LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Thursday, November 1, 1956.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO ACTS.

His Excellency the Governor intimated by message his assent to the following Acts:—Enfield General Cemetery Act Amendment, Fruit Fly (Compensation), Loan Money Appropriation (Working Accounts) and Homes Act Amendment.

COURSING RESTRICTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

ASSOCIATIONS INCORPORATION BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

TRAVELLING STOCK WAYBILLS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 31. Page 1301.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—As I understand that Parliamentary proceedings will terminate next week, I want to assure the Chief Secretary that the Opposition will do everything possible to avoid an all night sitting. For a number of years the Council has been called upon to remain here four or five hours waiting for the other House to finish its business, members sometimes having to continue on duty until five or six o'clock in the morning. We should try to obviate that and rise at a reasonable hour. I hope the Government will consider that.

In supporting the Bill, I remind honourable members that a Federal Labor Government was responsible for introducing legislation which has meant so much to barley growers in South Australia and Victoria. When the measure was passed in 1947 it was to come into operation by proclamation and not to apply until the 1948-49 season. It provided for a poll of growers to be taken before the scheme could be implemented, and was to operate for three years. The Commonwealth Government was later asked to agree to extend the control of the Australian Barley Board for an extra year. In the Bill was included a clause providing for a fine not exceeding £100 or imprisonment for six months, or both, for an offence against the Act. Some members thought that the penalties were too severe but they were defeated by one vote on a division to reduce the amount.

This Bill will extend the legislation for another five years to the 1962-63 season. For some time the Council has been passing Bills extending the operation of legislation for 12 months, but as the question of making arrangements to give stability to overseas trade is involved, this Bill is to operate for another five years. I agree with that. The Australian Barley Board has done a very good job and is entitled to every assistance from Parliament. This marketing scheme has proved very satisfactory to those most concerned, and therefore I have no hesitation in supporting the Bill.

The number of barley growers is increasing and barley production is now a strong competitor with wheat and it will be only a short time before it will exceed that of wheat. There are several reasons for this, one of which is that barley has a more acceptable sale overseas. Only two States are interested in barley production—South Australia, and Victoria to a lesser degree. It is of great importance to this State. Clause 3 deals with the illegal sale and delivery of barley, which must be sold through the board, except with its approval, The responsibility for the illegal sale of barley is placed on the buyer as well as the seller. We have heard of several instances of sales that were not in the best interests of the growers and clause 5 provides that any offence against the Act or regulations can be dealt with summarily. I can see no objection to the Bill and therefore support the second reading.

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON (Northern)—This Bill extends the Barley Marketing Act for five years to include the 1962-63 harvest. Clause 14a provides that a person shall not buy barley from the grower thereof except with the written approval of the board. I understand that a few transactions took place last year in which buyers induced some growers to accept ready cash, but in no instance did it represent true value. This provision provides that the buyer as well as the grower shall be liable for transactions outside the board, and clause 5 provides that offences against the Act shall, as Mr. Condon pointed out, be disposed of summarily.

I pay a tribute to the board for the very satisfactory way in which it has handled its operations. The ready disposal of the crop and finalization of each pool gave every encouragement to the production of barley in greater quantities each year, until this year it is expected that there will be a record crop of 26,000,000 to 27,000,000 bushels. That is a very conservative estimate and allows for some deterioration or damage by wind to which a barley crop is very susceptible. South Australian barley is known throughout the world for its very superior quality and only that grown in parts of Europe can compete successfully with it. A survey of European conditions this year leads us to believe that much of the crop recently harvested there will be fit only for stock feed.

It is gratifying to know that despite the increased crop that we may harvest there is no anxiety about its ready sale. Europe should take some of our best malting grades and it is expected that Japan will purchase about 300,000 tons compared with 255,000 tons last year. An interesting feature about our export of barley is that most of it goes to the production of foodstuffs. The barley we are selling to Japan is used by the Japanese as a substitute for rice. After it goes through a process of pressing it is quite palatable, with a flavour similar to that of rolled oats, and information from our Trade Commissioner in Japan suggests that the Japanese have developed a strong taste for this product, and that even if rice supplies were again available in greater quantity they would still buy our barley because of their liking for it.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Is it not a matter of price?

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—It all depends, of course, on Japanese purchasing power, but Japan is desirous of obtaining the quantity I have mentioned. Some anxiety is felt for the safety of this heavy crop owing to its susceptibility to wind damage. It may therefore interest members to know that a new technique has been recently introduced into South Australia, namely, the harvesting of barley by a large machine that is manufactured in America. The crop is cut some five or six days before it is ripe and placed into rows by the machine and then left to ripen from the moisture in the straw. Surprisingly enough, the barley produced in this way has proved to be of better malting quality than that ripened in the ordinary way. The Department of Agriculture is conducting experiments and will watch closely the results of harvesting in this way in the coming season. Quite a number of farmers on Yorke Peninsula are adopting this method and will harvest at least half of their crop in this way so that it will be safe while they harvest the remainder in the ordinary way. That will be a great safeguard against damage that can occur to barley when a hot north wind blows, for it has a very brittle straw.

I would like to congratulate the board on its excellent management, firstly, under the late Mr. Tomlinson, who was appointed manager at the inception of the scheme, and more recently under Mr. Martin and the other members of the board. The selection of Mr. W. J. Spafford, ex-Director of Agriculture, as chairman was a very sound choice for he has brought abundant technical and practical knowledge to the board on the many problems that it had to face. I therefore commend the excellent work that this board has done and the happy results achieved, and have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

The Hon. J. L. S. BICE (Southern)—I am very happy to subscribe to the views expressed by Mr. Robinson and the Leader of the Opposition. Over the years that the board has been in existence considerable support has been given it by really first class barley growers in most parts of the State. At the outset of the scheme I contacted several of our prominent growers in the south to get their views about working under the board, but it was always felt that, with the personnel of the then existing board, and particularly under the chairman of Mr. Spafford who had had a lifelong experience in matters associated with primary production, they could rely on the administration, particularly in view of the difficulties which cereals were labouring under at that time. As Mr. Robinson said, the management under Mr. Tomlinson was a first-class thing for this State, because he had had experience in marketing barley for many years under extremely keen competition. We were very fortunate to have his services. On occasions the board has found it necessary to utilize the conveniences for bulk handling at Ardrossan, and it was very lucky to have them available.

I think barley producers will be encouraged to produce more. I have a vivid recollection of a farm between Port Noarlunga and Moana on which the owner grew barley on land he had just ploughed, and obtained 60 bushels to the acre. This shows how cheaply barley can be grown and how profitable it is to the farmer. The farmers on Yorke Peninsula have given a lead to the farming community in this

matter. I believe that one day the soldier settlement land on Kangaroo Island will be developed into mixed farming land, and with the heavier stocking as a result of improved pastures and the use of trace elements it will be of real value. I believe barley will be a useful contributor to the farmers' incomes in that district. I am very much in favour of increasing the life of this board because I believe this will be in the interests of primary producers. I therefore support the second reading.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland)—We have been treated to a very interesting discussion on the measure, and on barley in general. Mr. Condon, Mr. Bice and Mr. Robinson have given a clear picture of the marketing of barley in this State. I associate myself with this matter because I represent one of the biggest barley-producing areas of the State, and I feel that the present system of marketing by the board has worked particularly satisfactorily. The Bill will extend the life of the Barley Board for five years. This provision seems necessary because with bulk handling, which is becoming important, the board may be called upon to enter into agreements that will take longer than the three years provided under the Act.

The other important aspect of the Bill is that at present the grower is liable if he sells to other than the Barley Board without the consent of the board; the Bill provides that the buyer will also expose himself to prosecution. We are very fortunate to have had the services of the men who have constituted the Barley Board over the years. Mention was made of Mr. Spafford, and I think we all know the services he rendered to this State before his recent appointment and during it. The Barley Board has paid for its complete administration charges out of increases in weight of barley in its possession, so it has not cost the grower anything. As the Bill will enable this satisfactory method of marketing to be continued, I support it.

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

STOCK DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—I move:—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Paragraph (*b*) of clause 4 provides that the Governor may make regulations prohibiting artificial insemination of stock except under the prescribed conditions. The Chief Inspector has pointed out that artificial insemination can be a considerable factor in the spread of diseases such as trichomoniasis and vibriosis and has recommended that provision should be made for some control of its practice.

Section 8a of the principal Act was enacted in 1954 and it empowers the Governor to make regulations dealing with measures to be taken to combat foot and mouth disease and other proclaimed diseases. Among other things, the regulations may provide for the quarantine of infected stock. Clause 5 extends this provision to enable the regulations to provide for the removal of infected stock to quarantine grounds in addition to providing for the quarantine of stock upon the land where they are kept.

Sections 11 and 12 of the principal Act empower inspectors to enter land. It is proposed by clauses 6 and 7 to extend this power of entry to premises and fittings. "Fittings" is defined by section 5 to include such as stalls, stables, horse boxes and so on. Obviously, the power of entering should extend to these structures.

Section 13 of the Act provides that if an inspector believes stock to be diseased, he may, for the purpose of deciding whether or not the stock are diseased, kill one head of stock, or if the stock forms part of a lot exceeding 100 in number, two head of stock. The section goes on to provide that if there are more than 100 head of stock in any lot, the inspector may, in addition, kill two head of stock in any 100 or part of a hundred of the excess. It is proposed by clause 8 to substitute 200 for the figure 100, so that the

number of head of cattle which may be killed for examination will be one for every 100 instead of two as now provided.

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

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

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

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

Section 23 provides that if diseased stock are introduced into the State, the Minister may direct that they be destroyed. Clause 13 provides that, in lieu of this, the stock may be returned to the owner on conditions determined by the Minister, including a condition for payment of any expenses incurred with respect to the stock and the condition that the owner will remove the stock from the State.

Section 24 provides that where land which has been quarantined is declared to be clean, a certificate to that effect of an inspector is to be published in the *Gazette*. Clause 14 provides that, in lieu of publishing the certificate in the *Gazette*, a copy is to be given to the proprietor of the land.

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

Section 32 provides that where sheep are dipped in compliance with Part V of the Act, the owner is to send a return to the Chief Inspector. It is considered that it is unnecessary to require these returns in all cases and clause 17 provides that, instead of the obligation to furnish returns being general, it will be necessary to send a dipping return only when the Chief Inspector requires the owner of the sheep to furnish the return.

Part VI of the Act provides for the inspection of poultry. The Chief Inspector has recommended that this Part be repealed as "poultry" is included in the definition of "stock" in section 5 and all poultry inspectors are also stock inspectors. Clause 18 therefore repeals Part VI. As a consequential amendment clause 2 deletes the words "and Poultry" from the short title of the Act.

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

to comply with clause 19 will be an offence under section 42.

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

FORESTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 31. Page 1301.)

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1)—The Bill provides for increasing the number of Forestry Board members from three to five and the constitution of a quorum. The board has very wide powers and responsibilities in the administration of our forestry undertakings. Under the Act the Minister of Forests controls the industry, but the board advises and makes recommendations to him on such things as leases, planting, and milling and disposal of timber, and subject to the authority of the Minister, manages the undertaking. Since 1950 the industry has grown enormously and is one Government undertaking which is paying. For the year ended June 30, 1955, there was a credit balance of £80,000, and in the following year it had grown to £120,000. The total log production for 1955-56 was 135,711,407 super feet and sales amounted to £1,291,313. In 1951-52 the value of sales was only £840,104. The increase shows the great advancement of this undertaking in recent years. Its present assets amount to £4,866,961. It therefore suggests that the increased number of board members is warranted.

I consider that the Bill should have been more specific in some respects. Section 6 of the 1950 Act provided for a board of three members, two to be appointed on the nomination of the Minister, the Conservator of Forests being the other member. It is now proposed that the Minister shall have authority to appoint up to five members. The Bill should say that the Board should consist of five members and the quorum three members. The previous Act did not provide for the constitution of a quorum, but the Bill proposes that a quorum shall be as determined by the Minister from time to time. That leaves the position wide open as to whether the number should be one, two, or any other number up to five. I feel that the Government must have realized that the time has come to increase the size of the board in view of the advancement made in afforestation and the increased responsibility, but I think that purpose could better have been served by amending the Act in the way I have suggested.

I wish to make only one other comment. Notwithstanding considerable research and inquiry I have been unable to ascertain what remuneration is paid to members of the board. There is no reference to it in the Auditor-General's report or in the Estimates, so I am rather at a loss to know what sum is involved and how it is paid. I understand that a sum is set aside for the purpose and divided amongst the members, but that is mere assumption. If that is true, however, I should like to know what additional sum will be required if the board is increased, or whether the existing pool will have to be shared by the greater number. In general I believe that the Bill is warranted and therefore support the second reading.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY (Central No. 2)—This is the second Bill on afforestation we have had this session, but now that the board is placed on a different financial status from previous years it seems a natural corollary that it should be strengthened. The ramifications of the department have grown considerably and the completion of the new mill at Mount Gambier will, I presume, throw another responsibility on the board. I see no objection whatever to increasing the number from three to five; indeed, it is advisable that is should be so. At one time the members of this board were part-time members, and I believe that at least some of them still are part-time members and not full salaried officers of the Public Service. An undertaking with a paid-up capital of £4,000,000 and assets probably double that warrants a strong board.

The question of a quorum is introduced into this Bill, and I do not know quite why. In companies I understand that the fixing of a quorum is at the discretion of the board itself, but as it has been introduced into the Bill I do not see why the number constituting a quorum should not be mentioned instead of leaving it to the Minister's discretion. I would like the Minister to indicate whether it is proposed to appoint full-time members or to continue the principle of part-time members. The Forestry Department presumably will in future submit annual reports of its activities beyond what we have had in the Auditor-General's report from time to time. That being so, I presume the board will sign the report and then the situation will become much clearer to members who desire information. I have always complained that the financial statement of the Forestry Department has not been clearly set out because it has been mixed up with loan accounts. Now that

has been altered I think the activities and the financial position of the department will be much more clearly stated. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—''Constitution of board.''

The Hon. E. ANTHONY—Like other members I was a little amazed to find that no stipulated number to comprise a quorum is mentioned, and to test the feeling of the Committee I move:—

In new subsection (c) of section 6 to strike out ''Such number of members as the Minister from time to time determines'' and to insert in lieu thereof ''A majority of the number of members for the time being of the board.''

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief secretary)—This amendment is not as simple as it sounds. It is easy enough if there is a board of three as two could form a quorum, but in a board of four there would have to be three for a majority and I am not quite clear what would happen if one member were sick. Would two then become a majority? I think this requires a little examination and I therefore move that progress be reported to afford me time to go into the matter further.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (TOTALIZATOR LICENCES).

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary), having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1956. Read a first time.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill deals with the problem affecting the Renmark and Berri-Barmera Racing Clubs. It provides that section 17 will be amended by striking out ''and'' in the fourth line of subsection 2 and by adding at the end of that subsection the words ''Berri-Barmera Racing Club Ltd. and the Renmark Racing Club Ltd.'' Section 17 relates to a restriction on totalizator licences, and provides—

(1) No licence shall be issued for the use of the totalizator on any racecourse situate within 10 miles of any racecourse in respect of which a licence to use the totalizator has been or usually is issued, and where more applications than one are simultaneously made for racecourses situate within 20 miles of each other, it shall be in the discretion of the Commissioner, subject to the approval of the Chief Secretary, to license which racecourse he thinks fit.

(2) This section shall not apply to the racecourses known as the Victoria Park, Morphettville, Cheltenham, and Onkaparinga racecourses, nor to the racecourses used by Jamestown Jockey Club, the North-Western Jockey Club, and the Quorn Jockey Club.

The Berri Racing Club and the Renmark Racing Club were originally the required distance apart, but due to the experience gained over the years and a succession of high rivers, it was found that, as their courses were on the flats, even a few points of rain made it impossible for them to conduct race meetings. In recent years both clubs have sought higher ground. The Renmark club moved in the direction of Barmera, and the Barmera club moved closer to Renmark so the clubs are now less than the required distance apart.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Wouldn't it be best to amalgamate?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—Mr. Condon has given what would appear to be the most businesslike answer to this problem, but I have discussed that aspect with the clubs concerned and have found that it is not as simple as it appears on the surface. This has been done on metropolitan courses quite a good deal with some advantage to the clubs using them, but it must be realized that sometimes 30,000 people attend metropolitan meetings and the revenue the clubs derive is on a large scale, so they can cater for additional racing.

Metropolitan clubs are able to plant grass, reticulate water, and have different tracks. They have tracks that are used for the race meetings, training tracks, tan and cinder tracks and can handle the wear and tear that takes place on them. These conditions, however, do not apply in the case of Berri and Renmark clubs. They have 20 meetings a year between them, and each of their courses is used by local trainers, but the clubs cannot provide alternative tracks. If all the meetings were held on one track, it would have to handle 20 race meetings a year apart from the training that would take place continuously throughout the year.

With the amount of patronage available to country clubs, those clubs would not be able to obtain the necessary capital to plant and water grass and maintain a track to enable all this racing to be carried out. They can only cater for their local requirements because their tracks are light and will not stand more than the amount of racing that now takes place on them. That is the answer to the obvious solution of amalgamation. I have often advocated amalgamation in other instances. I think it is a waste to see a trotting track, a

racing track and a showgrounds in one town, all trying to maintain a standard, but there are practical difficulties in the way of amalgamation. I discussed amalgamation with the two clubs concerned when they put their request before me after having discussed the matter among themselves.

We are not introducing a new principle, as it was provided in the original Act about 70 years ago. The towns are the required distance apart, but when the courses were moved because it was not practicable to continue racing on them, they came within the six miles specified by the Act. I think the circumstances are sufficient justification for submitting this Bill.

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

PRISONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 31. Page 1297.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—The purpose of this Bill is to provide for the appointment of a Deputy Comptroller of Prisons. I hope that a man from within the department will be appointed and we will not have a repetition of what happened in relation to the appointment of a Deputy Commissioner of Police.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—What if there is not a suitable man in the department?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I am surprised that any member would imply such a thing. We should all be proud of our public servants, who are very competent men. I have known the Comptroller of Prisons for many years. He was a constable stationed at Port Adelaide at one time, and has always been a very competent officer. The duties of his department are provided for under the Supreme Court Act 1935-55, the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935-52 and the Prisons Act 1936-54. In addition, the Sheriff, as Chief Probation Officer, is responsible for the administration of the adult probation service inaugurated in 1954 under the Offenders Probation Act, 1913-53. His department has grown considerably.

I do not agree with people who say that we have too many public servants, because, as our population is growing and the duties required of different departments are increasing accordingly, it is necessary to have additional staff. The accounts for the year ended June 30, 1956, reveal that the net cost to consolidated revenue was £262,000, an increase of £74,000 on the previous year. This shows that the activities of the department have increased. Receipts were higher by £15,000 in that year, as a result of increased proceeds from prison labour.

The Sheriff's time is considerably taken up with duties outside the metropolitan area, but I think he should always be in the city on call. He has to go away on circuit to Port Augusta and Mount Gambier, and at one time Gladstone was included in that circuit. In addition, he will be called upon later to do extra work when a new gaol is constructed, so he is entitled to extra assistance. The output of work from prisons is increasing every year. Just under 4,000,000 cement bricks were manufactured at Yatala Labour Prison in 1955-56, an increase of 1,797,000 over the previous year. The tonnage of laundry handled at that prison and other Government institutions for the year was 480 tons, an increase of 55 tons over the previous year. The Public Works Committee has recommended that a prison farm be established on an area of about 1,057 acres in the Hundred of Cadell to replace Kyeema, which has been a failure. Kyeema, which was established in 1932, was supposed to be a prison afforestation camp, but it did not prove suitable for this purpose. South Australia is worse off for this type of prison farm than other States.

It was first suggested that a prison farm should be established at Loveday, but strong objection was raised by local residents who feared that the nearby presence of prisoners would be a danger, and possibly they would have to sell their properties. Those who would be sent to such a farm would not be the bad type of prisoner, but similar to those who were camped at Kyeema. It would give them a chance to reform their lives, and their labours would result in considerably increasing the State's revenue. The object is to keep them away from the criminal class. The present Sheriff has played an important part in rehabilitating prisoners, and in recent years the work of his department has increased considerably. I think that the legislation is justified and I have no hesitation in supporting it.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from October 31. Page 1304.)

Clause 18—"Legal assistance to appellant."

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General)—Following upon the defeat of clauses 15

and 16 it is necessary to delete clauses 13, 14, and 18 to 24.

Clause negatived.

Clauses 19 to 24 negatived.

Remaining clauses (25 and 26) and title passed.

Bill recommitted.

Clause 13—''Application of this Part'' and clause 14—''Interpretation''—reconsidered.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—These clauses are not now required.

Clauses negatived.

Bill reported with amendments and Committee's report adopted.

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 31. Page 1303.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—For a number of years tenants have been protected from harsh landlords taking advantage of the housing shortage and charging exorbitant rents. From session to session the Council has been called upon to amend the Act, which is now whittled down to a skeleton. If the Bill is passed, it will be the end of this legislation. The Opposition intends to fight certain clauses. I protest strongly against the Government's action in introducing this measure. Whilst wages are controlled, rents should also be controlled. Certain rights of landlords have been abused for some time. I have a number of instances brought to my notice of people having approached the court asking for the possession of their houses under the pretext that they want them for themselves or relatives.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—It is their property.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—But they make false statements to get the property back. I know of instances where this has happened and they are mostly New Australians. They are prepared to pay any price for a house, well above its true value, and they go to the court saying that they want the house for themselves or for a relative. As a matter of fact there is nothing further from the truth. They do not care if they force people out into the streets. The next thing that happens is that they let it at a high rent. They get their orders from the court under false pretences, and this will continue under this legislation.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Perhaps they do not understand the language.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—They understand it well enough to know how to force people out into the street as a result of false statements to the court. I will not agree to any legislation which allows that kind of thing to continue. My colleagues and I represent those who are not so privileged as those represented by my friends opposite. All we ask for is justice.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—Do you think the landlord has been justly treated?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—In some cases he has not, but there is another side to that which unfortunately many people do not consider. I know of cases of hardship to landlords, but they are small compared with the cases of injustice to tenants. The Minister said that about 11,000 applications for homes were still before the Housing Trust. Is not that an indication that it is still necessary to control rents? A man's wages are fixed to some extent on the basis of the rent he pays, but wages are pegged and the worker is down 19s. a week on the cost of living basis alone. I know that some members in this place do not believe in controls, but those representing industrial centres find that the number of applications for homes are as many as they were a few years ago. People are still living huddled together; 10 or 12 in a couple of rooms in some instances.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Could you show me instances of that?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I could, but the honourable member does not know of such things; he does not mix with people in those circumstances.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—Was not a family of five living in half a tank?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—That was only one case. We all know that the housing situation is very serious.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe—They should go to Western Australia where there are plenty of houses and not enough jobs.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—If my friend is in power much longer there will be more out of jobs in this State. The number of applications for fixation of rent dealt with by the Housing Trust in 1955-56 was 4,749 compared with 4,143 in 1954-5. In addition 470 rents were provisionally determined compared with 245 in the previous year. Those figures alone show the necessity for the continuance of this legislation, and there is a stronger reason for continued control because of the denial of quarterly wage adjustments.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—This does not decontrol rent.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—The honourable member must admit that under this Bill the rights of the tenant are being whittled away.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—It is not whittling away his rights; it is something an Act of Parliament has given him.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—It may be all right, when things get back to normal, to do as is now suggested, but the time is not opportune in view of the grave housing situation. The Bill simply encourages people to make false declarations and to endeavour to mislead the court for gain. They do not care what disadvantage they inflict on a man and his family. There are many humane landlords who do all they can to help their tenants, but there is a section that will go to any lengths to gain possession of homes by unfair means.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—How many do you put in that category?

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I do not care whether there is a dozen or 20. Parliament does not makes laws for people who play the game, but for those who will not, and if there is any interference with the rights of people they are entitled to protection. This legislation is unfair, unreasonable and unjust and it will not be put on the Statute Book with the assistance of the Opposition.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—It was put through in another place with the assistance of the Opposition.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—Our Party opposed it in the other place, but I am not concerned with what happened there. My colleagues in this place and I are quite competent to look after our end, and if we do not oppose such things as this it is unlikely that anyone else will. In the Committee stage we will vote against certain clauses that we consider to be very vicious.

One part of the Bill may slightly improve the situation, namely, that dealing with agents who furnish addresses of houses to let to home seekers under the pretence that they will do something for them, charging an exorbitant fee without giving any return for it. This Bill deals with such persons. Although the Bill contains little of value I propose to support the second reading but do all I can to defeat certain provisions.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2)—I must confess that the prospect of having to consider this Bill this session caused me a good deal of concern. We all recognize that there certainly was a time when this type of legislation was most necessary and very proper, and whatever hardships followed in its train they had to be accepted because of the conditions of war-time and its aftermath. However, as with the Prices Act, time has marched on and I did not relish the prospect of dealing with this Bill because it appeared to me that the time had arrived when this legislation should be abandoned. On the other hand, the Government in its wisdom has seen fit to propose an extension for a further 12 months and as I am a great admirer and supporter of the Government it goes much against my grain to have to oppose on principle anything it might put forward.

The reasons that I saw and felt why this legislation should be nearing its end were, firstly, that the housing shortage seems to be fairly rapidly disappearing in this State. Mr. Condon does not agree with that; in fact, he told Sir Frank Perry that he could take him to places where 10 or 12 people are living in one or two rooms. That may be true, for I do not think Mr. Condon would make such a statement without the support of facts, but I venture the opinion that that is not a very widespread situation today because the Premier, in his policy speech at the last elections, made this statement:—

South Australians have one house to every 3.7 persons, the best figures for any Australian State and, I believe, better than any other country in the world except New Zealand.

Although one feels a certain amount of reflected pride in being a member of the Premier's own Party it will be realized that that gave me some qualms as to whether I should support this Bill on the ground that the people were still insufficiently housed, knowing as I do that the landlords have had a very torrid time under this legislation. I have no more brief for the landlords than I have for the tenants and, like Mr. Condon, would like to see justice done to both. However, it is very difficult to do justice to both under legislation of this nature. I think I can say without any fear of contradiction that the legislation has pressed very much more heavily on landlords than on tenants; in fact, its whole object is to protect tenants, to see that they are not improperly thrown out of their homes and that their rents are at a suppressed level. The landlord has been bearing the brunt of the legislation, and I think all members realize that any landlord who bought a house before the war has not had the benefit of the increase in its value. On the

contrary, because with the reduced value of money, in many instances the rents have hardly paid the cost of maintenace.

Rents have a big influence on the level of the C series index, and I think that is one of the reasons why this legislation has been retained—to try to keep down the cost of living. It is very laudable for a Government to try to keep down the cost of living, and by controlling rents and keeping them at a low level it has succeeded in doing so, but that has been done at the expense of one section of the community, which is unjust. Government amendments have been trying to alleviate the lot of the landlord, because no-one can say that one section of the community should bear the brunt of keeping down cost levels.

As section 55 (*c*) was opened by the Opposition in the House of Assembly, the Government was able to make a major step forward in this legislation, such a step towards the things I have mentioned that I am satisfied that the matter has gone as far as we can reasonably expect at this stage. The Bill provides, in effect, that on giving six months' notice a landlord can sell his premises with vacant possession and thus get the full price for it, and seek an alternative investment for the proceeds. This seems to me to be a pretty fair thing at this stage, because it is not our duty to keep an unwilling landlord in the business, so to speak, but our Party has now given him the opportunity to get out, obtain his full money, and invest it elsewhere.

It is unfortunate that landlords have had to suffer as they have, because the sum total of the effect of the Commonwealth legislation, and subsequently the State legislation, has been to discourage private ownership of houses for letting purposes. That, I feel, is a pity, because although I am one of those who believe that every person should whenever possible own his own home, and I would like to assist them to do so, I still think it is desirable in a democracy that there should be private as well as Government landlords. It seems to me to be a pity that this legislation has had the effect of reducing the number of private landlords and of discouraging them.

Looking at the amendment from the tenant's point of view, the landlord has to give him six months' notice before he can get him out, and in view of the statement that there is one house to every 3.7 persons in this State, I believe that tenants who receive notice should have ample opportunity within that period to find alternative premises. If this amendment becomes law, I think we will find that it will cause a resurgence in tenancies whereby houses that have been off the market will become more freely available. That in itself is a laudable reason for the amendment. As I feel that a major step forward has been made this year with this Bill, I support it.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1)—Although I may support the second reading, before the Bill is finalized I will certainly oppose some parts of it. This legislation was first introduced because of a very acute shortage of housing accommodation, to ensure that tenants would not be evicted or exploited. At the same time, the law made provision for determining what the authorities considered to be a fair return to landlords for their capital outlay. It provided that landlords could apply to have their rents increased and could lodge appeals. A fair rents court existed in this State, which was set up so that there would not be exploitation of tenants, and to ensure a fair return to landlords.

Landlords have sought from time to time to have this legislation repealed. I do not think the statement made by the Premier that there is a house to every 3.7 people would bear investigation. This was purely and simply propaganda; there are approximately 5,500 applications for emergency dwellings lodged with the Housing Trust, and this figure does not take into account the applications that have been made for permanent rental homes.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Do you think they are all waiting for houses?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—If they are not, why would they lodge applications? These applications are waiting because it is impossible to provide houses. The average waiting time for a trust home is six years.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—That is for rental purposes.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I am not talking about anything else but rental homes. We have been told that there are 3.7 people to each home, and if we could take any notice of that everyone would be well housed. However, they are not, so that estimate would not bear investigation. A case was referred to me recently of a married couple with two children, one 13 months old and the other a few weeks old. The case has been investigated by an officer of the trust. This couple lives in a house in which 10 people use one bathroom and one convenience, and they live in one room, cooking, eating and sleeping in it. The man had five years' service in the Islands during the last war; he has applied for an emergency

home and a rental home, but the trust cannot do anything for him, yet we are told there is no hardship because there are plenty of homes! There is definitely a shortage of homes, and while that exists it is necessary to retain this legislation.

Each year amending legislation has made it simpler for landlords to obtain possession of homes so, when we deal with this matter again next year, probably the amending Bills will enable them to get possession when they want it. Last year's amendments considerably eased the position for certain types of landlords. If they desire dwellings for their own occupation or for members of their families, the court, without any inquiry into the circumstances, has to issue an order if they file affidavits stating that they require the homes for the purposes I have mentioned, and they give six months' notice to the tenant. It could lead to false statements as the court does not inquire into the justification for an affidavit. I agree with Sir Arthur Rymill that rents play an important part in reference to living standards. If the Arbitration Court took cognizance of rents, the living wage would be much higher than it is.

Undoubtedly there is a great shortage of houses. I consider that the court would be the best judge to say who is in a better position to bear a hardship—the tenant or the landlord. Clause 3 provides:—

> Section 55c of the principal Act is amended—
>
> (*a*) by adding at the end of subsection (1) the words "or on the ground that possession of the dwellinghouse is required for the purpose of facilitating the sale of the dwellinghouse.

If that is agreed to, all that will be necessary is for the landlord to give six months' notice and he will be able to get possession. Beyond doubt this will lead to many anomalies. The owner will place his house on the market at a price which he knows he cannot get and then withdraw it from sale and let it at an exorbitant rent. There is nothing to stop him from doing that. He could get what he demanded and would be free from the Act. It is also provided:—

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

It will be very simple for the owner to get around this legislation, and when he is placed in possession he will be able to exploit the position. I commend the Government for including a provision to safeguard the interests of members of the fighting forces. Why should not we also safeguard the rights of all tenants who are doing the right thing by the landlord?

Provision is also made in another clause regarding any person who may demand or accept payment of money for registering or undertaking to register the name or requirements of any person seeking the tenancy of a dwellinghouse. If guilty he will be liable to a penalty not exceeding £50. A very lucrative business has been operating in this regard, and many people who did not know any better have been exploited. I have here a receipt upon which it is stated that the people concerned are agents for floor coverings and window trimmings, and are prepared to secure a home for a person on the condition that a deposit is paid. If the agency is successful in securing a home, a commission is then paid. This is where the catch comes in. On the bottom of the receipt is printed "No deposit refunded after 14 days." Can anyone imagine such an agency being able to obtain a rental home in these times within 14 days? People who believe that was possible should not go to one of these agencies, but to a psychiatrist, because definitely there would be something wrong with them. Many people have lost their deposits.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—What is the deposit?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—In this instance it was £4 10s. The person concerned got in touch with the agency and informed it that he no longer desired it to act on his behalf.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—Do you suggest that a landlord had any part in this?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—No. I am praising the Government for the inclusion of the clause. It should have been included years ago. The instance I have quoted is only one of thousands. In the case I mentioned the person applied for a refund of the deposit on the fourteenth day, but was told to look at the bottom of the receipt and that he could not have a refund. How many others have been fooled in the same way? The clause will protect people under those circumstances.

I should like further information on subsection (3) of proposed new section 100a:—

> A person shall not be guilty of an offence under this section if, after he has procured the letting of a dwellinghouse to any person, he demands or accepts payment from that person of remuneration for his services in procuring the dwellinghouse for such letting.

I think this could result in the wrong practices to which I have referred, in view of the housing shortage. The time is not opportune for a further easing of the position. I am afraid that if the legislation is passed, as undoubtedly it will be, considerable exploitation will take place, resulting in much hardship. An owner can get possession of his home now within six months, and under the Bill he will still have to wait for that period, but he will be able to sell his house whether there is a tenant in it or not. The number of occupied homes being purchased today is clear proof that the purchasers are prepared to wait six months for possession. I will certainly oppose that clause in Committee.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY secured the adjournment of the debate.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 31. Page 1308.)

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE (Midland)—Discussion of a matter such as this is somewhat outside my field, but there are a few things on which I would like to say a word or two. It has been explained to us that the purpose of this Bill is to obviate the payment of unnecessary death duties as far as possible, and it is generally accepted as a very good Bill. One amendment, which on the surface appears to be a very good one, will do away with the necessity for numbering fully paid shares, but apparently in the minds of those who drafted the Bill there is a difference between fully paid shares of commercial and industrial companies and those of mining companies, and I admit that I do not see any way of solving a problem that I did not know existed. In the case of one purely South Australian company whose shares are not fully paid, the unpaid portion represents a perpetual reserve and will not be called up, I should think, unless that company went broke, which is unlikely to happen unless the State of South Australia goes broke.

I do not believe in cluttering up an Act with all sorts of provisos; I prefer to keep it as simple as possible. Therefore I think that this difficulty probably cannot be overcome and that the result will be that although this will be of benefit to the larger companies, one of South Australia's own biggest companies will not benefit.

I cannot understand why the penalty under clause 12 for the failure to provide annual returns of no-liability companies is to be raised from £5 to £10 while the fine for limited liability companies will remain the same. I have studied the Minister's explanation of this amendment, but it strikes me that this is an instance where hard cases will make bad laws. The establishment of branch share registers has much to commend it, but very severe penalties are provided, and it would be possible I think for people quite unnecessarily and unavoidably to get themselves into serious and expensive trouble. A foreign company with its headquarters in England may have only one shareholder out here, but would have to proceed to establish a branch share register upon application. Permission for this would have to be sought from headquarters in England and it might be difficult to obtain it in time.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Twelve months is allowed for overseas companies.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—I have not ascertained whether the time commences after the application is made. The Attorney-General in reply may explain that point, but it seems to me that if the 12 months were to run from the time of application it might be better. With these few comments I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General)—I am indebted to members for the consideration they have given this measure for I realize that company law is not a law of which everyone has a knowledge, for it is a law whose ramifications are not easily understood even by those practising law. It is obvious to everyone that the Bill will clear up a number of anomalies. Sir Frank Perry made some observations regarding the provision requiring that a foreign company shall keep a share register in this State, but on looking into the matter in detail I think there are adequate safeguards in the Bill and that the obligation to establish a share register will not prove unduly onerous. Firstly, the section which amends the principal Act relating to establishing a share register comes under Part XII of the principal Act, and that applies only to companies that are incorporated outside of the State and which carry on business in this State. Any such company must be registered here and if it is registered it must have two things—(*a*) a registered office and (*b*) an agent acting under a proper power of appointment in accordance with the company's memorandum of association, authorized to accept moneys and notices on behalf of the company.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Does that mean either or both?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—An office or an agent, so that the office of the company must be established here and the attorney or agent must be established. Therefore, all that we are asking is that those shareholders of the company who apply to be placed on a share register in this State shall be so treated. Therefore I cannot see that it will place any very serious financial obligation on the company, but will be of great convenience to the company's own shareholders in this State. The purpose of the amendment is not to benefit the public at large but the company's own members resident in South Australia.

Sir Frank Perry also said that he felt that some of the requirements in connection with keeping the register were unduly onerous. I have checked this very carefully with the responsible officers and they assure me that the requirements set out in the Bill are no more than reasonably necessary for the proper maintenance of the register, and no more onerous than the requirements which devolve upon a company registered in this State; for practical purposes they are both the same. The position regarding the keeping of a share register in Western Australia is somewhat different and we do not propose to go as far. There the register must show not only the names of the shareholders resident in that State, but of all shareholders of the company wherever they may be. I see no real purpose in going that far.

I think members are clear as to the main purposes of the Bill, which are, firstly, to avoid the necessity of resealing probate in another State, the cost of which is not inconsiderable and which involves considerable delay in the distribution of estates and, secondly, to avoid the payment of duties in other States and the necessity of this State making refunds as a consequence.

Mr. Melrose raised a point as to the length of time allowed companies outside of Australia to establish a share register upon request. As I understand the provision they will be entitled to 12 months from the time they receive a request from a shareholder, which I think is adequate protection for the company.

There is only one other matter. I have a small amendment on the files which I will explain at the relevant time, but it is merely of a drafting nature.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 9 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

LAND SETTLEMENT ACT EXTENSION BILL.

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

SURVEYORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

TOWN PLANNING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 31. Page 1310.)

The Hon. J. L. S. BICE (Southern)—I listened with interest to the statements made by the Attorney-General when explaining this Bill, and I wondered why he was so careful to give such an exhaustive survey on clauses 1 and 2.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Don't you know why?

The Hon. J. L. S. BICE—It is difficult for me as a backbencher to ascertain why that survey was made, because in the Waterworks Act the Minister of Works has access to certain properties. Paragraph II of section 12 (1) of that Act provides that the Minister may:—

> Enter upon, take, and hold, either temporarily or permanently, such lands as he may from time to time deem necessary for the construction, maintenance, repair, or improvement of any waterworks authorized for the construction of which money is voted by Parliament, or for obtaining or enlarging the supply of water, or for improving the quality thereof, or otherwise for the purposes of this Act.

Clause 2 provides that the Minister shall have the right of easement, and that it shall be registered on the plan. This provision has some merit, but there are similar provisions in the Waterworks Act and Sewerage Act to give him the right to go on land and procure an easement.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—You missed the point; under this Bill the easement will be shown on the plan.

The Hon. J. L. S. BICE—I did not miss the point; I realize that is the merit of this legislation. Clause 3, which deals with agricultural land, is the crux of this Bill. When a Bill was introduced in this Chamber in 1954 we did not have sufficient time to give the matter the consideration it deserved. In 1955 it had a stormy passage through another place and was held in abeyance from about October 13 to November 2. It contained similar provisions to the Bill now before us. I think it should have been allowed to operate for two or three years; we should not have had an amending Bill after one year.

I point out that councils now submit plans to the Town Planner. Near where I live an area of 300 acres between Moana and Christies Beach North has been subdivided into building blocks. The subdivision of 240 acres was done in three stages. The plan for each 80 acres was submitted to the Noarlunga council, then to the Town Planner who either approved or suggested alterations, and then it came back to the council for final decision. Roads had been made and drainage provided in the area and many of the blocks have now been sold. The same thing happened in other areas of 40 and 50 acres. I speak of the Bella Vista Estate of 240 acres, the Wilson estate of 40 acres and an area near Moana of 50 acres.

A council is not compelled to submit plans to the Town Planner in connection with subdivisions but plans are given very careful consideration by the competent men who comprise the council. They know what they are doing. There is no need for this Bill to pass now. The Minister already has rights of reservation in regard to easements. In my area similar action has been taken in connection with farmlets. Land between Morphett Vale and Reynella is being cut up into small blocks of 2½ acres and four acres.

No doubt one member of the Town Planning Committee who passes this area each day brought the matter to the notice of the Minister. I suggest that if the Minister inspected what is being done there he would get a high appreciation of the subdivisional work. These farmlets will never be included in an industrial area, for they are midway between two farming villages. The position is different at Salisbury North, where the Housing Trust controls the planning, and we need have no fear that town planning requirements will not be met.

The Hon. R. R. Wilson—There is a lot of private land.

The Hon. J. L. S. BICE—I will be glad to hear the honourable member say where it is. The only private land I know of is on the eastern side of the present main road. Ultimately it will be included in Elizabeth for I understand the main road is to be re-routed. The Bill needs much consideration.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

It is proposed, therefore, to confer on the Minister of Agriculture power to provide harbour facilities for fishing boats and to make charges for the use of them. As, however, the Minister of Agriculture is not equipped to carry out construction work, the Bill provides that he may, with the approval of the Governor,

arrange with any other Minister or authority of the Crown for the construction of any works which he desires to provide. If necessary the services of the Harbors Board may be engaged. The cost of doing work under the Bill will be paid out of money voted by Parliament for the purpose.

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

POLICE PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to make an increase in the pensions of commissioned officers of police, and a corresponding increase in their contributions to the Police Pensions Fund. This question was brought before the Government by the Commissioned Police Officers Association. The association claimed that in comparison with the rates of pension in other States, the pensions of Commissioned Police Officers in South Australia are unduly low. The Government has had this matter investigated and the facts show that there is some merit in the contention of the association.

An important difference between the police pensions scheme of this State and those of other States is that in the other States the pensions of the higher officers bear a closer relation to their salaries than they do here. In this State there are only two rates of pension—the normal rate which is payable to all members of the force other than commissioned officers, and the commissioned officers' rate, which is 6/5ths of the normal rate. Thus, although the salary of a superintendent is more than double that of some constables, his pension is only 20 per cent higher. If the commissioned officers of police were contributors to the superannuation fund covering public servants their pension would bear a considerably higher ratio to their salaries than they do at present. In the eastern States also the pensions of commissioned officers vary with their salaries.

The Public Actuary at the request of the Government suggested a new scale of commissioned officers' pensions for the purposes of giving them increases to ensure that the pensions would be an adequate proportion of their salaries, having regard to what is done for public servants in this State and the standards of police pensions in other States. The Actuary's recommendation is that in lieu of the flat-rate margin of 20 per cent, by which commissioned officers' pensions exceed the normal pension, the following margins should be granted:—

	Per cent.
Inspector, 3rd Class	20
Inspector, 2nd Class	25
Inspector, 1st Class	33⅓
Senior Inspector	40
Superintendent, Deputy Commissioner, Commissioner	50

The Bill carries these recommendations into effect. It means that all pensions and lump sums payable to commissioned officers will be higher than those payable to other members, by the percentage mentioned.

The Bill makes corresponding increases in the contributions of commissioned officers to the police pensions fund. When asking for increased pensions the Commissioned Officers Association indicated that members were willing to pay increases in contributions corresponding to the increases in pension—which, of course, is just and in harmony with the provisions of the principal Act. Only 24 officers are affected by this Bill, and the additional cost resulting from the new scale of pensions and benefits will be small. The Public Actuary does not propose to recommend an increase in the Government subsidy to the Police Pensions Fund at present.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.26 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, November 6, at 2.15 p.m.