LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, November 4, 1958.

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

QUESTIONS.

FACTORY EXPLOSION IN FRANKLIN STREET.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Has the Minister of Industry a reply to the question I asked last week with regard to a disastrous explosion that occurred at a factory in Franklin Street?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE—As promised, I have obtained a preliminary report from the department in respect of the explosion that occurred at the premises of Torrens Tractor Service Ltd., Franklin Street, on October 29. The report indicates that it is not possible at the present stage of the investigation to form an opinion as to the cause of the accident, which is the first known of this kind in South Australia. However, by a curious coincidence, a similar accident occurred in another State and we are endeavouring to ascertain what the cause was. In any case, as there will be a coronial inquiry into the fire that followed the explosion I shall be unable to give any further information until the case is heard.

DISMISSAL OF ISLINGTON EMPLOYEES.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—Can the Minister of Railways advise the Council as to the truth or otherwise of persistent rumours among both permanent and weekly hired employees of the South Australian Railways Department at Islington Workshops that dismissals from the work force are contemplated?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—I have no information on the matter, but I undertake to get it for the honourable member.

FAULTY AIR BRAKES ON RAILCARS.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I ask leave to make a statement with a view to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I have been informed that on Sunday last, November 2, on a Bluebird railcar leaving Tailem Bend at about 5.45 p.m. for Adelaide the air brake system failed between Mount Lofty and Long Gully. I am given to understand that the maximum speed limit around curves between Mount Lofty and Belair is 25 miles an hour. I am informed that the railcar was nearly out of control and that the guard was called upon by the driver to assist him to put pressure upon the hand brake in order to bring the car under control. Apparently, through some adjustments that were made at about Long Gully, the air brakes again operated effectively until reaching Adelaide, but while the car was being taken back to the depot the air brakes again failed. It will be readily appreciated that with a car in this condition coming through the hills severe damage, if not loss of life, could easily have occurred. Can the Minister say, firstly, whether the hand brake system on these cars is effective and, secondly, is the braking system inspected and, if so, how often?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—I anticipated that the honourable member would ask a question on these lines and informed myself regarding the matter this morning. It appears that the air brake system on this car failed and the driver, realizing that there was an emergency, made doubly sure by having the assistance of the guard in operating the hand brake whilst travelling down what is a steep gradient in any terms on the main line, and the train was brought satisfactorily into Adelaide. Further failure then occurred and naturally an immediate inquiry was held by experts. The fault appears to be a minor one in the air braking system. Naturally, the emergency brakes have been checked, and I am pleased to say that the actual train was in operation this morning. A brake expert is travelling with it in order to ascertain what the problem is should it occur again.

STOP SIGNS AT RAILWAY CROSSINGS.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—I ask leave to make a brief statement with a view to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—I have been concerned, like many members of the public, for many years with the inconvenience caused to transport by the stop signs at railway lines where there are also automatic warning devices. I imagine that hundreds of vehicles must be forced to stop for each train that passes at a busy crossing such as that on Cross Roads which is within my electorate, and this must add to the inconvenience and cost of transport. This would also apply at the Park Terrace (Bowden) crossing, and probably others. In view of the apparent great efficiency of automatic warning devices, will the Minister of Railways investigate the possibility of being safely able to remove these stop signs or, alternatively, in view of the heavy traffic at these crossings, will he consider some alternative

method, such as automatic gates that can be operated from a distance, for the purpose of conveniencing the travelling public and not interfering with the hundreds of road users?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—The matter of individual crossings is continually under review. Unfortunately, whenever an accident occurs at an intersection there is a general outcry that the crossing is insufficiently or inefficiently protected. I have considerable sympathy with Sir Arthur Rymill in this matter, for I believe that warning lights should be sufficient; but the fact still remains that, despite the presence of warning lights, people drive into the side of the Melbourne express. Indeed, a local landholder once drove into the side of a local train at what was virtually a private crossing. We have continual demands from people like the National Safety Council to increase the number of "stop" signs. In the north, where the traffic flow is small compared with what it is at Bowden, for instance, the Commissioner of the Commonwealth Railways insists on "stop" signs as well as automatic lights at every rail crossing on the main road. I assure the honourable member that the matter will not be lost sight of, and that I will discuss the question with the Railways Commissioner again shortly.

"U" TURNS IN KING WILLIAM STREET.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—Can the Minister of Roads inform me whether the making of a "U" turn between intersections in King William Street is a breach of the law. If it is, will he take up the matter with the appropriate authority, whether the Adelaide City Council or the Police Department, with a view to having this unsafe practice stopped, particularly with regard to taxi cabs?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—Traffic control within the city boundaries is vested in the Adelaide City Council. A considerable difference of opinion existed between the council and the Commissioner of Police concerning the council's by-laws relating to "U" turns in King William Street, and I understand that that difference still exists. I undertake to contact both those authorities and obtain a reply to the honourable member's question.

PROROGATION DATE.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—An advertisement I have seen leads me to believe that a very important event will be taking place towards the end of this month. Can the Chief Secretary say when it is intended this Council will rise in order to allow members to take part in that event?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—The honourable member has not been very explicit, because what is an important event to him may not be important to other people. The event to which I think he refers will take place in my electorate, and I have every reason to hope that Parliament will be prorogued in sufficient time for members to attend.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 30. Page 1485.)

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—The Bill extends price control for another 12 months from December 31, 1958. Two opinions exist on price fixing: one for permanent control and the other to remove all controls. Many articles previously controlled have been decontrolled. It has been said that price control could force people out of business, but I do not know of anyone that has gone out of business because of this legislation.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—There have been.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I have always advocated that price control should be on a Federal basis, for it is very difficult for any State to control prices when it has competition from other States. When we control wages, why should we not control prices?

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—Wages are not controlled.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—They are not controlled: they are tied down.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—There is a basic wage, but employers can pay as much more as they wish.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—An application for an increase in the basic wage can only be made to the court every 12 months. The last basic wage increase in May was 5s. a week, but during the last two quarters the cost of living has increased by 10s. a week. The point is that the workers do not catch up, and they are worse off today than they have ever been. It is therefore necessary that prices be controlled.

The cost of administering the Prices Act in 1957-58 was £71,977, which was £2,693 less than the previous year because of the removal of certain controls. The Premier has stated that it is necessary that the activities of the Prices Department should be continued, as they are beneficial to all. One has to support

this legislation, even though it is not as effective as it could be. The only satisfactory solution is to have Federal price control. The legislation has been introduced for the protection of the consumer, and the Government must have found its introduction necessary. Irrespective of what my opinions may be, I have no option but to support the second reading.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY (Central No. 2)—Similar Bills have come before us on many occasions. I had hoped that the necessity for this legislation would long since have passed. It is certainly unnecessary when one has in mind the original intent—the control of prices because of the scarcity of goods to prevent anyone from making an excessive profit owing to the unfortunate position of the nation at the time. The position is far different now, but we still have price control on certain goods and this control operates in only two States—Queensland and South Australia. I believe the time has arrived when price control should be abolished and the position left to the ordinary commercial morality of business. I know that that can be criticized, and I should be almost prepared to agree that somewhere on the Statute Book there should be an element of control over prices.

No doubt the Prices Act over the years has provided the buying public with a fund of information. Some cartels and associations have not acted fairly in the judgment of the Prices Commissioner, but the number would be very few. No commercial community can expect to be entirely free from the actions of certain people who take advantage of a few of the buying public. That may continue for a short period, but I believe it soon stops because of competition which, I think, is always a guarantee of reasonable prices. Among the goods controlled are some grocery items. If ever a line of goods was subject to competition and cut prices it is groceries yet, despite that, certain items are still controlled.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—What about clothing?

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—Even with a great variety of walling materials available bricks, which are in free supply, are still under control. There may be some reason why they should have been subject to some penalty over the past years, but surely that time has long since passed. The retention of a few industries under price control, whereas the vast majority are free, is not, in my opinion, fair to industry as a whole. Mr. Condon mentioned that administration cost £71,000 a year. That is a lot of money to be used only as a check on prices. We seldom hear of prosecutions under the Act, and I believe the necessity for control has long since passed. I oppose the Bill and hope that next year, after a proper inquiry, the Government will find that this legislation is no longer necessary.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILIZATION BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 29. Page 1443.)

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS (Northern)—The Bill provides for a continuation of the wheat stabilization scheme and of its administration by the Australian Wheat Board. We have the advantage of the experience of the operation of this legislation for some 10 years and consequently have had ample time to consider its merits and demerits; so we have not some new proposition before us. As pointed out by the Minister in his second reading explanation, there is not much material alteration to the existing legislation. A new Commonwealth Act makes it necessary for complementary legislation to be passed by the respective State Governments.

I pay a tribute to the Wheat Board for the services it has rendered. I speak from personal knowledge of the benefit the scheme has been to Australian wheatgrowers. To a great extent it has removed the speculative aspect of wheatgrowing and marketing. I am sure that practical farmers appreciate that they do not now have to endeavour to estimate market prospects. By having a guaranteed price they know precisely what is before them and what they have to budget for. That is far removed from the speculative aspect of the early days before the scheme operated. When the Bill was presented one member interjected and asked what particular good was the Australian Wheat Board. To me that showed a lamentable lack of knowledge of the board's responsibilities. It plays a major part in marketing the Australian crop, and that is no small item. Not only does it provide for receiving and storing the crop, but it also arranges shipping, sales and deliveries—in other words, it is responsible for the whole gamut of financing the harvest and selling the crop. For any member to say that the board

plays only a minor part in the whole organization shows that he has not a true conception of its duties.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—Farmers are compelled to deliver to the board, aren't they?

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS—That does apply, and sales cannot be made other than through the board. I have no objection to that. We still have a guaranteed price, which is subject to review periodically in the light of production costs. This Bill differs little from the existing legislation, which goes out of operation in a few weeks' time. It has my full support. I appreciate the Wheat Board's services to the wheatgrowers of Australia.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON (Northern)—I, too, support the Bill and endorse the sentiments already expressed. I was most interested in Mr. Condon's speech. There was never a Bill to do with wheat to which the honourable member did not contribute a worthwhile speech. We can understand from his long association and his office for over 40 years as secretary to the Flour Millers Employees' Association that he has the interests of the flour millers at heart. This important Bill stabilizes the wheat industry which, next to wool, brings us the greatest export revenue from our primary production in Australia. Therefore, it is of great value to our economy. The revenue from the export of wheat over the years is worthy of price stabilization being introduced. I remember when the merchants were operating and we did not know from one day to the next what price we were going to receive for our grain. No doubt it forced hundreds of our best farmers into the bankruptcy court or to the Farmers Assistance Board. Wheat would be a certain price one day and the next day it might drop threepence. As a grower and a seller, one did not know what decision to make. Usually, many of our best growers were bad sellers. The industry has flourished ever since stabilization of prices.

It has been said that the merchants never made anything out of wheat buying. I disagree with that and maintain that some merchants made much money at the expense of the wheatgrower. We remember the advances made on wheat in the early 1930's. No one could prove that the losses claimed were suffered. I was one of the victims of the fall in price and I well remember the attitude of a particular wheat merchant. Since then, you could put your head on the pillow at night and know that you were going to get a reasonable price for your wheat.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Were not profits due to gambling in many cases?

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—I do not know.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Fluctuating markets?

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—That is the great value of stabilization, for then you are not subject to fluctuating markets. Some are lucky and some are not. We lost hundreds of our best farmers through the then system of marketing.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Where did they go?

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—I don't know. Some went to earn their living elsewhere; they were forced out. I pay a high tribute to the Australian Wheat Board for the excellent work it has done. Likewise, I pay a tribute to the Barley Board. Both boards have done an excellent job.

The present season's forecast is most satisfying to everyone in the country. This is one of the most promising years ever so far as yield is concerned. I travel fairly extensively in the wheat-growing areas and I have never seen the wheat crops looking more healthy and more promising than at present. In the district of Cleve, which I visited the week before last, there was a certain amount of hay die. It was so bad on the crop that the machine could not get into it.

Mr. D. C. Watson, the superintendent of the Wheat Board in South Australia, in last Sunday's *Mail* referred to the carry-over, which he estimates at 30,000,000 bushels. After 160,000,000 bushels are provided for, he claims that we shall be looking for a buyer for the 30,000,000 bushels that India could buy, but it has not got the money. If India is such a good customer, we should meet India either on terms or in some other way so that it could take our surplus wheat. It would pay dividends for the future markets of Australia. The stabilization fund today stands at £9,300,000 and that will support any setback for a year or two at any rate. A remark was made the other day in this Chamber about propping up this industry. I do not think it needs much propping up, but I remember the time when £198,000,000 was lost to the wheatgrower because of the higher prices overseas. In view of the sacrifice made by the wheatgrower generally, there is no need for any reference to propping up.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Two wrongs do not make a right.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—That doesn't matter. You cannot deny that the wheatgrower lost much money that could have been

available to him if the overseas prices had not been so high.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—He lost the money through his representative.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—Who is that?

The Hon. F. J. Condon—The wheat farmer.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—Who is he?

The Hon. F. J. Condon—He is the representative of the wheatgrower.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—He is there as an observer.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—He may be.

The PRESIDENT—Order! The honourable member will address the Chair and not speak to interjections.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—I bow to your ruling, Mr. President. A premium for our best wheat should be provided. I have always advocated better quality growing. We are paying the penalty now for falling so low in the world's markets in quality that our wheats are not easily disposed of. There is a limited market for flour wheat, but the grower who has grown good quality wheat in the past has not the yield the weaker wheats have provided. Our f.a.q. system of marketing —that is, quality wheat from all over the States from different districts being mixed in one heap—is wrong. I look forward to the time when the bulk handling system will separate our wheats and we shall sell our wheats according to label. I could have made much more money had I concentrated on the lower quality wheats, the high yielders, but I believe in taking an interest in whatever I do.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—How can you do it under bulk handling?

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—It is put into different bins. Provision has been made for that.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—How many bins have done that?

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—I don't know but it is being provided for. Heavy subsidies are being paid for wheat in certain countries. When I was in New Zealand last May, a crop was being harvested at Mossburn on South Island. I have never seen such poor quality wheat. It was almost white, but was yielding fairly well. The owner said he was quite satisfied because New Zealand paid a big subsidy to encourage wheat grown there. It is not a wheat-growing country for it has not the climate. South Australia in particular supplies most of the wheat to New Zealand. The bakers and millers in New Zealand are pleased with the selected wheat, much of which is going there, and that is good for the future.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—When a miller pays a premium on his wheat does he get an extra price for his flour?

The Hon. R. R. WILSON—He does not get any extra. This Bill renews the legislation for another five years and the cost of production has been determined at 14s. 6d. per bushel. I often wonder how the cost of production is arrived at because it varies so much in different districts and with different methods of farming. South Australia tried for a higher wheat price but it has accepted the present price of 14s. 6d. a bushel, which I maintain is fair for wheat this year. I pay a tribute to the Department of Agriculture for taking over the Northfield Hospital farm, as we know it, for the purpose of improving the quality of our wheats. That is a worthwhile venture. I am sure it will pay great dividends for the industry. I am glad to know that the stabilization of the wheat industry will continue for a further five years and have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Repeal and savings."

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—As I intimated on the second reading, I support this legislation and agree with what Mr. Wilson said. I point out, however, that no other State has yet passed similar legislation. As I understand it, a Bill was introduced in the Victorian Legislative Council and passed, but it is only in the second reading stage in the Legislative Assembly. In Tasmania, only Notice has been given. The Federal Parliament has passed a Bill and I understand that the other States will be asked to carry similar legislation.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—Someone has to be first.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I always like to have a look around because I know what happened in the past when this State passed legislation entirely different from that of other States on the same subject. I have been informed that rain has seeped into some of the newly built silos causing considerable damage; this of course will involve the Australian Wheat Board in some expense. Although I have not always agreed with what the Wheat Board has attempted to do, I compliment it in connection with this Bill as it is clear that the board

realizes that other interests have to be considered.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, is the honourable member in order in making a second reading speech in the Committee stage?

The CHAIRMAN—So far the honourable member is in order, but I am watching him closely.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—It is pleasing to know that someone is listening to me. As clause 3 is virtually the whole Bill I think I am at liberty, even though in Committee, to reply to what others have said during the debate. This Bill is based on compulsion: the farmer must supply his wheat to the board and failure to do so involves a penalty. In this case I agree with compulsion because to stabilize the industry all wheat must be delivered to the central authority. Furthermore, I think compulsion might have been applied to other industries which are up against it today. We have in South Australia today two gentlemen from India who are interested in the sale of cornsacks, which is controlled by the Wheat Board. They say that there has been no falling off in demand for sacks.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—There is a big demand for barley in bags.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON—I remember reading some time ago how the cost of production is arrived at, and a member of the board said the actual cost was shillings below the 14s. 6d. that has been adopted in this scheme simply because it might cost one man 9s. and another 16s. Therefore, an average must be adopted, and I agree with the figure of 14s. 6d. I hope that the Government will see that it is necessary that everyone, not only the wheatgrower, should get a fair deal.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—I thought the honourable member, who warned us about being the first to pass this legislation, was going on to show that we were doing something that was not intelligent. However, he did not pursue that point. He knows that the price mentioned, whether it be right or wrong, was agreed to by the Agricultural Council, which involves all States. Commonwealth legislation has been passed and it is simply a question of taking what has been arrived at by agreement. That is why I was pleased to hear the honourable member say he supported the price agreed on, and that is the only consideration at present. The position is quite clear. Either we want the scheme to continue or we do not, and no other issues can be brought into it. I know that the honourable member is concerned about another aspect, and so am I. We have tried to clear it up in other ways, but this Bill is simply to continue the wheat marketing scheme and under the circumstances I support the clause.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 to 22) and title passed, and Bill reported without amendment; Committee's report adopted.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from October 30. Page 1488.)

Clause 8—"Registration of accrued rights of access, etc."

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—I asked that progress be reported on this clause because it seemed that the difficulty might be adapted in another way. The provision in this clause is that pre-existing rights can be registered, but any new rights apparently are not to carry on. In other words, one can register a right within a limited period from the time of the passing of the Act, but if a person does not have a right at that time he cannot obtain one. A doubt seems to exist on the draftsmanship of the amending clause whether a person can still establish a right or not. If a person can still establish a right, I wonder whether it might be a better approach to still enable a person to acquire that right subject to his being able to register it within three months of acquisition.

I am always a bit chary about taking away rights that are traditional, because one does not know precisely exactly what one is taking away. My experience of the law for some years has made me very conscious of the fact that one can never anticipate all the widespread variety of circumstances that a section like this might cover. I do not propose to move an amendment. I made the suggestion to the Minister in the second reading debate, and if he has further investigated the matter as I understood he was prepared to do, I should be happy to hear his answer on this point.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government)—The honourable member indicated he was interested in this clause, and I have taken the opportunity to consult the Parliamentary Draftsman on it. The amendment deletes section 352 of the principal Act, which is as follows:—

Notwithstanding the provisions of The Real Property Act, 1886, when any street, road, lane,

yard, or passage, roadway, byway, or footway, or any part thereof, has been formed, levelled, drained, paved, flagged, macadamised, or otherwise made good, the right to use the same for the purposes for which the same has been so formed, levelled, drained, paved, flagged, macadamised or made good, shall be appurtenant to the land of every owner who contributes to the cost thereof.

I point out that A, B, and C may adjoin land; the title to the land is owned by A, and B and C have certain rights to the land. Simply because C contributes a small piece of bitumen to make the pathway negotiable in wet weather, as pointed out by the Registrar-General, surely should not give him rights to prevent A, the real owner of the land, from building on such right of way when he wishes to do so later.

That is the idea behind taking the section out of the Act altogether. This matter is covered by other sections dealing with private streets. If Sir Arthur's suggestion is to make it possible for rights to be incorporated in any future title, he should vote against the clause, because his suggestion is to put back into the Act what we are endeavouring by this clause to take out.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—My suggestion was not precisely that. A claim was made by the Registrar-General that this section was embarrassing because rights acquired under it could not readily be ascertained, particularly in a capital city. My answer to that is that we need not stop the acquisition of these rights, but merely make it compulsory to register them within three months, otherwise they would be lost. I feel I cannot contemplate the variety of circumstances under which these rights might be ascertained, or the necessity or otherwise for acquiring them. It seems to me that in the past the section has not worked disadvantageously, except in so far as adjoining owners and so on might not know where they stood in relation to rights. However, I do not propose to press the matter. Of course, if any hardship appeared to result from the passing of this Act the matter could easily be rectified in Parliament by a further amendment.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—There is a right of appeal.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—It seemed to me that we could achieve exactly the object the Registrar-General suggested, without any possibility of hardship to anyone, if my suggestion were adopted. However, as I cannot point to any specific case where I foresee hardship, I am prepared to wait and see what happens.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (9 to 15) and title passed.

Clause 3—"Appointment of deputy chairman"—reconsidered.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—I am sorry I overlooked this clause when the Bill was first in Committee. I pointed out in the second reading debate that I thought the appointment of a permanent deputy chairman on district councils might be undesirable. I have had a word with the Minister of Local Government and I understand that he has some very good explanation in the matter which I hope we will be able to hear. He, I think, draws a distinction between district councils and municipal councils in this regard. I bow to his superior knowledge of country local government matters, but I am afraid that if we pass the clause without challenge this practice may spread to municipal corporations, and I feel that would be undesirable. Although contemplating the possibility of an amendment, I should like to hear the Minister's explanation of the justification for this clause.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—The amendment was introduced at the specific request of representatives of local government associations, as opposed to municipal government associations. For some years they have felt the necessity to have a permanent deputy chairman on district councils. I point out that it is somewhat different in the case of municipal corporations, where most representatives do not have far to go to attend meetings and are able to attend regularly or find out exactly what is going on. It is very different in the country where some councillors live as far as 50 miles away from the seat of local government.

The Hon. A. J. Melrose—Where would that be?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—Meningie, LeHunte, and perhaps Tatiara. Councillors in those districts may be at least 50 miles away from places where meetings are held. Sometimes the chairman is not available and some matter before the council may be of considerable importance. A pressure group on the council might want a particular amendment, perhaps to change the headquarters of the district, and in the absence of the chairman that group could stymie the opposition party by appointing one of their party as the chairman and thereby giving him the casting vote. It is obviously much more desirable to have a permanent deputy chairman, and that is the opinion of representatives of the local government association. The practice in remote country areas of appointing a deputy chairman on a snap

vote, with perhaps a paucity of councillors present, may give results neither desirable nor in the best interests of local government. I appreciate the honourable member's point about municipalities, but I think that is a different matter. Councils have requested this amendment, and I therefore commend it to honourable members for their appproval.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—In view of the explanation, I do not intend to pursue that amendment any further.

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE—I have been in local government affairs for nearly 40 years, and in my experience I think that the general functions of the chairman would have to be thought over before a council meets. The question of the formal signatory to documents arises. The instance given by the Minister as likely to occur has never occurred in my experience, and I do not think that such things as he suggested would be decided at a snap meeting. If the amendment has any merit at all, it would provide an official signing officer for the council to act if the chairman were absent. In the country at harvesting time it is sometimes hard to get the attendance of councillors and the chairman may be ill or the deputy chairman engaged in harvesting. The position would in no way be improved by passing the amendment. Perhaps the Act could be amended to provide that when the chairman was absent two councillors could be appointed to sign documents on his behalf. That would overcome the difficulty.

Clause passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

BROKEN HILL PROPRIETARY COMPANY'S STEELWORKS INDENTURE BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 30. Page 1491.)

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON (Northern)—The agreement contained in the Bill between the Government and the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited for the establishment of steelworks at Whyalla is a red letter event in the history of South Australia. Ever since a blast furnace began operating there, South Australia has been looking forward to the establishment of a steelworks in the area that provides the great percentage of raw material for making steel. Up to the present, the company has considered it more economical to establish additional works at Port Kembla and Newcastle because they had the potential of power, etc. Much credit is due to our Premier and the Minister of Mines for the exploratory work carried out by the Mines Department to ascertain the quantity of iron ore outside the company's leases. That had some influence in bringing about the agreement, which we are asked to ratify in the Bill. This exploratory work cost the Government about £450,000 and the company agrees to reimburse it to the extent of £12,000 a year for 20 years. The great expansion that has taken place in the Whyalla area will be accelerated by the agreement. It can be considered one of the greatest decentralization moves in South Australia this century.

The growth of Whyalla, Port Augusta and Port Pirie since the Murray water was extended to those areas, originally as a result of the establishment of Whyalla, has been phenomenal. Whyalla has a population of about 9,000, Port Augusta, including Stirling, about 8,500, and Port Pirie has grown from 9,756 in 1925 to 14,818 in 1954; and with the growth since, the population is now more than 15,000. This growth is the result of the Government's vision in establishing a power plant at Port Augusta, using Leigh Creek coal, and in providing water from the Murray. These things have made the Whyalla projects possible.

The expansion in our north also provides an outlet for stock in these areas, and particularly on Eyre Peninsula. Producers in the upper part of the peninsula had had great difficulty in marketing their stock. Much credit for the establishment of steelworks in Australia is due to Mr. Essington Lewis, who, during a visit overseas, discussed with defence chiefs the desirability of establishing steelworks in Australia in the event of war. I need not mention what an important part this played in our efforts during the second world war. As a reward for this foresight it was suggested by the former Director of Mines that the South Australian Government should establish State-owned steelworks at Whyalla. Such action would have had a disastrous effect on other industries coming to this State.

I read in this morning's press an interview with Mr. W. W. Hackett, who arrived in the liner Oronsay and is chairman of Accles and Pollock Ltd., Birmingham, a member of the Tube Investment Group, with which the British Tube Mills (Aus.) Pty. Ltd., at Kilburn, is associated. He said that industries were attracted here because South Australia was still the most attractive State for overseas firms in search of Australian sites. Mr. Hackett pioneered the expansion of British firms

in South Australia and recalled that the directors of his company in Great Britain had been critical when, in 1937, he chose Adelaide for the establishment of a branch of the British Tube Mills. He said that they had since eaten their words and realized now that the choice was right. The prime factors in his choice were South Australia's labour stability and availability of houses for workers; and he considered that many more English firms would be induced to come here. I believe that the stability of our Government assures such firms of a reasonable deal in this State, and that this has been the cause of English firms coming here.

South Australia is now becoming a major industrial State. For many years the probability of the erection of steelworks at Whyalla was favourably regarded by the company, but in 1955 it informed the Government that this could not be undertaken until about 1959-60. However, owing to favourable circumstances that have arisen since, it can now enter into negotiations, but first it must have a guaranteed security in certain respects. In his explanation of the Bill the Minister of Mines mentioned these, chief of which were:—The availability to the company of iron ore and jaspilite deposits: rights for the company to prospect for all natural substances required for steelmaking: rights for the company to be granted mining leases giving rights to such substances: security of tenure of prospecting rights and mining leases: satisfactory arrangements for housing and labour: satisfactory supplies of water: rights over certain parts of the foreshore and adjacent land: and arrangements to provide that the steelworks would not be rendered unremunerative by too rigid price control.

I agree that all these were essential before the company could establish here with any confidence, but I suggest that the Government should secure an equal assurance that steel will be made available to South Australia at no greater price than is charged in the eastern States. I pay a tribute to the company, because over the years the Commonwealth has been supplied with the cheapest steel in the world. However, one instance came before my notice regarding the distribution of surplus steel from the Kwinana refinery in Western Australia. People in South Australia were charged about £9 a ton in excess of the Newcastle price for posts and droppers. It was sold as Australian steel, but it did not come from Newcastle or Port Kembla. While these posts were being distributed it was difficult to get similar posts and droppers from Newcastle. I suggest that we should be careful to see that some guarantee is given this State providing that the prices charged will not be in excess of those charged in the eastern States.

The Indenture provides for the supply of sufficient water to Whyalla to enable the steelworks to operate and for a minimum of 1,000,000,000 gallons a year, but the Engineering and Water Supply Department is providing for 1,750,000,000 gallons in order to meet the expansion of Whyalla and to supply Iron Knob. I notice that in his evidence Mr. Campbell (Engineer for Water Supply) suggested that there should be an increase in the size of the main from the Warren Reservoir and that the main from Mannum should be duplicated from just near Hanson running through Booborowie to the south of Jamestown and across to Port Germein. I am pleased to know that the passing of the Bill will be the means of this main being duplicated sooner than otherwise would have been the case. The additional water will benefit not only people at Whyalla, but also those along the route of the main. I should like an assurance, too, that some attention will be given to additional supplies for Upper Eyre Peninsula when this scheme is being put through.

The Bill also provides for housing accommodation at Whyalla. The Housing Trust has undertaken to supply 450 houses a year, which covers both the requirements of the industry and the growing population of Whyalla. It is interesting to note what this steel industry has meant to South Australia in the way of decentralization. Rapid Bay, Ardrossan and Iron Knob have all resulted from the operation of the B.H.P. Company. The amount of metals being mined at the different centres is interesting. Rapid Bay produced 465,081 tons of limestone during the 12 months ended September 1, 1958. That is a considerable tonnage providing much work for the people in that area. When I visited Rapid Bay a few years ago as a guest of the B.H.P. Company, I was interested to learn that in that area the company had built and given to the Education Department a complete school—an excellent gesture on its part, symbolic of its actions wherever it is established.

As Mr. Wilson has said, the dolomite industry has come to the rescue of Ardrossan. Some 126,403 tons were produced during the last financial year, and from the Middleback Range, Iron Knob and Iron Monarch some 3,000,000

tons of ore have been taken and shipped to Newcastle and Port Kembla. With the advent of the steelworks at Whyalla, some 300,000 tons of steel will be produced, requiring an additional 500,000 tons of ore.

It is obvious that the Select Committee thoroughly investigated the desirability or otherwise of works being established at Whyalla. The evidence given before it covered all the grounds that it could reasonably be expected to investigate. It was pointed out in evidence that South Australia was the greatest user per head of steel in the Commonwealth, using some 1,070 lb. per head as against 710 lb. per head in the next highest State, New South Wales. This indicates that South Australia has developed materially as an industrial State.

I support the Bill with confidence knowing the standing of the company with which we are dealing and the quality of its work. Supporting me in my opinion that the company is producing some of the best steel in the world is Mr. Hackett, who in yesterday's *News* was reported as saying that the Australian steel industry was regarded as one of the most efficient in the world. That could apply to the B.H.P. Company. It is efficient in everything it has undertaken and, wherever it is established, it contributes materially to the welfare of that particular district. It has done a great amount of work for Whyalla by providing roads, kerbing, guttering and footpaths. When we realize that Australia today is receiving its steel for £10 a ton less than the price at which we could import it from Great Britain, and at a price considerably lower than that at which we could import it from America, I have confidence in supporting the second reading.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (LONG SERVICE LEAVE) BILL.

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

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL.

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

LAND SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 30. Page 1492.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland)—We have already heard some excellent speeches on this Bill but I wish to throw a little new light on the subject. Many statements have been made recently, especially in the press, about land settlement in South Australia. This Bill extends the Act for a further 12 months. Notification has been received from the Commonwealth Government that it does not intend to continue its partnership with the States for further land settlement after June 30, 1959. This is a great disappointment to many, including those applicants who have not yet been settled under the scheme and are qualified to be settled.

It is not possible for this State to develop land on its own; it needs the resources of the Commonwealth Government, with its taxing power, to develop land settlement on the scale we have known over the last 10 years under this scheme. The State Government is prepared to go as far as it can with its resources in normal development, as we can see from this year's Estimates, where the sum of £100,000 is set aside for normal development, but this is not specifically for war service land settlement and development.

Reference was made in the daily press last Wednesday to an area of land at Lyrup on the Upper Murray. It was contained in a report from the National Congress of the R.S.L. meeting at Adelaide and attributed to Mr. John Hill, chairman of the land settlement committee of that body and delegate to the conference. This is the newspaper report:—

Lyrup Could Settle All S.A. R.S.L. Applicants—All approved S.A. applicants for irrigation blocks could be settled if Lyrup were opened to soldier settlement. S.A. delegate, Mr. J. Hill, told the R.S.L. national congress this today. Lyrup had been under discussion for some time between the S.A. and Commonwealth Governments he said. The Commonwealth originally rejected it because it feared over-production. But the S.A. Government was anxious to have it opened, he said. "A huge new cannery, which will cost more than £1 million, is being established at Berri and the S.A. Government is contributing more than £250,000 to this," he said. "If Lyrup could be established, the cannery would open to it a ready market for supplies."

Mr. Hill said the S.A. Lands Minister, Mr. Hincks, had written to say that, while the S.A. Government was not now in a position to go on with the Lyrup project at present, its potential for future development had been recognized.

We ought to get ourselves right on this matter. This area was investigated by the Land Settlement Committee and favourably reported on on June 2, 1955. The Government of South Australia accepted the recommendation of that committee and sent it on to the Federal authorities. The Federal Government rejected

the scheme mainly on the ground that the evidence tendered by certain industry representatives was not in favour of further plantings at that stage. I have before me the minutes of evidence presented to that committee by both the manufacturers and growers. The bodies represented were the wine industry, the Grape Growers Council, the Canners Association, the Winemakers Association, the A.D.F.A., the canning growers and the Irrigation Development Committee. For a start, I do not think that the wine industry was particularly encouraging; indeed, it was extremely pessimistic. This is what its representative said:—

> The council opposed further Government-assisted plantings of all grapes whilst present conditions exist in the industry, and until the impact of present plantings has been felt.

The growers' representative of the wine industry, Mr. E. M. Elsworthy, made three points:—

(*a*) Postpone indefinitely any further plantings of wine grapes.

(*b*) Provide greater avenues of distribution by means of growers' licences.

(*c*) Seek complementary legislation with other wine producing States to ensure at least cost of production for the grower.

I suggest that that was not evidence which would cause the Federal Government to be terribly happy about going on with further plantings. Mr. R. M. Simes, then chairman of the South Australian River Council of A.D.F.A., and now chairman of A.D.F.A., said:—

> The dried fruits industry, as such, had never been opposed to expansion, but it was definitely against establishing more men in the industry if those men were not guaranteed a reasonable standard of living.

He said further:—

> There has been no increase in spite of the increase in population in the Commonwealth; in some years consumption has dropped. The consumption of dried fruits in the Commonwealth has not kept pace with the increase in population.

That was not very encouraging either. The representative of the Citrus Growers Association, Mr. J. J. Medley, was a little more optimistic when he said:—

> In round terms we have now a potential increase in production which will at least double our present normal annual yield. While future marketing prospects are reasonably good, sound development will be of a progressive nature and it is suggested that, pending an opportunity to assess the reaction of various markets to the increased production from present war service and other post-war plantings, the approach to further expansion should be cautious and any assessment of prices based on the probability that disposal of substantially increased quantities to overseas markets will—with allowance for a quality premium—be related to competitive quotations by other supplying countries rather than to Australian market parity.

The only people who gave any real encouragement for the opening up of the Lyrup area were the canners and the canning fruitgrowers.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—If you move an amendment for the establishment of a permanent body I think you would have the support of the Council.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—I might do so if the honourable member would put that in writing. An election is coming on and people are worrying about what they can hang their hats on, and many have chosen land settlement. I intend to give the lie to some of the stuff that has been printed—and I am not referring to what was said by Mr. John Hill at the R.S.L. conference. The point I am making is that these industries gave their evidence in 1955. The conclusion that the committee came to was that by the time this scheme got under way there was a reasonable chance of its succeeding, and it recommended accordingly. The Government resubmitted it to the Federal Government in 1957 and it was again rejected on the same grounds; and after all, its advisers are those very astute gentlemen who work out the costs of production for wheat and dried fruit and butter in connection with the several stabilization schemes, namely, the Federal Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Is not the Federal Government of the same political complexion as the Party to which the honourable member belongs?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—I am referring to the evidence that was before the Commonwealth Government's advisers, and I consider that on the evidence they did absolutely the right thing.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Is the honourable member prepared to tell his electors that?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—I am telling them now, I hope. That is the point I want to make. All this happened in 1955 and it was rejected again in 1957. If the industries concerned have changed their minds and now wish this thing to go on they should again give evidence to prove that the circumstances have changed. I agree with the sentiments expressed by other speakers in this debate,

namely, that rural development should continue in order to settle the remaining ex-servicemen who are qualified, and I urge the leaders of the industries involved to carry out an up-to-date survey of their industries. It is significant that, although the wine industry gave evidence to the effect that there should be no further plantings, some of the biggest people in the industry are today developing at a very rapid rate.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—Was it not the Federal Government that prevented the scheme from going on?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—I am pointing out that on the evidence at the time it was right, and until the industries concerned do something about it, if they now think it wise to go on—

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—Don't you agree that this land should be brought into production?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—If I have not made myself clear I have missed my point. It would be gross folly to go on developing any particular commodity if those in the industry suffered as a result.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—Does the honourable member think it would result in overproduction?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—Some things are over-produced at times, but from the evidence available some development could be undertaken and should go on.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—On the one hand you agree that the Federal Government was right in rejecting the scheme and on the other you recommend it should go on.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—I am urging the industries involved to make an up-to-date survey so that South Australia, in the interests of the economy of Australia can be developed on a wise and practical basis. We cannot do that by our own resources; we must have Commonwealth aid. I should like to see the continuation of war service land settlement on a balanced scale and if it is found, after the survey that I suggest, that more development can go on, the industries concerned should come before the Parliamentary Land Settlement Committee again and at an early date. I support the Bill.

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

EXPLOSIVES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

SAVINGS BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT 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 purpose is to provide a practical means of encouraging the establishment of industries in country areas of the State. It provides that, with the consent of the Governor and upon the recommendation of the Industries Development Committee, the South Australian Housing Trust may erect factory premises on any land of the trust which is situated outside the metropolitan area. The Bill goes on to provide that the trust may let any such factory premises on terms fixed by the trust or may sell the premises upon such conditions as are fixed by the trust. It has been found by experience, both in this State and in other parts of the world, that a substantial inducement to the establishment of an industry can be the provision of suitable factory premises which are let or sold upon terms. In the case of some industries, the company contemplating the establishment of a factory is faced with considerable expenditure upon plant which may absorb a great part of its capital. If the company can be provided with factory premises which can be purchased by the payment of instalments over a term of, say, up to 10 years, that extra assistance may make all the difference between the industry coming to this State or being established elsewhere. In other instances, of course, the inducement provided by the Bill is not needed.

In conformity with the Government policy for the establishment of industries in country towns, the trust has already provided aid to industrial undertakings by building houses in many country centres. Houses for this purpose have already been erected in more than 20 country towns, and the number of houses provided have ranged from many hundreds in towns such as Whyalla, Port Augusta and Mount Gambier to a few in places like Tintinara where houses were erected to aid a small local industry. In instances, the industries assisted by housing would not have been established only for the provision of the houses and, in other cases, the houses built in the particular town have enabled existing industries to

be expanded. Assistance of this kind will be provided by the trust in any case where housing is necessary for industrial development in any country town. It has been found, however, that apart from the assistance provided by the building of houses, industrialists are, in instances, more likely to choose South Australia as the place to establish a factory if the factory premises can be built for them and, in some cases, let or sold on terms and, in fact, the Government has been asked by a number of industrial undertakings to have this work carried out.

Thus, under the scheme proposed by the Bill, the two things which will materially aid the establishment of industry, namely the provision of both housing and factory premises, can be carried out by the one organization, and the result should be that no suitable industry should be lost to any country town by reason of the lack of either of these aids. It is not expected that, by undertaking the building of factories, the trust's house-building programme will suffer. The trust has ample reserve funds, and some part of these funds can be applied towards these factory premises. In any event, it can be expected that the trust will recoup its expenditure under the arrangements it will make with the industries concerned. It will be noted that the Bill is limited in its application to parts of the State outside the metropolitan area. Thus, the Bill is intended to foster industrial development in country areas, and to give further aid to the de-centralization of industry in the State.

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

IRRIGATION ON PRIVATE PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General) —I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of the Irrigation on Private Property Act, which was passed in 1939, is to allow the owners of reclaimed land adjacent to or near the River Murray to petition the Minister to proclaim the area as a private irrigation area. The petition must be signed by one-half or more of the owners of the reclaimed land within the proposed area and the area of reclaimed land owned by the petitioners must be more than one-half of the total of such reclaimed land. Provision is made for persons opposed to the scheme to present a counter-petition. The Act provides that a proclaimed private irrigation area shall be administered by a board of management the powers and restrictions of which are prescribed by the Act.

Since the Act was passed five private irrigation areas have been constituted in the lower river reclaimed land areas, namely, River Glen, Toora, Woods Point, Yiddinga and Long Island. The Act in its present form applies only to land which is reclaimed or partly reclaimed from being swamp land and several requests have been made to the Government to amend the Act to allow the owners of other irrigable land near the River Murray to petition for the constitution of a private irrigation area. The lands included in past proclamations have been used almost exclusively for dairying and the main purpose of this Bill is to extend the scope of the Act to allow its provisions to apply to other lands which can be irrigated by the waters of the river and used for the production of fruit and vegetables. The proposed amendments will permit a group of private owners of irrigable high lands who have reached full agreement amongst themselves to take advantage of the provisions of the Act to have an area constituted as a private irrigation area, and thereafter to manage their own affairs through a board of management.

Other consequential amendments of the Act are necessary to provide for the differences between irrigation practice and control in the lower river reclaimed swamp lands which are used for dairying, and the high-lift irrigation areas which are envisaged in the amendments. The explanation of the clauses of the Bill is as follows:—

Clause 3 inserts a new definition of "ratable land" which, as I will explain later, is a necessary consequential amendment to define the class of land within the proclaimed area which is subject to rating and other powers vested in a board of management. This clause also strikes out the definition of "reclaimed land" and substitutes a new definition of "irrigable lands" which includes reclaimed lands and other land which is, or is capable of, being irrigated by waters from the River Murray.

Clause 4 amends subsection (2) of section 5 of the principal Act which provides that the Minister shall not consider any petition unless he is satisfied:—

(*a*) that the petition is signed by one-half or more of the owners of reclaimed land within the part of the State proposed to be constituted a private irrigation area; and

(*b*) that the area of reclaimed land owned by the persons by whom the petition is signed is more than one-half of the total area of reclaimed land within the said part of the State.

The effect of the amendment is that the same provisions will apply in respect of irrigable land which is reclaimed or partly reclaimed from being swamp land, but that in respect of other irrigable land the petition must be signed by all the owners of such land within the proposed private irrigation area. Thus the provision in respect of reclaimed land which has worked successfully for nearly 20 years remains unaltered. But as the Bill embraces highlands in localities where pumping from the river is necessary to provide water for irrigation purposes and as the only inquiries so far have come from persons who are unanimous in joining together to form a private irrigation area, the Government believes that it is desirable to provide that a petition in respect of irrigable land other than reclaimed land must be signed by all the owners of such land.

Another argument in favour of this amendment is that in private irrigation areas consisting of reclaimed land it is necessary for the good of all landowners therein that an embankment should be constructed to protect the whole of the area, and the views of a minority should not be allowed to endanger the whole scheme. In high-lift irrigation areas there is no comparable reason why a person should be compelled to have his land included in the private irrigation area; for example, a land owner may already have an adequate pumping plant and irrigation scheme, and it is unreasonable to provide that a majority of adjacent land owners could compel that person to join with them in a private irrigation area.

Clause 5 is a consequential amendment. Clause 6 amends section 28 of the principal Act which deals with the appointment and powers of a committee appointed by a board of management. The board, which comprises all the owners of irrigable land within the area, has power to delegate to a committee such of its powers and duties under the Act as it thinks fit. The clause strikes out subsection (4) of that section which provides that, "In no case shall a committee authorize an expenditure or pay any sum of money exceeding twenty pounds." This, in the Government's opinion, is an unnecessary and unwieldy restriction on a committee, which is answerable to the board of management and is unlikely to act contrary to the wishes of the board.

Clause 7 amends section 34 of the principal Act which regulates the duties of all owners of irrigable lands within a private irrigation area. The effect of the amendment is to impose an additional duty to comply with any order by the board to install adequate pumping plant and irrigation equipment. Paragraph (*b*) of clause 7 makes a consequential amendment to paragraph (v) of section 34. This paragraph requires land owners to preserve in good order, repair, and condition all trees and plantations within a private irrigation area. The amendment makes it clear that the trees and plantations referred to do not include trees and plantations grown for the production of fruit and other produce. Paragraph (v) was obviously intended to apply to ornamental trees or trees planted for the purpose of a windbreak or for protecting the embankment. Clause 8 is a consequential amendment.

Clause 9 amends section 38 of the principal Act which regulates the powers of a board of management. The effect of the amendment is to give the board an additional power to determine from time to time the maximum area of ratable land which may be irrigated. This is a necessary power for any irrigation scheme. Clause 10 enacts a new section 38a which will allow the board to order the owner of ratable land to carry out works for draining his land or for the prevention of possible seepage injury to other land. An owner who receives such a notice is given the right to make representations to the board. The Government believes that this is a necessary and desirable power to be vested in a board of management, as one owner's holding could be damaged by the neglect of his neighbour to carry out necessary drainage works. Under section 38 of the principal Act the board has power to construct main drains into which seepage water from private land could be discharged. The powers in section 38 of this clause are similar in principle to the provisions of the Irrigation Act, 1930-1946, for dealing with the seepage problem in fruitgrowing areas. Clause 11 is a consequential amendment.

Clauses 12, 13, 14, and 15 increase the penalties provided for a breach of sections 58, 60, 61, and 64 from a maximum of twenty pounds to a maximum of fifty pounds. It is almost 20 years since the present penalties were fixed, and the offences affected are fairly serious breaches of an owner's responsibilities under the Act not to act in a manner which is detrimental to the interests of the other owners within the scheme. Clause 16 enacts a new section 73 which will enable the

Governor on the recommendation of a board of a private irrigation area to make regulations to assist in the administration and enforcement of the Act. This is a desirable provision which will enable the Government to assist a board to regulate any conduct or other matters causing concern or trouble in the irrigation area. The clause provides for a penalty not exceeding twenty-five pounds, and in the case of a continuing breach an additional five pounds for each day on which the breach continues. Clause 17 is a consequential amendment.

Clause 18 and the schedule make a number of consequential amendments to various sections of the principal Act. The power contained in section 39 which enables the board to declare and levy rates on reclaimed land is limited to ratable land as defined in clause 3 of the Bill. Thus the owner of irrigable land within an area which is not being supplied with water or for which a supply of water has not been approved by the board would not be liable for the payment of rates. As I explained earlier, the purpose of the Bill is to enable persons mutually interested in the development of irrigable lands adjacent to or near the River Murray to join together in a petition to declare their lands to be a private irrigation area, and if granted, to thereafter manage their own affairs within the framework of the Act.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.32 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, November 5, at 2.15 p.m.