

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, July 20, 1967.

The SPEAKER (Hon. L. G. Riches) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

### QUESTIONS

#### TOMATO CASES.

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister of Forests say, first, whether the price charged case-makers by the Woods and Forests Department for timber largely used to manufacture half cases for the tomato-growing industry is to be increased, and, secondly, whether a plentiful supply of this timber is available at present?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Sufficient supplies are available to meet producers' requirements. The Leader may be aware that the Forestry Board brings down recommendations on matters such as this one and, as yet, I have received no recommendation for an increase in price.

#### SAFETY.

Mr. LAWN: For a couple of years employers, the Government and others have conducted safety campaigns to achieve greater safety in industry and to make the public more safety conscious, even in regard to household appliances and utensils. As a photograph appeared in the *Advertiser* of Tuesday last showing an adult and a child three years old riding on the back of a combine that was being pulled by a tractor, does the Minister of Works believe that publishing such a picture would tend to convey to the public generally that riding on these farm implements was safe?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As the honourable member said, not only the Government but also individual organizations have taken much action in the past with a view to creating the greatest possible degree of safety in industry and in every other respect. Without doubt, the publication of that photograph amounts to an irresponsible attitude on the part of the press. I was perturbed and, indeed, disgusted when I saw the photograph because, in addition to a three-year-old child riding on the back of a combine, it showed the child's grandfather sitting next to him, while the child's father was apparently driving the tractor. When this sort of thing occurs, one wonders whether parents have ceased to have due care for the welfare of their children.

#### WISANGER RESIDENCE.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: In 1947 a group of residents at Wisanger, on Kangaroo Island, banded together to build a house for the schoolteacher-driver stationed there at the time, as they could not arrange for school transport in any other way. I think this illustrates their commendable community spirit. After 20 years, that house is still being used by the Education Department. However, one of the original shareholders died recently, and, in order to try to wind up the matter, the remaining shareholders and the trustees have asked the Education Department whether it would like to purchase this house at what seems to me to be an extremely reasonable price. Having previously mentioned this matter to the Minister of Education, who promised to consider it, I now ask him whether he has a definite reply on this matter.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I thank the honourable member for raising this matter with me earlier. As Minister of Education, I appreciate the action of these people in building this house for a schoolteacher-driver. That sort of co-operation has assisted the Education Department considerably. The department, which is interested in the building, intends to obtain a report from the Public Buildings Department in the usual way and, depending on the nature of that report, a recommendation will be made. The honourable member showed me a letter in which it was suggested that a deputation might come to Adelaide, but I do not think that is necessary at present. As soon as further information is to hand, we will see whether that procedure will be necessary.

#### TREES.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked recently concerning the planting of certain trees close to drains and consequent costly plumbing jobs?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member asked me whether I would take steps to have this matter advertised in the press and, having entered into an agreement with the weekend papers to publish a statement concerning this, I did not want to anticipate the publication because the press is doing a good job in the interests of the public of South Australia. This article should be read thoroughly, because not only is it expensive to replace pipes, some of which may be under cement footpaths, but it is of considerable inconvenience to the people concerned. Having investigated this matter, I find that people are usually careful about what they plant near

drains on their own allotments, but that some people tend to plant a most offensive type of tree near their neighbours' fence, thereby causing them much inconvenience. I assure the honourable member that this matter will soon be given publicity.

#### CALTOWIE SCHOOL.

Mr. HEASLIP: I have received the following letter from the Caltowie school committee regarding work carried out on the surface, and for the drainage, of the school yard:

At present all water from the school yard has to go under the portable classroom and forms a pool underneath it. This creates a hazard for the building and also to the health of grades I, II and III children who use the classroom. We have written to the Education Department on several occasions over the past two years and have received the same reply: "that it has been referred to the Public Buildings Department for consideration". Also when the new shelter shed was erected late last year an asphalt floor was supposed to have been put in it. A gap was left between the ground and the walls to be covered when the floor was built. During wet weather the water flows into the shed unless a bank of dirt is kept around the walls.

Will the Minister of Education take up this matter with the Public Buildings Department to see whether something can be done about it?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to take it up with the Public Buildings Department and to ask that it be treated as urgent.

#### MAGAZINE EDITORIAL.

Mr. CLARK: In the early edition of today's *News* appears a statement by a senior student of the Murray Bridge High School to the effect that he was the author of an article which appeared in the school paper and which has been discussed in this place. Part of the article states:

Peter said he was upset at the inference that the Agriculture Minister, Mr. Bywaters, had anything to do with the publication. "He has always been Chairman of the school council as a helper, and has had nothing to do with the paper," he said.

The article also states:

"I would have thought politicians had better things to do with their time rather than 'blow up' this issue beyond its importance," he said.

I entirely agree with that and I would not have asked this question except for two things said by the member for Mitcham yesterday in reply to a question of the Minister of Agriculture. The member for Mitcham said:

I do not know whether or not the Minister had any direct influence in the preparation of that article.

The member for Mitcham also said (this was featured in this morning's press, and justly so because it was said):

All I will say is that it is a jolly funny thing that this editorial appeared in a school paper and that the Minister is, in fact, the Chairman of the high school council.

In view of the obvious insinuations and innuendos in at least those two sentences of the honourable member's reply, and in view of the feeling of a number of people both inside and outside this House, will the member for Mitcham apologize to the Minister of Agriculture for the things he said about him yesterday?

The SPEAKER: Does the member for Mitcham desire to reply?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, Sir, I am happy to reply. The answer is "No".

#### WARREN RESERVOIR.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Yesterday, I asked the Minister of Works a question about the quantity of water at present held in the Warren reservoir, which has a capacity of 1,410,000 gallons and which serves a great part of my district as well as districts farther north. I also asked what intake there had been following recent rains and whether the maximum quantity of water possible was being discharged into the reservoir from the Mannum-Adelaide main. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I should like to apologize to the honourable member for telling him yesterday that I did not have the facts on this matter with me. A few minutes after Question Time had concluded, on making a further examination I found that I had them. I regret that that happened. I think that, if I give the figures for last year and for this year, the honourable member will realize that we are pumping effectively and strenuously to keep Warren in a proper state to serve the people dependent on that reservoir. The return for the week ended 8.30 a.m. on July 17 shows that the capacity is 1,401,000,000 gallons, that the storage last year was 270,000,000 gallons and that the present storage is 446,300,000 gallons. The natural intake since July 1 has been 10,100,000 gallons. From July 1 to July 18 last year we pumped 6,900,000 gallons, and this year since July 1 we have pumped 73,500,000 gallons. The reservoir at present is in what may be regarded

as a reasonable condition, not a flood condition. I assure honourable members that every effort will be made by pumping to keep the holdings in all reservoirs at such a level as will enable the imposition of restrictions to be avoided. Nevertheless, I again appeal to the public to try to conserve water wherever possible without, of course, refraining from using it when necessary.

#### WILLIAMSTOWN PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: The playing area at the Williamstown Primary School is divided into two sections by the main road from Gawler and Lyndoch, and the playing area opposite the school requires fencing. At present the children are exposed to traffic danger when crossing the road or when playing sport. They become careless when they are playing with sporting equipment, such as a ball, and they could run on to the road and be knocked down by a motor vehicle. On one occasion when I was in the district the policeman there pointed out this danger to me. The matter was referred to the Public Buildings Department, a preliminary scheme prepared and an estimate of cost calculated. The fencing is being considered in relation to the priorities of many other urgent minor works. Because of the reason why this fence is required (that is, the safety factor), will the Minister of Education consider giving this work a high priority?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes, I shall be pleased to ascertain whether we can treat it as an urgent matter because of the safety factor involved.

#### MAITLAND COURTHOUSE.

Mr. FERGUSON: About two years ago I asked the Attorney-General a question about the provision of new court facilities at Maitland. At that time the Senior Design Architect in the Public Buildings Department said that the court conditions were extremely poor and that all the buildings should be demolished and new ones erected. The Attorney-General told me that, because of the heavy Loan programme commitments, he could not undertake the work at that time but that when the Loan Fund position improved, he would consider the matter. As it seems that the Loan Fund position has improved, will the Minister of Works ask the Attorney-General whether these court facilities can be provided in the near future?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: It does seem that the Loan Fund position has eased, but

only slightly. I shall certainly take the matter up with the Attorney-General. The Public Buildings Department is the constructing authority with which the other departments place orders. The Government has to consider the provision of buildings in the order of greater need. Because they are used infrequently new courthouses must be placed on a lower priority, whereas many school and hospital buildings are used every day, and must be provided. I shall ask the Attorney-General whether provision can be made in the Estimates.

Mr. FERGUSON: The Minister of Works says, in effect, that there are not sufficient funds available to build a courthouse in my district. As the Treasurer has announced that, in order to improve the Budget Account and to achieve a balanced Budget, he has charged to Loan Account a substantial sum for subsidies to hospitals, which previously has been paid from the Budget Account, does the Minister agree that, if that switch in accounting (in order to make the Budget look really better than it is), had not taken place, more funds would have been available for the building of courthouses and other works?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: First, I did not say that there was no money to build the courthouse: I warned the honourable member of the need to give priority to projects that were more urgent. That is not saying that we do not have the money to build the courthouse. I think that if the honourable member examines the Loan money spent by the Government he will find that last year's sum was more than that of the previous year, and that increase will also be evident next year.

#### GRAPES.

Mr. CURREN: Recently statements have been made about the need for a survey to establish the true cost of production in the grapegrowing industry. As I know that requests have been made to the Minister of Agriculture by growers' organizations for this survey to be undertaken, can the Minister say whether this matter was discussed at the recent meeting of the Agricultural Council and, if it was, what decisions were made?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: True, grower organizations have asked the Bureau of Agricultural Economics to make a survey in order to ascertain the true cost of production. Some time ago a survey was started, but it was later discontinued. At the Agricultural Council meeting in Melbourne last February I raised this matter, but it was not discussed

as much as I should have liked. Following that meeting I received a letter from the Chairman of the council, Mr. Adermann (Minister for Primary Industry), in which he asked me to submit this matter for inclusion in the agenda of the council meeting to be held in Darwin. After being dealt with by the Standing Committee on Agriculture, this matter was carefully discussed by all Ministers. Although there is a long waiting list for surveys, and some other requests were received earlier, the bureau has given this matter a high priority, and a survey is expected to commence in 1968.

#### NATIONAL ROUTE No. 32.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It has been suggested to me by the Riverton Chamber of Commerce that signposting is inadequate on tentative National Route No. 32, which starts north of the Gawler by-pass, follows the old Main North Road to Giles Corner, thence through Riverton and Saddleworth to Broken Hill. As the chamber suggested that more positive signposting was needed at Gawler and at Giles Corner to indicate that this route was the main road to Broken Hill, will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Roads whether this can be done?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to obtain a report soon for the honourable member.

#### ABORIGINAL CARVINGS.

Mr. CASEY: It has been brought to my attention (and no doubt the matter will interest you, Sir) that Mr. Absalom of Broken Hill recently discovered Aboriginal carvings and drawings in a gorge in the northern Flinders Ranges. We are unfortunate in perhaps not having more of these carvings in our State. I know they are of great interest not only from the tourist's point of view but also from an historical point of view. I sincerely hope that, if the carvings are as good as the statement claims they are, steps will be taken to preserve them. Has the Minister anything to report on the matter?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I made some inquiries about the matter as soon as I saw the report in the press. I am anxious that steps should be taken to preserve these carvings. In fact, the area concerned is known to our officers, who are interested in these matters in South Australia. An Act for the control and preservation of Aboriginal and historic relics in South Australia will be proclaimed shortly, providing for the protection of Abori-

ginal carvings such as those that were recently reported in South Australia. We are ahead of the other States in legislating to prohibit the sale of genuine Aboriginal artifacts and to make the defacing of cave paintings, rock engravings and other relics a punishable offence.

Personally, I believe that Aboriginal relics are a great part of our cultural heritage and that their preservation is a matter of great importance and urgency. I hope there will be an educated response from the public to the new measures by which we are endeavouring to ensure the survival of many relics for the benefit of future generations. Surely we can show that we are sufficiently civilized to have at least as much respect for these sacred and cultural relics of our Aboriginal friends as we have for our own. I think it is time that we looked at these things from the point of view of the people to whom they are so important. Unfortunately, with the increased mobility of the public today, sites that were formerly protected by their inaccessibility are now visited by members of the public and, in fact, reports of damage are quite frequent.

The first reaction to the so-called discovery was to exploit it and not preserve it, and I hope that, if this gorge becomes open to tourists, they will pay some attention to what I am saying and ensure that other people take care of what is there. If the study of this area showed the site to be unique or of special interest to anthropologists, it could be designated an historic reserve or a prohibited area under the new Act, and proclamation would be made only with the consent of the owner or occupier, who might be appointed as an honorary warden. The Act would not interfere with the use of sacred places by Aboriginals, but entry to prohibited areas by other visitors would require a permit. Persons causing damage will be liable to fines up to \$200. As I said before, the area has been known to the Promoter of Relics (Doctor Crowcroft) and, in fact, sections have already been chiselled out of the solid rock which, I think, is most unfortunate. I hope that no further vandalism will occur in the area.

#### COUNTRY HOUSING.

Mr. QUIRKE: There is a growing necessity for Housing Trust houses in country towns but, unfortunately, a person must at present be nominated for a house before it is built. Employers in the country, who desire to engage employees, do not know, in fact, who that employee will be, and that is an immovable

object in regard to building a house in the country for a prospective employee. Small industries or businesses in Jamestown that desire employees have no houses for them. However, if a house were available, a family could come to the town from Adelaide and be domiciled there (which is an important factor when we hear so much about decentralization). I point out that two houses that had previously been situated at Radium Hill were rebuilt at Jamestown. Those houses, although not good (they were vacant for a while) are now occupied. However, when prospective residents were previously taken to inspect the houses they were not, understandably, what the people wanted. I point out, though, that such houses could be used temporarily until another house was built. As this position could apply in other country towns, and as I think it is highly desirable that action be taken in regard to this matter, will the Minister of Works obtain a report?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As I think there is much merit in the question, I will certainly refer it to my colleague the Premier as Minister of Housing.

#### OUTER HARBOUR RAMP.

Mr. RYAN: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to my recent question about installing a light over the public boating ramp at Outer Harbour?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I think the request is reasonable, and I hope that it will be granted. However, I will ensure that a report on the matter be made available as soon as possible.

#### SUPERANNUATION.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have seen representations that have been made by a retired civil servant, who is living on superannuation, with regard to a small increase that has been made in his superannuation payment. The Minister of Works (in his capacity as acting leader of the Government) will remember that in years gone by any surplus in the fund has been distributed in a lump sum at the beginning of each financial year, but on this occasion in the last few weeks there has apparently been no lump sum allocation, because the letter that I have here states:

This year on July 1 I had no cheque, which was due on that date, but had 25c added to my superannuation cheque, which was also due on that date. This goes to pay for the amount which would have been due to me on July 1, 1968, so I have been deprived of a full 12 months—

of the sum the person concerned should have received. If this statement is accurate it is something which is at least unfortunate and perhaps unjust. Will the Minister ascertain what alterations have been made in arrangements for payments of superannuation with special emphasis on the matter I have raised?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Not being the Treasurer, I do not know whether changes have been effected. If the honourable member will give me the name of the person concerned, the matter will be treated in confidence, and I shall be happy to see that he gets an answer.

#### ABORIGINES.

Mr. BURDON: Following the recent successful referendum that resulted in the Commonwealth being given certain powers on the advancement of the Aboriginal people, I understand the Minister is to attend tomorrow's conference, in Perth, of Ministers of Aboriginal Affairs. Has he any views on how the Commonwealth Government can assist the State Governments with regard to the many things to be done to improve the lot of Aboriginal people, and can he say whether these views will be brought before the conference of Ministers?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have carefully considered what should be put forward at tomorrow's conference, and I am sure that what the Commonwealth will be prepared to do (and how it should do it) will probably be the most important matter for discussion. I was interested to hear the remarks of Mr. Wentworth, M.H.R., as reported in the press, to the effect that the Commonwealth should provide 20 or 30 per cent of the total of about \$9,000,000 now being spent by the States on Aboriginal affairs. I was pleased to hear his remarks suggesting that the Commonwealth should not only take an active part financially in this matter, but also leave the administration (now in the hands of the State) in the hands of the officers who have handled these matters so well for a long time. I believe that any Commonwealth assistance could best be given in the fields of housing and training. Of course, training may seem a rather vague term, but it could be described as education in the broadest sense. I believe that kindergarten training is essential for young Aboriginal children, because it has been found that when they first attend primary schools they suffer from a lack of pre-school training. The Commonwealth Government could assist in this field.

This is an excellent opportunity for the Commonwealth Government to set up an

administrative body which could make an intelligent study of the whole question, bearing in mind the recent legislation of the States on Aboriginal affairs, particularly in this State where, as Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, our Premier has done so much in the last two years. The new legislation in this State has set a pattern for the whole of Australia to follow, and if the Commonwealth Government will set up a body to make this intelligent study of all aspects, it should have on it a good representation of Aboriginal people. They should have a strong voice on all the arrangements that are to be made regarding their welfare, otherwise they will think (quite rightly, I believe) that once again we want to impose on them our point of view without properly considering their viewpoint. The success of anything the Commonwealth Government does in this regard will be largely bound up with the Aboriginal people's having proper representation on such a body. I believe that the Commonwealth Government will favourably consider the points I am making, and I think the result will be extremely beneficial to Aboriginal people throughout Australia. I believe that we shall be able to get the other States to adopt much more humane policies than they have adopted in the past, and that they will be far more intelligent in their application of those policies towards the solution of what is a difficult problem.

#### PINE POSTS.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It has been reported to me that the supply of impregnated pine posts for fencing and other purposes is somewhat short at various times. It has also been suggested that the quality of the product coming on to the market has deteriorated so that some posts, after treatment, have split deeply, revealing the untreated wood beyond the depth of normal impregnation. Of course, this reduces the life expectancy of the post, and removes the benefits of impregnation. I am well aware that these items are available from the department's mills as well as from private sources, but I do not know to which article the complaint applies. In the case of radiata pine flooring, some years ago we instituted a system of branding, and clearly marked the timber with the departmental mill stamp. I wonder whether this might be advisable for the product to which I refer. Will the Minister of Forests call for a report to ascertain whether there is a shortage, either long-term

or short-term, of these posts, and whether the department has received complaints regarding the deterioration of the quality of the article being supplied?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I am pleased to hear the honourable member say that there are two sources of supply, because this fact could cause confusion. I will ascertain whether the suggestions regarding branding of timber can be adopted. I should be surprised to hear that there is any shortage of impregnated pine posts, because the department has sold considerable quantities of these posts, which are proving successful. In fact, I have been told by farmers who have used them that they are particularly useful and are standing up well. They are becoming increasingly popular as fencing posts, because they are easy to handle, because they are easy to bore, and because they are a well regulated post and not uneven as are some other posts. I will ascertain for the honourable member whether complaints of any sort have been made to the Woods and Forests Department. Frequently people complain to the department about products from other sources. However, there is excellent liaison between the private forests and the department—in fact, it would be hard to find a better liaison in any type of business. Therefore, I am sure that, if what the honourable member has referred to has happened, it will be taken to the proper authorities and corrected, because all concerned want to make sure that radiata pine retains the good name it has.

#### KANGAROO MEAT.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Social Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a reply to my recent question about the sale for consumption in the metropolitan area of buffalo, donkey and kangaroo meat?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: My colleague informs me that regulations under the Food and Drugs Act prohibit the preparation, storage, delivery or sale of donkey meat as human food from any food premises. The Public Health Department would be glad to be supplied with any evidence of an offence against this regulation so that appropriate action may be taken. Buffalo meat is brought into South Australia from the Northern Territory. The greater part of it is accompanied by a certificate of inspection, either from the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry or the Animal Industry Branch of the Northern Territory Administration. It is quite permissible for this meat to be handled

and sold for human food. The food and drugs regulations prohibit the handling or sale from human food premises of buffalo meat not the subject of a certificate of inspection. Uncertified buffalo meat may be sold as pet food provided it is free of pathogenic organisms, or has been sterilized by heat and packed in a clean sealed container. Kangaroo meat may be sold for human consumption if it has been handled throughout as meat for human consumption, and meets other requirements of the Food and Drugs Act and regulations in the same way as other game such as rabbits. Salmonella organisms are found from time to time in a wide variety of foodstuffs and action is taken by the Public Health Department, the Metropolitan County Board and local boards of health to discover and eliminate sources of such infection.

#### RULING.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In a debate last evening, the member for Mitcham said that the Parliamentary Draftsman had scuttled out of the Chamber. You, Sir, immediately called him to order, saying that the words "Parliamentary Draftsman" should not be used in debate. I can find no Standing Order to support your action in asking the honourable member to withdraw his statement. From the record of Parliamentary practice, I have been able to find some Speakers' rulings to the effect that opinions of Parliamentary Draftsmen must not be canvassed in debate. I can understand the propriety of such rulings, but to rule that the words "Parliamentary Draftsman" may not be used in the House appears to be taking away one of the fundamental privileges of Parliament, members of which should have the right to discuss any matter that they think is important to the State. Mr. Speaker, what is the ground for your ruling?

The SPEAKER: First, I must point out that I was not in the Chair on the occasion to which the honourable member refers, and I gave no such ruling. I believe the honourable member is confused and may be referring to a ruling that may have been given by the Chairman of Committees. Secondly, a point of order of this nature should have been taken at the time of the incident. Thirdly, I remind honourable members of the practice in this House since 1934, when a former Speaker, Sir Robert Nicholls, drew the attention of honourable members to the undesirability of referring to the name of the Parliamentary Draftsman in the course of debate. As I

imagine that that would have been the ground on which the Chairman gave his ruling last evening, I believe that, on reflection, members will regard it as a sensible and proper ruling. As I have just been handed a copy of the ruling given by Speaker Nicholls, it could be of advantage to the House if I read it. The then Speaker said:

I draw honourable members' attention to the custom—the Leader of the Opposition just mentioned the matter but I am not referring to him by way of rebuke—of members bringing the name of the Parliamentary Draftsman into debate. That officer has a place in the Chamber in an advisory capacity by a special resolution, and there is a growing custom on the part of members generally to say that they consulted the Parliamentary Draftsman. It is not in accordance with procedure, and I ask members not to bring his name into debate, because conclusions may be improper.

I believe honourable members will agree with that ruling. Although I think it is self-evident that I am not conversant with all the circumstances surrounding the incident last evening, I point out that the Parliamentary Draftsman is in this place to advise members. However, members must take full responsibility for any advice of which they make use whether it be from the Parliamentary Draftsman or from any other public officer.

#### FORT LARGS.

Mr. HURST: At Fort Largs there is an old gun and I understand that other guns have been removed from the fort and taken to various parklands. As Fort Largs has historic interest, it is an attraction to tourists and other visitors. I have asked the Minister of Immigration whether something can be done to restore the old gun and its mountings and possibly to return the other guns to add to the attractions of Fort Largs. Can the Minister say whether he has considered the letter I sent to him, and whether progress has been made regarding my request?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I appreciate the interest the honourable member has shown in the future of this tourist resort. As I believed his suggestion was worthwhile, his letter was forwarded to the Director of the Tourist Bureau so that it could be further investigated. As yet, I have received no report on the matter, but I hope the Director will see fit to see that steps are taken to comply with the honourable member's request.

#### IRRIGATION.

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Works ascertain, if the lower part of the Murray River and the lake is brought

under the Control of Waters Act, as has been recommended recently by a committee, to what extent this will affect the various tributaries that run into the river and the lake?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I understand that it would affect anybody drawing water from the Murray River or its tributaries.

Mr. CURREN: From reports issued regularly by the River Murray Commission about the quantity of water in storage in the Hume reservoir and Lake Victoria, the two storages under the control of the commission, a greater quantity of water is apparently stored at present than was stored at this time last year. As the main irrigation season begins in mid-August when all settlements will be taking their first general irrigation, will the Minister of Works ensure that sufficient water is released from storage to ensure that good quality water is available for pumping for the irrigation settlements?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall certainly take this matter up with my department, but I am confident that it has been closely watched by Mr. Ligertwood, working jointly with the Irrigation Department, which is under the control of my colleague, and my department to ensure that arrangements are made for adequate and proper supplies to consumers. However, as the member has asked the question, I shall ascertain whether that has been done and, if not, whether it ought to be done so that adequate water will be available for irrigation.

#### ISLINGTON WORKSHOPS.

Mr. COUMBE: The Islington railway workshops, at which many of my constituents are employed, is currently engaged on a large contract to supply, with Commonwealth financial assistance, rolling stock for the standard gauge line being constructed between Broken Hill and Port Pirie. Will the Minister of Social Welfare inquire of the Minister of Transport how long this contract has to run and what further contracts are likely to be secured for the workshops so that the current employment position there will at least be maintained?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes.

#### PESTICIDES.

Mr. RODDA: My question refers to pesticidal residues in certain products, such as horticultural products and dairy produce. I understand that these residues are caused by the side effects of certain pesticides and that they are affecting the marketing of some of

our primary products. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether this is so and, if it is, what steps are being taken to minimize these side effects and to prevent the use of the offending pesticides?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Agriculture Department, in association with other departments throughout Australia, has been extremely conscious of this problem. A pesticides committee was set up at, I think, the second last meeting of the Agricultural Council. This committee is an organization within the council and all States are also appointing committees to supply information to the overall body. Recently, I agreed to the appointment of members of the South Australian committee, which will soon be assisting in this important work. Some other countries are concerned about pesticidal residue, which has caused some products to be rejected. However, I do not think there is cause for alarm here. We have the matter under control, and recommendations from the Standing Committee on Agriculture have been considered. In fact, because of this problem, the sale of some pesticides is not allowed. I think there has been considerable improvement in the position in recent years.

#### PORT PIRIE RAILWAY WORKS.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Social Welfare a reply from the Minister of Transport to my question of July 12 concerning progress on standardization work at Port Pirie?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The new station at Port Pirie will be used for broad gauge train working from Saturday, July 22, 1967. The earliest date for the completion of the overway bridge at Solomontown junction is August, 1968.

#### X-RAY UNIT.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: As many health-minded people at Christies Beach have previously been X-rayed and are interested in the mobile unit's return to the district, has the Minister of Social Welfare asked the Minister of Health when the unit will again visit the Christies Beach area?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Concerning visits of the mobile X-ray unit to Christies Beach, my colleague states that the last survey of the South Coast District, which includes Christies Beach, was made in March, 1963. On present indications a further survey of this area will be made some time next year, but anyone wishing to have an X-ray may have one at Austin Street, Adelaide, at any time.



**HIGHBURY SEWERAGE.**

Mrs. BYRNE: On referring to the area to be served by the Highbury and Hope Valley sewerage scheme I find that Landscape Crescent, Observation Drive, and part of Park Valley Drive, are not included in this scheme. As I have been approached by five house owners in these streets, will the Minister of Works investigate whether a sewerage system can be connected to these houses as well as to other houses in these streets omitted from the approved scheme, if I supply the details? Also, if the connection cannot be made, will the Minister obtain a report as to why these streets cannot be included in the present approved scheme?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be pleased to investigate this matter further. If it is not possible to make these connections the reasons will be given, a practice that has always been followed.

**STREAKY BAY SLIPWAY.**

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to the question I asked last week about work to be done on the slipway at Streaky Bay?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I had asked the Director for Marine and Harbors to treat this matter as urgent but, unfortunately, he has been busily engaged this week with the Senate Select Committee on Containerization. For that reason I do not have a reply but, as the honourable member's request is reasonable, I hope that permission will be given for this work to be done soon.

**MID-NORTHERN ROADS.**

Mr. CASEY: Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Roads whether the Highways Department intends to seal the roads between Hallett and Jamestown and between Whyte Yarcowie and Jamestown and, if it does, when?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to obtain that information for the honourable member.

**PANORAMA TRANSPORT.**

Mr. MILLHOUSE: From time to time I have made representations to the Government in office concerning transport services in the Panorama area of my district, especially for the provision of a new railway station on the Hills line and for the extension of the Colonel Light Gardens bus service south along Goodwood Road. The Minister of Social Welfare will be familiar with this area as Goodwood

Road is the boundary between his district and mine. I have received a letter from the Secretary of the Panorama Community Group which, in part, states:

For most people in the area and certainly for the many people who visit Centennial Park Cemetery a bus route along Goodwood Road as far as Panorama Drive is highly desirable, and we wonder if you could further press our claim with the relevant authority.

The preceding paragraph points out that there has been much residential development in Panorama in the last two or three years, thus giving rise to the assumption that there is a considerable potential for an extension of the bus service. Will the Minister ask the Minister of Transport whether an extension of the Colonel Light Gardens bus service could be made at least as far as Panorama Drive?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes.

**SECONDARY EDUCATION.**

Mr. CLARK: I was interested in a press report this morning of an address given yesterday by the Director-General of Education (Mr. John Walker) to the Rotary Club of Adelaide. I was particularly interested in what he said about examinations in the past, present and future, and I entirely agree with him. Will the Minister of Education comment on the future of our examination system in secondary schools?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I am pleased that the honourable member was interested in what the Director-General said and I was pleased to see that the press gave a good report of it and placed it in a prominent position on the news page, which it deserved. What the Director-General said was of great importance to education and I heartily endorse his comments. We still have obstacles to overcome in the minds of the public concerning examinations, particularly in the minds of people who adhere to what is becoming an outworn notion that a student should be judged on a pass-fail system and can be branded a failure through missing an examination by one mark. I consider that the officers of the Education Department have a most progressive outlook on this matter but, from time to time, the department is criticized by people who do not appreciate this outlook. The Director-General's comments show that these criticisms are unfounded. The future of our students should not rest on a pass-fail examination in which they obtain one mark less than what is considered the pass mark. I believe that the new arrangements whereby we are eliminating the Intermediate examination and introducing an

internal examination, associated with a report by the headmaster on the student's past record, will be a far better guide to employers and other people who wish to assess a student's ability. In fact, as Mr. Walker said, employers will no longer be able to use examination results as a convenient prop on which to make their decisions: they will have to be more constructive in their thinking concerning the employment of young people, and that is as it should be.

The most progressive firms in South Australia have already adopted the principle of not relying merely on examination records; many of them are engaging apprentices, for example, before examination results are known, on the basis of interviews and reports from headmasters, who, after all, know far more about the student than does anyone else (particularly the examiners who see only the examination paper of a student and who know nothing whatever about his other qualities). Many of the examinations must, of necessity, be held in a rather artificial atmosphere on an occasion when the student frequently does not do his best.

I think we should all be seized with the importance of this change from the point of view of the future of our young people. It is a good thing that we shall no longer judge them on the old standards in regard to examinations and that we shall have proper regard to their abilities and their suitability for particular employment. I am sure this will lead to fewer square pegs in round holes, and that our society will benefit considerably from this change of idea in regard to examinations.

#### OUTER HARBOUR TERMINAL.

Mr. HURST: Can the Minister of Marine say what progress, if any, is being made on the new Outer Harbour terminal?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am glad of the question, because I have seen reports to the effect that work on the terminal has been stopped. That is not correct: work is continually progressing in preparation for the terminal. During this financial year it is hoped that we shall be able to complete the roadwork, fencing and the construction of some of the ancillary offices that will be required, making it possible for work to be commenced on the terminal proper during the next financial year.

Mr. HURST: I have read in the press and noticed on television that the Senate Select Committee on Containerization recently visited Outer Harbour to inspect the facilities available there for a major shipping terminal. Will the

Minister of Marine say whether his officers have submitted all the evidence possible at this stage to try to influence the Commonwealth authorities as to the merits of Outer Harbour as a main oversea shipping terminal operating under containerization?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: True, the Senate Select Committee visited South Australia and the Director of Marine and Harbors (Mr. Sainsbury) gave evidence before it. He also took the committee on an inspection of both Port Adelaide and Outer Harbour, and I am convinced that he went to no end of trouble to show that we have the facilities at Outer Harbour for a terminal port, and that he did all he could to encourage its establishment here at the earliest possible date. In fact, last evening a member of the Select Committee telephoned me to say how delighted members of the committee were with Mr. Sainsbury's evidence. They considered him an excellent witness who had done all he could to make out an excellent case for South Australia.

#### BELAIR WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to a request that I conveyed to him by letter concerning the water supply and pressure in Gloucester Avenue, Belair?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am glad to say that the honourable member's labours have not been in vain, because on Monday next I shall be referring to Cabinet recommendations concerning a water supply for this area. If those recommendations are approved (and I hope they will be) I shall immediately inform the honourable member of the details of the scheme. I take the opportunity here to point out that, as soon as a scheme is approved in a member's district, I notify the member and ask that, if it is convenient, he inform his colleague in another place. That procedure will apply also in this case.

#### ABATTOIRS.

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Agriculture ascertain how many recommendations of the committee that inquired about 12 months ago into the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board have been implemented?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Provision exists under legislation for this committee to investigate all aspects of the abattoirs every three years. Reports such as this are tabled each time one is issued, and the report referred to was tabled. I am not aware of any particulars concerning recommendations for legislation, but I will refresh my memory.

## WHYALLA RAILWAY LINE.

Mr. COURCEL: When I last asked a question, on March 16 this year, regarding the construction of a railway line between Port Augusta and Whyalla, the then Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh) said that he would ascertain, and inform me, whether negotiations on this matter were proceeding with the South Australian Railways Commissioner, the South Australian Government and the Commonwealth Government. However, I have not yet received a reply. Will the Minister of Social Welfare ask his colleague whether negotiations have been conducted and, if they have, what decisions have been made on the proposal to build this line? I realize that this is in the area of the Commonwealth railways system, but it will still be of great importance to this State.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have not yet received a reply, but I will have the matter further examined and see whether one can be obtained for the honourable member.

## WALLAROO FERTILIZER PLANT.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Minister of Works, in the absence of the Premier, say whether the establishment of a fertilizer plant at Wallaroo has been shelved permanently because of the proposed route of the Gidgealpa-Adelaide gas pipeline, or is it still an active project? If it is still active, what steps are being taken to see that the proposed plant is expeditiously connected to the pipeline?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: No-one would know better than the honourable member that certain negotiations must to some degree remain secret. However, I can say that negotiations are still taking place with the interested parties. The member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) was requested to contact, when he arrived in the United States, a gentleman interested in the project, and the Government has given an unqualified assurance that, should an industry desiring natural gas be established pending the line being brought to Adelaide, a subsidiary line will be provided.

## SCHOOL TEXTBOOKS.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The issue of common textbooks has been considerably publicized in the press of late, and I refer to a report appearing in the *Advertiser* on June 15 headed "Is Against Common Textbooks". The report states:

The Director-General of Education (Mr. E. Mander-Jones) said yesterday that he was not in favour of common school textbooks throughout Australia, even in some subjects.

He was addressing members of the staff of Nuriootpa High School to which he was paying a final visit before his retirement next month. Mr. Mander-Jones addressed the school assembly.

Can the Minister of Education say whether the then Director-General of Education was stating the Minister's policy, or has the Minister different views? Will he state the Government's policy regarding common textbooks?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have not got Mr. Mander-Jones's statement here, but I think I remember the occasion to which the honourable member refers. This matter has been a subject of much discussion over the years and, in fact, it came up rather prominently in the *Australian*, where Professor Schoenheimer was against any suggestion of uniformity of textbooks throughout Australia. This article was answered at considerable length by the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science (Senator Gorton), and I agree in general with his statements on this matter. In fact, we in South Australia are already using a basic textbook in, I believe, biology (although I stand to be corrected on that). I see no good reason why we should not have a high degree of uniformity in basic textbooks. However, that does not mean I am wedded to the idea of uniform textbooks throughout, because such a policy could be dangerous as it might cause difficulty in changing textbooks when they really needed changing as a result of new ideas, progressive thinking, and new methods in education. However, the teaching of educational courses is not tied up with textbooks. Such books are only a guide: teachers use their own methods and ideas. Therefore, the adoption of a basic textbook does not prevent a teacher from being flexible in his teaching methods. I believe much good and some economy can result from the use of some uniform basic textbooks. Further, I believe that the Commonwealth Government is rather interested in assisting the States in this direction. I suggest that the honourable member read the two sides of the question (if he has not read them already) as presented in the *Australian* by Professor Schoenheimer and Senator Gorton, because the matter is thoroughly debated there. I believe I have made my opinion clear.

## EROSION.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The erosion of the cliffs at Port Noarlunga and Christies Beach is such that the cliffs are falling into the sea at an alarming rate. In fact, the

local council is seeking to have the road along the cliffs restricted to one-way traffic. If action is not taken, many houses behind the road will also be threatened. A number of alternative plans have been put forward to arrest the erosion but all are extremely expensive. About 18 months ago, when I saw the principal plan of most of the experts, the cost to do the work was estimated (from memory) at about \$300,000. Of course, such a sum is beyond the means of the council. On occasions I have raised the matter with the Minister of Roads and the Minister of Works. However, no clear-cut responsibility for the work falls on either of the Ministers or on the council, so that the problem rests with the council because it is on the spot. I have discussed the matter with the council and it suggests that a deputation should approach a Minister who can speak on behalf of the Government. Obviously, the problem is out of proportion to the means and facilities of a lonely district council. Also, there is the question of the involvement of at least one other Government department (whether the Marine and Harbors Department or the Highways Department). Therefore, a deputation could seek to clarify the matter, giving the council something on which to work in the future in arresting the alarming situation that has developed. Will the acting leader of the Government ask the Premier, on his return, whether a deputation from the council can be received by the Premier or by another Minister, who can speak on behalf of the Government?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I can understand the honourable member's concern. Of course, the Marine and Harbors Department's responsibility ends at the water's edge, the responsibility then transferring to the local council. Often councils confer with the Mines Department and work is done with its assistance. The matter raised by the honourable member obviously involves finance and is therefore more complicated. As I think the Premier would be the most appropriate Minister to receive a deputation, I will raise the matter with him on his return and inform the honourable member of the outcome.

#### EBENEZER SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: Several times during the last five years (so I am told) the Ebenezer Rural School Committee has written to the Education Department asking for the replacement of the fin. water supply pipe to the school. This pipe, which connects the school to the fin. main, has been in use since the early 1920's

and is very much corroded. The water service supplies both the garden and the toilets, with rainwater tanks being provided for the school and the school residence to provide water for drinking purposes. I point out that, to date, all approaches by the committee to the Education Department have failed. As the water pressure is restricted because of the condition of the pipe, especially in the summer months when there is a fire risk (and I draw to the Minister's attention the fact that the schoolhouse is of timber frame construction), will the Minister of Education ask the department to reconsider the matter and even to consider making pipes available to the committee for it to install under the supervision of the Public Buildings Department?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I will have the matter examined and see what can be done to expedite the repairs.

#### UREA.

Mr. McANANEY: One of the most progressive farmers in my district finds that many of his stock are affected by urea when it is included in stock foods, and that, although he is getting more milk from his cows, he has less fat for butter production. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the department is investigating the matter and, if it is not, whether it will do so?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: As the department has made extensive investigations into the matter, I will bring down a report.

#### PUBLIC RELIEF.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question arises out of the answer given to me by the Minister of Social Welfare last Tuesday week to my question regarding the payments of relief to various people in the community. In the course of that answer, he said:

Alterations were made to the means test allowing people to receive public relief, without their being required to be completely destitute before qualifying.

As I know the Minister agrees, the word "destitute" is difficult to interpret. Can the Minister say what actual amount in liquid assets is used as a figure to determine destitution?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: No. If there is any word I detest to be used regarding people in South Australia it is the word "destitute". I intend to persist as far as I can in this matter to see that whatever relief is paid will be in line with what is provided by the Commonwealth Government. Other considerations are involved in cases of

extreme hardship, such as periods of sickness. When I think of relieving destitution, I consider what means test would enable eligibility for relief to be decided. As an example, a person may be working short time and, through no fault of his own, may be taking home on Friday night a pay packet containing about \$25 instead of one containing about \$50. After the family makes purchases over the weekend, there may be \$10 left on Monday. In my opinion, the fact that those people have that amount left on Monday and thus are not entirely destitute would exclude them from eligibility under a certain definition of "destitution". However, anyone in those circumstances must be considered to be entitled to relief forthwith.

Another matter about which I have been concerned is the practice of sending out relief orders. There will be a big migration of Aborigines to the northern part of the State because of improvements that have been made to an institution in the Port Augusta area and, if payments are required to be made to the husbands, I doubt that the wives and families will receive the money that ought to be paid to them. It may be necessary in some cases to revert to the system of issuing a type of sustenance so that we shall know that the money is being spent in the way intended. Much water will run under the bridge between now and the termination of this Parliament but I am not losing any time in resolving many of the things with which I find fault in this particular department.

Mr. QUIRKE: Has the Minister any knowledge of a stratum of society which cannot be regarded as being destitute but which is in very real need? I am referring to people on fixed incomes, the values of which have depreciated over the years. Many of these people are suffering various forms of malnutrition because of the lack of purchasing power of their money. Has the Minister any information about that difficulty, which is a real one in life in a suburban area?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It may be misleading to say "Yes" to this important question. A type of assistance is being examined as a result of instructions that I, as Minister, have given. I am extremely disappointed about the attitude that has been adopted by some Governments of South Australia in regard to certain people in this State. Even under fairly buoyant conditions many people in distress have not been cared for. I assure the honourable member

that much work has been done and I hope that the results of that work will be in the interests of the people.

#### BLACKWOOD ORCHARD.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On June 6 I wrote to the Minister of Agriculture about the future of the Blackwood Experimental Orchard, which is in my district. I have raised this matter with both the present Minister and his predecessor. The Minister was kind enough to acknowledge my letter on June 13, and he said:

I shall obtain a further report from the Director of Agriculture and will let you have this information as soon as possible.

More than five weeks have passed and I have not heard from the Minister again. Can he tell me what is to be the future of the property at present used as the Blackwood Experimental Orchard? If he cannot tell me today, can he get me an answer as soon as possible, preferably next Tuesday?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I have not had a report from the Director yet, but I shall get it now that the matter has been raised again.

#### HOUSING TRUST PROGRAMME.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Minister of Works, in the absence of the Premier and Minister of Housing, say what type of tenant the Government intends to house in accommodation built in terms of the high-density housing proposals announced a few days ago? Is it intended to make this accommodation available to people with large families, or will restrictions be imposed as to the type of family that can be accommodated?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As I understand it, at the beginning the high-density housing will be for young couples, who will be moved out when they have families, and for people of advanced years.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS: NATURAL GAS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I wish to read a short extract from the speech made by the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) yesterday in order to enable me to make my explanation. The honourable member

referred to me and to an incident in these terms:

The member for Gumeracha said that the grizzling Mayor of Wallaroo had asked him for a copy, and he had told him that he had only one copy for himself—and what did he do? I do not know whether he had it all photostated but there were certain parts he wanted to emphasize. That is how this thing goes on. I say this afternoon that it is not correct that the “grizzling Mayor of Wallaroo” asked him for a copy.

Mr. Nankivell interjected, “‘Grizzly bear’ or ‘grizzling Mayor’?” The member for Wallaroo continued:

It was not a correct statement that the former Premier made, because of the time factor involved in the photostat copies reaching Wallaroo. The member for Gumeracha knows that only too well. It was he who contacted the Mayor of Wallaroo.

The facts are that I saw the Mayor of Wallaroo on at least three occasions and he also brought me in contact with a gentleman from America who was most anxious to establish an industry in the honourable member's district. That district was regarded as being suitable for the establishment of a fertilizer industry based on natural gas. The Mayor of Wallaroo came to me and said that he could not get any satisfaction from the Premier about the pipeline and he asked me whether I could give any information. I said that the Premier had made a statement on the matter and that I had a copy of the report. I showed the copy to him and he asked me whether he could get a copy regarding the route of the pipeline. I took him to the Parliamentary Library and the Librarian showed him how to do the work and copied the report, which was then a public document that had been laid upon the table of the House by the Premier. So, the incident was not as the member for Wallaroo described it. The Mayor of Wallaroo had come to me on three occasions to get information. Incidentally, I have no recollection of calling the honourable mayor a grizzling mayor.

Mr. Hughes: No, you wouldn't want to.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have the highest opinion of the mayor. I may have said that he was dissatisfied or exasperated, but I have no recollection of having said that he was grizzling.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. HUGHES: In referring to the personal explanation made by the member for Gumeracha, I assure the House that I stand by what

I said last evening and that it is correct. For the benefit of the House, I point out that the Mayor of Wallaroo informed me by telephone that he had received photostat copies of the typewritten submissions, prepared for the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, from the member for Gumeracha. Indeed, that is what I said last night, and I stand by it. Although I referred yesterday to the corridor, to be more specific I will now say that it was at the end of the toilets that I challenged the member for Gumeracha. I referred only to the corridor previously because some young people were present in the gallery. I challenged the honourable member at the end of the toilets, because that is where we met. The words he used were the “grizzling Mayor of Wallaroo”, and that has been substantiated this afternoon by my colleague the member for Rome, who was with me at the time.

#### FRUIT FLY (COMPENSATION) BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### MURTHO RESERVE.

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's resolution.

#### REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT (STRATA TITLES) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 18. Page 627.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I regret that I must start my speech with a complaint about being obliged to go on with the debate only 48 hours after the measure was introduced.

Mr. Lawn: We had to do it more than once when we were in Opposition.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: It is a difficult and vexed problem.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In the 10 years that I have been in the House I do not remember this sort of thing happening. I challenge the member for Adelaide to give a specific instance where the debate had to begin immediately, but I do not think he can.

Mr. Lawn: I followed Sir Thomas Playford immediately after he introduced a Bill on workmen's compensation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I cannot accept that.

Mr. Lawn: I am telling you it happened, and *Hansard* will prove it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know whether the honourable gentleman had to do it, but I complain about having to do it today.

Mr. Casey: You are capable of doing it.

Mr. Lawn: I did not have a copy of the explanation either.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am glad the member for Frome has such a high opinion of me, because sometimes I doubt it. I reproach the Government because it obliges the debate to go on at such short notice. When the Premier introduced the Bill on Tuesday he asked the Opposition to be prepared to go on with it yesterday. That was entirely unreasonable on a measure of this difficulty and on a Bill of such length. I am prepared to go as far as I can today, but we have the ironical situation that, although the Bill was introduced by the Attorney-General, he is not here to take charge of the debate. I complained about this situation in another matter last evening, although I appreciate the heavy burdens that he had to carry.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Self-imposed!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. The multiplicity of portfolios that he handles may become difficult and, as a friend of his, I can see—

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Did you say "a dear friend"?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, as a friend. Obviously a heavy physical and mental strain is being imposed on the honourable gentleman because of the number of portfolios he carries. That is a matter for him, but we hope he can stand up to it. We have been asked to continue this debate today because the Government has no other business to put before the House. How ridiculous! In this place and outside it the Premier has spent many hours boasting about the amount of business that has been put through since the Labor Party came to office and about the heavy Notice Paper we could expect this session.

Yesterday, when I asked a question about an Act that obviously needed amending (and the Premier did not want to do anything about it), he took refuge in the point that there was so much business that had to come before the House that there would be no time this session to deal with the Lottery and Gaming Act. If this is the position, where are the Bills that are to be placed before the House? Why haven't we got them? We have reached the stage where there is hardly a thing on the Notice Paper, and that is part and parcel of my complaint.

Mr. Lawn: You criticize the Government every time you speak: you don't have to speak on everything.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The previous Government acted reasonably in these matters.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am prepared to speak as long as I can, and I have spent as much time as I had available preparing for this debate.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: I appreciate your attitude.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am sure the Minister does, and I appreciate his saying so.

Mr. Quirke: At 4 o'clock you can obtain leave to continue your remarks.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not intend to do that. At the Minister's request I have spent as much time as I could preparing for this debate, and I intend to say as much as I can. This is a long and complicated Bill, and runs to 57 pages of print. I do not know how many clauses it contains because of the extraordinarily unfortunate numbering of them. It is the product of an over-tidy mind. Instead of the new Part being added to the end of the principal Act it has been tacked in between two other Parts as a separate Part XIXB, with sections appallingly numbered 223nb and so on. The Bill is long, complicated, and quite technical. I have done my best to comprehend it in the short time I have had available, and I have taken the best advice available in the legal profession on this matter. The practitioner with whom I spent nearly two hours going through the Bill said he had found it impossible to understand completely a Bill of this complexity and to make a proper appreciation of it in such a short time.

This Government (and the Premier is never tired of saying it) is keen on law reform, and I applaud it for that keenness. This Bill is one item of law reform, but it is useless introducing Bills like this unless we are sure that they will work in practice, and we cannot be positive until they are in practice. The best we can do at this legislative stage is to ensure that they are examined and considered by as wide a cross-section of those interested in the subject matter as is possible. However, it is impossible for this Bill to be so examined in the short time available since it was introduced. I do not know whether copies are available to the general public but I hope the Government will not take refuge in the argument that the Bill can go to another place and spend some time there. That would be ironic in view of the Government's oft-expressed wish to abolish that place.

We should be satisfied that the Bill is in as good a condition as we can put it when it leaves this Chamber. Much law reform has been introduced since this Government assumed office, for which I give it full marks, especially when the law reform is of a non-Party political nature, as this matter should be. However, there should be some body in the community charged with the duty of advising the Government on questions of law reform. It has been undertaken far too haphazardly since the present Attorney-General came into office. I suggest that the Minister of Lands should suggest to his colleague that this matter should be placed on a more permanent basis, and that there should be a body set up to deal with questions of law reform. In his second reading explanation the Premier said:

By the provision of title upon which mortgage finance can be raised, the strata titles measure, as this is, should release in South Australia a considerable amount of extra finance for certain forms of home-unit building. The main purpose of the Bill, which amends the Real Property Act, is to authorize and facilitate the ownership of and the issue of titles for home units.

In other words, the object of this Bill is to make the ownership of home units a more attractive and an easier proposition. In yesterday's *Advertiser* the Premier went further and said that this was to be an "inexpensive and practical plan for ownership of home units". In the short time I have had to consider the Bill, I have concluded that it is going to be neither inexpensive nor practical. It is a most complicated matter and the legal costs and other fees, which will have to be paid by those who wish to own their home units and have a title to them, will be heavy. If it is the Government's intention, as I believe it is (and hope it is), to help those who are of limited means in this community, then it is not furthering that intention by this particular measure.

In fact, if I may say this with charity to those concerned with the presentation of the Bill, it is more appropriate to a multi-million dollar project for a 10-storey building in Sydney than for the type of home unit schemes that we have in South Australia. Let us remember that in South Australia the development of home units has been rather different from that in cities such as Sydney and Melbourne where there is higher-density living. Many of the owners and occupiers of home units in South Australia are older people who are not of very great means; many of them are widows in their 50's, 60's and 70's.

How capable will such people be of using the complicated machinery that is set out in the Bill? How much money will they have to spend on the fees and costs they will have to bear if they are to take advantage of these provisions? The answers to those questions are not likely to please any members in the House. Whilst I support the idea of separate titles of home units (and I am glad that the Government has gone further than Governments in other States have gone and has included single-storey accommodation) I am disappointed at the complicated and cumbersome nature of the scheme contained in this long and intricate Bill.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Are you going to suggest that there are other ways?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Given time, I certainly will. One of my main criticisms of the Bill is of the fact that so many complicated procedures connected with the Companies Office have to be observed. I should have thought it would be possible to create a statutory corporation by the Act itself, without having to go through all the procedures that are far more appropriate to a normal company such as we have here. The measure needs much examining before it is allowed to pass. It is not good that the Government should rush through legislation simply to be able to say, "We've passed 100 Bills of a reformative nature this session. Isn't that a good thing!" I draw attention particularly to the disparity in new section 223m(1) between the definitions of "special resolution" and "unanimous resolution". Why is there a difference between the terms of a special resolution and the terms of a unanimous resolution? I point out, too, that, although the definition of "unit subsidiary" refers to a "suite of rooms, utility room, laundry, garage, carport or shed", a common incinerator for the home units, which is important in this sort of living, does not appear. What about swimming or wading pools, which could easily be incorporated in the general plan? If we are to spell out as much detail as the Draftsman has attempted to spell out in this Bill, we had better be entirely thorough and spell out everything.

One of my more important objections is to new section 223 mb (1), the marginal title of which is "Strata plan". I do not blame the Draftsman for using the term "strata" even though more correctly it should be "stratum" because "strata" is plural. This sort of legislation generally refers only to strata, that is,



more than one layer, but here, of course, the Government has gone further, and it can relate only to one layer, so strictly it should be "stratum". However, I do not blame anyone for this. New section 223mb states:

(1) Subject to this Part, but without limiting its effect, a strata plan may make provision for—

- (a) the division of a building into units;
- (b) a unit wholly on one storey or level or partly on one storey or level and partly on another or others; or
- (c) a unit comprising part of a building and one or more unit subsidiaries shown as appurtenant thereto.

That is all right if there is only one building, but those of us who are familiar with home unit schemes will know that quite frequently there is more than one building in the scheme and that the buildings are physically separate. Therefore, if my interpretation of this provision is right, it cuts those schemes out altogether. Of course, "building" should be in the plural, because there are home-unit complexes, not one home-unit building at all. This is one thing which, I suggest, should be looked at.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: It applies to multi-storey buildings.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, one big building, but it does not apply to separate buildings, which are quite common in South Australia. In fact, I can think of Thornber Court in Thornber Street, Unley Park, and in the honourable member for Torrens' district Buckingham Close has a scheme in which there are separate buildings. They should be covered if this Bill is to work.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: In that respect this legislation is supposed to differ from the New South Wales legislation, according to the second reading!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, it is supposed to. It does, too, but it does not cover this particular sort of erection. One general point I come to here (and one can see it dotted throughout the whole Bill) is that the power to prescribe requirements and so on is given everywhere, but these requirements are not set out and no-one knows what they are likely to be. New section 223mb (2) (f) provides that a strata plan must contain such other particulars and comply with such other requirements as may be prescribed. The power to prescribe particulars and details, and therefore to increase the costs which will have to be met and the obligations of people who want to take advantage of this legislation, is legion. Why

it is necessary to tie up everything in this way, I do not know. We find the same thing in new section 223mb (3), which provides:

(3) Where a unit shown on a strata plan consists of or is part of a single-storey building the plan must comply with such requirements as are (and may be) prescribed in relation or with respect to . . .

One finds that wretched word "prescribed" time and time again. In new section 223mc (3)

(a) we find that the provisions of this Act as to existing buildings (which are not now divided into home units), apply only to buildings erected or for which permission has been given on or after January 1, 1950, which is a fairly reasonable date. However, I suggest that it is a pity to make it mandatory, and that there should be discretion in some way to allow all buildings erected before that time to be converted into home-unit ownership. I am told that most of the home units in this State have sprung up since about 1955, but blocks of flats that were constructed before 1950 may, quite appropriately, be converted to home-unit ownership. I do not see any reason why they should be cut out, as in fact they are in this provision.

I want to say a little more on new section 223md (6). This, it seems to me, is no better than a form of indirect taxation, because we find in effect that for every single home unit that is erected, if it is within the metropolitan area, a sum of \$100 has to be paid to the State Planning Authority to go into a special fund; or if it is outside the metropolitan planning area, a sum of \$40 has to be paid. The reason given in the section is that ". . . it shall be used by the State Planning Authority for the acquisition or development of reserves".

That sounds all right, but what does it mean? It means that if there is a home-unit complex with, say, 24 home units in it, the State Planning Authority immediately nets \$2,400 and puts it into the reserve fund. Now this is bad enough, because it is an added expense to people who are often of limited means; but there is no guarantee, of course, that they will get any reserves or that any reserves will be acquired anywhere near them. What if a home-unit scheme is put up in Mitcham or Burnside? This money can be used to have a reserve down at Taperoo, in which case it will give no benefit at all to those who are paying out the money.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Who might need it most.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. It simply says that it shall be used for the acquisition or development of reserves.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: By whom?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The State Planning Authority. The reserves could be anywhere in the State and not in the vicinity of the particular home units, the owners of which have to pay the money. It seems unreasonable that there should be this flat payment. If there was a big group of home units all together, then perhaps it would be necessary to have reserves in the area because of the high-density living. I suggest that some figure should be stipulated, and that if there were less than, say, 10 home units this payment should not be made. If there were, say, 15 home units the total amount payable could be \$500. As it stands now, it seems to me to be a quite unreasonable form of taxation on these people. Incidentally, I think there is a drafting error in subsection (6), and I shall mention that later to the appropriate authority.

There are one or two other matters that I want to mention. I have to apologize to you, Mr. Speaker, and to members of the House for having to speak at random, as it were, because I just have not had time, of course, to tie my remarks together, so the points are just coming out one after another in no particular order. One point I think I mentioned before is the requirement for the formation and the winding up of the companies referred to in the Bill. In some cases a person has to apply to the court and therefore pay the fees and the legal costs involved. It seems to me that all of this could have been avoided. It is all very well to say that a company is a company, that it has a corporate personality and that it has to be treated with respect, and so on. However, our aim here should be to save as much expense and to streamline procedures as much as we can. However, because of the scheme that has been written into this Bill we just do not do that.

The same could be said (and this is a very serious objection that I have to the scheme) of the committees of the corporations that are supposed to run these particular schemes. This is my next big point. New section 223ne (1) deals with the committees of corporations. When a home-unit scheme is formed, a corporation comes into existence, and all owners of the home units become members of the corporation. There is provision for committees of those members to be formed to

look after the corporate property. I think that gives the essence of the scheme. But, Sir, is this going to work? This is what that new section provides:

Subject to this Part, the powers, functions and duties of the corporation shall be exercised and performed by the committee of the corporation in such manner as the corporation by resolution passed at a general meeting of the corporation may direct or, in the absence of such resolution, in such manner as the committee think fit.

Then we have many pages setting out the procedures that have to be followed. This is entirely inappropriate in the case of, say, a group of old ladies who may be in fact the members of the corporation. Who on earth is going to run these things? If the committee, made up of the owners, who may be women in their 60's and 70's and no-one else—

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Would it apply to only two units?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I suppose it would. So far as I have been able to discover, it would apply to any number.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: If there were only two, you would have a corporation and a committee of two.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. I suggest that the more important point is that often, because of the nature of the ownership of these units, the people who are members of the corporation just are not capable of (nor will they want to do it) undertaking this responsibility, yet under the Bill they are saddled with that responsibility.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Compulsorily.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes; in fact, they incur penalties, under the penalty clauses in the Bill, if they do not carry out their duties. This is going to be an inhibiting factor in the whole scheme. Let us imagine a group of half a dozen or a dozen widows, for example—people with some means but not very great means. It would not be hard to find such groups already living in home units. It would be entirely unreasonable and quite impractical to expect them to undertake this. As far as I can see, these provisions are far more appropriate to groups of businessmen, who are experienced in meeting procedures, than to anybody else, yet these are the things that would have to be worked by home-unit owners.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: I notice in the Bill that a committee can comprise only one member.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. This again is something that may be strange. I have not worked through the ramifications of that. The point I make now is that often there will not be anybody capable of doing the work. On the other hand, and looking at it from the other point of view, there is a prohibition against any payment being made to a member of the corporation. It could well be that one of the members of the corporation (one of the home-unit owners), if it were a big block of flats, could act as the secretary; but under this Bill a person would be precluded from doing that, because he cannot be paid anything for doing it.

Why is this? What if one of the occupants of the home units happens to be a plumber and one of the other home units has a leaky tap? Why should that plumber not be able to go and fix it up? Yet as far as I can see, that cannot be done under this Bill, because there is a prohibition against payment to any member of the corporation.

This again is something that I suggest should be tidied up, and tidied up by people who know something of these matters. There is the question of the service of notices. No public officer is appointed for these corporations, so there is not one person to whom one can look for the service of notices or for contact or responsibility or anything like that. Under the Associations Incorporation Act there must be a public officer for every association. As this is a matter of convenience, I think it is something that could have been imported here. I commend members who want a little mental exercise to improve their mental agility to look at the insurance provision, new section 223nk (particularly new subsections (5) and (6)), to see whether they can understand at first glance what those new subsections mean, because I am afraid I have had great difficulty in understanding them.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Would it be necessary for people with home units to understand them?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It would certainly be desirable, because they deal with insurance which, as the Premier said in his second reading explanation, is an important matter. This only illustrates that we want a simple, easy scheme that the people who are likely to go into home units can understand and operate themselves. We do not have it in this Bill, yet the Premier said in the press that that was exactly what he wanted. He said he wanted an inexpensive

and practical plan: he put forward the Bill as an inexpensive and practical plan.

The last matter with which I shall deal on this occasion (and I hope I shall have an opportunity in due course to make more comments) is new section 223nr, which provides the wide regulation-making power. New subsection (1) provides:

The Governor may make such regulations, not inconsistent with this Act, as are necessary or expedient for the purposes of giving effect to this Part and of any matters incidental thereto.

That is a good, wide, blanket power. New subsection (2) provides: "Without limiting the generality of the provisions of subsection (1) of this section such regulations may", and the special powers are set out. One of them seems to me to mean legislation by regulation, and that is new subsection 2 (c), which provides:

. . . prescribe, in addition to the grounds set out in section 223md of this Act, any grounds on which a council or the Director may refuse an application referred to in subsection (1) or subsection (2) of that section . . .

It is going fairly wide if, by regulation (having set out grounds in the Bill itself) we provide any other grounds on which an application may be refused.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: They need not even be relevant.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No. It is as wide as the world and I suggest (even in the fashion of our contemporary legislation) that it is too wide. I am sorry that I cannot do more on this Bill at present, but I hope that I have said enough to show that this is a Bill which, because of the intrinsic value of the scheme itself, merits detailed and wide examination by those who will be concerned with it. The Government is entirely unreasonable (and I am afraid the Minister of Lands must take some share of responsibility for it as he is one of the team) in introducing a Bill on Tuesday and expecting it to be debated today. I appreciate (and I say this with great sincerity) the reasonable approach of the Minister of Works. I understand the difficulties under which he has laboured in the last 24 hours in this House and the fact that he has no real business to go on with. I have done my best, and I appreciate his courtesy in allowing me to continue my remarks which I now seek leave to do.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.35 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 25, at 2 p.m.