LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, November 18, 1958.

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

QUESTIONS.

U TURNS IN KING WILLIAM STREET.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—Has the Minister of Local Government a reply to a question I asked last week regarding U turns in King William Street?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—I am advised by the Commissioner of Police as follows:—

The making of a U turn between intersections in King William Street is permitted under Adelaide City Council by-laws, except during peak traffic periods (when right-hand turns are not permitted) or across safety zones or double painted lines. The police are not favourably disposed to U turns being made in King William Street at other than specified points. However, I understand from press reports that when the tramway lines are removed a median strip will be laid down the centre of the road, and no doubt certain bays will be left to permit vehicles to turn and travel in the opposite direction. This would confine U turns to definite points between intersections, and as other road users would be aware of this, the danger from haphazard turning should be eliminated. If this action is taken by the Adelaide City Council I consider that section 122 (*b*) (1) of the Road Traffic Act should be amended to permit markings which would allow the application of a "diamond turn" to a cross-over. Even after the laying of the median strip it is the police view that U turns should not be permitted during the peak traffic periods when "no right turn" is in operation.

SINKING OF WELLINGTON PUNT.

The Hon. J. L. COWAN—Has the Minister of Roads any statement to make regarding the sinking of the Wellington punt on Sunday last, and will he give an assurance that everything possible will be done to ensure the safety of the public using other punts on the River Murray?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—A very thorough investigation is being made into this accident, but all available evidence so far indicates that it was not in any way due to a defect in the punt. A full report will be released as soon as possible.

TRANSPORT CONTROL BOARD PERMITS.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—Will the Minister of Roads make representations to the Transport Control Board to expedite the consideration of applications by sporting bodies desirous of making country tours so that they will be in a position to know exactly what arrangements they can make in connection with the coming holidays? I am informed that it now takes about 14 days for an application to be dealt with.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—Yes.

PRIVATE BUS SERVICES.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY—I ask leave to make a short statement with a view to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY—In this morning's *Advertiser* appears a statement by the chairman of the Metropolitan Omnibus Operators Association with reference to the taking over of a private bus service by the Tramways Trust. Can the Minister of Local Government say which service is being taken over and indicate the reason?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—I am not aware of the specific point, but will refer the question to the Minister of Works.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The PRESIDENT laid on the table final reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works on Mount Gambier North Primary School and Drainage of Cooltong Division of Chaffey Irrigation Area, together with minutes of evidence.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

PAYMENT OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It proposes an alteration in the remuneration of members of Parliament. The present rates were fixed in June, 1955, and vary according to the distance of the electorates from Adelaide. Metropolitan members receive £1,900 without any addition; members whose districts comprise territory more than 50 miles from the G.P.O., but no territory more than 200 miles receive an additional £50 a year; and members whose electorates comprise territory more than 200 miles from the G.P.O. receive an additional £75 a year. When these rates were fixed the Margins Case had recently been decided and

the increases resulting from the decision of the Commonwealth Arbitration Court in that case were taken into account. However, the basic wage was then £11 11s. It has since increased to £12 16s., and there has been a steady increase in salaries generally.

As a result of representations that Parliamentary salaries should again be reviewed in the light of the general changes in rates of pay, the Government asked an experienced industrial officer to investigate the general position in connection with these salaries throughout Australia. After considering all the rates payable to State members of Parliament he came to the conclusion that a remuneration of about £2,200 a year was the appropriate figure for this State. The Government gave careful consideration to the data submitted in the report, and came to the conclusion that an increase on the lines recommended by the officer was justified. It may be mentioned that in making his recommendation the officer did not pay regard to the abnormally high rates of Queensland and Western Australia, but based his recommendation on the standards of the other three States. The proposal in this Bill is to maintain the present basic rate of £1,900 a year, but to give an increase of £250 in the allowance based on electoral districts. Thus a member whose district is wholly within 50 miles from the G.P.O. at Adelaide will receive an electorate allowance of £250. A member whose electorate comprises land more than 50 miles from the G.P.O. but no land more than 200 miles, will receive £300, and a member whose electorate contains land more than 200 miles from the G.P.O. will receive £325. As a result of these increases the remuneration of private members of Parliament will range from £2,150-£2,225. All Ministers of the Crown will receive the basic electorate allowance of £250 a year, irrespective of the situation of their electorates. The new rates will be payable as soon as the Bill is assented to. An amendment has been distributed to honourable members, but it is purely a drafting amendment and does not in any way alter the contents of the Bill.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—It is usual on the eve of the prorogation for members to speak immediately following the second reading explanation. I support this Bill with certain reservations, because I do not think the increase is over generous. It is two and a half years since Parliament dealt with a similar Bill. Honourable members will recall that on that occasion the Ministers of the Crown were not included, and it was an amendment moved in this Chamber which gave them the same consideration as was given other members.

All we desire is to receive similar consideration in certain respects to that extended to members in other States. Ministers of the Crown, who occupy very responsible positions, are today underpaid for the work they do for the citizens of the State. Many people claim that South Australia has one of the outstanding Parliaments of Australia, therefore I think that the value of the services that Ministers and other members of Parliament generally render to the State should be considered. The Bill provides that the basic salary shall remain the same but that electoral allowances shall be increased by £250. I should like to know whether this £250 will be subject to income tax, or whether it will be exempt. I understand that members in some other States receive some consideration in this respect, and I think we are entitled to the same consideration. After a member pays superannuation and taxation contributions today his salary is approximately £1,550 a year. Can anyone say that is over-generous? Certain officers of the Public Service receive higher salaries than the Premier of this State, and much higher salaries than members of Parliament. I am not complaining about that, but I think that members of Parliament should receive much higher salaries than they are now receiving.

I cannot remember any other session of Parliament in which we have had so much retrospective legislation, and a Bill that adds to that list will be discussed this afternoon. Why should not this legislation also be made retrospective? If we cannot make it retrospective to July 1, as we did with the legislation affecting Supreme Court judges and the President and Deputy President of the State Industrial Court, we should at least make it retrospective to November 1. I think that is a very reasonable suggestion, and I ask the Government to consider it. With several minor exceptions, members of the South Australian Parliament are the lowest paid in the Commonwealth. The salaries of Tasmanian members are higher than those of members in South Australia, except in one or two instances in certain electorates. In every other State members of Parliament are treated better by their respective Governments than we are.

Can anyone claim that members of Parliament in South Australia are not worth as much as those in other States? From my observations, the money earned by South Australian members

is well earned. I ask the Government to consider the two points I have raised, namely, retrospectivity and the question of taxation deductions. I trust that there will be no opposition to this Bill. We were recently called upon to increase salaries of certain people in high public positions, and all members subscribed to that legislation. Although I am disappointed that the proposed increases to members are not bigger, I support the Bill.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY (Central No. 2)—Mr. Condon was very frank in his statement concerning the remuneration he thinks members of Parliament should receive; and in his judgment he does not consider it enough. It is not what one would regard as a pleasant job or one that could be tackled with any enthusiasm. Members are called upon to make judgment on the remuneration they should receive for the work they do in the interests of their constituents. For many reasons that is a difficult decision to reach. Members face the question with much diffidence, but I think the responsibility is on each member. In the past this responsibility has been allotted to people outside Parliament, to which I am totally opposed. There is much difference in the services given by members, consequently I favour the action of the Government in bringing this matter forward for the consideration of Parliament. Any man who has been a member for any time and has any sense of responsibility realizes that he is called upon to decide on the merits of the case and not from a personal interest point of view. One fundamental is that a member gives his decision in the national interests and not from a personal point of view. If he has not reached that state of mind, he has no right to be a member. This matter should be dispassionately faced by every honourable member, as he knows the work he and other members do.

I think that every honourable member will readily admit that the remuneration paid did not prompt him to attempt to enter Parliament. That was secondary: his aim was to give service. Every honourable member, however, is not in the same category. In my experience not one member ever thought of the remuneration he would receive as a Parliamentarian. It is recognized that members themselves are the only judges of the work they do. They cannot accept any opinion from outside as to the extent or effectiveness of their work. They are the only judges of that and consequently must accept the responsibility of facing up to this question of pay. I consider that being a member of this House is not a full-time job. It may be that I do not do sufficient work in the interests of the people, but I do what I think is my duty. However, I do not think my duties would involve a full-time job.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—You are speaking only for yourself?

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—Yes. I would not be prepared to undertake this as a full-time job on the salary provided. If a man thought only of the money, there are too many opportunities outside to recompense him the better for his labours. I do not hesitate to say that some other honourable members work harder than I do, particularly country members who have to travel almost the length and breadth of the State in carrying out their duties. The city member does not have to do that. Travelling involves time and expense and in that case such an honourable member may feel that his duties in this Chamber warrant his treating it as a full-time job. There is no need to mention that the duties in the Chamber do not represent the full extent of an honourable member's work. When legislation is before the House he has to consider the well-being of the State and all this is done not only in the Chamber, but often in his own home. He has to come into contact with other people to get their opinion. To judge a member's remuneration on the time spent in the Chamber is quite erroneous. As our method of bi-cameral Government has developed, people of various financial responsibilities have become members. The most earnest member need not be the wealthiest man and often the hardest working member is the one who has not a private income to support him. He does it out of interest, to benefit the people he represents and for the sake of the State. Our system has developed along those lines, which is a good thing. Some honourable members may not remember when the salary of a member of Parliament was £200, but there was a time before that when there was no remuneration at all. Consequently, it was a bar to people interested in the wellbeing of the State taking part in the deliberations of Parliament. Although it is objectionable to me, no doubt many members are prepared to serve under this present system. Therefore, I and many other members must fall in step with it.

In my judgment, if a member gives his full time with no personal income to support him, the remuneration suggested by this Bill is not at all out of keeping with the times, for calls upon a member are considerable. Also,

the higher one's salary, the higher one's taxation. The calls on his time and his status in the community as a member of this Chamber involve him in much expense he would not otherwise have to bear. Therefore, the suggested amount is not out of step with the times. I feel that honourable members are nowhere near sufficiently well paid for the work they do for the State. That can readily be appreciated when we refer to some salaries paid to members of our Public Service. It may be said that a Minister is not a trained man in the way that a head of a department is, but he carries a far greater responsibility. He carries the responsibility of the administration of policy on his shoulders.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—He carries the responsibility of his department, too.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—Yes.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—And he has to come up for election every three or four years.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—Yes; he takes all those risks. He carries the responsibility of his department. He may shirk it and accept the judgment of his officers but, coming down to cold facts, he is the man who accepts the responsibility and gets the praise or blame for the policy he follows. This type of thing is not popular. It is so easy to criticize another, and so difficult to undertake his work, not even knowing what he does. Therefore, I feel that, although many members do not need this money, out of consideration for their co-members, many of whom need an increase in their personal income, they should support this Bill, as I do.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS (Northern)—In the course of a session, many Bills go through this House dealing with a wide variety of subjects, all more or less of great interest. Some are highly controversial while others are, to a certain extent, routine, but this Bill is in a separate category, inasmuch as members are called upon to decide a matter affecting their own pecuniary interests. In common with Sir Frank Perry, I am somewhat diffident in approaching this matter but realize that a certain field has to be covered in order to justify the proposed increase in salary.

The ordinary man in the street has a mistaken idea about the service rendered by a member of Parliament. Sir Frank Perry has just mentioned that some people evidently think that the duties of a member start and finish when the House is in session, whereas up to a point that is the easiest part of his responsibilities. Although making decisions on important matters is a very real responsibility, it is the work that has to be done outside and the expenditure that has to be incurred in doing it, particularly in the case of those representing the far-flung country districts, that form the basis upon which I endeavoured to decide the justification or otherwise of an increase in our salary.

Increased taxation has been mentioned. The proposed increase in our Parliamentary remuneration will place us in a higher grade of taxation, so that a fair proportion of that increase will be absorbed in that way. Therefore, although on the face of it £250 or £300 seems to be a decided increase, it does not necessarily mean that it works out as a profit to the member.

As has been said, a member of Parliament is called upon to sacrifice much and do much travelling. Members representing country districts often travel between 10,000 and 20,000 miles a year in their own cars. I am driving my third motor car since I came into Parliament, and my expenditure in that direction is heavy. When I first came here, my salary was £400, which meant that I found it necessary to draw considerably upon my own private resources to do my job.

Another aspect is that frequently in the course of our country duties we are away from our homes and incur heavy travelling and accommodation expenses. Invitations extended to us often include invitations to our wives, for our constituents like to see a member's wife accompany him to a country function. That is another expense that has to be met. Honourable members seem to be regarded by every charitable and sporting organization and agricultural society in the State as good prospects for membership. Sometimes it rather amuses me to get a nicely worded communication from some sporting organization to the effect that it is pleased unanimously to appoint me a patron—which, after all is said and done, could be taken as a polite request for a donation to their funds. All these items have to be added up and it would be difficult for me or any other members to calculate in hard figures our costs as against our salaries and work out anything like a definite sum.

For instance, our duties take us to some social functions in the country. It is not only a matter of travelling expense. We are expected to patronize whatever the function may be—perhaps a bazaar—and, if one gets away with spending less than £1, one is lucky. We do not object to that but these things have to be considered in assessing our net

income. Although the figure proposed in this Bill may to some people appear handsome, in the final analysis the net amount is probably no higher than that received by the ordinary tradesman every day.

So, although I feel diffident about having the responsibility as a member of voting something to myself, there is no other way out that I can see. On one occasion I recall—I think it was when the last rise in salaries was granted—a committee investigated and reported to Parliament but, in the final analysis, it still was the responsibility of Parliament to decide the matter, as we have to today. If anybody outside cares to challenge my statements and desires their confirmation, I shall be only too happy to do all I can to satisfy his curiosity; but, from the point of view of our outgoings and net returns, we are not as handsomely paid as many people seem to think we are. I support the Bill.

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

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 13. Page 1706).

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2)—The Act we are asked to extend is now about 20 years removed from reality, and I feel I cannot conscientiously support it. I know perfectly well that, if this Act ceases to operate, the C series index will increase considerably, but what if it does? We are living under 1958 rates in 1958. We cannot put off this tide forever. We have to face up to the situation as it is and, what is more, we cannot fob off these evils, the consequences of inflation, at the expense of a small section of the community, which is what we are doing by passing this legislation, as it is totally unfair to landlords. The rents provided under it are not actual rents. I have tried to understand the Government's argument on it, and it seems to be based on the fact that these people bought their houses with pre-war money at probably one-third of present-day costs or less, and therefore there is no great injustice in pegging them back to the rents that prevailed in those days plus a small percentage increase. I cannot see the validity of that argument. True it is that in actual money—in the figures you write down on paper or talk about—landlords are receiving slightly more than they were then, but that is not real money; those are only figures. Real money is measured by what income will buy, and the money they are receiving today is not commensurate with what they were receiving in pre-war days. They are getting far less today in real money—and not a soul in this Chamber can gainsay that—than they were when they bought those houses, and they paid far more in real money when they bought the houses than the equivalent would be at today's rates.

Everyone else, as far as I can see, has had what are sometimes called the benefits of inflation, but they are not benefits at all. They have had a rise in the expression of money values in respect of those real things that they possess, such as real estate or non-depreciating goods, but the value of these things remains fundamentally much the same. This legislation, I believe, is grossly unfair to the landlord. We have singled out a small section of the community to bear this burden for us. They have been forced to bear it though they do not want to do so. How would these tenants who relish these low rents like to be told that if they wished to sell their furniture they would have to do so at pre-war values plus 40 per cent? They would throw up their arms in horror and scream to high heaven, and one could not blame them for doing so, yet these are the people we are pegging in these houses at these rates.

I realize all the consequences that would be entailed if this Act ceased to exist. The C Series index would rise, but cannot we face up to the fact that we are living in post-war days, that we have suffered a period of high inflation and the inevitable effects of war? When are we to do justice to these people if we cannot do it now, 12 or 13 years after the was has ended? "Is this Act to go on for ever?" is what I feel like asking. In all conscience, as I have said, I cannot support the Bill. I have done my best to see the Government's point of view on it, but I am afraid that, with the passage of time, my worst fears about the legislation have been confirmed, and I propose to vote against the measure.

There are one or two amendments apart from the provision extending the legislation on which I would like to comment. It seems, as the Minister explained, that they are for the purpose of clearing up anomalies. In fact this Act has become so highly complicated—and I am not trying to insult members in saying this—that I doubt if there is one member in this Chamber today who understands it, or who could at one reading give an intelligent

explanation of what it means. That is not a condemnation of members but a criticism of an unjust Act that of necessity, because of its injustice, and the fact that people have tried to evade it, has become so extremely complicated that, unless one has had not only a legal training, but has also been constantly in touch with the Act, reviewing it and practising under it, it is impossible without considerable study to understand it. Although I have had the advantage—if it is an advantage—of a legal training, I sat up all night over the amendment to this Act that came before us last year, and it was very much in line with the amendment presented to us today. I have tried to study these amendments 12 months afterwards because I had not seen the Act since, but I found they were completely double Dutch to me. I still find them most difficult, because one has to go right through the Act and all the sections in order to find out what it is all about. I feel that even the Attorney-General, with all his advantages, could not get up and tell us exactly what it all means. It is a rigmarole, a tangled skein of thread and silk and rope all hopelessly jumbled together, and one has to be, I imagine, almost a superman of the law to understand it at all.

I would like to ask the Minister to explain—although I am not asking him to do so at once for I feel sure he would not be able to do so—why, in clause 3, proposed new section 60a (1) (II) says:—

After three months after the expiration of the period of the notice to quit, proceedings may be commenced by the lessor for the recovery of the possession of the dwellinghouse.

The Act gives a certain time after the expiration of notice to quit during which proceedings can be commenced. This amendment, which I am having great difficulty in understanding, says that three months after the expiration of the period of notice to quit proceedings may be taken by the lessor for the recovery of the dwellinghouse. It seems to me that if one lets premises to a person on a fixed term these premises are not let for a fixed term, but for the period of the "fixed term," plus the period of notice to quit, plus the time it takes to get an order from the court, plus this floating period of three months which seems to have been thrown in for good measure. I may be wrong in that, but I do not intend to accept any chiding from the Minister if I am, because I have done my utmost to understand this. I have spent considerably more time on it than probably the importance of the amendment warrants in the light of what Sir Frank Perry referred to earlier this afternoon, and I still do not feel that I am properly at grips with it.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—Would you advocate that after seven days the tenant be tossed into the street?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—What I am advocating is simply that we do not extend the Act. That is the only just thing to do.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—That's lovely!

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—How would the honourable member like to sell any of his possessions at 1940 prices? He would love that.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—I am doing it today.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—I do not think the honourable member is doing himself justice because I am sure he is a better business man than that. I oppose the Bill, and in the Committee stage I would like the Minister to explain this floating three months, as I call it.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1)—It must be evident to all members what the Government is doing, because until the housing shortage is met in far greater degree it is imperative that this legislation should continue. I have listened from year to year to the debates on this subject, and the present debate has followed the usual pattern. Sir Frank described it as a remnant of the war years and said the time had arrived when it was unnecessary to continue it further. Sir Arthur Rymill spoke in the same vein, and he admitted that if the legislation were discontinued it would have the immediate effect of increasing rents. Of course it would. We all know that, and it would increase the C Series figures, but they are no longer of any use to anyone except as a guide to the actual cost structure previously adopted for fixing the basic wage. With the discontinuance of this legislation rents would soar, and that is the reason for the continued agitation outside Parliament for the discontinuance of rent control, as it would enable the landlord to increase rents to what he considered an equitable rate. However, the tenant (the worker in the workshop), would have his standard of living reduced because any increase in rents is no longer considered in the compilation of the basic wage. The C Series index figures are now disregarded and quarterly adjustments have been discontinued. The Arbitration Court has adopted a totally different attitude in the compilation of the basic wage and now stresses "the ability of industry to pay." Only in this morning's paper we read of the action of one section of primary producers who are applying to the Arbitration Court for a reduction in wages because of the considerable fall

in the price of their product. That is the attitude being adopted by the Commonwealth Arbitration Court today.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—It awarded an increase on the score of prosperity.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I am pointing out the attitude of the court today in fixing the basic wage. When the C Series index figures were being used by the Commonwealth Arbitration Court in the compilation of the basic wage, one-sixth of the wage was allowed for rent. One sixth of £12 16s. which is the basic wage in South Australia today, and based on a family of a man and wife and three children, which would be a normal family unit occupying a five-roomed home, would give a rental for that home of approximately £2 2s. 6d. Are any landlords not getting that rent now? They are getting over and above that. If the Act were revoked our position would be similar to that in the other States where the rent control legislation has been discontinued. An extract from an article which originally appeared in the *Sydney Morning Herald* is as follows:—

Everything in Sydney is big—even the rents. Without batting an eye-lid landlords are asking, and getting, 10 guineas a week for two roomed flats tucked away in dingy apartment blocks in the not-so-pleasant parts of town.

For 12 guineas reasonably furnished two bedroom flats are now and again available in the suburbs. A Harbor view costs anything from 14 guineas a week to 30 guineas.

Occasionally luxury flats of two bedrooms overlooking the Harbor at spots such as Point Piper are let for terms of up to three years for about £5 10s. a week.

But these beautifully situated homes are not rushed because not many people care to pay the £2,000 plus asked by the landlord for the few hundred pounds worth of well-used furnishings.

Does Sir Arthur Rymill advocate that we have those conditions here? It would not be long before this sort of thing would happen if we discontinued the legislation. We are not picking up on home building in this State. The Housing Trust reports from time to time indicate that it still has between 2,000 and 2,500 applicants for homes.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—And we have just passed a Bill for 95 per cent advances.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Over the last 12 months the activities of the trust in building homes has dropped. Its report shows that the numbers of homes built in the metropolitan area and in the country, both for letting and for sale, are as follows:—For the year ended June 30, 1958, 1,726 single unit homes and 1,020 double unit homes, making a total of 2,746; for the year ended June 30, 1957, 1,681 single unit homes and 1,164 double unit homes, making a total of 2,845. That shows that 99 fewer homes were built in the last financial year than in the previous year. Consequently the great demand for homes still exists. I have heard it said on the floor of this Chamber that people will not build homes for speculative purposes because of this legislation, but no-one can say that this legislation is preventing any of these people from building homes for rental purposes.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—We can say that the legislation discourages them.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Nothing in the Bill can discourage them, because under this legislation they are free. If they build a home for letting purposes and can get somebody foolish enough to pay £10 a week for that home, they can charge that amount and there is nothing under this legislation to stop them.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—They know that if this sort of legislation is tolerated other legislation can be brought in.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—We can always go outside and dig up the proverbial red herring. There is no deterrent under this legislation to building homes for letting. Such homes would be exempt from the legislation, because the owners could enter into leases for a period of one, two or three years or even longer.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—That has only been over the last year or two.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—They are free to build homes for letting or selling purposes, but are they building them? Of course not. The outlay is not going into home building, and I readily admit that in this State very little home building is going on apart from the activity of the Housing Trust.

The Hon. E. Anthoney—Much flat building is going on.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I am speaking of speculation, not of people building their own homes. Most of the materials and manpower is being diverted from building homes to building big office buildings. The approximate expenditure on the Advertiser building—and I challenge the *Advertiser* to publish this statement in tomorrow's newspaper—is £1,000,000. The Commonwealth Government has already entered into a contract with Advertiser Ltd. to rent six and a half floors of the new 12-storey building at a rental of £80,800 a year. Those

six and a half floors will comprise 61,300 square feet. At present the Commonwealth Government in this State holds 244,250 square feet of floor space in their various offices for which it pays £155,600 a year.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—What has this to do with houses?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I will explain that in a moment. When the Advertiser building is completed and the Commonwealth Government moves in, it will vacate 46,000 square feet of office space in the city for which it is now paying £16,400 a year. It will pay a rental of £80,800 a year for 61,300 square feet in the Advertiser building.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry—Which will be air-conditioned.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Let us look at the overall picture of home building. In the year 1951-52, 81,806 homes were under construction throughout the Comonwealth. In 1952-53 the figure had dropped to 66,340—a very appreciable drop. In 1953-54 it was 65,650, and in 1954-55 it had dropped to 60,902. In 1955-56 the figure was stepped up to 64,971, and in 1956-57 it was 65,863. At the end of March, 1958, 64,520 homes were under construction. The figure fell from 81,806 in 1951-52 to 64,520, a total of 17,286 less homes, yet the demand for homes in this State—and I should think throughout the Commonwealth—is just as great today.

The Housing Trust reports also show that there is only a very small reduction in the waiting list because as the trust is supplying homes on the one hand the applications are coming in on the other hand because of the increased population and the natural increase in demand for homes. What would happen if this legislation were discontinued, as suggested by some members? I think we know perfectly well what would happen. Some people have spent their savings over the years, bought a little home for themselves and then gone on and bought another home and let it, and they may be in difficulties because they are not free to charge what rent they like. But there are always two sides to the argument. The people who are renting the homes are the workers in industry whose living standards are pegged, and they are the ones who would suffer if this legislation were discontinued. I will not advocate at any time the discontinuance of any legislation where that discontinuance would be harmful to the general community, as would the discontinuance of this legislation. Until the demand for homes has been met, this legislation should be continued. Sir Arthur Rymill said that when goods were in plentiful supply there was no necessity for control, but the same argument applies to houses: when they are in plentiful supply there will no longer be any need for control, but until then we must have some control for the protection of the tenants and their standard of living, and the protection of the whole community. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY (Southern)—I have often spoken on this legislation. I know of no harsher legislation than this. Throughout the period since the war and even during the war this legislation was one in which people could pick out very difficult cases. I should say, after listening to Mr. Bevan, that there would not be any more herrings left in the sea by the time he finished his speech.

Some years ago, shortly after the war—and I say this because of the propaganda put up by the Labor Party—I remember a widow living in the South-East. Her husband had been working in the timber industry and they had a departmental house. Before going to the South-East they had a house at Brighton and were paying about 13s. to 14s. a week to the State Bank. They let the house to a building contractor for a little more than 10s. a week. However, when the husband died and the wife was evicted from her Forestry Department house, she could not get her own home back and the only way she could get accommodation was by boarding.

Mr. Bevan talks about hard luck stories and refers to people who do not own anything, but what about the person who owns something and has used all his money trying to keep up payments on a house and then cannot get the dwelling back? Such things have embittered me against this legislation. The argument has been used for a long time that a person could not buy a house in the metropolitan area, but today you cannot walk down the street without seeing numerous notices of houses for sale; and there must be literally hundreds of others for sale for which no notice is put up. People do not want to buy houses while they can get one under controlled rent. As people are sheltering under this legislation, it is up to Parliament to take the necessary steps and revoke it.

Mr. Bevan complained about the erection of offices and big buildings. I believe it is a fine gesture on the part of those concerned. Six months ago the honourable member and other honourable members expressed disappointment because the building industry had lagged and many builders were out of employment. Many who had worked in the trade for 20 to 30

years without loss of time found themselves entirely without work. We should be pleased that they have since been able to find employment in other building activities. The Housing Trust has built to the limit of its finances. We know that it could have built more homes had the finance been available. We shall get out of this kind of control only premeditatedly. The Government did an extremely good job in liberalizing finance for the building of homes. Today a worker can get a 95 per cent guarantee on the little home he wants to build, or if a person desires to build a better type home he can get an 85 per cent advance. Surely that opens up an avenue whereby people can get out of their housing troubles if they want to. In every suburb one sees flats being erected, some for letting and others for sale. The answer is that this is the type of dwelling that is paying, but this does not apply to the building of individual homes for letting. We have passed the stage where this legislation can be considered a war measure. I do not say that it is not legislation suitable for finding homes for new Australians. Many of these people have managed to buy their own homes which otherwise would possibly have been available to our own people; but the answer is that if these people can do it, others could do it if they had the will. No-one can claim that the hardship is greater to the public who rent homes than to those who let them. If a person is relying on letting houses for an income, he must be near starvation today, because the increase in the cost of living has been terrifically greater than the increase of rent allowed. I cannot think of any good argument in favour of a continuation of this legislation. I know that there would be cases of hardship if it were revoked, but are there not cases of hardship in every walk and activity of life?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan—What about throwing this legislation out before next March?

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY—I should be happy to do that with the honourable member's help. In the best interests of the people of the State I oppose the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Provision as to holding over."

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—I should like the Minister to explain where the three months mentioned in this clause comes from, why it is in the clause, and whether it lines up with the rest of the legislation.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—I listened attentively to the discussion and I do not think it would make any difference to the honourable member if I told him, so I will satisfy myself by explaining the clause, which the honourable member seems to have difficulty in understanding. As this is not the kind of legislation with which we are associated every day of the week, I made an examination of the clause. Section 6 (2) of the Act provides that certain leases, for example, a lease in writing for two years or a lease of a new house, are not to be subject to the provisions of the Act. As a result of some decisions by the Local Court certain doubts have arisen as to what is the position if the lessee holds over after the expiration of his lease, and the purpose of clause 3 is to make provision for such a case. The exemptions set out in section 6 (2) fall into two classes.

The first class comprises leases of houses completed since 1953 and of houses which had not been let previous to 1953. All leases of such premises for whatever term and whether in writing or not are free from control.

The second class comprises leases in writing of houses where the term is of two years or more, written leases of combined shops and houses for one year or more and leases to employees of the lessor. Whilst such leases are free from control, subsequent leases of the same premises may, if not within the exemptions set out in the section, be subject to control. For example, if after the termination of a two years' lease, the house is let on a weekly tenancy that tenancy will be subject to control. Accordingly, clause 3 distinguishes between the two classes of leases.

As regards leases of new premises and of premises not privately let, the clause provides that the Act is not to apply to any notice to quit or any subsequent proceedings. Thus, the ordinary law as to landlord and tenant will apply and the policy of the Act will be preserved that, as regards premises of these kinds, there is no control of any kind.

As regards the class of case such as where the lessee under such as a two years' lease holds over, clause 3 provides that the lessor may give notice to quit at any time after the termination of the lease. The notice must be for a period of at least seven days but it is provided that proceedings to recover possession are not to be commenced until after three months after the expiration of the notice to quit. Thus, the lessee will be given some opportunity to find other premises. Apart from

this; however, it is provided that the Act is not to apply to the notice to quit or the subsequent proceedings.

The effect will be that if the lessee continues in possession it will, in effect, be on sufferance and the lessor will have the right to recover possession at any time. The clause goes on to provide that, during the time the lessee remains in possession in this manner, the rent of the premises will be that provided for by the lease or such other amount as is agreed in writing by the parties. Acceptance of rent by a lessor during a period of holding over can, in some circumstances, be regarded as creating a new letting. In order to provide against such a contingency, the clause provides that acceptance of such rent by the lessor will not be deemed to create a new tenancy. Thus, if he so desires, the lessor can leave the lessee in possession for any time he chooses and can accept rent during that time but his right to recover possession will not be impaired. This amendment tidies up something that was difficult to understand previously.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—It seems to boil down to the simple sentence that the three months period has been inserted to enable people to find other premises. This amendment relates to fixed period leases of two years or more. In other words, the lessee knows when he takes a lease that, unless he can get some further agreement from the landlord, he has to quit the premises—or he would but for this legislation—in two years' time. He has two years in which to prepare himself for the eventuality for which the Government thinks he should have another three months. In addition to that, he has the time of notice to quit, which may be seven days or more; he has the time it takes to get a court order, which I imagine, is three weeks. Thus, he has at least two years and one month in which to find other premises—and he is being given another three months. It is this type of legislation that makes people think wrongly and upsets our whole system of Government.

A client came to me a few years ago and said, "My landlord has given me notice to quit my premises. It is a terrible thing." I asked, "Why?" He replied, "I have been in these premises for years." I said, "What notice has he given you?" He replied that it was six months or a year, or something like that, and continued, "It is iniquitous. Surely they are not allowed to do that sort of thing, are they?" I said, "After all, he owns the premises, not you, and the fact that you have had them for so long does not make you the owner. Your trouble is that this restrictive legislation that we have had for so long has made you think that you have a right to stay in the premises for ever." That is the thinking to which I am totally opposed. It is utterly out of keeping with any ideas of the law or politics that I have ever had.

This clause takes another step in that direction. Here is a solemn contract made for a tenancy for two years, and nothing more, and the law we are asked to pass not only says that the man has to get a notice to quit of a certain period—and then the machinery takes longer to put into operation—but, despite an agreement for a fixed period, gives him another three months on top of that. I just cannot compose my thinking to agree with that. Although I have not given notice of my amendment, I move—

In paragraph II to strike out "after three months."

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I support the clause in its present form because of Sir Arthur Rymill's argument. The Chief Secretary has explained that it means a limitation on a two years' lease. He said that a tenant had two years in which to make other arrangements, but what about the other side? The lessee may expect to be able to renew his lease and makes no other provision. Then the lessor does not want to renew the lease or wants to renew it at a figure beyond the means of the lessee. He merely gives seven days' notice, according to Sir Arthur, and the lessee must get out, whereas the clause gives him three months' protection. Three months' notification is far too short.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—I support the amendment. The reasons for the agreement have been attacked in this clause. Certain premises which do not come under the Act of 1953 may be subject to a two years' lease. No provision is made to safeguard the lessor. Merely because a house has been previously controlled, we allow three months' notice even after a two years' lease. The lessee knows the term of the lease when he enters into it and should ascertain whether the lease is to be renewed. Instead of increasing the control, we should be lessening it.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—When it comes to voting on important matters, nobody has a greater appreciation of principles than I. I am always prepared to accede to the merits of a debate, where speakers can voice their opinions on some definite point of principle. However, I am surprised on this occasion to find that, in the very same session

in which honourable members have given a unanimous vote to extending the tenancy over something that has been defined by legislation as a given period, a few months later they say, "On principle, we cannot support it." I can only say that nothing in this Bill contravenes the principles already voted for unanimously in this Chamber. I hope that that principle will prevail in this measure.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL—The honourable the Chief Secretary has chosen to be rather cryptic in that remark. I do not know whether it is over the heads of other honourable members, but it is certainly over mine. All I can say is that, if during this session we have extended any tenancy that has any likeness to this, it was not extended against the will of one of the parties to the agreement.

The Committee divided on the amendment—

Ayes (4).—The Hons. L. H. Densley, A. J. Melrose, Sir Frank Perry, and Sir Arthur Rymill (teller).

Noes (14).—The Hons. E. Anthoney, K. E. J. Bardolph, S. C. Bevan, J. L. S. Bice, F. J. Condon, J. L. Cowan, E. H. Edmonds, N. L. Jude, Sir Lyell McEwin (teller), Hons. W. W. Robinson, C. D. Rowe, A. J. Shard, C. R. Story, and R. R. Wilson.

Majority of 10 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clause (4) and title passed and Bill reported without amendment; Committee's report adopted.

PULP AND PAPER MILLS AGREEMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 12. Page 1711).

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY (Central No. 2)—This Bill authorizes an agreement between the Government and other interested parties concerning the drainage and control of water in the South-East. At Millicent a board mill was established some 20 years ago designed to use the thinnings from the Government forests and other sources. That company has had a chequered career, but has now overcome its difficulties and is branching out into another field. It has become associated with Australian Paper Manufacturers, a big company with strong financial and technical resources which can greatly assist the industry. The Bill and the agreement have been submitted to and approved by a Select Committee so I do not think this Chamber need be much concerned about the conditions the Government has granted to the company, which is known as Apcel, the shares being jointly held by the Cellulose Company and A.P.M. At the outset it is intended to produce semi-chemical pulp and finally to develop a full chemical pulp, and the ultimate cost of the installation is expected to reach about £2,000,000 in two years' time. The Cellulose Company already has an agreement with the Government regarding the use of thinnings and water at Snuggery, and it holds, I believe, the only place in South Australia which is near to the forest areas and has a supply of water sufficient to permit such a mill to function. Indeed it is unique not only in South Australia but in Australia, in that there are few localities where large areas of softwood exist. Although other States have pine forests they are not concentrated as they are in the South-East, thereby making for easy transport of the timber to the mills.

The history of this company is interesting. It started prior to the war but encountered many difficulties and the Government had to come to its assistance, and so the Government is now also interested financially. I was rather interested to hear Sir Arthur Rymill on that point, for in my judgment the holding by the Government of shares in private companies is not desirable.

The Hon. J. L. S. Bice—I suggest that there is a difference in this case.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—I admit that there is only one mill of this type in South Australia, consequently there is an absence of conflict of interests. That is one excuse, and another is that the Government is concerned in the use of timber grown in its forests; it must be either sawn or treated in some other manner before it can be placed on the market, and thus the Government has a measure of interest, but it should endeavour to get somebody else to undertake the work rather than develop its own interest. If I am a judge there will have to be several outlets for this timber if it is to be profitably converted into money, and the Government would be well advised, as opportunity offers, to quit its shares, as it could do at a profit, and allow the company to carry on unfettered. Although the Government holds only a minority of shares it has two directors in Sir Richard Butler and the Under-Secretary, Mr. Drew.

That in itself is, to my mind, not advisable. The Government accepts certain responsibilities if it nominates directors and appoints them to the board. If this company is to develop into an industry worth millions of pounds, the shareholding of the Government will have to develop on similar lines if it wishes to hold its directorate members.

To my mind, therefore, the Government would be well advised to dispose of its shares as opportunity offers and not have nominees on the board. If those nominees remained, the Government could either be blamed for a failure in the industry or would have to associate itself with any increased development. Admittedly, the Government is interested in the timber, therefore I am very pleased to see the association of the Cellulose Company with the Australian Paper Mills, which latter company in the first place years ago endeavoured to get the thinnings from the forests at a rate that would have been rather disastrous for the forests had the agreement been carried out. No mention has been made, either in the Bill or in the Minister's explanation, of the timber rights which this company must have, either itself or through the Cellulose Company. We have heard about the water from the Snuggery drain and from underground sources, and we have also heard that the Government undertakes to supply an efficient method for the disposal of effluent, which by the way is one of the main difficulties in establishing a mill of this type, because the effluent can be objectionable and has to have free and quick access to the sea.

I am pleased to see the development taking place. Those who have visited New Zealand know that the softwood forests there completely dwarf our areas in the South-East. This proposed activity is small compared with the millions of pounds being spent in two or three areas in the establishment of paper mills, board mills and pulp factories in New Zealand. Unless this project in the South-East is started soon it seems that there is a danger of the New Zealand competition being felt, as Australia is one of the markets supplied by New Zealand at present. I see nothing objectionable in the Bill; indeed, I see much advantage to the area and the State in the development of the proposed mills. I think the mills are sound financially and technically, and that they will result in the establishment of industries which will be a credit to the company itself and an advantage to the people of this State. I support the Bill.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY (Central No. 2)—This Bill should meet with the approval of every member. The scheme was submitted to a Select Committee which subjected it to a fairly strict inquiry. It called for evidence, but the local district council did not see fit to submit evidence, apparently because it was perfectly satisfied with the scheme. As Sir Frank Perry said, the Australian Paper Mills years ago made an offer for the whole of the thinnings of the forests at a fairly nominal rate, and the proposed agreement at that time also extended to the growing of trees if sufficient thinnings could not be found to satisfy the company's needs. That offer was very nearly accepted. However, after strenuous action on the part of members of the House of Assembly, who took strong exception to the agreement, and of whom I was one, it was delayed. The matter was then submitted to an inquiry which took three years to conclude, with the result that the A.P.M. went out of the picture altogether and the forests were saved. It is quite true, as Sir Frank Perry has said, that if that agreement had been concluded the lot of the forests would have been a very sad one. The forests have now gone from strength to strength and have been a very great service to the community. The timber from those forests was a very great help during the war.

These two companies, when they go into full production, should be beneficial not only to the South-East but to the whole of the State. I do not think for a moment that there will be any lack of demand for timber. It seems that the demand will be very strong, and I am wondering whether our planting programme of 5,000 acres a year will be big enough to satisfy the requirements of these industries, plus the increased requirements of the people of the State with its growing population. I think we shall require much more timber than the South-East is at present producing, and the department may have to step up its planting programme to meet the needs.

It was once a problem getting rid of the water from the South-East, but now we find that water is becoming useful because every gallon will be required for the successful working of this industry. I am pleased to support this measure, which will be of great benefit to the State. I see no objection to the Bill at all, and I therefore trust that it will pass and that this undertaking will come to fruition.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY (Southern)—This Bill is to ratify an agreement between the

Government, the District Council of Millicent, Apcel Limited, and Cellulose (Australia) Limited, and it is one which gives me much pleasure to support. I believe that this project will be very important to South Australia. This is the fifth Bill in one year with regard to agreements which the Government has brought before us. I think that is a major achievement for any Government, and probably unique in the history of South Australia. I give full credit to the Government for the great industrial advance with which it has been associated in South Australia in the last few years, particularly in the fields in which legislation has been introduced this session.

The forests of the South-East have passed through many troublous times in years gone by. We are indeed proud of the very fine forests which the Government has built up and which it owns in the South-East, and also of those forests owned by private companies. When the agreement was originally made with Cellulose it was expected that that company would take much more of the thinnings of timber than they were eventually able to take, and in that respect the Cellulose Company was rather disappointing. Much timber was left about in the forests that could have been used in an undertaking such as is envisaged in this legislation.

It is interesting to look back over the history of the forests. I think it was in 1930, when the Hon. S. R. Whitford was Commissioner of Forest Lands, that the Government was seriously considering selling the forests. The Labor Government that was in office contemplated selling the thinnings at a nominal rate to the A.P.M., as Mr. Anthoney has just mentioned. I remember that later the then member for Southern (Mr. Mowbray) fought vigorously against the action of the Government. The history of the forests has not been altogether one of prosperity. We know the troubles that Cellulose (Australia) Limited and the forests have gone through, and today we are happy that both those undertakings are proving so successful. No doubt the advent of the war brought about an increased demand and increased prosperity both to the forests and the Cellulose Company. We will now be able to make full use of the thinnings, and I believe this will be at a price which will be of some value to the Government. Added to the profit the Government has made over recent years from the forests and sawmills, this will be advantageous to South Australia. It will also be advantageous because of the decentralization of industry. This big industrial concern in the South-East will employ many men and benefit not only employment in the district, but also the forestry undertaking. There is much water in the vicinity, but whether there will be ample as the years go by is not so certain. However, it would appear from the advice received from the engineers that there will be sufficient. The fact that the Apcel Company will make paper will be to the advancement and advantage of South Australia. It therefore gives me much pleasure to support the second reading.

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

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE ERADICATION FUND BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 13. Page 1712.)

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON (Northern)—I support the Bill, as I consider it very important legislation. Already we have had excellent speeches upon it and perhaps no more is necessary to be said to commend it to honourable members. I congratulate the Agricultural Council on its foresight in recommending this legislation and the respective Governments, State and Commonwealth, on the readiness with which they have implemented it to safeguard Australia from the ravages of this very far-reaching disease. It is one of the most wide-spread of the world's livestock diseases and is prevalent in most European countries as well as in Africa, Asia and South America. The only countries that can claim to be free are Australia, New Zealand and North America, although outbreaks occurred in Mexico in 1946 and in Canada in 1952 and were eradicated only at very heavy cost.

As was pointed out by Mr. Melrose, this disease affects all cloven-hoofed animals such as cattle, sheep, goats, and pigs, but is chiefly a disease of cattle. In dairy herds it is especially to be feared and not so much because of the deaths it causes. These are relatively few, but the trouble is that the disease spreads so rapidly through a herd and affects nearly every animal and drastically cuts down production for a long period. An outbreak would drastically affect our milk and butter supplies. Perhaps its worst feature is the readiness with which it spreads. It is the most infectious of all diseases affecting man or animal. The symptoms of the disease

were set out in the *Agricultural Journal* of November, 1956, and included the following:—

A common symptom of the early stage of the foot and mouth disease in cattle is that saliva forms profusely and drips from the mouth, usually accompanied by sucking sounds and the smacking of the lips while chewing.

This journal goes to all members of the Agricultural Bureau and is a means of disseminating knowledge regarding the disease, but it could be disseminated to a larger extent if the milk firms had a pamphlet prepared and sent a copy to all clients with the monthly return.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—What is the method of treatment?

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—Slaughtering. In many countries foot and mouth disease has gained such a hold that it cannot be eradicated and all that can be done is to keep it within bounds. Care by our quarantine services has kept Australia free from the disease, but the danger of its being brought here is growing greater. It was introduced into Canada by a migrant farm worker in February, 1952, and before freedom was declared in August of the same year compensation amounting to 311,445 dollars (or roughly £120,000 Australian) had been paid. One of the greatest outbreaks in Europe was the most recent, continued for 18 months in 1951 and 1952 and cost approximately £240,000,000. During the same period Denmark had 26,000 outbreaks, Holland 23,000 and Democratic Germany 155,000, and in the second half of June there were 39,000 outbreaks. The United States of America has been very worried about the disease. An outbreak began in Mexico in 1946 after two shipments of cattle from South America. Slaughter of the infected stock was carried out and at the peak 200,000 animals a month were being killed and by 1951 a total of 17,000,000 stock had been vaccinated four times, at a total cost of £36,000,000.

I visited South America recently and when we arrived at Maracaibo Airport we were taken in hand by two military police with revolvers at their hips and marched through a disinfecting bath. Every person visiting the State of Venezuela had to pass through a similar bath. When a person travels from one State to another he has to get out of his motor car and walk through one of these baths. However, there is some laxity, as children are allowed to proceed without treatment. It is said there that if a woman driver smiles at the inspectors they allow her to proceed. While I was there there was a grave outbreak of the disease among the Venezuelan dairy herds.

In Australia, and especially in South Australia, we have a different set-up to guard against the introduction of fruit fly; inspectors at the borders carry out an effective control. I commend our officers of the Quarantine Department. It will be remembered that when the Olympic Games were being held in Victoria quarantine officers recommended that no horses be allowed to enter Australia to take part, consequently the equestrian events were held in Sweden. That was a wise precaution. Whilst we adopt such stringent measures I feel sure that we shall be able to prevent the introduction of the disease by imported animals. At the moment there is a total prohibition of cattle entering Australia and I believe that unless there is some unforeseen event we shall keep this scourge away from our stock. I commend the Government for so readily introducing the Bill, and by this action I believe we are locking the door before the disease enters here, with the added provision for the payment of compensation should any animals be destroyed. This will be a means of encouraging people, if they suspect that their animals are infected, to notify the department early and in this way if the disease happens to break out we can control it in its early stages. I feel sure that this measure will go a long way towards securing this result and therefore have much pleasure in supporting it.

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

HOUSING IMPROVEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 13. Page 1713.)

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY (Central No. 2)—This Bill deals with similar authority to that given to the housing authority in respect of factories and types of buildings other than houses outside the metropolitan area; in effect, it brings the same authority into the metropolitan area. However, it goes a little further. Perhaps we have not fully examined the effect of its proposals. The purpose of the original Act was—

To provide for the improvement of sub-standard housing conditions, to provide for housing of persons of limited means, to regulate the rentals of sub-standard dwelling-houses in the metropolitan area and in certain other parts of the State, and for other purposes.

Clearly the aim was the improvement of houses. In effect, it has controlled the building of all small houses for rental and many houses for sale. It has had a pronounced effect. It has handed over housing largely to the control of the Housing Trust, along with the financing of home building largely by the Government. The Government now seeks to add to this Act, which dealt primarily with sub-standard houses and homes for people with limited means, a much wider authority—the power to build—

any shop, workshop, factory, hall or building of any kind which in the opinion of the housing authority will beneficially provide for the requirements of persons inhabiting houses erected by the housing authority.

True, it is limited to a small degree by that clause, but houses are being built all over the metropolitan area and it seems that the Housing Trust under this authority can start building any type of building it thinks is required by the people.

The Hon. L. H. Densley—It has done that for a good many years.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY—Yes, which shows how the presumed authority can be acted upon without any authority at all, and how custom grows up to licence. This Act was originally designed for the purpose of building homes for people of limited means, mainly on the basic wage, and improving sub-standard areas. As such, it received the commendation of honourable members at that time. This Bill, however, goes a step further, which I criticize and do not like. All sorts of people desire buildings of various types built and all sorts of methods can be used to get them built. We are following too much the practice of giving the Housing Trust a stranglehold on building and development, in which we would like to see many others engage. It has the effect of using Government money—I do not know whether these places are sold or rented—and preventing it from being used, as originally intended, for sub-standard homes and small homes for people of limited means. We have all the architects and builders necessary and people can obtain facilities for building outside the Housing Trust, therefore I see no reason why, in the metropolitan area, they should have to go to the Trust for this purpose. I intend to vote against the Bill.

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

MAINTENANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Consideration in Committee of the House of Assembly's amendment:—

After clause 5, page 2, line 10—Insert the following new clause:—

5a. *Amendment of principal Act, s. 151—Board may pay for maintenance of child in private reformatory.*—(1) Section 151 of the principal Act is amended by striking out the word "twenty" in the fourth line thereof and by inserting in lieu thereof the word "forty."

(2) This section shall be deemed to have had effect as from the fifteenth day of April, nineteen hundred and fifty-eight.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary)—The amendment inserts a new clause 5a which amends section 151 of the principal Act which deals with payments by the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board for the maintenance of State children in private reformatory schools or institutions. Under the existing section such payments are limited to a sum not exceeding 20s. a week for each child, a maximum which in the opinion of the Government should be increased. In 1957 section 150 of the Act was amended to increase the weekly amount payable to foster parents of State children from 30s. to 50s. per week for each child. In the early part of this year the Sisters of the Home of the Good Shepherd at Plympton, an institution which houses about 20 State girls, applied to the department for an increase in the allowance for State girls detained there. The department, under a mistaken impression that the 1957 amendment to section 150 of the Act applied, increased the allowance from 20s. to 40s. per week. The section which authorizes the payment of maintenance for State children to private reformatories is section 151, which was not amended in 1957, and it is therefore necessary to propose this amendment in order to ratify the past action of the department and provide for future payments at the new rate. There is no doubt that the proposed increase from 20s. to 40s. per week is desirable for the purpose of bringing section 151 into line with section 150 as amended last year. The reference to the 15th of April, 1958, in subclause (2) of clause 5a relates to the date on which the increased payments were first made to the Home of the Good Shepherd. By making the clause retrospective to that date the Government proposes to ratify the action of the department, which although made in good faith and with good cause, was nevertheless not authorized by the principal Act.

I submit the amendment which legalizes what, although a mistake and not authorized by the Act, I think was fair and reasonable.

The Hon. E. ANTHONEY—There is much merit in this amendment. I know that the department experienced considerable difficulty in getting foster mothers because the amount it could offer was too small to induce people to take these children. Even now 40s. a week is little enough. A while ago I took out the figures of the various institutions to see what it was costing, and I found that 40s. a week would nowhere near cover it. How these people managed on 20s. a week I cannot imagine. The amendment has my hearty commendation.

Amendment agreed to.

HOSPITALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Minister of Health) introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Hospitals Act, 1934-1952. Read a **first time.**

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It amends section 33 of the Hospitals Act, which provides for the appointment of an advisory committee to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Honourable members may remember, as published in the press on my return from overseas, that a report to the Government included certain recommendations applying to the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Part of those recommendations was a proposal that each hospital should have its own separate advisory committee. I say that to make it clear to honourable members that this alteration in the committee of the Royal Adelaide Hospital has no bearing whatever on the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, where the Government can appoint a committee without being tied to any particular legislation. I wish to make it clear that an appointment of an advisory committee to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital will be made when the honoraries have been appointed, so that they will be there to make their own nominations. That is by way of introduction, because honourable members may be wondering, when I submit this amendment covering only the advisory committee of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, what our intentions are in relation to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

Since those committees were recommended, the Royal College of Surgeons and the Royal College of Physicians have applied for representation on the advisory committee. A reason given was the increased number of honoraries operating today compared with the number when the Royal Adelaide Hospital legislation was first drawn up. At that time there were about 30 honoraries all told, compared with probably 70 honoraries today, plus clinical assistants. So it is important that in making these appointments proper representation should be made on the committee which makes the appropriate recommendations.

This Bill makes alterations in the constitution of the committee appointed under section 33 of the Hospitals Act to advise the University and the Adelaide Hospital Board with respect to matters concerning the medical and dental courses of the University, and the attendance and instruction at the Adelaide Hospital of students in those courses. In practice, the principal function of the committee is to recommend the appointment of the honorary physicians, surgeons, and dentists of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. These appointees, besides being members of the staff of the Hospital, also hold appointments from the University as clinical teachers.

At present, the committee consists of seven persons. Three of them are University representatives, one being nominated by the Council of the University, one by the Faculty of Medicine, and another by the Faculty of Dentistry. Two are nominated by the members of the Honorary Medical Staff of the Adelaide Hospital and two are nominated by the Adelaide Hospital Board. By arrangement, one of the board's representatives is elected as chairman, with the result that only one representative of the Board votes on matters coming before the committee.

It is proposed in the Bill to enlarge the committee to ten men. The three additional members will be a chairman appointed by the Governor, a nominee of the Council of the Royal Australian College of Physicians, and a nominee of the Council of the Royal Australian College of Surgeons. These two bodies have for some time been seeking representation on the Advisory Committee and on other like bodies throughout the Commonwealth. The argument in favour of giving them recognition is that they have special knowledge of the qualifications of physicians and surgeons and are therefore able to give valuable help in recommending appointments of the honorary clinical teachers.

The proposal to have an independent Chairman of the Committee will make it unnecessary for one of the Adelaide Hospital Board representatives to act as chairman, and the Hospital Board will accordingly have two effective representatives instead of one. In consequence of the increase in the number of members of the committee, the Bill proposes to raise the quorum from four members to five.

The Hon. F. J. CONDON (Leader of the Opposition)—The Bill enlarges from seven to 10 the members of the committee appointed under section 33 of the Hospitals Act to advise the University and the Adelaide Hospital Board on matters concerning the medical and dental courses of the University and the attendance and instruction at the Adelaide Hospital of students in those courses, and increases the quorum from four to five members. I see no objection and I support the second reading.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY (Southern)—I, too, am pleased to support the Bill. I think the recommendation of the Chief Secretary that it is desirable to increase the number of members of the committee is sufficient to assure us that the work may be done with greater efficiency. The new members to be appointed will be a nominee of the Council of the Royal Australian College of Physicians and a nominee of the Council of the Royal Australian College of Surgeons with a chairman appointed by the Governor. I also express my pleasure in the fact that separate advisory committees will be appointed for Royal Adelaide and Queen Elizabeth Hospitals. This is a condition which has been sought by a large number of people as they believe it will be in the best interests of both institutions. As it has a large bearing on the education of medical students it is desirable that they should have close association with those organizations and the medical fraternity.

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

LIMITATION OF ACTIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General), having obtained leave, introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Limitation of Actions Act, 1936-1956. Read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.19 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, November 19, at 2.15 p.m.