

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.**

Wednesday, October 8, 1952.

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

**AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT**

The PRESIDENT laid on the Table the annual report of the Auditor-General for the year ended June 30, 1952.

**CORONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.**

Read a third time and passed.

**SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GAS COMPANY'S ACT AMENDMENT BILL.**

Read a third time and passed.

**SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.**

Read a third time and passed.

**PUBLIC OFFICERS' SALARIES BILL.**

Read a third time and passed.

**URANIUM MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 7. Page 771.)

The Hon. A. A. HOARE (Central No. 1)—  
I support the Bill in its entirety, particularly because the Labor Party in the House of Assembly supported it in its present form. It is an important measure and it is necessary that we provide severe penalties in cases where secrets are revealed. Some people may not agree with the penalties but we should know where we are going and exactly what the law will be. When this becomes law I take it the Government will ensure that those working on the uranium field will know exactly what can happen if they reveal any information relating to the workings of the field. We all recognize the immense benefit uranium will be to Australia but I am doubtful whether we should export it. We have already received monetary and other assistance from America and she will receive some of our uranium, but if more is to be exported it should go to England because we are closely attached to England. We are fortunate in having such a valuable mineral in our country and the ownership should always remain with the Commonwealth.

The general uses of uranium will be of immense value to Australia, particularly in war-time. One does not know what will happen in the world and no country seems secure. Unfortunately, war is likely to break out in any part of the world at any moment. America may be afraid of Russia and Russia of America and England, particularly as England has recently conducted a successful atomic test at Monte Bello. The world is wandering a long way from the teachings of peace on earth, goodwill to men. Instead of fostering friendship countries are endeavouring to grasp pieces of other countries and if they cannot obtain them peacefully they do so by force. Many men will be employed at the uranium field and it is no use merely posting notices at the field to the effect that if laws relating to the undertaking are broken wrongdoers will be prosecuted and fined about 5s. That will not make men honest. If the penalties remain as set out in the Bill, it will make a person think twice before divulging valuable secrets. There has always been a Judas in this world, a man who will sink his principles for monetary gain. I am afraid that that type of man will always be with us, but the severity of the penalties will assist in keeping him more honest. We are endeavouring to make this kind of man honest, if possible, but some men are always prepared to take the risk. I do not know of any way of compelling a man to be true to his country.

Uranium is a recent discovery. All countries are trying to find out something about it, what it will do and how they can get a grip on the country that is producing it. The British Commonwealth will have to defend itself in this direction. America is standing by as a friend in this matter and there must be some reciprocity between Australia and the United States. I trust that the uranium finds in Australia will prove a success in every way and will be the means of keeping us out of troubles in which we might otherwise become involved. I hope that Australia will go on and on and build up a strong defence through uranium and so make us free from aggression. I trust that there will not be any leakage of secrets in connection with the mining of the ore and sincerely trust that we will never see amongst us a Judas who sold his Master for a handful of silver. I support the Bill.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH secured the adjournment of the debate.

## BUILDING OPERATIONS BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 7. Page 766.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1)—I support the Bill which, as indicated in the Chief Secretary's second reading speech, continues controls in a modified form for 12 months. It goes further and means that the priority system will disappear, together with the practice of giving Ministerial direction to suppliers of building materials of the manner in which they are to be disposed of. That provision leaves it wide open for those who desire to attempt to corner essential building materials. It is freely stated that during the post-war period certain interests attempted to control the supply of building materials immediately Commonwealth controls were lifted. During the war all supplies of building materials and other essentials were pooled on a Commonwealth wide basis and after war demands had been met each State was given a quota to supply its immediate needs. I think that worked most satisfactorily.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—Except that we did not get our quota because of the wharries.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Mr. Cudmore has a very short memory. If he reads the records he will find that the turn-round of shipping and handling of cargo during the war and post-war periods at South Australian ports was more efficient and quicker than in other ports in the Commonwealth. Any laxity in handling cargo on the waterfront was mainly attributable to the inactivity of the Government which Mr. Cudmore supports.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—I did not say anything about South Australian ports.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—It was necessary for the Government to prevent certain importers of goods from using storage sheds on the wharves as warehouses. It is unfair for Mr. Cudmore to impute these motives against a most noble body of workers who handle all the commerce that comes here.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—I was not referring to South Australian ports.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—My friend made a general statement affecting wharries.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—The stuff has to be shipped before it can get here.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Mr. Cudmore cannot side-track me on this issue. In explaining the Bill the Minister said that the priority system would disappear. Members of the Labor Party have always advocated the

setting up of a building committee on which would be representatives of people immediately engaged in building operations. I once had the pleasure of moving in this place a motion for the setting up of a building committee consisting of representatives of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects, the Chamber of Manufactures, and the building trades unions, and at the appropriate time I purpose moving an amendment to this Bill to provide for the setting up of such an advisory committee. This will give my honourable friends, particularly those who desire these controls to be abolished, an opportunity to express their views, by way of a vote, as to whether or not they are desirous of seeing the building industry conducted as it should be, that is, by an advisory committee, in order that there shall be a proper allocation of materials, and that the Minister will be advised by competent authorities concerning this important subject.

The Chief Secretary stated that clause 9 was similar to the provisions of the existing Act and gives the Minister power to issue permits. On our previous attempt to have an advisory committee appointed we were told by the Minister that a Priorities Committee already existed. I never make a practice of decrying the activities of any Government department or of those who offer their services in a voluntary capacity, but this committee was appointed on the assumption that it would fulfill the functions demanded of it. There were sheaves of applications from ex-servicemen and munition workers who were desirous of building homes, but the committee was one of expediency only, appointed to deal with the exigencies of that period. It did valuable work in advising the Minister and the Building Materials Office, but in the last analysis it was merely a registering committee; that is to say, it determined whether Tom Brown's needs were greater than those of Bill Jones, but it had no power to recommend who should have permits. I say that that time has passed. The Building Materials Office officials did an excellent job in administering the Act in difficult times, and the advisory committee which I suggest would assist those officers and would also be of valuable assistance to the Minister.

Members have said that these controls should go, and it is true that other States have relaxed them. In New South Wales building operations and building materials controls have expired, and similar power was contained in that legislation as is contained in all

building control measures throughout Australia, in that the Minister had power to delegate his authority in respect of all the provisions of the Act. That is why I purpose moving for the setting up of an advisory committee to which the Minister could delegate those powers. In Victoria the Minister has this power of delegation. In Western Australia the Act is administered by the Housing Commission, although I do not suggest that South Australia should burden its Housing Trust with the administration of building controls. It has its own problems and it is working very efficiently on behalf of the people of South Australia.

Queensland has approached this problem from a totally different angle. There the building controls have been zoned and a controller appointed for the various zones. That is to say, a controller is appointed by the Minister to deal with one or two essential materials, whether it be bricks or timber or cement. How that works out I do not actually know, but I submit it to indicate that we are not tied to the provisions of this Bill. I believe that every member desires that the legislation should work in the most efficient manner; it is certainly the desire of the members of the Opposition to put forward proposals which they consider, after mature judgment, will be in the interests of the Bill. Therefore, at the appropriate time I will move to insert a provision for the setting up of an advisory committee such as I have described.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY (Southern)—Although I have read the Bill on several occasions I find it difficult to follow the meaning of the various clauses, and the previous speaker has not said much to clarify them. Clause 2 repeals the existing legislation and then the Bill sets out to transfer the control of all building materials to a control of building operations. I regret that it has been found necessary to still further control the building of homes, for a few months ago quite a number of builder's labourers were finding it difficult to secure full employment. It was only by the relaxation of controls that we got back to a reasonable building programme by virtue of the fact that those who desired to build houses of larger dimensions, costing more than the Act previously permitted, were able to go ahead. The building trade has very nearly absorbed the work available to it in the normal course of building. Unless the Act is repealed we will probably find that the building of private homes will

fall to such an extent that there will be unemployment in the trade again. I pay a tribute to those officers who have carried out the work of controlling materials. On many occasions I have waited upon the Building Materials Office for assistance and the officers have always carefully examined my requests and done all that was possible to assist those I have represented. We have reached a stage when materials are more readily available and any member who doubts that can read in any issue of the *Advertiser* advertisements offering materials for sale—including *pinus radiata* and cement which are supposed to be controlled. Those materials are available at reasonable prices and as they are more plentiful we can look forward in the near future to the abolition of all restrictions on home building.

Many applications have been received for the building of halls and churches in country areas and when controls are lifted more public buildings will be erected. There have been press reports about the building of offices in the city but apart from that there have been extensive building operations by manufacturing concerns. I would much rather this Bill provided for the lifting of all controls on home building. Clause 22 enables the Treasurer to provide finance for temporary housing. I do not know that it is desirable to continue building emergency homes as in the next 20 years the result will be many sub-standard homes. It would be wiser to permit people to build better class homes. I support the Bill.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—The Bill provides ample opportunity for Committee discussion, as is evident from the amendments on the files. Throughout the debate it is apparent that members unanimously favour the earliest possible relinquishment of controls and one object of the Bill is to achieve that purpose. An amendment I will move will provide that when any material becomes readily available the Government can immediately release it from control.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—How—by proclamation?

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—Yes, for the purposes of speedy action a proclamation is the desirable way of achieving that object.

The Hon. C. R. Cudmore—That does not apply to the size of houses.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—The Bill generously extends the size of houses and if its provisions do not meet some cases permits can be obtained. The Bill is designed to relieve

existing restrictions before the expiry of the Act and provides three months' grace for extending the existing restrictions. The respective clauses will be discussed in Committee and I will not further delay the Council at this stage.

The Council divided on the second reading.

Ayes (10).—The Hons. K. E. J. Bardolph, S. C. Bevan, J. L. S. Bice, J. L. Cowan, E. H. Edmonds, A. A. Hoare, A. L. McEwin (teller), W. W. Robinson, R. J. Rudall, and R. E. Wilson.

Noes (7).—The Hons. E. Anthony, C. R. Cudmore (teller), L. H. Densley, N. L. Jude, A. J. Melrose, F. T. Perry, and Sir J. Wallace Sandford.

Pair.—Aye—Hon. F. J. Condon. No—Hon. C. D. Rowe.

Majority of three for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Paragraph (b) of the definition of "area" reads:—

The superficies calculated in accordance with paragraph (a) hereof of every verandah, balcony, porch, and similar structure attached to the building or structure.

Part of a building might mean an open porch or verandah and should not be included in the 18 squares. I move—

To insert at the end of paragraph (b) of the definition of "area" the words "such verandah, balcony, porch of each storey to be calculated as half an area."

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—It is obvious that Mr. Anthony's amendment seeks to extend the area. We have straight out amendments to extend the area, which is the proper way the thing should be done. Why quibble about a little drafting?

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—I support the amendment, which is reasonable, but I think it could be done much more simply by inserting "one half of" at the beginning of the paragraph. I suggest that Mr. Anthony withdraw his amendment.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—I move—

To insert at the beginning of paragraph (b) "one half of."

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I am glad that this point has been raised. The practice of the Building Materials Office has always been to

calculate the area of balconies and verandahs as one-half of the actual area when deciding what the area of a building shall be. The amendment will do no more than to bring the Act into line with actual practice. As the Bill stands there will be no power to calculate the area of balconies and verandahs as half the full area. I support the amendment.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I oppose the amendment because the present practice of the Building Materials Office is to calculate the area of balconies and verandahs as one half. I see no need for the amendment, unless it is for the purpose of increasing the area above the maximum set out.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—There is nothing subtle about the amendment. Porches, verandahs, and balconies cannot be used as rooms. The amendment will enable a builder to increase the area commensurate with the applicant's requirements.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—Mr. Rowe's remarks bear out my experience with the Building Materials Office, which has always been most helpful. It endeavours to procure best results for an applicant by arranging his house in such a way that he can achieve his object possibly by rearranging his rooms. My desire is that there shall be complete removal of controls and I would like to see the paragraph deleted. People should be allowed to extend verandahs by not including them in the size of the house. We are losing sight of hot weather conditions here. Many houses are being built largely with glass and they must become hot-houses. Occupants will come out of them looking like grilled chops in the summer.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—Nobody will object to a person having the additional comfort which can be obtained by the erection of a verandah if materials are readily available. Members have said that the amendment will do something that is already being done. There is no difference in the provisions of the paragraph to those existing in the Act. Why tamper with something merely for the sake of tampering? There is no object in it.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—The Chief Secretary contends that we are attempting to do something that is already being done.

The Hon. A. L. McEwin—I did not say that.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—We should include this provision in the legislation so that everyone will be aware of the practice followed.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—The principal Act which this Bill repeals had a definition of

"area" just as this Bill has, couched in the same words, although not divided into paragraphs. That definition included the whole area of every verandah, balcony or porch. The Bill repeals the old Act and in its place we are putting something else which includes this definition of "area" in clause 3. It has been stated, and not denied by the Government, that the Building Materials Office has in practice been calculating the area of verandahs, porches, etc. as only half. If that is so and if it is the policy of the Government let us have it in the Bill so that everyone will know what we are doing.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—I support the amendment. If it is already being done we should state it clearly. The Act should be ahead of practice rather than behind it. Also I feel that a verandah is certainly less than half of a room and even on logical grounds it should not be classed as the same area. Over the last five or six years, due to this type of legislation and to circumstances, we have built far too many houses of the one type and if more people could be encouraged to build larger houses to accommodate larger families the better it would be. On those grounds I propose to support any alleviation of the Act.

The Committee divided on the amendment.

Ayes (7)—The Hons. E. Anthoney, C. R. Cudmore (teller), N. L. Jude, A. J. Melrose, F. T. Perry, C. D. Rowe, and Sir Wallace Sandford.

Noes (10)—The Hons. K. E. J. Bardolph, C. S. Bevan, J. L. S. Bice, J. L. Cowan, E. H. Edmonds, A. A. Hoare, A. L. McEwin (teller), W. W. Robinson, R. J. Rudall, and R. R. Wilson.

Pair.—Aye—The Hon. L. H. Densley.  
No—The Hon. F. J. Condon.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—"Regulation of building operations."

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—I move—

After "dwellinghouse" in the first line of subclause 2 (1) to insert "and any appurtenant outbuilding."

This is a drafting amendment. Subclause 2 (1) provides that a dwellinghouse may be constructed without permit where the area, including outbuildings, does not exceed 18 squares. The purpose of the amendment is to

make it clear that this provision authorizes the construction of appurtenant outbuildings in addition to the house.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—I move—

After "dwellinghouse" in the third line of subclause 2 (1) (a) to insert "other than outbuildings upon land used as a grazing area, farm, orchard, vineyard, market garden, dairy farm, poultry farm, pig farm or apiary."

This also is a drafting amendment. Subclause 2 (IV.) authorizes the building, without permit, of outbuildings on agricultural properties without regard to size or cost. The purpose of the amendment is to make it plain that where a house is built without permit on a farm or other agricultural property the area to which the house may be built shall be 18 squares, exclusive of outbuildings.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—This is a most interesting provision. It is in the Bill in other places and apparently was missed here by the draftsman. In a nutshell it means apparently that it has been decided that people in the country can have as much in the way of outbuildings as they like, but those in the metropolitan area cannot. That is entirely wrong. The Bill is far more restrictive than the Act and I want to know why. Why should people in the country not have to take into account the area of outbuildings? People anywhere should be allowed to erect them. If they can do so in the country why not in the city?

The Committee divided on the amendment—

Ayes (14).—The Hons. K. E. J. Bardolph, S. C. Bevan, J. L. S. Bice, J. L. Cowan, L. H. Densley, E. H. Edmonds, A. A. Hoare, N. L. Jude, A. L. McEwin (teller), A. J. Melrose, W. W. Robinson, C. D. Rowe, R. J. Rudall, and R. R. Wilson.

Noes (4).—The Hons. E. Anthoney, C. R. Cudmore (teller), F. T. Perry, and Sir Wallace Sandford.

Majority of 10 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I move—

To delete "eighteen" in subclause 2 (I.) (a) and insert "twenty."

The amendment is to increase the size to which houses can be built without permit from 18 to 20 squares. In my second reading speech I indicated the basis of my argument. When a similar Bill was before us last year I moved that houses outside a radius of 30 miles from Adelaide should be built to 14 squares without permit but that amendment was defeated. It was later announced that country

people could build to 14 squares without permit and suggested that almost anyone in the country could obtain a permit to build to 15 squares. This Bill increases the area to 18 squares but it is different to what applied last year, when the 12½ squares did not include outbuildings. This year outbuildings such as laundries, garages, etc., are included in the 18 squares.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—But only as half of their total area.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—No, the whole area unless the outbuilding is a verandah. If the area of the outbuildings is calculated at 2½ squares the permitted size of a house is only being increased from 12½ squares to 15½ squares, and the Bill does not result in any concession to home builders.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—How do you arrive at 15½ squares?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—By calculating 2½ squares as the area of outbuildings. The only possible objection to the amendment is that materials are in such short supply that somebody who urgently needs materials will be compelled to go without. We cannot object to it on the grounds that we can dictate to anybody how, when, and to what size he can build his house. There are provisions which give priority to people needing materials in short supply and they are adequately protected. It is reasonable to allow people to build a house of the size they would build in ordinary times and 20 squares is not an area beyond which they would normally build. My own home—a small bungalow, by no means pretentious—is over 20 squares in area and I do not feel justified in preventing anybody from building to that size. The suggested area will not make any appreciable difference in the supply of materials.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I appreciate the plea which has been made but the mover has attempted to lead the Council to believe that 18 squares is the maximum area to which a person can build. Permits can be obtained for larger houses. The amendment would leave the way open for speculative building.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—It applies to houses which are built for personal occupation.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—If a person requires an area greater than 18 squares he can apply for a permit. The Building Materials Office has never capriciously refused a permit where the need for a larger house has been proved. It has been necessary to introduce this measure in order to conserve the supplies of essential materials.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—It is not correct to say that the position is any different from what it was last year, because 12½ squares did not include outbuildings. The relative position is the same and the Bill represents a most generous increase. A later provision permits a person to increase the area of outbuildings after 12 months. The purpose of the Bill is to relax controls and if materials become readily available controls will be dispensed with. I ask members not to extend the provisions as suggested.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—Will the amendment apply to houses built for sale as well as those built for a person's own occupation? On my reading of the Bill it will extend to all houses.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—The amendment will apply to houses which are built for personal occupation. Subclause (2) reads:—

The carrying out of any of the following works shall not be a contravention of this section:—

1. The construction of any dwellinghouse where—

- (a) the total area of the dwellinghouse (including all out-buildings appurtenant to the dwellinghouse) does not exceed or, if completed, will not exceed eighteen squares; and
- (b) (i.) the dwellinghouse is constructed at the cost of a person upon land in which that person has a registered interest and the dwellinghouse is constructed for occupation by that person as his permanent and principal place of residence;

My amendment is limited to people building houses for their own use and occupation and the question of speculative building does not arise. In 1950 section 4 of the Act was amended by inserting the following subparagraphs:—

- (a) the total area of the dwellinghouse does not exceed or if completed will not exceed twelve and a half squares; and
- (b) the total cost of the construction of the dwellinghouse (including the total cost of the construction of any out-buildings appurtenant to the dwellinghouse the construction of which is commenced prior to the completion of the construction of the dwellinghouse) does not exceed or if completed will not exceed . . . . .

Various prices were set out and nothing was said about out-buildings being included in the area. The general impression was that they were excluded and that is my purpose in moving this amendment. I have not yet seen sufficient evidence that essential materials are in short supply and that we are further justified in

dictating the size to which people can build. The emergency has passed and although we should not permit people to build mansions we should allow them to build a house to the size they would build if there were no controls.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—I support the amendment because of the views I have already expressed. It has been suggested that a person can apply to the Building Materials Office and obtain a permit for a larger house but earlier this year I wanted to build a home to 14½ squares for a family. Three months elapsed before a permit was granted and throughout the negotiations there was a continual frustration. We should encourage people to build larger houses if they can afford them because in the future people will want larger houses rather than the four and five-roomed houses which we have been permitting. I trust that they will not receive the same treatment as I did.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—The Chief Secretary interjected that it was almost a 50 per cent increase. Many people experienced difficulty when, during the Gawler by-election, an announcement was made that the area would be increased from 12½ squares to 14. They thought they were at once entitled to build to that area, but found otherwise. I support the amendment.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—I support the amendment and, to be logical, would support a move to defeat the Bill. The amendment will make the provisions more liberal. People who are willing to invest their money in order to increase their capital assets should be encouraged. There is no shortage of timber and only a slight shortage of bricks. If there was ever a time when we could liberalize provisions it is now.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—Mr. Anthony said he would vote for a move to defeat the Bill, but a more generous approach to building can only be done by agreeing to it. If it is defeated the permissible area will still be 12½ squares. The Bill, however, allows an increase to 18 squares. If Mr. Anthony refers to permit houses, 20 squares can be obtained. It is all very well for him to say that building materials are available, but that is not so. Only yesterday the Premier had to make a considerable quantity available from Government stocks to enable building operations to proceed.

The Hon. E. Anthony—Merchants informed me that plenty of timber was available.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—The whole object of the Bill is to enable the Government to remove controls at the earliest possible moment.

The Committee divided on the Hon. C. D. Rowe's amendment—

Ayes (7).—The Hons. E. Anthony, L. H. Densley, N. L. Jude, A. J. Melrose, F. T. Perry, C. D. Rowe (teller), and Sir Wallace Sandford.

Noes (10).—The Hons. K. E. J. Bardolph, C. S. Bevan, J. L. S. Bice, J. L. Cowan, E. H. Edmonds, A. A. Hoare, A. L. McEwin (teller), W. W. Robinson, R. J. Rudall, and R. R. Wilson.

Pair—Aye—The Hon. C. R. Cudmore.  
No—The Hon. F. J. Condon.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—I move—

After "dwellinghouse" in the first line of subclause 2 (II.) to insert "and any appurtenant outbuilding."

To strike out "when" in the third line of subclause 2 (II.) and to insert "where."

To strike out "dwelling" in the first line of subclause 2 (II.) (a) and to insert "dwelling-house."

These are drafting amendments.

Amendments carried.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—I move—

After "dwellinghouse" in the third line of subclause 2 (II.) (a) to insert "other than outbuildings upon land used as a grazing area, farm, orchard, vineyard, market garden, dairy farm, poultry farm, pig farm, or apiary."

This is also a drafting amendment.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—I repeat my protest against these words being inserted as it will mean preference to country people. Members have not been told of the necessity for the alteration.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—I am surprised at Mr. Cudmore protesting against preference being given to country people as I thought that the Federal Government was desirous of increasing primary production. I support the amendment.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—The answer of course is that the provision of suitable outbuildings is the background of the whole efficiency of the primary industries of the State. Any member who has travelled through the country will have seen that South Australian farmers do not leave valuable farm implements under a tree or out in the open.

A person in the city may want a garage or a fowlhouse, but he does not need a building to house expensive machinery.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—The clause permits an expenditure of only £300.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—Only last week on my own farm two essential implements were purchased at a cost of £2,650. Does the honourable member suggest that valuable implements like that should not be properly housed? This has nothing to do with dwellinghouses and I am surprised that members should even query it because it should be so obvious that the whole fate of primary production depends on the necessary outbuildings.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I move—

To strike out "eighteen" in subclause (2) (II.) (a) and insert "twenty."

This amendment is not one which stands or falls on the same ground as my previous amendment where I tried to increase the area from 18 to 20 squares in the case of a person building a house for his own occupation. Nothing was said in that about the use of controlled materials. Clause 7 (1) refers to the use of burnt bricks, galvanized iron, and galvanized piping made within the Commonwealth. In other words, it relates to the building of a house provided a person does not use any of the materials in short supply, so that if opposition to the previous amendment was based on the grounds of shortage of materials that argument is not valid in respect of this amendment, for the clause particularly excludes the use of materials in short supply. What we are asking for now is to allow a person to build a house up to 20 squares provided he does not use any materials in short supply. I feel I am justified in pressing this amendment because the main argument against my previous amendment is not valid against this one.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—I support the amendment. As the honourable member pointed out this refers to a house in which no materials of the kinds mentioned in clause 7 (1) are used. The whole Bill sets out to limit the size of houses and clause 7 forbids the use of certain materials without a permit. If people are willing to build with imported materials which are in ample supply they are doing no harm to those who want the cheaper local material.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—I think a case has been made out for this amendment, whatever view the Committee may have taken in regard to previous amendments. If a person

wishes to build a house of 20 squares with imported materials he should be entitled to do so, and those who have started to build houses within the last few months with such materials should have this restriction removed. A considerable number of firms imported materials and served the State a very good purpose by doing so. They risked a good deal of money and I fear that some have been caught by over-purchasing. Consequently, if there are people who desire to build larger houses and they are prepared to use the imported materials available and thereby assist the merchants who may be somewhat embarrassed financially they should be encouraged.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—The principle of the Bill is to extend and liberalize controls, which has been done quite extensively already, for persons building houses to live in. This clause applies to speculative building and the amendment would give them a larger area than the man who is building his own house. The answer to the honourable member's contention that they would use only non-permit materials is, of course, that it would defeat the advantage we are giving to the person building his own house by absorbing available labour in the building of larger homes. Consequently, I must appeal to the Committee to reject the amendment.

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—I cannot follow the Chief Secretary's contention that there is a scarcity of labour in the building trade. Only this week I had a letter from a building firm, consisting of a man and his son, informing me that the little man has been quite squeezed out of the building trade by these controls. Those two people are looking for jobs and I have no doubt there are others. If we can liberalize the Act let us do so and make it possible for people to include certain refinements which they have not been able to do in the past five or six years. Let them live like free people and not like slaves.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I see the point that if this clause is passed in its present form it will enable a person to build a house even though he may not require to occupy it himself but I have no objection to that. If we had allowed more people to do so we may have had far more and thus alleviated the position earlier. If my amendment is not carried I propose to move a further amendment to provide that the person building for his own use and occupation may go up to 20 squares provided he does not use controlled materials.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Mr. Rowe says there is a surplus of labour, but that

is a poor excuse to fortify his argument. It is true that there is a greater percentage of labour available now in the building industry, but it should be engaged on the building of the large number of schools and hospitals urgently needed, and which have been approved by the Public Works Standing Committee. It is unfair to say that a vote against this amendment will mean a vote against providing an avenue of employment.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—That will be the effect.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—It will not be. Those who vote against this amendment will be preventing speculative buildings, which quite a number of people desire to undertake. Any surplus labour available should be employed on schools and other public buildings, and Housing Trust homes, and not on luxury building.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY—I was happy to hear Mr. Bardolph admit that there is a surplus of labour. I am anxious that those who have money and desire to build should be permitted to do so in order to absorb some of that labour. The Government has assured country people that it has not the finance available for building schools and hospitals and that rules out the avenues of employment Mr. Bardolph suggested. In the interest of the employees he should support the amendment.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—I do not altogether agree with members who suggest there is a pool of unemployment or a shortage of money but people are probably prevented from building because of costs more than anything else. To suggest it will assist employment by permitting people to build luxury houses is a somewhat impractical approach to the problem. We have gone a long way in extending the provisions of the Act and the Bill provides for an increase of 50 per cent in the size of homes, which should be sufficient.

The Committee divided on the Hon. C. D. Rowe's amendment.

Ayes (7)—The Hons. E. Anthoney, C. R. Cudmore, N. L. Jude, A. J. Melrose, F. T. Perry, C. D. Rowe (teller), and Sir Wallace Sandford.

Noes (10)—The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph, C. S. Bevan, J. L. S. Bice, J. L. Cowan, E. H. Edmonds, A. A. Hoare, A. L. McEwin (teller), W. W. Robinson, R. J. Rudall, and R. R. Wilson.

Pair—Aye—Hon. L. H. Densley. No—Hon. F. J. Condon.

Majority of three for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—I move—

After "dwellinghouse" in the next to last line of subclause 2 (v.) to insert "other than out-buildings upon land used as a grazing area, farm, orchard, vineyard, market garden, dairy farm, poultry farm, pig farm or apiary."

This is a drafting amendment and is similar to previous amendments to the clause.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—The Chief Secretary made a strong point of the desire of country people to build sheds. We all realize the cost of building materials these days but I am concerned whether there is any limit on the amount which can be spent.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—There is no limit. Amendment carried.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—I move to insert the following paragraph in subclause (2)—

va. The carrying out of an addition to any dwellinghouse where the total of the area of the dwellinghouse (including all outbuildings appurtenant to the dwellinghouse, other than outbuildings upon land used as a grazing area, farm, orchard, vineyard, market garden, dairy farm, poultry farm, pig farm, or apiary) and the area of the addition does not exceed eighteen squares and where the person at whose cost the addition is carried out resides in the dwellinghouse.

The object of the amendment is to permit a person whose house is less than 18 squares to build to that size. Some people built houses without permits and the amendment enables them to take advantage of the extensions to the Act.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—The amendment is in accordance with the general provisions of the clause and I accept it.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—I would like further explanation of the amendment because it does not seem necessary unless it refers to buildings erected after 1939.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—Subclause (2) (v.) provides that additions may be made, without permit, to a dwellinghouse built after September 3, 1939, so long as the area of the dwellinghouse, together with the additions and any appurtenant outbuildings does not exceed 18 squares. The amendment provides that additions may, without permit, be made to any dwellinghouse whensoever built, if the house together with the additions and appurtenant outbuildings does not exceed 18 squares and if the person making the additions resides in

the house. The amendment is in accord with the general policy of clause 4, namely, that non-permit building is to be permitted for dwelling-houses up to 18 squares.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—I move—

To strike out “of” in the last line of sub-clause 2 (vi.) and to insert “after.”

This is merely a verbal drafting amendment.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. C. R. CUDMORE—I move—

In subclause (2) (vii.) to delete “three” and to insert “five.”

The amendment will increase the amount which may be spent on alterations to £500. It is a question of the amount which can be spent on alterations to any completed building, out-building, or structure during any financial year, exclusive of the cost of any painting. I desire to increase the amount to £500 as the £300 provided by the Bill is not nearly sufficient. Although most building materials are available

and cement will be obtainable without permit early next year, costs have increased enormously and are still on the upgrade. The basic wage is also likely to increase further.

The Hon. F. T. PERRY—I support the amendment. We have kept to the price item far too long. Two years ago I tried to have “£1,800” deleted from the Act. If people can build with imported materials, price should no longer concern us. I would like to see the provision as regards amount deleted altogether. I do not think any person could build three extra squares today for £300.

The Hon. A. L. McEWIN—I would like time to examine the amendment before expressing any opinion. The Bill will double the amount allowed to be spent from £150 to £300. I move that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.20 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, October 9, at 2 p.m.