officials of the Mines Department were men of high integrity he felt that they lacked actual mining experience. In the light of our experience with the Leigh Creek coalfield, for example, I would suggest that the officials of the Mines Department, who are responsible for that, are fully competent.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—That is not mining. It is only quarrying.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—They have done an excellent job there and if the State Government is not competent to mine the ore at Radium Hill it cannot be said to be competent in regard to Leigh Creek.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—It does not do it there either. A trust does it.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—If that is not the Government I have yet to learn what it is. It is a trust under the control of the State Government, so do not let us fool ourselves.

The Hon. F. T. Perry—It is not under Government control.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—The legislation passed by both Houses of Parliament proves that it is. I suggest that the Government is able and capable of looking after and retaining control of the assets of the State for the benefit of the State. Some time ago I referred in this place to the copper content of the uranium ore at Rum Jungle and the loss of wealth by the exportation of that ore to America because the copper was being lost to this country. In the *News* of August 19 under the heading "Copper in N.T." the following statement appeared:—

Canberra: Copper deposits of immense value had been discovered in Rum Jungle uranium mine, and might do more than uranium for development of Northern Territory, Mr. Nelson, Labor member for Northern Territory said. He expected big smelting works would be built in Northern Territory to process copper.

That bears out my previous statement and the contention that we should retain control of our assets and process minerals for the development of the country. The amount of money set aside for the development of Radium Hill is worth-while but the project should be State-controlled. The State should look after its own interests by treating the ore and retaining the by-products for its own use. If we follow the suggestions of some honourable members and hand this industry over to private enterprise we will lose control of those assets. If we can conduct one business profitably we can do so in this case. It has not been suggested that we should relinquish our control of the Leigh Creek coalfield, our afforestation schemes, or our railways. I believe we should extend our facilities and instead of providing money for the tramways the Government should take control of them and we would be better off. In discussing the Electoral Act Amendment Bill Mr. Rowe said that Mr. Condon did not subscribe to any extension of the franchise but my understanding of the Labor Party policy is that

we subscribe to adult franchise. Yesterday Mr. Jude referred to a statement published in the *Mail* last week attributed to Mr. O'Halloran. I direct his attention to Mr. O'Halloran's statement suggesting an extension of the present legislation dealing with the reaggregation of land. If Mr. Jude re-read the statement he could perhaps quote correctly. I support the second reading.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN (Chief Secretary) —I take this opportunity of thanking honourable members for the prompt way in which they have dealt with the Loan Estimates, for the personal consideration which every member has shown me during my illness and for their kind references to me in the debate. Members have discussed many important matters which vitally concern the Government. I assure them that they will, as in the past, receive the greatest attention of the Government.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

BUILDING OPERATIONS BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN (Chief Secretary) —I move:—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill makes important alterations in the law dealing with the control of building operations and the supply of building materials. Its general effect is to relax appreciably the controls now imposed by statute. It will be remembered that the Building Materials Act provides for control over the use of various essential building materials such as building bricks, roofing tiles, galvanized iron, flooring boards and other materials, and it is now an offence to use any of these materials for any purpose except under permit or for certain exempted purposes. The main exemption applies to the erection of a dwelling house for occupation by the owner or, in the case of a primary producer, by an employee, but the area of the house must not exceed 12½ squares and the limit of the permitted cost is £2,200.

As regards other buildings, the Act provides that a permit is necessary if the cost, exclusive of painting, will exceed £150. The present law requires a permit to be obtained for the carrying out of additions, alterations or repairs if the cost of the work, exclusive of the cost of painting, exceeds £150. The Act also provides for a system of priority certificates under which users of building materials are allotted different priorities. In addition, the Minister has power to issue directions as to the manner in which the sellers may dispose of essential building materials.

It is proposed to repeal the Act and to set up a new system for the regulation of building operations. As mentioned, the control proposed by the new legislation will be very much less stringent than that now provided. It is considered by the Government that the time is appropriate to take such a course. In general, the supplies of building materials have increased appreciably and, in addition, the labour position has eased. There are still, however, considerable numbers of people lacking proper dwellings and it is felt that the time has not yet arrived for the complete relaxation of controls and that it is still essential that the resources of the building industry should be principally devoted to the provision of dwelling-houses.

The scheme of the Bill is as follows:— The regulation of building operations will, in future, not refer to what have been known as essential building materials and, with two exceptions to be referred to later, it is not proposed to exercise any control over the disposition or use of any specific building materials. This means that the priority system will disappear, as will the practice of giving Ministerial directions to suppliers of essential building materials as to the manner in which they are to dispose of them. The proposed control will, in general, be limited to the actual building operations.

Clause 4 sets out the general principles on which the Bill is to operate. It is proposed that the following building operations may be carried out without any permit.

1. It will be competent for any person who desires to build a house to an area of 18 squares for his own occupation or for occupation by an employee. This area will include all domestic outbuildings such as garage, laundry, etc., but it will be seen that this is a very big increase on the present maximum of 12½ squares. Another point of difference is that, under the Act, a house for an employee can only be built by a primary producer, whereas the Bill now provides that any employer may build a house of up to 18 squares for a person employed or to be employed by him. Another very important difference is that no limitation is placed upon the cost which may be incurred in building a house although, as has been pointed out, the present law now imposes a maximum cost of £2,200. It can be reasonably

assumed that, with present day building costs and restrictions on mortgage finance, a person will not build a bigger house than he reasonably needs and it is considered that, in existing circumstances, there is no reason why the limitation on costs should be continued. If a person wishes to build a house to an area greater than 18 squares he will, of course, be required to take out a permit, but, as the ordinary family house does not need to exceed 18 squares, it will be seen that, as regards this class of building, control is virtually brought to an end.

2. It is provided that a person may build a dwelling-house for any purpose so long as the area, including outbuildings, does not exceed 18 squares and none of the materials mentioned in clause 7, namely, burnt building bricks, Australian galvanized iron or piping, or *Pinus radiata* flooring, are used. As will be explained later, clause 7 provides that there will be certain restrictions on the use of these materials of which the supply is less than the demand. Where a house is built for occupation by the owner or an employee any materials may, subject to clause 7, be used in the construction. In the case of a house built for other purposes, for example, for sale, the Bill provides that these scarce materials are not to be used. It will be realized that this provision will result in a very substantial relaxation of control as, up to the present, non-permit building of houses has been allowed only where houses are built for occupation by the owners or employees of primary producers.

3. Buildings other than dwelling houses may be built without permit so long as the area does not exceed 3 squares or the total cost £300, exclusive of the cost of painting. The present Act provides that non-permit buildings of this kind must not exceed a cost of £150, so that there is some relaxation of control in this regard. It will be noted that, as far as buildings other than dwellinghouses are concerned, building without a permit will only be allowed up to a relatively small limit. The result is that it will still be necessary to obtain a permit if it is desired to build commercial buildings of any size and, in effect, this will be the only way in which any great degree of control will be exercised under the Bill. However, it is the opinion of the Government that this form of control should continue as otherwise the result would probably be that a considerable amount of the effort now being devoted to house building would be diverted to less urgent purposes. Building for other than housing purposes will, in general, still come under the permit system, but it will be possible to administer the legislation so that necessary building other than housing will be permitted and, if necessary, to see that the resources of the building industry are fully engaged.

4. It is provided that as regards a house built after the commencement of the war, additions may be made to the house bringing the total area, including the area of the outbuildings, up to 18 squares. During the war years and subsequently persons who built houses were restricted considerably in the area to which they could build and it is considered that, if the owner of such a house now desires to increase its area, he should be able to do so, up to the limit of 18 squares, without requiring a permit.

5. An outbuilding may be built upon land used for primary production without any limitation as to cost or size. It is considered that this form of building should cease to be controlled.

6. Alterations and additions to existing buildings are to be permitted to the extent of £300, exclusive of the cost of painting, in any financial year and, in the case of additions, with the further limitation that the additions must not exceed three squares in area. Each of these operations is regarded separately for the purposes of the Bill so that it will be competent for an owner to carry out £300 worth of alterations and £300 worth of additions in the same financial year. The present Act limits the total which can be expended without a permit in any financial year for repairs, alterations and additions to any building to £150.

It should be noted that all reference to repairs in the law have been deleted. The Act provides for control over repairs where essential building materials are used, but it is not proposed under the Bill to exercise any control over the carrying out of repairs. The clause also provides that the Governor may by proclamation declare other classes of building operations which will be exempted from the permit system so that, if it proves desirable to do so, a proclamation can be made extending the exemptions now given by the clause. To sum up, the clause provides that a dwelling house may be erected for occupation by the owner or an employee without permit to the extent of 18 squares and without limit of cost and that a house may be built for any other purpose up to 18 squares and without limit of cost provided certain scarce Australian materials are not used. The law regarding alterations and additions will be considerably liberalized,

repairs will cease to be subject to control, but permits will still be necessary for houses beyond the size mentioned and for commercial buildings of any appreciable size.

Clause 5 deals with the use of cement and cement products. The Act now provides that they are not to be used for paving or the construction of fences, footpaths, kerbs and similar work. It is proposed by clause 5 to continue these provisions for the time being, but the operation of the clause will be limited to cement manufactured in South Australia, so that there will be no control over the use of cement imported from another State or from overseas. It is expected that within a relatively short time the cement production in the State will be such that it will be unnecessary to have any control over the use of cement for the purposes mentioned but, at present, the production of locally produced cement is not such that its use should be permitted for the purposes mentioned in the clause. However, it is provided by subclause (4) that the clause is to cease to operate after February 28, 1953, and in addition, it is provided that the Governor can, by proclamation, declare that it shall cease to operate on any earlier date. The intention is that it shall only operate until such time as the cement production in South Australia reaches a stage where control ceases to be necessary.

Clauses 5 and 7 are the only clauses which provide for the control of the use of specific materials. In the case of some Australian manufactured materials the supply is still inadequate to meet the demand and clause 7 provides that these materials are to be used only for various essential purposes. The materials in question are burnt building bricks, Australian galvanized iron of 24 or 26in. gauge, Australian galvanized piping from ½in. to 3in. diameter, and *Pinus radiata* flooring boards. Imported materials do not come within the scope of the clause. The clause provides that these Australian materials are only to be used when authorized by a permit or for one of the purposes set out in subclause (2) namely, building bricks may be used for the construction of dwelling houses, schools and hospitals which are constructed in accordance with the Act or for underpinning any dwelling house, school or hospital.

At present the general practice of the Building Materials Office is that permits for the use of Australian galvanized iron for buildings will only be given for use in country areas and this policy is continued under the clause. It is provided, in general, that Australian galvanized iron is to be used only for roofing purposes outside the metropolitan area, but that Australian iron may be used for such purposes as guttering, flashing and similar purposes for buildings constructed anywhere, and that it may be used in the metropolitan area for making additions to existing houses, schools or hospitals where the roofing of the existing building is of galvanized iron. In addition, galvanized iron may be used for the manufacture of water tanks. As regards Australian galvanized piping it is provided that this may be used for the purpose of water reticulation. *Pinus radiata* flooring may be used for the flooring of houses, schools and hospitals and additions and repairs to that class of building. It is provided by paragraph (*e*) of subclause (2) that secondhand materials may be used for any purpose. The general effect, therefore, is that the use of these building materials is confined to the purposes set out in the clause and when it is desired to use them for any other purpose a permit must be obtained. But as mentioned, the restrictions imposed by the clause will not apply to secondhand materials but only to materials manufactured in Australia.

Clause 6 is similar to section 6 of the Act and prohibits the demolition of dwellinghouses unless a permit is obtained or the demolition is carried out as a result of an order of a local board of health. Clause 8 authorizes the giving of a stop notice where building is carried out contrary to the Act. The clause is similar to the existing law and includes those provisions which were inserted in 1951 providing that an appeal lies to the local court where a stop notice has been in force for six months.

Clause 9 is similar to the existing Act and gives the Minister power to issue permits. The clause deals with one matter which has given some difficulty. Under the Act it is provided that the Minister may make it a condition of a permit that the cost of the building operation is not to exceed an amount specified in the permit. It has sometimes occurred that contracts between builders and owners have been made for amounts greater than those provided in the permits and, when these contracts have been considered by the courts, they have been held to be tainted with illegality and this has, on occasion, had the effect of depriving one party of rights which he might otherwise have exercised against the other. Sometimes the excess amount has been the result of a rise and fall clause in the contract

and such a clause is, of course, now commonly included in building contracts. One of the difficulties of the existing provision is that the Act provides for a sum to be specified in the permit and no provision was made for its variation. Subclause (3) provides that, if a condition as to amount is included in a permit, the condition may relate to a specified sum or to a sum which is computed or approved in manner provided by the permit. Thus it will be competent for the permit to provide, in effect, for a rise and fall clause in the cost of the building. In order to deal with past permits, subclause (4) provides that where a sum has been specified in a permit issued after January 1, 1949, the permit is to be construed as if it provided that the cost specified in the permit is to be the amount actually specified together with such further amount or amounts as may from time to time be approved in writing by the Prices Commissioner.

Clause 12 re-enacts the provisions of section 14 of the Act which was enacted for the protection of building owners. It provides that where a builder accepts a deposit from a building owner, the deposit is to be paid into a special purpose account. Clause 25 provides for the duration of the Bill and, in accordance with the policy which has been followed with this legislation, it is provided that the Bill is to continue in force until December 31, 1953. As the Act provides that it is to continue in operation until December 31, 1952, the effect of this provision is to extend the control of building operations for a further 12 months. At the end of this period it will be necessary for the matter to be referred again to Parliament if it is considered that control should be continued. The remaining clauses deal with various administrative matters which are necessary in legislation of this class. They are substantially similar to sections contained in the Act.

The Hon. F. J. Condon secured the adjournment of the debate.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 21. Page 502.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—This is a short but most important Bill. I particluarly draw member's attention to clause 3, which deals with the fixation of a maximum price for butter and cheese. It states:—

The following section is enacted and inserted in the principal Act after section 21 thereof:—

21a. (1) The Minister shall exercise his powers under this Act so far as they relate to fixing and declaring the maximum price for butter or cheese sold by a person other than the proprietor of a butter factory or cheese factory, so that every such maximum price will at all times be based on a price from time to time determined by the Minister of State for Commerce and Agriculture of the Commonwealth, and notified by him to the Minister, as the appropriate price for butter or cheese, as the case may be, sold by the proprietor of a butter factory or a cheese factory.

It is time we extended the provisions of the Margarine Act, 1939, which allowed the manufacture of table margarine. By doing so we would render a great service to the community. An extension of the Act is not a Party question as at a recent conference of the Liberal and Country League a resolution was carried seeking a relaxation of it. The same question was on the agenda paper at the Labor Party conference, but was not dealt with because of lack of time. I do not go as far as the L.C.L. resolution, but draw attention to it to show that there is a consensus of opinion on the matter. The price of butter today has been fixed at 4s. 1½d. lb. and that of margarine, a substitute for butter, at 2s. 6½d. In 1939 the margarine quota was fixed at six tons a week, or 312 tons yearly. During the war an honourable agreement was entered into between the Commonwealth and the States for a reduction of that quota, but South Australia was the only State which honoured it. At the end of the war the quota was restored. Queensland and New South Wales passed legislation to double the margarine output. The quota in Western Australia was higher than in South Australia and legislation has been introduced there to increase it. The matter is under consideration in Victoria. Since 1939 the population of South Australia has increased by 130,000. If six tons was a fair quota in 1939 there is no reason why it should not be increased today.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—On your figures it should be increased by more than one-third.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—The quota in South Australia has been exhausted and manufacturers are at a disadvantage. Doubtless members are aware that margarine is being imported from other States. Why should the manufacturers and the consumers be penalized? There is nothing in section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution to prevent the importation of margarine from another State.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—How many people are employed in the industry?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I do not know, but some have had to be put off because the quota has been exhausted, and no more margarine can be manufactured until January 1, 1953.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—What do you say the quota should be?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I leave that to the Government, but if it is reasonable to double the already high quota in Queensland and New South Wales and to increase it by some amount, not yet known, as is proposed in Western Australia, it is reasonable here. I would be the last to do anything detrimental to the dairying industry, but I fail to see that an increase in the quota of margarine would interfere with it.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—The dairying industry can sell all the products it can manufacture.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Exactly, and we are paying 4s. 1½d. for butter whereas we are selling it in London at 3s. 6d. a pound. Should not the consumer in South Australia be considered?

The Hon. L. H. Densley—You remember what happened during the war over the price of butter?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I am not concerned about what happened during the war, but with the position at present. I am out to back the dairying industry and I am not objecting to the price of butter which has been fixed. It is proposed now to transfer powers to the Federal Government, so there will be two controls. The present quota is 312 tons a year, which is very small, and if it were doubled it would amount to an increase of only about half an ounce a week a head.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—What is its price?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Two shillings and sixpence a pound. It is the housewife who has to balance her budget and I hope that the Minister will take up the matter with the Government with a view to amending the Margarine Act. In 1948, when the legislation under discussion was introduced, the following passage appeared in the Governor's speech:—

> My Ministers have no hesitation in accepting the responsibility for price control thus laid upon them.

The second portion of this Bill extends the life of the legislation until 1954.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—If passed in its present form it will extend it for five years.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—The majority of the people voted by way of referendum against Commonwealth price control, but if we are to have legislation let it be effective. The Act has not been satisfactory to the people, and by that I do not refer to any particular section of the public. It is often said that increased wages increase the price of the products but that is not always the case. As an illustration, last week it was my privilege to attend a big conference in Melbourne, attended by representatives of a very important industry, at which the question of price control arose. I have always been a believer in round-table conferences and in this case concessions were granted which meant an added burden to the industry. Although the agreement has not yet been signed only last Saturday the price of the article was reduced by 11s. 6d. a ton and the price of a by-product by 13s. 6d. a ton. My point is that it is not correct to say that every time wages are increased the price of the article is increased. It is very satisfactory to know that there that there exists a body of employees prepared to give full consideration to the facts without resorting to action in court.

Some action should be taken against the selling of petrol stations at very high prices. Doubtless members know that in recent months petrol bowsers have been changing hands at exorbitant rates. Who is paying for that but the general public? The same applies to advertising on the radio. The fact is that there is not sufficient control.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—Who is paying the subsidy on butter?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—The public again.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—You have not told us whether you would like to see controls removed.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I have not yet had the pleasure of listening to my friend on this matter and as he may be able to convert me I will not commit myself at this stage. A few days ago a case was brought under my notice by a man who was constructing a home for a widow with three children. He wanted to purchase some materials to complete the house, but was told he could not buy them unless he took a proportion of imported material which was much dearer than the local article.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—Country people have had to put up with that for years under building restrictions.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Exactly, but in a case like that something ought to be done

instead of forcing a person who is, to use a colloquialism, kicking against the wind, to pay an extra £50.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—The honourable member is making out a great case for removing controls.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—If I were in control I would not merely talk about things but would do them. My friends who are continually squealing about this are in control, through their Government. Why do they ask for my support?

The Hon. L. H. Densley—You are giving it voluntarily.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—If my friend calls for a division he will not need spectacles to see on which side I vote. I challenge him to call for a division and to go against his Government. The result might be surprising because this Government has found itself in a minority on a division on other occasions. I am bound to support the second reading because the Bill provides for an extension of the present legislation but I am not tying myself down to any amendments. It is better to have some control in some directions but it is for supporters of the Liberal Government and not the Opposition to say whether this legislation will be passed. My policy has always been to enable a Bill to reach the Committee stages so that amendments might be made and I support the second reading hoping the Government and Cabinet will seriously consider what I have said.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE secured the adjournment of the debate.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 21. Page 497.)

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE (Central No. 2)—This is a short Bill containing only two points, and the first is interesting because it relates to the fact that banks in the old days were appointed distributors of stamps apparently under an old section of the Act which most people have forgotten and which read:—

> The Governor may appoint any person a distributor of stamps. Any such distributor may be remunerated by a commission on the value of stamps purchased for disposal by him . . . .

That was introduced in 1886 and the banks took their cheque books to the Stamp Duties Office, had them stamped and then were entitled to commission. Two years ago it was persuasively suggested that it would be cheaper and would save time and labour if the banks were allowed to print a 1½d. stamp on their cheques. Everybody agreed that that was desirable—the banks, the Government and Parliament—but the banks had apparently overlooked that they might lose their commission. That happened and the first object of this Bill is to restore that commission to them. It is very interesting to note that when they asked for this new method to be introduced none of them discovered that they would lose their commission and they now come and ask that the commission be restored. I do not object to that but I have some doubts as to whether it is right for us to make such restoration of commission retrospective. We are generally against retrospective legislation and perhaps the banks deserve to lose what little commission they would have received for not waking up. The other part of the Bill is simply to extend to soldiers who are fighting in Malaya and Korea the same benefits regarding reductions in stamp duty as have already been extended to returned soldiers of the second World War. I am sure there can be no objection to that and I support the second reading.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON (Northern)—This Bill has two objects. Mr. Cudmore has fully explained the first and with him I will be interested to hear the discussion which will probably take place on the retrospective payment dating back to November 2, 1950, which probably involves a considerable sum. It is proposed to enable the Treasurer to allow commission at the rate of 1¼ per cent on the amount paid to him. The second object relates to stamp duty concessions to be granted to men serving in Malaya and Korea. Ex-servicemen's organizations appreciate the action of the Government in recognizing the merit of these people because it means a lot to them to be exempt from stamp duty when purchasing homes or land. The Korean war has been described as a cold war and the Malayan campaign as a police war but we have had 1,014 casualties in those campaigns. We do not fully recognize the sacrifices these men make in leaving their homes, possibly because war has not been declared. Figures I have obtained from a reliable source reveal that there are 324 soldiers, 100 sailors and 100 airmen from South Australia serving in those campaigns and it means a lot to them to receive the benefits of this Bill, which I strongly commend to honourable members.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—''Commission on duty paid on cheque forms''.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—Clause 3 (4) reads:—

Subsection (3) of this section shall be deemed to have come into operation on the second day of November, nineteen hundred and fifty, and the Treasurer may, out of the general revenue and without any further appropriation than this section, pay to any bank the commission allowed under subsection (3) of this section, in respect of all duty paid to the Treasurer as mentioned in subsection (3) of this section after the said day.

The banks did not realize they were going to lose their commission when the Act was amended in 1950, but we are generally against retrospective legislation. I have not the faintest idea what this will cost but we should know something more than that it was a mistake on everybody's part and that we should put it right. I would like the Minister to tell us how much is involved before we pass this clause.

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL (Attorney-General)—I cannot supply that information but it is perfectly obvious that it was not envisaged by anyone that the 1950 amendment would result in the banks being deprived of the commission they originally received.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Commission was never mentioned in the 1950 debate.

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL—No, and no-one realized that what we passed would deprive the banks of the commission payable under the old Act. They applied for their commission and the Commissioner of Stamps ruled that because of the amendment they were no longer distributors under section 7 to which Mr. Cudmore referred and therefore not entitled to commission.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Do you say that they are not distributors now?

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL—They are not entitled to payment under section 7.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

PORT AUGUSTA SUB-BRANCH R.S.S. AND A.I.L.A. (PURCHASE OF LAND) BILL.

(Continued from September 16. Page 515.)

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—''Power of Minister to sell.''

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL (Attorney-General)—I move—

To delete ''all or any of the said pieces of land'' and insert ''the said allotment numbered 107.''

This amendment was unanimously agreed to by the Select Committee. When the committee took evidence it was apparent that both allotments Nos. 4 and 107 were covered in the purchase, but there was no intention of selling allotment No. 4, which was essential from the point of view, not only of the Port Augusta Branch of the R.S.L., but of business firms, which required to use it as a means of ingress and egress. Neither the Select Committee nor the parties concerned could see any reason why the Minister should be given power to sell allotment No. 4. The amendment will empower him to sell allotment No. 107, but not allotment 4.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 4—''Financial provision.''

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL moved—

That it be a suggestion to the House of Assembly that the clause be deleted.

Amendment carried.

Title passed.

Bill reported with an amendment and suggested amendment and Committee's report adopted.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 16. Page 517.)

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY—(Central No. 1)—The Bill amends the Act in one or two minor but nevertheless important ways. Under section 128 of the Act a medical practitioner who calls on a patient or who has a patient suffering from any form of tuberculosis who visits him must inform the Central Board of Health. The information a doctor supplies gives only the name and address of the patient, together with a statement that he is suffering from some form of tuberculosis. Section 129 provides that the Central Board of Health shall pay the doctor a 2s. fee for the information; the Bill, however, increases the amount to 10s. 6d. The Advisory Council of the Tuberculosis Association of S.A. Incorporated, has stated that it would be better if the medical practitioner forwarded to the Central Board of Health a lot more information regarding patients and considered that there

should be a form of certificate on which the doctor could state the result of an X-ray examination and any bacteriological facts relating to them. That information will enable priority of a patient for admission to hospital to be decided. I was pleased to hear Mr. Melrose give results of X-ray examinations in the country. I was rather apprehensive of the compulsory provisions contained in the Act and am glad to know that the public is taking kindly to compulsory X-ray examinations, which must prove of benefit to the health of the community generally. The Bill is a good one and I support it.

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

LAND SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. R. J. RUDALL (Attorney-General) —I move:—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Land Settlement Act, 1944, provided that members of the Land Settlement Committee were to hold office until the end of 1949, and no provision was made for appointing members after that time. It was thought that the committee would have completed its work by then. However, in 1949, the Government found that the advice and assistance of the committee were required for a further period and accordingly the Land Settlement Act Amendment Act was passed extending the existence of the committee until the end of this year. The Government now considers that the services of the committee are likely to be required for a further three years. The Bill therefore provides for the appointment by the Governor of members of the committee for a period of three years as from January 1, 1953.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.27 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, September 23, at 2 p.m.