

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Thursday, November 7, 1963.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. L. H. Densley) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS.

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

- Appropriation (No. 2),
- City of Whyalla Commission Act Amendment,
- Explosives Act Amendment,
- Land Settlement Act Amendment,
- Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment,
- Associations Incorporation Act Amendment,
- Offenders Probation Act Amendment,
- Police Regulation Act Amendment.

QUESTION.**PIG BRANDING.**

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I address my question to the Chief Secretary representing the Minister of Agriculture in this Chamber. It relates to the compulsory branding of pigs. Great difficulty has been experienced in ascertaining the origins of various forms of pig disease. There has been quite an outcry in the industry for the Government to introduce appropriate legislation. Does the Government intend this session to introduce legislation on this matter, which in certain more enlightened quarters of the pig industry is desired?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The subject which the honourable member has mentioned has received some consideration and I know it is occupying the attention of the Department of Agriculture at the moment, but I do not expect that legislation will be ready in time to be introduced in this immediate sitting of Parliament.

PHYSIOTHERAPISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Minister of Health) obtained leave to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Physiotherapists Act, 1945-1955.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (DIAMOND TURNS).

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Roads) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Traffic Act, 1961. Read a first time.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this short Bill is to provide for "diamond turns" as the general rule for vehicles turning to the right. Under section 70 of the principal Act the prescribed method of turning to the right is to drive to the centre of the road on which a vehicle is travelling and then turn so that the vehicle is kept as near as practicable to the left boundary of the road into which it turns. This procedure must be followed unless there are words or signs indicating that a short right turn must be made.

Clause 3 of the Bill repeals and re-enacts section 70 of the principal Act to provide for the short right turn (known as the "diamond turn") to be made in all cases except where there are words or signs indicating a contrary course to be followed. The effect of the amendment is that a vehicle, before turning into a two-way road, must move to the centre of the road, pass to the right of the centre of the intersection and enter the road into which it turns on the left of, but as near as practicable to, the centre of that road, and before turning into a one-way road must enter that road as near as practicable to the right boundary of that road. Under subsection (7) of new section 70 the vehicle is deemed for the purposes of that section to enter the road into which it turns when it crosses the prolongation of the property line of the road on which it was travelling. The property line is defined (subsection (9)) as being the boundary line of land abutting the footpath or road adjoining that land. The amendment is in conformity with the provision of the National Road Traffic Code and has been recommended by the Road Traffic Board.

I think it is quite obvious to all honourable members that the doubt in the minds of many motorists that has existed over the last 12 months or so with regard to diamond turns should be removed. Many people realize, shall I say, the common sense of diamond turns and have been using them where the markings have not been made on the road. In layman's language this will make diamond turning the ordinary rule of the road except where the road is marked otherwise, and this is in conformity with the rule that applies in other States at the moment. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

RIVER MURRAY WATERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (TROTTLING).

Read a third time and passed.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (MENTAL HEALTH AND PRISONS) BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEWIN (Minister of Health): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill amends both the Mental Health Act, 1935-1962, and the Prisons Act, 1936-1956, so as to make provision for the more effective custody, housing and treatment of persons who are criminal mental defectives and to simplify the administration of those Acts in relation to such persons. At present criminal mental defectives are housed in a ward at the Parkside Mental Hospital but a recent survey of that hospital revealed that the facilities available there are inadequate to maintain maximum security in the public interest. Mental health authorities also consider that it is most undesirable that special security patients be housed in the grounds of a mental hospital where non-security patients are treated as the trend now is towards the opening up of mental hospitals and the abolition of their security atmosphere. A security block built and operating on prison lines in a modern mental hospital is an anachronism. At the same time adequate security measures have to be taken and maintained so far as criminal mental defectives are concerned. For these reasons both the Director-General of Medical Services and the Sheriff and Comptroller of Prisons have recommended that a part of the Yatala Labour Prison be declared under the Mental Health Act to be a hospital for criminal mental defectives and in order to give effect to the recommendation certain amendments to that Act and the Prisons Act have been recommended by the Crown Solicitor. This Bill gives effect to those recommendations.

The Bill is in three parts. Part I deals with the short title and arrangement of the Bill and needs no explanation; Part II contains the amendments to the Mental Health Act and Part III contains the amendments to the Prisons Act. The amendment proposed by clause 3 is consequential to the new section 18a to be enacted by clause 4. This new section

applies only to an institution which is a part of a prison declared to be a hospital for criminal mental defectives under section 16 of the Act, and is designed to assign the responsibilities and duties in connection with the medical care, treatment and welfare of the patients of the institution to the medical superintendent and the internal administration, the custody and security of patients, etc., to the officer in charge of the prison. For the purpose of more effectively defining the duties of the medical superintendent and the officer in charge of the prison, and of avoiding any inconsistencies between the provisions of the Mental Health Act and the Prisons Act, regulations may be made for the purpose of assigning to the officer in charge of the prison certain of the administrative and custodial duties, responsibilities, powers and functions of the medical superintendent under the Mental Health Act and of declaring that any provision of that Act shall not apply in relation to such an institution. The amendments to the Prisons Act proposed by this Bill are designed to place each hospital for criminal mental defectives (when it is a part of a prison) and the patients therein under the administrative control of the officer in charge of the prison and for that purpose clause 6 amends the definitions of "prison" and "prisoner" to include such hospitals and patients respectively.

Clause 7 will enact a new section 15a which will contain a regulation-making power with respect to administration, custody, discipline and employment of such patients and with respect to such matters as are necessary to give effect to the objects of the two Acts. For the purpose of avoiding inconsistency between the two Acts, the regulations may declare that any provision of the Prisons Act and regulations shall not apply to such patients. Section 62 of the Prisons Act deals with the offence of harbouring a person under sentence of imprisonment who is illegally at large and section 63 deals with the holding of communication with and the giving of forbidden articles to prisoners undergoing sentence. Clauses 8 and 9 in effect extend the application of those sections to patients of a hospital for criminal mental defectives where the hospital is a part of a prison. This Bill is to give immediate effect to a problem that concerns the administration of our mental hospitals that care for criminals and mental defectives. The present position is not safe from the point of view of public interests and is a risk to the officers of these hospitals. After consideration by the two departments concerned the Bill has been introduced to provide for a

safe method of custody in the treatment of patients. I commend the Bill to honourable members for their consideration.

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

RENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 6. Page 1490.)

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1): I support the Bill, which is important to the Renmark Irrigation Trust. I could speak at length on the measure but I will not do so. Clause 3 amends section 64 of the principal Act and deals with special irrigations. Ordinary irrigations are made about four times a year, but at times it is necessary to have special irrigations. For various reasons, such as climatic conditions, light and heavy soil types, etc., these special irrigations are essential. Also, over the years there have been considerable extensions of the vine and fruitgrowing areas. In what I may call the dark ages it was not considered that special irrigations would be necessary, but now they are required during the year. I understand that the special irrigations were given under by-laws of the Renmark Irrigation Trust, but only with the consent of the Minister in writing, which was obtained in accordance with section 64. This could be inconvenient, especially as the consent must be in writing. Because of his Ministerial duties, or for other reasons, the Minister may not be available to give the consent when the irrigation is required. He could even be out of the State and there could be a delay in getting the consent, which would cause inconvenience to the trust.

After the 1959 amendment of the principal Act it was necessary to redraft the by-laws. That was done and they were submitted to the Minister of Lands in 1960. They were sent on to the Crown Solicitor, who advised that in his opinion the Act did not give the necessary power for the trust to make such by-laws, and that before he could give a certificate the Act would have to be amended. That is why we have the Bill before us. I understand that the by-laws provided for special irrigations. The practice was for the trust to advertise asking for landholders to indicate the area to be irrigated and the quantity of water wanted, and the by-laws set out the charge that could be made for the water. However, under the Act the trust had no authority to do this. Clauses 3 and 4 of the Bill enable the trust to make regulations setting out the conditions associated

with special irrigations, and to determine the charge for them. The matter will be dealt with under regulations, in the same way as it was under by-laws. I understand there will be little difference between the regulations and the old by-laws.

Clause 5 deals with section 121o of the principal Act. Under it the Renmark Irrigation Trust is authorized to use revenue derived from the sale of electricity for certain purposes. That amendment is necessary to enable the trust to repay principal and interest on a loan of £80,000, which the trust, with the approval of the Government, raised with the Bank of New South Wales. Section 121o did not contain a provision authorizing the trust to do this. Now the trust will be able to repay the principal and interest from revenue derived from the sale of electricity. The trust buys electric power in bulk from the Electricity Trust for all requirements in the area under its jurisdiction, including irrigation and domestic uses. The power is resold to the various ratepayers, but some of it is used by the trust for the working of pumps and for other purposes. About 1959 when the powers of the Irrigation Trust were curtailed, the District Council of Renmark was given jurisdiction in certain matters. That jurisdiction was previously held by the trust. Now we have two authorities dealing with the sale of electric power—the district council and the Renmark Irrigation Trust. I think it should be under the one authority—the Electricity Trust, which could directly sell power to the trust and the consumers. This would enable the Renmark Irrigation Trust to apply to the Electricity Trust for special rates. Under such circumstances the Renmark Irrigation Trust would be better off than having to buy the power in bulk for resale to its ratepayers. However, this is a matter for the trust to decide.

Clause 7 contains a number of amendments to section 123 of the principal Act. In 1959 this section was written into the principal Act to deal with drainage in the irrigation trust area in Renmark. When the Bill in 1959 came before this Council, I spoke at some length about the necessity of urgent drainage work in the Renmark area. I was subjected to some criticism about what I said by some people who said that even the experts did not know anything about the effect of flooding. I was told, "If the experts know nothing about it, what do you know about it?" I was, of course, only a metropolitan member! Over the years it has been proved that what I said then was correct.

Renmark is the oldest irrigation settlement in the Commonwealth. I believe it was established in 1887 by the Chaffey brothers, and it is natural that over the years there has been a rising of the water table, with the inevitable build-up of salt. This process takes place in all irrigation areas sooner or later. In the case of Renmark the River Murray locks have helped to raise the water table, but the culminating point was reached in 1956 during the big flooding by the Murray itself. We know what happened, especially in the Renmark area, because of the lack of drainage. Prior to that flood, there had been a considerable rise in the water table. It was some time before the floodwaters receded and the land became a little less waterlogged than hitherto. The problems in Renmark were considerable. The result was that considerable damage was done because many vines and fruit trees died. The roots were steeped in water of a saline nature, which killed all growth in that area. The blocks there suffered considerably from the flooding; indeed, there are blocks that have not recovered from the effects of that flood, aggravated by the rising of the water table. A close examination of the production figures in the Renmark area reveals that they are much worse than the figures for other more favoured areas.

This means, of course, that those growers are worse off financially than growers in other areas. Because of the decreased production from their holdings, they do not earn as much money as people in other areas do. As I stated in 1959, the flooding from the river necessitated urgent drainage work, and financial assistance was necessary. It was given by the Government. In the nearby area of Loxton, I think that urgent drainage work is necessary, too, although Loxton is only a new irrigation area compared with Renmark. However, it was found in 1959 that drainage was absolutely necessary in the Loxton area. The Government made available from revenue £1,000,000 for drainage in the Loxton area, but a different outlook prevailed when we looked at the Renmark area. Approximately £1,000,000 was made available for the Renmark area—£750,000 by the Government and £250,000 by the trust itself from its revenue. Of the £750,000 made available by the Government, spread over a period of 10 years, £500,000 was in the form of a grant and £250,000 in the form of a loan, on a pound-for-pound basis with the £250,000 to be made available by the trust itself. This money was to be used for drainage work, and that work has been proceeding ever since.

It is anticipated that this work can be completed within seven years, and not within the 10 years originally contemplated, so this Bill amends from 10 years to seven years the period within which this work shall be completed. It provides also that moneys will be made available so that work can be carried on, and sufficient money will be available for completion within seven years. Although there are a number of amending clauses in relation to section 123 of the principal Act, they all deal with drainage, the finance available to the trust, and the amount of money that the trust itself will be called upon to subscribe.

The Hon. C. R. Story: The Bill does not alter the Renmark Irrigation Trust's contribution; it still has 10 years in which to do its part.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. The period of time is reduced but the finance available is increased, including the £250,000 that the Government is making available for the seven-year period. But all these clauses are interwoven in that section. This Bill is necessary because the sooner this work can be completed the sooner the blocks will get the full advantage of extensive drainage. Some internal drainage work will be done, too. This Bill will enable the work to go ahead and be completed sooner than was originally anticipated. It is a considerable improvement on the 1959 Act. I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I rise to support the second reading of the Bill which, as the Hon. Mr. Bevan has said, is of great importance to the area particularly mentioned. This Bill comes to us as the result of a good deal of experience. In 1959 the Government, after consultation, made available a sum of £750,000 to the Renmark Irrigation Trust in consideration of its spending £250,000 of its own money out of revenue. This was not done lightly; it was not done terribly smoothly, because the Renmark Irrigation Trust was asked to give up its powers of local government which meant that the people of Renmark had to find some alternative. This, as honourable members could well imagine, in any town always brings in its wake certain disturbances and troubles.

The people of the district, in their wisdom, decided to hand over the powers of local government to the municipality of Renmark and amending Bills went through this Chamber in due course which made Renmark the largest municipality, in area, in the State. It was a unique municipality, necessitating special provisions in the Local Government Act.

The position since 1959 has settled down to the great advantage, in my opinion, of the people of Renmark. Local government is working extremely well there and the district is progressing. The Renmark Irrigation Trust's administration has proved itself, as is reported by the Minister who was in charge of the Select Committee on the Bill—the Minister of Irrigation. That is a very good thing because there was a great deal of doubt in some quarters at the time as to whether the trust was a competent body to carry on the duties of a water trust and a drainage authority. I think that this has been proved beyond doubt and very much of the good feeling that has been built up between the Government and the departments has resulted from the appointment of the Renmark Irrigation Trust's engineer, Mr. Waltham. He is an excellent officer and has rendered sterling service since his appointment.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: As a matter of fact the trust has had some very efficient officers.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I should know. I have been paying rates there for years. Like the people of this State under this Government, the people of Renmark have never had it better than under the present administration. This Bill, as Mr. Bevan has said, contains three main points: it deals with the supply of water for special irrigations, the Renmark Irrigation Trust's electricity undertaking, and the variation of the contribution which the Government is making to the drainage of the area. We have always had special irrigations in the Renmark Irrigation Trust area; the necessity for this is nothing new. It has been known for many years that it is necessary to apply more water than the four or five general irrigations that are provided by the trust for the straight-out water rate. People who wish to grow more to the acre need water more frequently, especially with the advent of spray irrigation with smaller applications.

Although we have always paid for special irrigations it comes as a shock to some of us that perhaps we did not have to, because there has apparently been some doubt whether this section of the Act is in order. I cannot understand why the Minister was the authority to tell the Irrigation Trust how much it should charge for water or whether or not it could actually deliver water to growers in the area. However, this is probably one of those things that happen. The necessity for special irrigations is becoming more and more apparent,

especially as we have this comprehensive drainage scheme and internal drains in the area at present. The salinity of the district has built up much more slowly than in the newer areas. When I say "the newer areas" we must remember that Renmark is the oldest irrigation settlement in the Commonwealth—it is 76 years old—and it has taken much longer in that area for the salt to become completely impregnated in the root zone. However, although it took a long time for this to happen it will take a long time for the salt to be washed out and more frequent applications of water to the land will be necessary to force the salt into the drainage systems.

I do not think there is much cause to worry about the first section of the Bill, under irrigation. It gives the trust a greater advantage because it will now be able to control this matter itself, which I think it has proved itself competent to do. The next important aspect of the Bill deals with electricity, and this again was quite a contentious part of the agreement when the Government offered the sum of £750,000 to the trust. The Renmark corporation had had its undertaking and power station, and so had the Irrigation Trust. There was no desire on the part of the trust to operate in the town area, neither had it been the desire of the town to take over the trust's operations prior to this merger of local government.

Then there was a strong feeling, particularly in the area of the municipality that, because it was the local government body, it should have the franchise for the distribution of electricity. This was resisted and I think the Premier had to become the arbiter in the matter. Both electricity undertakings still continue through the Electricity Trust of South Australia and both undertakings distribute power to their various ratepayers and consumers. The suggestion made by Mr. Bevan that the Electricity Trust should take over the whole of the distribution of electricity in the Renmark area has been canvassed from time to time in that district. However, I do not think it would meet with the approbation of the Renmark Irrigation Trust's ratepayers. Although it is considered in official circles that it would be more economic for Renmark to allow the Electricity Trust to reticulate electricity through the whole area, the Renmark Irrigation Trust thinks that, while it has the control of the distribution and still has a standby plant, it is safe in case of industrial strife and breakdowns and should continue to have control

over the distribution of electricity in its area. I think that in time there will be a mellowing in those thoughts. The trust feels it should continue as the distributing authority and the municipality still wants to retain its undertaking. As they are elected bodies, who are we to decide their fate? I have no objection to the Hon. Mr. Bevan expressing his personal opinion—I have done the same. However, I do not think his suggestion would be acceptable to many of the people in the outlying areas at present unless substantial savings in the cost of electricity could be proved.

Much of the matter before us is the result of the work of the Auditor-General (Mr. G. Jeffery). He was appointed by the Government to examine the affairs of the Renmark Irrigation Trust because the trust felt it could not meet all the obligations and demands made upon it under the 1959 amendment. I agree with the trust's contention. The Auditor-General carried out his work with great integrity and without bias. He came up with many excellent suggestions that will benefit the trust, which is the first body to acknowledge the fact that he gave it some very useful assistance. In addition, he gave some useful advice to the Minister.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: What is all this leading up to?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: To the fact that we are getting a better deal in this fairly important part of the State than was the case under the old arrangement. I do not think the honourable member will object to that.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Your Government was in power under the old Act, too.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: My Government has been in power for a long while and it will continue for much longer, especially if remarks similar to the honourable member's are made, because that is the sort of stuff I could use in the district to which he refers.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Your Government was in power while they were suffering all these disabilities.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Action has been taken so that they will not suffer any disabilities. The Government offered £750,000 to enable them to get on with the job of draining the district when it did not have any legal obligation to pay—that is not too bad. That was virtually the position. Under the Irrigation Act wherein the Minister is not only empowered, but instructed, to look after the Crown's assets in the districts of Berri, Barmera, Loxton, and so on, he has to do these things to protect the area in time

of flood and see that it gets water at other times and is properly drained. Under the Irrigation Act he is under no similar obligation to the trust at all. No doubt the Government is under a moral obligation and over the years when the area has been unable to finance itself the Government has helped it. What is more, at present the Government is going much further than it did in its original undertaking to the trust. It is speeding up the payment of its part of the money to the trust to enable the work to be completed in seven years instead of 10. That will be of immeasurable advantage to the area. Since drainage, production in Mildura has been about 35cwt. of dried fruit to the acre. It is difficult to ascertain the position in Renmark, but it is about a ton to the acre.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Is that a paying proposition?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No, and until the area is drained and again becomes an economic unit and produces at least 35cwt. to the acre it will have to be supported. The sooner the work of drainage is carried out the better it will be, not only for the settlers of the area, but also for the economy of the State. The Renmark Irrigation Trust had had very little direct financial assistance until the 1959 amendment for water distribution or drainage. In fact, the only Government assistance it had received was £3,000, which, of course, it has repaid. When one considers the amount written off in other irrigation schemes every year and the difference in operating costs and what is considered could be paid for water and drainage which runs into many thousands of pounds a year, one realizes that the Renmark area has not been expensive to the taxpayers.

The main point is that the Government has undertaken to go on with this drainage. Certain difficulties have arisen. Very little was known about draining this type of soil, most of which is of a heavy clay type. No-one, apart from the sewerage people, have drains to the depths needed in this area, where some have been sunk as deep as 20ft. Similar drains in other parts of the State under the jurisdiction of the sewerage branch would be concreted. This, of course, would be financially prohibitive in this case. Vast difficulties have been experienced in the type of soil under the clay band. It is known as boiling sand and is the equivalent of quicksand and laying a pipeline in that type of soil, 15 to 20ft. deep, results in much damage to the lines. Up to

100 chains will have to be replaced. Another problem is that the trust will have to apply for an additional grant for repairs to lines and maintenance in addition to the amount allocated for the initial work. I have no reason to believe that the Government will be less generous in its approach to this application than it has been in the past.

The Select Committee in another place received evidence from the Renmark Irrigation Trust representatives and I was impressed when I read of the amount of work that had been done and the good relations that have been built up between the Government departments and the trust in the last two or three years. I believe it is fair to say that those relations were not very happy in 1959, but they have improved out of sight since that time; and well they might, because the present Minister of Lands has done everything in his power to assist and expedite the work of the trust. The Engineering and Water Supply Department prepared the plans and they have been very helpful. When the department discovered that the original method was unsuccessful it sent other people to investigate. The trust has consulted the University of Adelaide, and has accepted the advice from people there who know about stresses and soil textures. These representatives have been in consultation with the suppliers of the pipes and I believe that the area is going along as well as can be expected.

I commend the Bill to members. We should see more of this type of approach. Obviously, from the evidence given, the trust and the department are trying to work closely together, and this is desired in order to get the area back to full production, and in time become the revenue earner for the State that it was prior to the 1956 flood.

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

RURAL ADVANCES GUARANTEE BILL.

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

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.
Its object is to assist persons to obtain loans for the purpose of acquiring land for rural production, by empowering the Treasurer to guarantee the repayment of such loans in cases where those persons would not otherwise have,

or be in a position to obtain, adequate financial resources to acquire the land. The Bill, if approved by Parliament, would give effect to the Government's policy of assisting deserving persons in overcoming the difficulties, with which they would otherwise be faced, in obtaining long term loans for the purchase of land for the purpose of setting themselves up in the business of rural production.

Clause 3 authorizes the Treasurer to guarantee the repayment of a loan to an approved borrower. An approved borrower must be a person who, having regard to his ability and experience in the business of rural production, is approved by the Treasurer as a suitable person to undertake or conduct such business. The main conditions that must be fulfilled before a guarantee is given are as follows:

- (a) The Land Board must certify that the purchase price of the land in question does not exceed the fair value of the land having regard to the particular type of rural production to be undertaken or conducted on the land.
- (b) The loan must not exceed 85 per centum of such value.
- (c) The board must report to the Treasurer that the borrower has the ability and experience to undertake or conduct such type of rural production.
- (d) A report must be furnished by the Director of Agriculture or some other responsible person nominated by the Minister of Agriculture that the land would be adequate for maintaining the applicant's family after meeting all reasonable costs and expenses.
- (e) The Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement must recommend that the guarantee be given.
- (f) The Treasurer must be satisfied that the terms and conditions of the loan are reasonable and the provisions governing repayment are as set out in the clause.
- (g) Security must be given by the borrower to the satisfaction of the Treasurer.

Clauses 4 and 5 cast obligations on the board and the committee to carry out the functions assigned to them under the Bill. Clause 6 makes a guarantee subject to certain terms and conditions which are essential for protecting the Treasurer's liability under the guarantee. Clause 7 gives the Treasurer power to agree to the deferment of payment of interest and

principal in deserving cases where such deferment would promote the operation or rehabilitation of the business of rural production conducted by a borrower. Clause 8 deals with the application for a guarantee. Clause 9 requires the Auditor-General to include in his annual report a report upon the guarantees given under the Bill. Clause 10 contains the usual financial provisions and clause 11 contains the usual regulation-making powers.

I think the interest displayed already in this measure is justification for it, because it indicates the need for something of this nature to assist in financing primary producers in this age when the securing of finance is becoming a greater problem than in any other period. The Bill is not of an experimental nature. This type of legislation has been considered by Parliament previously, and it has worked satisfactorily. We have two excellent examples. In connection with assistance to secondary industry, similar safeguards apply, and the State has derived much advantage from the legislation. We also have a tremendous demonstration of what this type of legislation can do for

housing. About three houses a day are purchased under the scheme where guarantees are given by the Government. Nobody can deny that this type of legislation has not assisted progress. With similar legislation applying to the land, people, particularly those who want to keep their sons on the land, will be able to get finance, because of the Government guarantee. There will be greater security and a greater capacity for these people to get finance that would not otherwise be available to them. I commend the Bill as a progressive measure.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: It will help to stop the drift to the city.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Yes. It will assist primary producers, and I commend it to members.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.27 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, November 12, at 2.15 p.m.