LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, October 24, 1961.

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

QUESTIONS.

SITTINGS OF THE COUNCIL.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: In view of the state of the Notice Paper, can the Chief Secretary indicate whether the Council will be required to sit at night during the remainder of the session, and in view of important engagements some members will have to meet in the near future can he indicate when the session is likely to end?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The honourable member asks the position regarding the sittings of the Council. That, of course, depends on the length of the debate that takes place on the various Bills, and it is not easy to anticipate what that will be, but in view of the condition of the Notice Paper I would ask members to make themselves available to sit on Tuesday and Wednesday nights as required for the remainder of the session. I say "as required" because it depends on the amount of progress made on the respective Bills. We have a long Notice Paper, but I think it is not particularly contentious. Of course, the hours of sitting must depend upon the amount of debate involved. As far as the conclusion of the session and prorogation are concerned, two Select Committees are sitting at the moment, and I am not sure of the dates when their reports will have to be submitted, but their investigations will take some time. I would think that at the latest we should be able to prorogue in the second week in November.

BLINDNESS.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my question of October 3 regarding making blindness a notifiable disability, following on a conference in Queensland? The Minister said he would get some information or discuss with Cabinet whether action should be taken in the direction indicated.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I referred the question to the Director-General of Public Health, and his report on the subject referred to by the honourable member is as follows:

The addition of blindness to the list of notifiable diseases has been suggested on a number of occasions. Support comes from organizations interested in the care of the blind and a resolution favouring notification was passed by the Public Health Committee of the National Health and Medical Research Council in 1957. Some opposition has been expressed by the Federal Council of the British Medical Association and the Ophthalomological Society of Australia. The main reason for requiring notification of any particular disease under the Health Act is so that effective control can be exercised in order to prevent further occurrence of the disease. Additional value attaches to notification reliably carried out, in the building up of a body of useful information about each disease. General experience is that notification is fully observed only in those condtions where action of importance in preserving public health is considered likely to follow upon notification. There are many conditions where useful information could be collected by compulsory notification. These include blindness, deafness, congenital heart disease, mental deficiency and numerous others. People especially interested in these diseases might make an equally good case for their notification. The public would not be likely to favour compulsory notification of the many conditions in this group. I understand that blindness has not been made notifiable in any other State, and I do not recommend its inclusion in the schedule of notifiable diseases in South Australia. Notification implies that a doctor or other responsible person is aware of the condition. Almost all such cases are brought under suitable care at the same time.

TANTANOOLA CAVE.

The Hon. A. C. HOOKINGS: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question regarding the new Tantanoola cave?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The Director of the Tourist Bureau has reported as follows:

The matter of a new cave at Tantanoola has been discussed with the local district clerk, who supplied the following information:

1. The cave is situated on the Tantanoola Caves national pleasure resort approximately 600 yards away from the cave which is now open to the public. The existence of the "new" cave has been known since about 1931.
2. In his opinion the cave is not as attractive as the one which is now open to the public, although the presence of the lake has created interest.
3. A great deal of work would be necessary to open the cave for public inspection.
4. The Caves Exploration Group is preparing a report regarding the "new" cave and a report will be available to this department about the end of this year.

Therefore, it is suggested that this matter be allowed to remain in abeyance until the report from the Caves Exploration Group is received.

TOURIST BUSES.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (on notice): In view of the importation of four buses by Pioneer Tourist Coaches Pty. Ltd. for the interstate tourist trade and the likely effect of this on railway revenue, is it the intention of the Government to meet the challenge by re-organizing the South Australian Railways to provide better and cheaper travelling facilities?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: No reorganization is being considered at the moment.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE REPORT.

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the Standing Orders Committee's report, together with schedule of suggested amendments to the Standing Orders.

Ordered to be printed.

MENTAL HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Minister of Health) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Mental Health Act, 1935-1960. Read a first time.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to ensure that any State child, who is received and detained in a mental institution in accordance with the provisions of section 31 or 35 of the principal Act, retains the status of a State child. In 1958 the principal Act was amended to enable State children to be admitted to mental institutions without their being classified as criminal mental defectives. At the time that amendment was proposed it was felt that such a child should not be classed as a State child during the period of his detention in the mental institution and the amendment provided accordingly. Experience, however, has proved that that provision was not a wise one.

Previously, for many years, all State children admitted to mental hospitals remained State children for the periods covered by the relevant court orders. The 1958 amendment unfortunately varied this position so far as admissions under sections 31 and 35 of the principal Act are concerned, whereas State children admitted as voluntary patients to mental hospitals remain State children and those admitted to Minda Home and to other hospitals and institutions continue to remain the responsibility of the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board. Apart from those anomalies, certain difficulties have also arisen in relation to the exercise of control over and the granting of relief to children who have been affected by the 1958 amendment. Under section 126 of the Maintenance Act the Governor has power, upon the recommendation of the board, to extend the period of supervision of a State child beyond the date specified in the relevant court mandate until the child attains the age of 21 years in the case of a male or for any period in the case of a female. This power is used in appropriate cases for the benefit of a child in need of assistance beyond the age of 18 years, but can only be exercised if the child is a State child. It could therefore not be availed of since the 1958 amendment came into force in relation to a State child who has been admitted to a mental institution under section 31 or 35 of the principal Act and who thereby ceased to be a State child.

When a child so ceases to be a State child, contact between that child and departmental welfare officers is virtually lost as such officers, for instance, have no right to approach such a child while on trial leave from the mental institution. It is felt that the supervision which the board has power to exercise over a State child should not be interrupted by the child's admission to a mental institution. The supervision which the board exercises over State children is essential for the welfare of the children themselves and the community at large.

The removal of these anomalies and difficulties has been recommended by the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board, with the concurrence of the Director-General of Medical Services and the Director of Mental Health. Clause 3 accordingly gives effect to that recommendation by striking out from subsection (1) of section 37a of the principal Act the provision whereby a State child ceases to be a State child whilst detained in a mental institution pursuant to section 31 or 35 of the principal Act.

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

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General) moved:

That the Hon. A. J. Shard be discharged from attending the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation and that the Hon. A. F. Kneebone be appointed to the committee in his place.

Motion carried.

MARRIAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Marriage Act, 1936-1957. Read a first time.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill makes certain necessary amendments to the Marriage Act which will be required following upon the proclamation of the Commonwealth Marriage Act. Although further amendments to our Act may be required in the light of experience there are four small amendments which are considered essential. The first amendment effected by clause 3 is to insert into the principal Act a definition of "authorized celebrant". Under the Commonwealth Act persons who can celebrate marriages are specifically defined and as the provisions of the State legislation on this matter will be superseded by the Federal provisions it is necessary for this provision to be inserted in our Act.

The second amendment is made by clause 4 which relates to procedure. Under our State law the celebrant of the marriage completes three certificates. One is handed to the parties, one is sent to the central office of the Registrar and one to the District Registrar. Under the Federal law the celebrant still completes three certificates one of which is handed to the parties and only one to the central office for entry in the general register. The third copy is retained by the celebrant for church records. It will therefore be necessary for the central office to copy its registration and forward the copy to the District Registrar for entry in his register thus preserving the present practice in this State. Clause 4 accordingly makes the necessary amendment to section 33 of the State Act.

Section 49 of the State Act provides that any Registrar who wilfully registers a marriage contravening the Act shall be guilty of an offence. It is considered desirable to add to that section words which will cover contraventions of Commonwealth law and this is done by clause 5. The last amendment concerns the fees payable for celebration of marriages after ten days' notice—under the Federal law this period is seven days—and clause 6 of the Bill accordingly amends the Sixth Schedule of the State Act. I should point out in connection with this Bill which is purely of a technical character that the State Act provides not only for marriage but also for the registration of marriage certificates. The Commonwealth Act does not, however, cover registration so that the registration provisions of the State Act will remain in force. This is why it is necessary for the present Bill to make the alterations in the State registration provisions.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD secured the adjournment of the debate.

BOTANIC GARDEN ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

DOG FENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In asking Parliament to agree to a continuance of the Prices Act for a further 12 months—that is, until the end of 1962—I am influenced by reasons similar to those which I have previously submitted to honourable members. Boiled down, they can be summed up in one simple proposition—namely, that the State continues to derive substantial and important benefits from the activities of the department. The work of the department comprises not only the control of certain prices, but the carrying out of investigations and negotiations affecting important aspects of the industrial and commercial life of the State. In both these aspects of its work the department continues to be of considerable service to the Government and the public.

Honourable members are familiar with most aspects of price control, but let me remind them of some of the advantages gained by continuing this legislation.

Regarding the effects of declaration of the living wage, I think it is correct to say that practically every declaration of a basic or living wage in recent years has increased the wage with the result in each case that the annual wages paid in Australia are suddenly increased by many millions of pounds a year. There are roughly 3,000,000 wage earners in Australia, so that an average increase per week of ten shillings adds about £75,000,000 to the annual wages bill. There is, not unnaturally, a tendency for employers to raise prices in order to pay the increases, and no doubt some of them cannot avoid doing so. But if by control the increase in prices can be kept low, the wage earner derives a benefit from the increases which he would not get without control. The Prices Department has, in a number of cases, restrained or prevented

sellers from using the increased wage as an excuse for making price rises which in fact were not justified by the rise in wages.

As to housing, this State is the only one which has continued to exercise control over building costs, with the result that they are the lowest in the Commonwealth. An average five-roomed brick dwelling can be built in South Australia today for about £750 lower than the same type of house built in any other State. The lower building costs enjoyed by this State have enabled the number of houses built here for the year ended June 30, 1961, (9,376) to be built for about £6,000,000 less than the same number of houses could have been built in any other State. This has also meant that semi-governmental authorities have been able to erect an additional 600 houses from funds available.

With the highly competitive export trade it is necessary in the interests of both primary producers and industry that costs be kept to a minimum. The large number of component parts which go towards making up the total cost structure cover a very wide range and in this respect the exercise of some force of control over the range of items which are incorporated in various export costs has greatly assisted in keeping them at reasonable levels. The fact that the Prices Department has been able to keep such items as superphosphate, petroleum products, cartage rates, a wide range of building materials and services and every day living costs, at reasonable levels, has contributed materially in this respect.

The Prices Department has carried out a number of special investigations on behalf of the Government and in the interests of certain important sections of the community. Two separate investigations—one dealing with wine grape prices and the other dealing with low-priced wines—resulted in substantial benefits to grape growers in the case of the first investigation, and greatly assisted wine makers to stabilize their industry in the latter case. Other investigations of a special nature carried out by the department have been of a confidential nature but have been of great assistance to the Government and certain industries.

Restrictive trade practices can take many forms, and in a number of cases require delicate handling by a specialized staff. The Prices Act gives a fair measure of control over restrictive trade practices and in some cases the department has, by its adaptability, been able to negotiate favourable agreements, in view of which restrictive practices in this State are by no means as prevalent as we know them to be in some other States. With a specialised and experienced staff which is able to distinguish what is a fair trade practice and what is an unfair trade practice, continuation of the Prices Act will serve to keep restrictive trade practices to a minimum and to deal with them effectively where they are harmful.

Since the uniform Hire-Purchase Agreements Act became law in this State the Prices Department has been policing this Act also, and has already provided a valuable service to both the trade and the public. Already a number of complaints lodged have been investigated and in certain transactions the department has successfully taken action to ensure the hirer his entitlements.

Regarding exploitation, the department continues to receive numerous complaints against overcharges covering a wide range of goods and services, and there are many members who, from their own experience of certain matters which they have brought to the attention of the department, have found that where exploitation has occurred the department has acted and obtained most satisfactory results. Refunds continue to be obtained by the department for persons who have been excessively charged.

Investigations carried out by the department into individual industries alone have resulted in some very substantial savings. In a little more than the last four years there have been 12 successive series of reductions on major petroleum products without any increases. With the exception of relaxation in customs duty all these reductions have been initiated by the S.A. Prices Department and the savings over this period for South Australia alone total £8,695,000. Of this amount customs duty totals £614,000. In effect the department itself has saved consumers in this State over £8,000,000. Price reductions over this period have been:—Petrol, 5½d. per gallon; lighting kerosene, 1½d. per gallon; power kerosene, 1d. per gallon; distillate, 3d. per gallon; diesel oil, £3 11s. 6d. per ton; furnace oil, £4 per ton. It might also interest members to know that the retail price of 3s. 3d. per gallon for standard grade motor spirit in South Australia is 1½d. per gallon lower than the price in all other States. It is also the equivalent of 2d. per gallon below the price at which the same octane spirit sells in San Francisco and 3d. per gallon below the price in New York. In other individual investigations the department has also effected some remarkable savings figures. In the last five years, primary producers have been saved almost £1,000,000

on superphosphate and in the last three years users of timber have been saved a total of £600,000. I could quote many more instances of individual industry savings effected by the department, but the facts given are more than sufficient to illustrate the position.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill wants the facts, but he keeps muttering that things are not true. If he wants the facts I have them in the file. I have no desire to go into what I consider private dealings between the department and the firms concerned, but if the honourable member wants the facts I am prepared to give them to him.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Give them.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The honourable member has already had one go and has had publicity. I have the answers if he wants me to give them to members.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I wish you would.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Honourable members will realize that the prices legislation has conferred on this State a number of benefits, the nature and the extent of which have been so useful that it would be most unsound to allow this legislation to lapse. The very protective role of the department has contributed greatly in maintaining freedom from industrial unrest in this State. I therefore ask members to vote for a continuation of this legislation for a period of a further 12 months.

The Bill before the House also provides that the sections of the present Act dealing with the control of land transactions will cease to apply at the end of the year. During the war the Commonwealth Government exercised a control over land sales but difficulties were found in policing the provisions. The Government of this State has come to the conclusion that the provisions are unnecessary and the Bill accordingly so provides.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD secured the adjournment of the debate.

AUCTIONEERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 19. Page 1396.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): The object of this Bill is to insert in the principal Act a provision making it an offence for anyone, whether a natural person or a company, to offer, deal in, sell or put up to sale any land or estate in land by way of auction on any Sunday. The Bill is limited to auction sales of land, the sale of goods or chattels other than exempted goods, whether by auction or otherwise, being already prohibited in shopping districts by the Early Closing Act. The Bill will not prohibit ordinary land sales on Sundays, and that is where I disagree with it. The Bill simply prohibits the auctioning of land on Sundays, and I do not think it goes far enough. As far as I can ascertain there has been only one auction sale of land on a Sunday in the metropolitan area in the last 10 years. The people who want this legislation desire a prohibition of the sale of land on Sundays, which has developed considerably over the last few years. Every weekend in the newspaper we see large advertisements that land agents will be at a certain spot at a certain time for the purpose of selling land, and invitations are given to people to attend at that spot on the Sunday to inspect the land and make purchases. In my opinion it is wrong to do this on a Sunday. I have read the report of the debate in another place, where it was indicated what the Real Estate Institute of South Australia wanted. The institute is vitally concerned in this matter, and the following appeared in an article in the *Advertiser* of October 19 under the heading of "Institute favours Sunday Ban":

> There appeared to be some confusion about the attitude of the Real Estate Institute of South Australia to the proposed legislation on Sunday trading in real estate, the President of the Institute (Mr. H. F. Gaetjens) said yesterday. He was commenting on statements made in the Assembly on Tuesday during the second reading debate on a Bill which prohibits land auctions on Sundays. Mr. Gaetjens said, "Our institute, which is a member of the Real Estate and Stock Institute of Australia, strongly supports the resolution passed at the Federal Conference 'that all States seek legislation banning Sunday trading in real estate'." At a special general meeting of the Real Estate Institute of South Australia, held on May 2 this year, it was unanimously resolved "that this meeting is opposed to Sunday trading in real estate and urges that steps be taken to seek legislation to ban such trading, but in order to establish the feeling of all members recommends that a ballot be taken of all full members of the institute on the following question: Do you favour the banning of Sunday trading in real estate?"
>
> The subsequent result of that ballot showed 87 per cent in favour of the ban. At a recent deputation by this Institute to the Premier, we sought the following amendment of the Land Agents Act:
>
> > "No person on a Sunday shall sell or offer for sale or canvass persons to purchase land or any interest therein or invite any person to enter into a contract for the construction or acquisition of any building or part thereof provided that it shall be lawful for the person to sell or offer for sale or to canvass

persons to purchase land owned by him on which is erected a dwellinghouse *bona fide* occupied by him as his principal place of residence.''

It will thus be seen that sales by private treaty or auction on a Sunday would be abolished except in special cases.

That was the decision of the institute. Nobody wants to take away from private persons the right to conduct sales of their own property on Sunday, but the vast majority of the community is opposed to Sunday land sales in and around Adelaide.

I do not wish to carry this matter any farther, but I ask the Government to re-examine this Bill in the light of the view expressed by the Real Estate Institute and what is generally known of the view of the community. Then the Government, in its wisdom, may prohibit Sunday land sales. I support the Bill and no member should have any opposition to it in its present form, although some members may agree with my view that the Bill does not go far enough in the direction desired by the community.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 18. Page 1328.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): This is a simple Bill that all honourable members can agree with. It simply amends the Act in relation to the allowance of His Excellency the Governor, which was previously adjusted on a ''C'' series index basis. That index is no longer in existence. Although the second reading explanation of the Minister did not say so, I believe the new index on which the allowance will be adjusted is the consumer price index. I believe that is the correct way to deal with such allowances, because this matter should not be debated from time to time in Parliament. It should be adjusted according to the rise and fall of the cost structure in our State. It is a pity that the Government could not have seen eye to eye with the Opposition's request to consider the consumer price index as a cost of living basis for South Australia. That would have meant an increase of 19s. in the basic wage as at June last. However, the Government has seen fit not to use that index in one direction but to adopt it in another way. If the matter had been considered in its right perspective the consumer price index figures issued last week, which indicated a reduction of 2s. a week, would have reduced that figure to 17s. I do not wish to carry that matter any further, but I hope the system which is being introduced to adjust His Excellency's allowance will be adequate because Sir Edric and Lady Bastyan have already created a favourable impression with the people of South Australia. I trust that their term of office in this State will be very happy. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY (Central No. 2): This Bill surprises me, because it has taken the line of least resistance on a matter that deals with the highest office in South Australia. The basic wage was developed originally for the benefit of the man on the bottom rung. I believe we have now seen the cycle go right around. I do not object to protection for the man on the bottom rung, who, in a measure, cannot look after himself as others can. When the basic wage was instituted most people believed that some good would be accomplished by its establishment. However, since that time we have seen basic wage adjustments applied right through every form of industry and efforts have even been made to have them applied to members of Parliament.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Why not?

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY: I do not think it is advisable, necessary or desirable. Its original intention was to protect people who could not, in a measure, look after themselves. We are now controlling in every possible way the development of the country by enforced and automatic laws, and I do not believe that is the way the country was originally developed. That method will undermine the stamina of the people as time goes on. That is quite different from dealing with matters that have become customary in the control of our economic system. The Government should adopt a satisfactory method of fixing His Excellency's allowance, but to deal with it in this manner is a great mistake. People should not be afraid to tackle these problems. If a view is right and justifiable then honourable members should tackle the position in a straight-out way. Under this Bill automatic increases are to be given without control and without members even seeing whether they are justified. I have not examined the details closely, but presumably the adjustment of the allowance is to be on a percentage basis: that position does not apply elsewhere. I do not know whether it is an increased marginal rate?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Yes.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY: It is limited to that?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Yes.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY: Then it is more paltry than ever. I do not think that this matter should be brought before the House, as it is not the desirable way to handle the position. I intend to vote against the Bill.

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

LAND SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 12. Page 1217.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill, which will do two things. It will extend the life of the Land Settlement Committee for another two years as from December 31 and provide that certain lands in the South-East may be acquired under certain circumstances. I support this measure with some hesitation because during the last 12 to 15 months this committee has had practically no work to do. That is unfortunate. If I remember correctly, the last time that this legislation was before the Council the Hon. Mr. Edmonds was chairman of the committee and he told us how well it had worked and what it had done in the interests of the State. Therefore, members could feel satisfied with their work and that they had earned their remuneration. According to the second reading speech of the Chief Secretary, the Government intends to provide this committee with some work in the near future. If the members can maintain the standard of their previous efforts, they will not only have earned their remuneration, but will have the added satisfaction of knowing that they are doing a worthy job. It can be truly said that no honourable member wants to be a member of a committee that has no work to do or to take payment for work not done. I support the second reading.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS (Northern): I also support the Bill, and more readily so in view of the intimation by the Chief Secretary that the committee will undertake some work usually done by the Public Works Committee and thus relieve its members, who undoubtedly have been snowed under with references during the last couple of years. As the Land Settlement Committee has been inactive for a long period it is desirable that it should undertake such inquiries which come within the realm of its authority. The question arises whether some further amendment may be necessary before effect can be given to this committee undertaking some of the work usually done by the Public Works Committee. In this connection it is interesting to notice that the Parliamentary Papers for 1960 reveal that this latter committee handled 57 references. Of this number 47 concerned schools and school buildings and renovations; eight, water supplies; and two, sewer proposals.

The duties of the Land Settlement Committee are laid down in the parent Act and the question arises whether its members can relieve the Public Works Committee of some of its work, having in mind that, in future, references to this committee may be as numerous as in the past, and that is the indication at present. The preamble of the original Act was as follows:

> An Act to provide for the establishment of a Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement and for the acquisition, improvement and closer settlement of under-developed lands, and for purposes incidental thereto.

Section 22 lays down that among the committee's duties shall be:

> (*a*) to inquire into and report to the Governor upon any project for land settlement or any question relating to the settlement, development or working of any land, which is referred to the Committee by the Governor;
>
> (*b*) to make recommendations under section 25 of this Act in relation to the acquisition of land;
>
> (*c*) any other duties which relate to the settlement, development or working of land and are conferred on the Committee by the Governor.

As a layman, I question whether that widens the scope of inquiry by the committee along the lines suggested. The references to the Public Works Committee in 1960 included only two which could be considered as being applicable to the Land Settlement Committee. By no stretch of the imagination would we consider that the building or reconstruction of schools could be taken as contributing to land settlement or to the development of land. It is quite possible that something beyond the two amendments proposed will be necessary if we are to put the Government's desires into effect and give the Land Settlement Committee something to do in the field that has been suggested.

It was my privilege to be associated with the committee for some years and I may be forgiven if I say that its members did effective

work on the matters referred to them. I pay a tribute to the officers of the Lands Department, the Land Development Branch, and those who were associated in any way with land settlement proposals that were investigated by the committee. The committee was an adjunct of the Commonwealth War Service Land Settlement Agreement made between the States and the Commonwealth. The part of that agreement relating to the acquisition of land terminated in June, 1959, and since then the committee, with the exception of the inquiry into the Loxton irrigation area in 1960, has been inactive. This committee could be fully and properly engaged in relieving the Public Works Committee, or perhaps other statutory bodies, if its scope was widened. I have no doubt, because of my association with the committee, that any proposals submitted to it would be investigated with the same efficiency and keenness as in the past.

An interesting feature of the Commonwealth-State War Service Land Settlement Agreement was the enthusiasm and interest displayed by those associated with the project. It was something more than a Governmental inquiry for them, because it concerned the satisfactory repatriation and re-settlement of ex-servicemen who wished to go on the land. The development of Kangaroo Island has been an outstanding accomplishment. My knowledge of Kangaroo Island goes back many years when I had an extensive tour of the island. This was long before I was associated with politics, and I formed an unfavourable opinion of the island as regards future settlement and its productive capacity. However, as time went on and I had further opportunity of investigating the island, I realized its potential. The establishment of the experimental farm at Parndana and the work done by the departmental officers proved a success, for great benefits ensued for those ex-servicemen who took up land on the island. One of the problems in that area was lack of transport, and it was some time before there was much improvement. Now, we are on the eve of the introduction of a most modern transport facility, as the roll-on roll-off ship will be in service next month. I commend the company responsible for the introduction of this service for its efforts in assisting in the successful development of that part of the State. I support the Bill.

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

HOUSING AGREEMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 18. Page 1329.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Central No. 1): The purpose of this Bill is to extend the 1956 housing agreement between the States and the Commonwealth Government. The original housing agreement was drawn up after extensive inquiries by a committee set up by the Chifley Government to investigate housing problems throughout Australia. Mr. A. V. Thompson, who was at that time a member of the House of Assembly and who is now a member of the House of Representatives, was appointed to that committee. The committee presented a report to the Commonwealth Parliament, as a result of which, after a conference with the States, the housing agreement was introduced. In the original report provision was made for more leasing or renting of homes than at present. However, with the change in the Commonwealth Government, that part of the agreement was eliminated, and most of the funds that are now being provided by the Commonwealth Government to the respective States to be used by housing authorities are mainly used to build houses for sale.

This legislation amends the 1956 Agreement, and whilst the Opposition will not raise objections to money being made available to build houses, it does consider that the Bill has certain deficiencies which cause frustration to those not in a position to purchase a house. The major building authority in this State is the Housing Trust. Many people have a great regard for its activities, and the State Government should feel proud that there is such an institution which shoulders all the responsibility of the Government for housing and makes the lot of the Premier much easier than it would be if the trust did not exist. The State Bank Board is playing a prominent part in providing money for house building, and so, too, are the private banks.

As indicated in its report for the last quarter, in the last 12 months the Housing Trust has completed 3,314 houses, including multiple flats, cottage flats, emergency houses and houses to let. I understand that the target for this year is about 8,000 rental houses and 3,000 purchase houses. The trust is the only authority building rental houses, and it has a back lag covering about nine or 10 years. Since it began operations in 1937 the trust has completed 43,317 houses and flats. Between 1937 and 1946 the houses built by the trust were solely for rental purposes. Under its house sales scheme,

initiated in 1946, the trust has built expressly for sale 18,843 houses in the metropolitan area, Elizabeth and the country. This figure does not include houses previously let. On July 1, 1961, 2,810 houses and flats were under construction by the trust. This is the largest number at any time except 1953 when many timber houses were imported. The total rentals received by the trust from all its houses during the year ended June 30, 1961, amounted to £3,106,000. The trust is regarded as a most efficient organization. Losses in rentals are infinitesimal as compared with New South Wales, where I understand the losses run into many thousands of pounds. Such losses do not occur in South Australia, proving that the trust is efficient.

The Hon. W. W. Robinson: It does good work.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I also pay a tribute to the people who rent the houses. They realize their responsibilities and do not want things handed to them on a plate. They have running through their veins the same pioneering spirit that was successful in developing South Australia and other States. Under the Bill a percentage of the money available will be distributed to building societies. New South Wales has a number of such societies, but the number here is small, probably three or four; consequently most of the money available under the agreement will go to the trust.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Surely you are not going to kick the ladder away now you have built up a good picture?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I said earlier that the trust is doing a good job, but we have the right to point out where we think there are difficulties under the agreement. I have no quarrel with the Bill. When the building industry is in a low state of activity all other industries are in the same position. If we have a buoyant building industry allied industries are also buoyant. In America the insurance companies and private banks deal in what are called packet mortgages. I understand that some of the private builders are doing it here. The house purchaser pays so much deposit on the house, which is fully furnished. The married couple go into the house and pay only one amount each quarter.

The Hon. C. R. Story: They need insurance to go with that.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Yes. Here the breadwinner can be insured so that when he dies there is no difficulty for the widow and the family. It may be difficult to have a similar scheme here, and perhaps it is outside the ambit of the legislation dealing with the Housing Trust, but the scheme works efficiently overseas. The period of payment ranges from 25 to 45 years, and the scheme does away with much of the interest charges. The amount that is paid each quarter covers interest and principal repayments on the loan on the house, and a payment for the furniture in the house. It is a matter that might be considered by our Government. There could be the one payment to cover all the indebtedness of the person going into a house. Under the Bill the Commonwealth Government and the defence authorities can ask that five per cent of the money made available be spent on the building of houses for people in the defence forces. I do not object to that, because any country that has good defences has a wide avenue for peace. The people who are in our defence forces should have special consideration in the matter of houses for them.

The interest rate on the money borrowed under the agreement will be 1 per cent below the bond rate. In the original agreement the rate of interest was 4½ per cent. The State Bank now charges 5¾ per cent, and the Savings Bank a similar rate. Private lending authorities for house building charge 6 per cent or 6½ per cent on first mortgage. When the agreement was first operative the interest rate was low, and as time goes by I hope that we shall get back to a lower rate of interest on loans for house building. The greatest contentment we can have in the community is to have our people, who are ready and willing to work, to be at work and decently housed. Because of that I offer no objection to any legislation providing houses for the people. I support the second reading.

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY (Southern): I, too, support the second reading of this Bill and express appreciation of the attitude adopted by the Hon. Mr. Bardolph. He has shown a full appreciation of the activities of the Government in enabling finance to be available for house building. He has been appreciative of the work done by the Government and various building organizations that perform this work. Out of the £8,000,000 provided, an amount of £4,250,000 will be used by the Housing Trust and the balance will be used by the State Bank and building societies. This will mean that many people will have access to funds for work to be performed for the benefit of their customers.

I regret that the rate of interest should have been increased. Houses that have been built for the same purpose should all be on the same basis, but there has been a rise of 1 per cent on a rental basis. Consequently, the rents are a little higher than they would otherwise have been. I commend the Government for having been able to bring about this agreement and for providing a lower rate of interest than would have normally been available for housing. Even if the rate is not as low as the Government desired, it is beneficial in every other regard. The fact that the agreement permits the Government to build houses for sale, thereby enabling it to re-invest money in the State's programme, must have a big bearing on the number of houses that can be built each year. Consequently, that, too, is a valuable medium for the building of houses.

We are fortunate in having a Housing Trust to build so many houses. The trust has built some houses very cheaply: probably some have been built a little too cheaply. The fact that the trust has engaged in large house-building projects does, perhaps, make it a little difficult for other house builders to get access to some of the work that might otherwise be offering. I wonder whether the introduction of large-scale building in this State has been entirely in the interests of the State as a whole. Time alone will prove that point, and whether the introduction of house-building by foreign contractors building at a rate that is considered too low by local house builders is in our best interests. The Housing Trust, the State Bank and other organizations have been successful in keeping the number of houses built somewhere near the demand for houses.

The Hon. Mr. Bardolph has expressed regret that more houses are not built for letting, but I believe that criticism is more than met by the fact that, in the repayment for homes sold, more money becomes available for the building of further houses. The agreement is of great benefit to South Australia and the working people, and I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES (Southern): I support the Bill, which is to approve a housing agreement between the Commonwealth and States. I intend to deal with two topics. The first relates to the question of houses built for rental and for purchase. The Hon. Mr. Bardolph mentioned the pioneering spirit of the early Australians. Obviously that spirit continues today. The monthly bulletin issued by the Housing Trust indicates that there is a lag in the number of houses built for purchase as against those built for renting. In a country such as Australia it is desirable to encourage home ownership. Although the figures are down in comparison with rental homes, I believe that, over the years, this policy of building a certain number of houses for purchase should be extended as it would be in the best interests of the people of the State.

We see today a picture of vast housing projects in various parts of the State. All the houses are not built in the metropolitan area. Members might think of housing projects at Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Stanvac, and in the South-East around Mount Gambier within the next few years. We must give full marks to the Government for building these houses which are of a good standard and of solid construction. They encourage people to go to the various parts of the State. I hope that in future the tendency to make houses more readily available in and around the metropolitan area will not cause people to lose sight of the necessity to build more houses outside this area. The future of South Australia, to a large extent, lies in the development of its southern areas. Several members have the honour to represent those areas, and the practice of making houses available and encouraging decentralization by the establishment of major industries in those areas will generally benefit the State. I support the Bill.

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

REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 18. Page 1328.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): This is another short Bill. Clause 2 repeals section 20 of the Act which requires every Registrar-General, Deputy Registrar-General and Acting Registrar-General to make a formal declaration before a judge of the Supreme Court that he will perform his duties. I have no objection to that and the section should be repealed. If this results in cutting out some red tape and assists the officers in their duties, it should have our support. Clause 4 is designed to get over certain practical difficulties arising out of the operation of the Town Planning Act and relates to rights-of-way and easements. If all the people concerned are happy that such rights-of-way

or easements should revert to the property owner, this may be done by the Registrar-General making the necessary entries. I have not had much experience with these easement provisions, although I have had a couple of inquiries about them. If anything can be done to make the lot of the property owner easier, and it is done in the interests of the community, it should meet with our approval. I therefore support the second reading.

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

STOCK DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 12. Page 1217.)

The Hon. L. H. DENSLEY (Southern): I do not suppose I have seen a shorter Bill. It simply confers on the Governor power to make regulations requiring persons carrying stock health certificates from the authorities of other States to produce their certificates to the owners or managers of runs entered by them with the stock or to any inspector or members of the police force. Although it sounds a very small amendment, it has great significance. The Victorian and the South Australian legislation varies in regard to regulations on these matters. A few years ago the South-Eastern people on many occasions requested the Government to take action to control footrot. Many pastoralists were of opinion that footrot was something that one just had to live with. I can remember when a former Minister of Agriculture, the late Mr. Christian, attended a meeting in the South-East for the special purpose of hearing requests from stockowners regarding the introduction of legislation, the object of which was to eliminate footrot. Even in their wildest imagination, no one thought it would be as effective as it has been. Footrot has decreased so much that all those concerned have come to realize how important it is to take care against the introduction of this disease. This Bill will have a large bearing on that. The regulations require the production of a permit for stock to enter South Australia, but unfortunately they do not require the production of a certificate of health. This defect in the legislation will be remedied by the Bill. It is fairly reliably stated that 12 outbreaks of footrot among sheep occurred in the South-East last year, 11 of which were among sheep introduced from Victoria. One can therefore see that this legislation can provide great benefits to the people in that area. The Victorian Act, although it provides for a permit, does not provide for the compulsory production of a certificate of health. The South Australian law provides for the production of a certificate if sheep are suffering from footrot and thus we have overcome a difficulty, which has not been met by the legislation of other States. I believe that this short Bill will result in incalculable benefits to sheep breeders, owners and pastoralists generally in South Australia. I therefore have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON (Northern): I also support the Bill. Stock raising is an important industry in South Australia and when we realize that the borders of every State, with the exception of Tasmania, come in contact with that of South Australia, the need for this legislation is emphasized. Producers take every precaution to have healthy stock and believe in the policy "Prevention is better than cure". However, they have no control over disease being introduced by stud stock. There is no hardship for people when introducing stock into this State to secure a health certificate and produce it to the owner or manager of a property, to a stock inspector or to the police. During drought periods in other States there is a big influx of stock to South Australia, and at this time a careful watch must be kept against the introduction of diseases. I support the Bill, which will enable the Governor to make regulations at any time to deal with this important matter.

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

ALCOHOL AND DRUG ADDICTS (TREATMENT) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 18. Page 1327.)

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1): This is a measure that should have the support of all honourable members. For many years authorities and social workers have been concerned with alcoholics and drug addicts. Church organizations and other social societies have established homes in the hope of being able to cure persons suffering from such a disease; and it is surely a disease, not just a habit acquired over the years. These persons have reached the stage of requiring attention and it is the intention of this Bill to help them.

This disease has caused many hardships not only to the persons concerned but to the members of their families. On numerous occasions

it has been the cause of violence and robbery and even death. Gaol is not the answer to this problem because the people afflicted by this disease need expert and professional treatment. The church organizations and social workers do a good job in attempting to rehabilitate people afflicted by the disease, but they are working under extreme difficulties because, in the first instance, the sufferer enters the home voluntarily and only remains for as long as it pleases him. He may leave and in many instances he drinks again, which is what he was trying to avoid by entering the home. The homes are restricted because of lack of finance and they cannot be conducted in the way they would be if the necessary finance was available. Many homes have not the finance to employ a doctor or psychiatrist to give the necessary treatment.

In South Australia the Sheriff and his staff have been and are doing excellent work in an attempt to help persons afflicted with either drug addiction or alcoholism. One of his problems, however, is that it is difficult to help some people because as soon as they are out of gaol they do the same thing for which they were originally convicted. There are numerous cases where a person has been discharged from gaol and is arrested later in the day and charged for the same offence for which he was committed in the first place. The Government realized the extreme difficulties and that the answer was not to commit these people to gaol, and it set up a committee to inquire into what could be done. The committee has made extensive inquiries and has presented a report to the Government and no doubt, as a result of that report, this legislation has been introduced. I appreciate that the Bill is the first of its kind to be introduced in any State in the Commonwealth, and it is an attempt by the Government to cure and rehabilitate people suffering from this disease.

There may be clauses in the Bill with which we do not all agree and which may need amendments later to give effect to the intention of the Government. There are one or two clauses in the Bill upon which I would like to comment and ask for some clarification. I refer to clause 13, which states:

(1) Any person may be received into and detained in an alcoholics centre upon the application in writing in the prescribed form of—

(*a*) the person himself; or
(*b*) any relative of the person; or
(*c*) an adult probation officer appointed under this Act; or
(*d*) a member of the police force.

(2) The application must be supported by a certificate of a legally qualified medical practitioner (not being the applicant) given not more than two weeks prior to the lodging of the application with the superintendent or other officer in charge of the centre and certifying that having examined the person the practitioner has formed the opinion that the person is an addict.

That appears to be a safeguard. Under it a doctor must certify that in his opinion the person is addicted to alcohol or a drug. Subclause (4) says:

The patient shall, subject to this Act, remain in the centre for such period, not exceeding six months, as the superintendent or other officer in charge of the centre determines on the recommendation of the medical officer or the classification committee of the centre.

The subclause says "The patient shall", which is mandatory. Other clauses say that the period may be extended under certain circumstances. The person who voluntarily enters an institution must stay for six months, although the period can be extended. Clauses 17 and 18 are related to clause 13. Clause 17 says:

A person admitted to an alcoholics centre shall, until his discharge therefrom in accordance with this Act, be deemed to be in lawful custody so long as he is kept at the centre pursuant to this Act or is in the custody of any person under whose care or charge he is placed by or with the authority of the director . . .

The clause says that a person shall be deemed to be in lawful custody so long as he is kept at the centre. Clause 18 says:

Any person who, being a patient, escapes or, without authority from the director or the superintendent of the centre, is absent from the alcoholics centre to which he was admitted, or who escapes from the custody of any person under whose care or charge he has been placed pursuant to any order made or direction or permission given under this Act, may, without further or other authority than this Act, be retaken by the superintendent of the centre . . . and returned to the centre or to his former custody, as the case may be.

The person who believed that he should enter a home for treatment in the hope of being cured would be in such a state of mind at the time that he would do anything in order to be cured. I visualize all sorts of forms having to be completed and signed in connection with his entering an institution, but I wonder whether by law he can be detained against his will in the institution, and whether, if he is being detained against his will and escapes, he can be arrested and forcibly taken back to the institution and forcibly detained there. I appreciate that the Bill gives the authority where a person has been convicted by

a court of law, because one of the penalties imposed could be detention in an institution. I am concerned about the person who voluntarily enters an institution.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: No treatment is likely to be effective unless the person is there for some time.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes, but I understand that under the Bill a person who enters an institution voluntarily, is kept there against his will and escapes can be forcibly taken back and detained against his will. The Bill says also that if the treatment is not completed in six months and it is desired that the person concerned shall remain there for a longer time it can be done, but only with the consent in writing of the person concerned. I am thinking of the man who does not stay for six months in order to have a cure effected. Another clause gives the director or a member of the staff, where it is proved that a person does not abide by the discipline of an institution and does not respond to any treatment, authority to discharge that person from the institution, but if a person escapes after being detained against his will he can be arrested, forcibly taken back and detained.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: Only if the authorities want him back.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. I seek further clarification of that point.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: Do you think they should have that authority?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: If a person enters an institution he enters it for a specific cure and he goes there voluntarily. However, if he is not prepared to receive the treatment he should not be forced to remain there. Other provisions in the Bill enable the authorities to do something about that. If the patient is often under the influence of alcohol the circumstances are quite different. Normally he could be arrested by the police.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: Do you say he should not be compelled to receive treatment even if it is for his own good?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. The Bill compels persons to stay there, but I have heard members state that they do not believe in compulsion. This Bill if passed will result in absolute compulsion.

The Hon. C. R. Story: The institution is not a philanthropic society.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I appreciate the difficulties, but it is not so much a matter of what I feel should be done with the patient. I seek more information on this point and whether this aspect of the matter could be taken into account. I do not believe that a person should be forcibly detained against his wish if he desired to walk out of an institution after having entered it voluntarily, even if he had been certified by a medical practitioner to be addicted to alcohol. I hope that the Minister will give me further information on that point. Clause 14 provides that a person who is convicted of certain offences may be released on recognizance or be committed to a home. This is the other side of the question. The courts are given certain powers to commit offenders to a home for treatment. Subclause (2) provides:

> Where—
>
> (*a*) a person is convicted by a court of an offence of a kind mentioned in subsection (1) of this section; and
>
> (*b*) the court is satisfied that the person, within a period of 12 months immediately preceding that conviction, had been convicted of two or more offences of such a kind;

The court may—the Bill does not say it "shall"—order that the person receives treatment in one of these homes for a period determined by the court. I do not believe that two convictions in 12 months are sufficient to have a person declared a habitual drunkard for the purpose of committing him to a home. A person may be convicted twice within 12 months for various reasons. He may never previously have committed the offence of drunkenness, but because he is unfortunate enough to be charged twice with that offence in one year the court may order treatment even if treatment is not desired by the offender. In those circumstances a person may be convicted after having attended various functions.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: That does not apply.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: This is in association with many other offences. He may have been guilty of breaking and entering with which drunkenness was associated. The honourable member should read the first part of the clause.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: It is in connection with offences that the court considers were due to over-indulgence in alcoholic liquor. The clause visualizes that a person might have committed some other crime, but the prime offence is that he was under the influence of liquor whilst he committed the offence. It is argued that if he had not been intoxicated he would not have committed the other crime.

The Minister suggested that the offender may have been arrested on a charge of drunken driving. Probably the court could, in the case of two convictions for offences of that nature, commit a person to an institution such as this. Subclause (3) provides:—

This section shall apply whether the previous convictions or any of them took place within the State or outside the State and whether those convictions or any of them took place before or after the commencement of this Act.

This will result in retrospective operation. It does not relate only to an offence that occurred within the State or within the Commonwealth. A person may have had two overseas convictions in the previous 12 months and if that came to the notice of the authorities those convictions could be used against him. I do not agree with the provision that enables a person to be committed for compulsory treatment on two convictions in 12 months.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: I think you will find it is rare that convictions are isolated.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The very persons that this Bill is attempting to help are those who are past self-help. I do not think that two convictions under the circumstances I have enumerated are sufficient to warrant the convicted person being sent to a home for treatment.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: To be convicted of being drunk one has to be convicted of being drunk in a public place.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: A person may have been to a function and enters a street on his way home, but unfortunately is seen by a policeman and arrested for drunkenness. What is such a person to do? He cannot disappear in thin air. He could attend a few more functions during the year and commit a similar offence and be caught again. He could then find himself in a court faced with the possibility of being declared a habitual drunkard and be sent to a home. Sub-clause (2) of clause 25 provides:

The Director may on his own authority or upon the recommendation of the superintendent or an official visitor order the discharge of a patient admitted to an alcoholics' centre pursuant to section 13 of this Act who—

(*a*) does not respond to treatment; or

(*b*) fails or refuses to observe any of the rules of discipline relating to the centre or to obey any direction given to patients generally or to him specifically by, or with the authority of, the superintendent.

Sub-clause (3) refers to the other point I have already mentioned and provides:

Where it appears to the superintendent that the treatment of a patient admitted to an alcoholics' centre pursuant to section 13 of this Act should be continued beyond the period for which he has been so admitted the superintendent may, with the patient's consent or, if the patient had been so admitted, pursuant to an application made by a relative of that patient or some other person, with the written consent of that relative or person or with the patient's consent, extend that period for a further period not exceeding six months.

Under this measure professional treatment will be given to those persons and it will enable them to be rehabilitated so that they can be looked up to instead of being looked down upon. We can all appreciate the difficulties these people suffer and homes such as those envisaged will certainly go a long way, if not the complete distance, to rehabilitate a considerable number of these people who suffer from alcoholism or from the excessive use of drugs. The State is undertaking a worthy cause in establishing these homes and therefore I support the second reading.

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

HOUSING IMPROVEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 18. Page 1330.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill. My understanding is that the Housing Trust was originally intended to cater for the lower income group, with emphasis on rental houses, whereas in recent years, in accordance with the Government's policy, it has concentrated on building houses for purchase. By no stretch of the imagination could it be said that these houses cater for the lower income group, a group that would not be in a position to meet a mortgage payment of about £4 a week, plus rates and taxes, from a total income of about £15 a week. The Housing Trust has done a most praiseworthy job in the housing field, but despite statements to the contrary by the Government the housing lag in South Australia has not been overtaken. If the Government does not put forward some effective plan in the near future, the housing position will get completely out of hand within the next three or four years as a result of the increased birth rate just after the Second World War.

The Bill is similar in intent to one introduced in 1958, because it seems to give the Housing Trust power to erect houses on any land for any persons, to erect houses and buildings on any land for any Government department or instrumentality, and to construct shops and

buildings on its own land for the convenience of persons occupying houses erected by the housing authority. These activities are already being undertaken by the trust, but doubt has been raised about their legal validity. These activities are completely in accord with Labor policy, because we feel that the first need of any community is for the people to be properly housed and adequately served by the necessary and related services. I seem to remember that something on similar lines was expressed by the Hon. Mr. Bardolph earlier this afternoon. The Opposition supports this Bill with pleasure and I imagine it will be difficult for some Government members to support the Bill which is so socialistic in its nature. It is Socialism in the form which my Party supports, that the State with State money provides houses, schools and buildings for Government departments with an overall State control. The only difference between the Bill and our policy, which is complete Socialism, is that the Housing Trust itself calls for tenders. If the Government had a Housing Department and did all the work by day labour it would be the complete policy of my Party, and the State would provide houses for the people to the best advantage.

I take this opportunity of replying to the Hon. Mr. Story, who criticized me last week. I do not want to be charged with misquoting him but, as I understand the position, he was critical of my speech on the Appropriation Bill and said that I had criticized the Housing Trust for not building enough houses in the metropolitan area. That is not true. I did say that in relation to the western portion of the metropolitan area. I suggested that while the temporary houses were being demolished, a plan could be put into operation for solidly-constructed houses to be built in the western portion of the metropolitan area, in addition to what was being done, and this would create further employment. At no time did I criticize the Housing Trust. On page 1104 of *Hansard* I am reported as saying:

I am particularly concerned about the people who live in the western portion of the metropolitan area.

A few lines further down I said:

The Housing Trust has decided wisely that all temporary houses in that portion of the metropolitan area . . . About 2,000 temporary houses are situated in that part of the metropolitan area.

On page 1105 I said:

. . . and that as soon as possible he would be given a house in the western part of the metropolitan area.

To infer that I criticized the Housing Trust for not building enough houses in the metropolitan area is distinctly unfair and far from the truth. If any honourable member wants to criticize someone openly, for all that's good and holy let him quote correctly and not take something from a document and put a different complex on what was said. There was only one occasion when I was misunderstood in this Chamber.

The Hon. C. R. Story: You are boasting now!

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: There is no form of debate lower than taking something out of its context. On the occasion to which I referred, I made a statement which, on reflection, had a double meaning. At the first opportunity when the honourable member concerned spoke to me, I explained and apologized to him if my remarks had hurt his feelings. If the Hon. Mr. Story wants to do the correct thing, he should at the first opportunity apologize for his insinuations last week.

I give the Housing Trust credit for what it has done. I have had few complaints concerning the trust's activities and administration, but strangely enough I have had two in the last week about the methods of collecting rents. The first complaint concerns collectors who come in a vehicle and blow a whistle or sound the horn, and the people who are to pay the rent come to the vehicle. The complaint was from a lady. When she mentioned her name the person collecting the rent said to her "You are all right, you are up to date". It can be assumed that a certain remark would be made if a person was behind with the rent. If that practice is general, though I doubt whether it is, it is something that should be corrected and I intend to take it up with the trust as soon as possible. I received the second complaint last evening. I have known the person concerned and his family for about 30 years and would accept his word without hesitation. They live in a different area and they have been told that the rent collector will call in the street between 8.30 and 9.45 a.m. on Monday mornings. This person informed me that there is a by-law which prohibits the sounding of a warning instrument or using a whistle. This means that the people paying the rent have to keep a watch for the collector for about 1¼ hours, which is not convenient on a Monday morning, particularly for those who are washing or doing routine housework. Yesterday morning this person's wife was informed that the collector was in the street and she started to

go down. Another person informed the collector that she was on her way, but unfortunately he did not wait and the rent was not paid. Within 24 hours a Housing Trust inspector would call on these people wanting to know why the rent had not been paid.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: Don't you think they are lucky to have a rent collector call?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, but if that is the policy regarding rent collecting, then it is time it was done in a proper and decent manner. At Elizabeth and Salisbury there are offices in various parts of the town where people can pay the rent, and this seems to be a much better idea. I ask the Minister or the Government to consider this matter to see whether there is not a better, more decent and more humane way of collecting rent than having a person's status divulged among whoever happen to be there; whether tenants should have to take a risk of catching the rent collector; or whether this type of collecting should be stopped altogether. I have received this complaint from respectable people who want to pay their rent. If the trust wants to continue collecting rent in this way it should be done without creating the problems I have mentioned. The Opposition supports the Bill, which deals with something that the trust has been doing for some time.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I support the Bill. In explaining the measure the Chief Secretary pointed out how the trust had been established, and said that this Bill validates something that the trust has been doing illegally for some time. The trust was established in 1937 as the result of a proposal put forward by Mr. H. Hogben in another place. Despite some opposition the trust was set up to provide rental houses for people most in need of them. We have gone a long way since then, and the trust has done a terrific job in providing houses. Its latest report shows that since 1937, the year of its establishment, the trust has built 44,175 houses and flats. Clause 3 of the Bill says:

The housing authority may erect houses on any land of the housing authority for disposal as provided by subsection (6). The housing authority may erect houses on land other than land of the housing authority for any person or approved body and may erect houses or buildings of any kind on land other than land of the housing authority for any department or instrumentality of the Commonwealth or of the State.

That is a big step. The Hon. Mr. Shard was jubilant about the introduction of the Bill. A government of another political colour could make good use of this type of legislation. The Hon. Mr. Bardolph referred to packet budgeting. As most actions under the legislation are to be done by proclamation, we could have proclamations encompassing the matters mentioned by him. I have little objection to what the Bill proposes, but the provision dealing with retrospectivity is intriguing. It reminds me of a matter that we included in the Marriage Act last year. It seems that this Bill deals with a matter that has been carried on by the trust without its having the full authority of Parliament. That is a dangerous sort of thing to do. In 1958 it was said that the legislation that year was introduced to clarify the position regarding some actions by the trust, concerning which it was thought the trust had no authority. The same was said in 1961, but regarding a different matter. If this sort of action is to be continued we should have Parliament deal with it properly. Proposed new subsection (10) of section 16 says:

The housing authority may use, for the purposes of subsections (4) and (5) of this section, any moneys in the housing improvement fund.

Whenever the Industries Development Committee recommends to the Government that a factory should be built I hope the money made available in accordance with the recommendation will not be detrimental to housing activities. Another provision deals with additional powers to the authority to level and prepare land for house building, and that the authority may use any money in the Housing Improvement Fund for such work. The Hon. Mr. Shard said this was socialistic legislation. He said that if the Labor Party ever took office in South Australia and this legislation was on the Statute Book the Government would become the housing authority. In other words, he said there would be no more tendering for house building, with the trust supervising the work.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is what I meant.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The honourable member said it, and he also said that the work would be done on a day-wage basis.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: You mean day labour.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I do not mind what it is called, because it is the same thing. Under the Chifley Commonwealth Government the Snowy Mountains scheme was started on a day-labour basis but the progress made in the first 12 months (the New South Wales Government was the constructing authority) showed that it was impossible to continue on

that basis. Since the change to the contract system a mighty job has been done. I hope that our present Government, or a Government of a similar complexion, remains in office for a considerable time. I can see no reason why it should not remain in office. I do not quite know why the Hon. Mr. Shard chose this occasion to make a personal attack on me because, after all, what I said was not very dreadful at all. The honourable member, from memory, raised the point that not as many houses were being built in the western suburbs as he would like to see built there. He made the point that temporary houses were being pulled down and rebuilt at such a rate that the State would not catch up at all on the back lag in housing. I questioned where the honourable member expected the Housing Trust to prune in order to build more houses in the western suburbs because, after all, country housing has not received quite as much attention as housing for the metropolitan area. Elizabeth is developing fast and is attracting people from the congested areas. Industry is going there so I do not see that there is any great need for an attack in that direction.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: In view of that progress the honourable member will have to get his skates on for the next election.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am in the hands of the electors, but I do not rely entirely on this for my bread and butter. I give as good a service as I can while I am here. If the electors think they can get someone else to do a better job they will be the first to register that opinion at the appropriate time, but not without some fight on my part. The honourable member also said that I was not strictly honest in what I said. He can say what he likes, but the reflection on my honesty hit me on a raw spot. I do not think the honourable member has had cause to doubt my honesty and I hope he will not have cause in the future. I cannot see why I should apologize for nothing, so I have not the slightest intention of apologizing because I do not consider that I reflected on him. Having passed those few pleasantries and unpleasantries and having made my points, I indicate that I support the Bill. I hope the Housing Trust continues the work it is doing and, again, I agree with the Hon. Mr. Shard that if it does, so much the better. Everyone needing a house should be housed soon.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Do you believe in proclamations or regulations?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am a great believer in regulations normally, because they enable Parliament to have second thoughts on various subjects. When legislation of this nature is gazetted it is not always possible for Parliament to review it. I do not believe that the State should always accept the responsibility for housing everbody in rental houses. Where humanly possible people should be responsible for owning their own houses and it should be their pride and joy to do so. I do not believe that the trust should go into some of the areas where the Hon. Mr. Shard desires that houses should be built, particularly if the trust has to pay exorbitant prices to build houses there. If people are prepared to live in rental houses they should be prepared to put up with some discomfort provided they pay a reasonable rent and can proceed to their work without undue difficulty. I support the second reading.

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

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from October 18. Page 1344.)

Clause 6—"Amendment of principal Act, s. 9a."

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Minister of Health): When the Committee reported progress it was dealing with this clause and an opinion was expressed that the powers relating to investments by friendly societies were too wide. It was suggested that some consideration should be given to defining what the investments should be. I caused certain amendments to be drafted, but I believe the Hon. Mr. Bardolph has a prior amendment which should be dealt with first. I therefore withdraw at this stage in favour of the Hon. Mr. Bardolph.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I move:

In new paragraph (*g*) of section 12 (1) to insert after "consent" the words "of the Chief Secretary after recommendation" and to strike out "Public Actuary" second occurring and insert "Chief Secretary".

This will mean that instead of the Public Actuary having the supreme power he will submit to the Minister a recommendation on these things and then the Minister will have the last say. The Minister will be able to impose certain conditions which, under the clause as drafted, reside in the Public Actuary.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY: Although the amendment may improve the position a little, it does not meet my objection to the clause. I consider that the less control by

the Government in these matters the better. We already have price control and rent control. This clause seeks to give the Government authority over investments by friendly societies and it should be left to the trusts concerned. If the Government or Parliament in its wisdom considers that certain types of investments are dangerous, those investments should be specified. We already have the Trustee Act, which specifies certain types of investments. The clause gives a wide power to the societies themselves, subject to certain conditions, which the Chief Secretary or the Government may approve. The Committee is setting up a standard, and then immediately knocking it over. That is not the way to make legislation. I intend to vote against the Government's interfering with and taking the responsibility of outside investments. If we start controlling such investments, where shall we finish? We shall be giving authority to the Government to control all kinds of things. If they were for the benefit of the community as a whole, I would agree, but not when it it confined to a small section.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: We are not introducing much in the nature of a new principle, but dealing with a section of the community. There is hardly a thing that these societies can do without reference to the Public Actuary. The provision has been in operation for more than 40 years and apparently has done little harm. There is no real need for fear, because the principle has been written into the Act for so long. There has been no embarrassment or trouble, and I am sure that the aims and objects are as honourable today as they have been over the last half century.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I support Mr. Bardolph's amendment, but I do not want it to be understood that I am dissenting from all that the Hon. Sir Frank Perry has said. His remarks were directed more to the clause as it is intended to be amended by the Chief Secretary, and therefore there is perhaps some substance in what he said. At this stage we are dealing only with an amendment to enable the Chief Secretary to have the final say. I consider that this is a material improvement. If there is to be any form of investment by friendly societies that will clash with the interests of any trading concern, then the Government must fix on a policy and say that it will or will not approve of such forms of investment. I support the amendment.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: The Hon. Sir Frank Perry said that the legislation dealt with a small section of the community, but statistics show that members of friendly societies in South Australia number 222,000. The honourable member claimed that the Government would be able to control businesses. I would remind the honourable member that innumerable Acts have been passed in this House, when the majority of members have taken the stand that Parliament should not lose the right to determine certain issues, and that the Minister, as representative of the Government, is the person who should normally take the responsibility by virtue of his position, and he could be questioned in Parliament on his actions. My amendment has that effect. The power should not be given to a Government official, no matter how competent he may be. I am not decrying the Public Actuary, but the power is being handed over to bureaucratic control if this House does not accept my amendment.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I move to add the following proviso to new paragraph (*g*):

Provided that this paragraph shall not authorize—

(i) any investment in the share capital of a company or in debentures of or notes issued by a company unless such investment together with any existing investment or investments in that company will confer on a friendly society or on friendly societies a controlling interest in that company and the operation of that company will assist that society or those societies in carrying out its or their objects; or

(ii) any investment whatsoever in any company referred to in paragraph (*a*) of the proviso to subsection (1) of section 26a of the Pharmacy Act, 1935-1952.

This amendment governs the concerns in which the societies' money can be invested. Objection was taken to the Bill as drafted in that it was wide open to any sort of investment, and it was suggested that societies might invest in company chemist shops and defeat the restrictions in the Pharmacy Act. These two provisos will ensure that any money invested will be used for the aims and objects as shown in the Friendy Societies Act, and will ensure that Parliament will know of what it is approving. Section 26a in the Pharmacy Act deals with companies and associations and was put in at the time when we were threatened with general chain stores coming to this State. The proviso was that restrictions should not apply to any company which on the first day of August, 1942,

was carrying on the business of retailing, compounding, or dispensing drugs or medicines on the order or prescription of a legally qualified medical practitioner. That meant that a small company represented by three or four shops was exempt from the restrictions, but this present proviso will prevent investments in such shops and defeating the spirit of the Pharmacy Act. There were three types of chemist shops to which the restrictions did not apply. This amendment will impose restrictions in section 26a on friendly societies, in that they will not be allowed to invest in such shops.

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY: This amendment is certainly an improvement and overcomes some of the objections I raised, but it seems to me that certain types of investments are not provided for.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: You are getting like Oliver Twist. You want more!

The Hon. Sir FRANK PERRY: The clause as it stands indicates clearly what the object of the amendment is, and that is the establishing of a wholesale warehouse or manufacturing plant for supplying drugs to chemist shops. This Bill gives them all the power necessary for doing that. I do not say that is wrong, but if a thing is right for a certain section of the community then it should be right for another section. In the Friendly Societies Act the idea was that chemist shops should be preserved to individual chemists. That was the arrangement 20 or 30 years ago, because care had to be taken by those running a chemist shop and some privacy was necessary, and it was better to deal with the principal of the shop rather than with an employee or a chain of employees, although there is some advantage in a chain, as has been shown by the number of chain stores that we have. It gets away from the individual, but at one time Parliament tried to safeguard the interests of the individual chemist. The Minister's proposal may be all right, but in the short time at my disposal I have not been able to decide definitely that it is so. We should not set up something in a clause and then whittle it away by a subsequent clause, and I am sorry when the Government resorts to this type of legislation.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I support the amendment, which makes a big difference to the clause as drafted. Unfortunately it does not specify, as does the rest of section 6, the individual investments in which the funds of friendly societies may be invested. The amendment gives a blank cheque, but says what it does not cover. I think the Minister has gone some way towards solving some of the matters raised by members. It prevents the investment of money in existing pharmaceutical shops and in equity shares except where such investment will enable a friendly society to control or own a company which will assist it in carrying out its objects. I said earlier that this matter dealt with the investment of trust money and I would have liked an additional amendment giving friendly societies power to set up a specific company to assist them in carrying out their pharmaceutical work. An additional paragraph in section 7 would have been a better way of dealing with the matter. If this can be done for friendly societies why not generally for trustee investments? As far as I can see in the short time at my disposal the amendment seems to be reasonably satisfactory. I cannot see any catches in it. The Minister said that my complaint was a matter of drafting, but I think the drafting is wrapped up in the principle. We should have had a more specific provision in section 7.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 7 and title passed.

Bill reported with amendments. Committee's report adopted.

WILD DOGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

ARTIFICIAL BREEDING BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from October 18. Page 1346.)

Clause 1—"Short title"—which the Hon. A. J. Melrose had moved to amend by deleting "Breeding" and inserting "Insemination".

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE: I gave notice of what I intended to do and spoke in opposition to the title of the Bill. Honourable members must be well seized of my argument and I have been promised a certain amount of support from them.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary): I have discussed this matter with the Minister concerned. The special committee that investigated this matter recommended that the name of the Bill should be changed to "breeding". That is supported by other legislation and by what has happened elsewhere in this matter. The committee must have given some consideration to this matter when it altered the word from "insemination" to "breeding" and in view of the committee's recommendation I ask this Committee to support the Bill as it stands. The title cannot prejudice the working of the Bill in any way

that I can see and it is purely a matter of words. A rose by any other name would smell as sweet.

The Hon. G. O'H GILES: I said previously that old habits die hard and that I was used to calling it "insemination". I was a member of the committee to which the Chief Secretary referred, but since then one further point has cropped up that may have some bearing on the matter. In my second reading speech I said that the service provided by this Bill is entirely one of insemination. Such processes as the transplanting of prefertilized ova would conform closely to artificial breeding, probably more so than the reference made by the Hon. Mr. Melrose to a test-tube baby. The attitude may well be taken that a centre such as Northfield may eventually have a broader function than it will have under this Bill and it could then logically be called an "artificial breeding centre" rather than a "semen-collecting centre". The Bill, if it deals with the setting up of such a centre, may correctly be titled "A Bill to set up an artificial breeding board and an artificial breeding centre". The Bill deals with artificial insemination but, because it may possibly have wider repercussions, I am prepared to support the *status quo* as it exists in other countries where the board is referred to as "an artificial breeding board".

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE: I do not think that I am out of touch with the general run of South Australians and I am prepared to call a spade a spade. The term "artificial breeding" smacks of Grundyism. That term might be applied to the transplantation of a previously fertilized ovum from its dam-of-origin into a living foster parent. That is an established practice and there are all sorts of astonishing intervening parents. What we are really talking about is "artificial insemination" and I see no reason why we should be tied down by the errors of Grundyism. Let us call it "artificial insemination", because that is what it is and that is what we are talking about. We are trying to set up and establish a board for that purpose.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Do you think the name will affect the potency of the Bill?

The Hon. A. J. MELROSE: I think it affects the sense of the legislation. If we are talking about artificial insemination, why shouldn't we call it an artificial insemination Bill?

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (6).—The Hons. Jessie Cooper, L. H. Densley, A. J. Melrose (teller), F. J. Potter, Sir Arthur Rymill, and R. R. Wilson.

Noes (12).—The Hons. K. E. J. Bardolph, S. C. Bevan, E. H. Edmonds, G. O'H. Giles, A. C. Hookings, N. L. Jude, A. F. Kneebone, Sir Lyell McEwin (teller), W. W. Robinson, C. D. Rowe, A. J. Shard, and C. R. Story.

Majority of 6 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 23 passed.

Clause 24—"Duties and functions of the board."

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I should expect to find somewhere in the Bill associated with the duties of the board provision for the buying of bulls on a year to year basis. To me it does not matter where it appears, but what concerns me is that the breeds societies concerned should be given the chance to inspect bulls before they go to work under the provisions of the Bill. The society that I know best is the Jersey Herd Society, which has 300 members. I strongly consider that the future success of this scheme is tied up with the good relations with these breed societies. There should be a panel of selection for sires before they are put to work.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (25 and 26) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.53 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, October 25, at 2.15 p.m.