HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, August 30, 1962.

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. HUTCHENS: It is reported in the press today that Senator Spooner (Minister for National Development), when speaking in the Budget debate, said that the Premier of South Australia had made it plain to the Commonwealth Government that he placed a higher priority on the Chowilla dam project than on rail standardization in South Australia. Is it a fact that prior to our recent unanimous approach to all South Australian Senators on the importance of rail standardization the Premier had already agreed to the deferment of rail standardization in South Australia until the Chowilla dam was completed?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No, that would not be correct. South Australia has these two large and urgent works on its hands, both of which are necessary. When the Chowilla dam was proposed as purely a South Australian project, the Government indicated that it would not expect the Commonwealth Government to provide for a dam in South Australia and for railway standardization at the same time, the volume of work involved in the two projects together being so high that it would not be possible to expect large amounts as South Australia's share of the Commonwealth Budget. We have never expressed the view that railway standardization was not urgent: in fact, we have attempted in the High Court to force the issue and to have that work carried out. The answer to the honourable member's question is that it is not correct to say that, but the South Australian Government did indicate that, if it could get one of these projects going really well, it would not expect a large expenditure on the two projects simultaneously.

Mr. RICHES: I was much distressed at the attitude of the Commonwealth Senators to the resolution carried by this House last Thursday, in placing the matter on a personal basis as between the Premier and someone in the Commonwealth Parliament. Believing that this rises above any question of personalities, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether the resolution that was carried last Thursday has been conveyed to the South Australian Senators and, if so, have you received any acknowledgment or reply?

The SPEAKER: The answer to the question of the member for Stuart is that the resolution carried by this Parliament was conveyed to the South Australian Senators at Canberra on the same day, almost immediately after it was passed. So far, I have received no reply.

Mr. RICHES: My attention has been drawn to an article in today's *News*, which reads:

> PREMIER WILL ANSWER SENATE.
> TO HIT BACK IN TV TALK.
>
> A spirited reply to charges made against him in the Senate last night is being prepared today by the Premier, Sir Thomas Playford. The Premier will make his reply tonight in a telecast from NWS-9, and ADS-7, at 6.55. This is the latest development in the clash between State and Commonwealth interests over the proposed standardization of the Port Pirie-Broken Hill railway line.

I agree that an unwarranted attack has been made on the Premier.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot debate the question.

Mr. RICHES: I am explaining the reason for the question and I believe this attack follows action that was taken by every member of this House. I feel that an affront has been offered by members of the Senate to this House and, through this House, to the people of this State. The people of South Australia will get the impression that the Premier is speaking for and on behalf of the whole House when he replies to this attack. I think that is a reasonable assumption. Will the Premier accord honourable members the courtesy of giving them a resume of what he intends to say?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In view of the honourable member's interest in this practice (he has raised two or three queries about this on previous occasions) and to ensure that there will be no opportunity for him to miss the broadcast, I have arranged for it to be delivered by several stations. Therefore, the honourable member will have every opportunity of hearing it. Dealing with the second part of the question relating to the attack made in the Senate yesterday, that was not only an attack on the South Australian Government, but also a personal attack upon me. I have never previously in this House used the Parliamentary privilege that this place affords to answer criticism that may be levelled against me. I have always replied in a place which is open for everyone to hear me and to which Parliamentary privilege does

not apply. However, I have already this afternoon answered one question regarding this matter, and have made it clear in the statement that I am making today that the resolution carried by the House of Assembly was not only a resolution that was proper for the House to move, but that it was framed in terms befitting the occasion. It was not a Party statement in any way, but a statement by the Parliament of South Australia setting out, as no other authority in South Australia could set out, what is believed to be a necessity for the development of this State.

BRINKLEY WATER SCHEME.

Mr. JENKINS: During the Loan Estimates debate on the lines I asked a question about improving the Brinkley water scheme. Has the Minister of Works a reply to that question?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. Some time ago the honourable member requested, on behalf of his constituents, an improvement in the water supply position in the Brinkley district. The department has recommended various works to improve the supply at a cost of £19,000, for which provision has been made on the Loan Estimates. I shall take the matter to Cabinet for consideration on Monday next.

WIRRABARA WATER SCHEME.

Mr. HEASLIP: In the debate on the Loan Estimates I asked a question about the sum set aside for the extension of the Caltowie-Booleroo main to Wirrabara. Has the Minister of Works any information about that sum, and when and how it will be used?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Provision has been made in the 1962-63 programme of Loan works for an expenditure on this project, and I think the department will be able shortly to recommend it to me for approval. When it does, I will take it to Cabinet for consideration. If approval is forthcoming, a start may be made on this work and a little of it done towards the end of this financial year.

BETHLEHEM HOMES INCORPORATED.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Has the Premier the report on the Bethlehem Homes Incorporated about which he spoke yesterday afternoon when I asked a question on the matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I had a telephone message from Mr. Halleday this morning in connection with this matter, and I understand that the advisory committee is considering it next week.

GEPPS CROSS HOSTEL.

Mr. JENNINGS: Without undue cynicism, I have always been rather sceptical of the statement by the Premier, when he winds up the Address in Reply debate, that matters raised in that debate will be examined by departmental officers. I am trying to ascertain now whether the remarks I made about the Gepps Cross hostel have been investigated by officers of the appropriate departments, and I also refer to last year's session when the Premier said:

> This hostel is the property of the Commonwealth Government and for many years was run as a hostel, when it was the subject of great criticism. At the request of members, the Housing Trust was prepared to take a lease of the property, and to make some adjustments to turn the accommodation into living units rather than have it like a military camp. We are not able to alter the property substantially. I think I can go further and say that the continuation of this type of establishment is not in accordance with our general ideas on housing.

The last sentence is something with which I thoroughly agree. Will the Premier say whether, since then, there have been negotiations between his Government and the Commonwealth Government regarding any procedure about knocking down the Gepps Cross hostel, because that is the only thing that can be done with it, and have any arrangements been made to rehouse the people living in those buildings?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The hostel is the property of and located on land belonging to the Commonwealth Government. We have no authority to knock it down. The hostel is being used as a staging camp for migrants coming to this country.

Mr. Jennings: Yes, for about four years.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Some of them stay there a long time but, on the other hand, some of them leave fairly soon. The hostel has been the subject of correspondence with the Prime Minister, not on the basis of knocking it down, but on the question of what work can be done to keep it in repair.

RED HILL ELECTRICITY SUPPLY.

Mr. HALL: I have been approached by a constituent living south of Red Hill regarding electricity extensions in Red Hill and surrounding districts. I am informed that this person is included in a proposed single wire earth return scheme called "Red Hill No. 1". Apparently, the people living in this area have been promised a power supply several times

during the last few years, but in each case the target date has eventually been set back. As there is now a clear indication of how much money is available this year on the Loan Estimates, can the Minister say whether it is possible to set a definite target date for the s.w.e.r. Red Hill No. 1 scheme?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I shall direct the honourable member's question to the Chairman of the Electricity Trust. It is my experience that the trust is usually very close on target date in the completion of its extensions, and I should think the Chairman will now be able to indicate fairly firmly whether or not this work can be done this financial year. I shall request him to forward a report on the matter.

RABBITS.

Mr. TAPPING: This morning's *Advertiser* carries a report from Melbourne, which is headed "Rabbits" and which states:

The Victorian Graziers' Association will ask the Federal Government to devalue the rabbit industry in an attempt to get rid of the pest. The association's council today adopted a motion that all types of rabbit products be progressively devalued by 20 per cent over four years and their sale prohibited after that.

Has the Minister any knowledge of the move in Victoria, and is any similar move contemplated in South Australia?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have not seen the report the honourable member refers to. I have heard from time to time the suggestion that rabbits and rabbit products should be decommercialized, but we have not decided to do anything of that nature in South Australia. In any event, it would be a matter of Government policy, so if anything were decided it would certainly be a policy decision and not one made by the Minister in charge without full discussion with the Government.

MITCHAM RAIL SERVICE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on August 21 concerning the restoration of the full body of the 7.26 a.m. train from Mitcham, which I presume is a "red hen"?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Railways, reports that the train referred to is No. 172 which leaves Bridgewater at 6.41 a.m. and arrives in Adelaide at 7.42 a.m. Mondays to Fridays, inclusive. The consist of this train until the last time table issue on August 12, 1962, was two power railcars, both of which were stabled at Bridgewater overnight. The need for the second car occurred only on the "up" journey from Torrens Park to Adelaide. Therefore, in the interests of economy, it was decided in the new time table to reduce the consist of the train to one power car. However, an additional train now runs as No. 180 leaving Mitcham at 7.36 a.m. and arriving at Adelaide at 7.52 a.m. It was anticipated that this additional train would attract a number of passengers who travelled on No. 172. Recent counts taken on No. 172 have shown a maximum of 102 passengers between Torrens Park and Keswick, where a number of them alight. As the seating capacity of the car is 80, the number of passengers standing is by no means unduly high for such a short journey.

ELIZABETH LIGHTING.

Mr. CLARK: I understand that the Minister of Works has a reply from his colleague, the Minister of Roads, concerning the question I asked recently about the lighting of the Main North Road through Elizabeth.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Minister of Roads reports:

The department and the Road Traffic Board are aware of the poor lighting conditions which exist on the Main North Road through Elizabeth. The responsibility for provision of this lighting is primarily that of the local governing authority concerned, namely, the District Council of Salisbury. The Commissioner of Highways' power to finance lighting is controlled by provisions of the Highways Act, and is at present restricted to Anzac Highway and the Port Road, and furthermore, stipulates a maximum amount which can be expended on lighting in any one financial year.

I have not had an opportunity to check this report from the Minister, in which I think there are possibly some typographical errors. I have some doubt about the powers of the Commissioner in respect of the maximum amount that can be spent, and I shall check on that matter and have it clarified. The report continues:

Although the degree of hazard, due to the absence of lighting, is most evident at the intersecting streets, it is considered that it would be unwise to provide lighting only at intersections, as this would have the effect of contrasting sharply with the unlighted sections and causing a greater degree of hazard to pedestrians who cross at other than intersections. To summarize, it is considered that the whole length of the road should be lighted to a proper standard, but the Commissioner of Highways cannot provide this facility.

FRUIT CANNING.

Mr. BYWATERS: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on August 15 regarding payments to fruitgrowers by Brookers (Aust.) Ltd.?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. The Under Treasurer has given the following report on the matter:

As you indicated to Mr. Bywaters on August 15, 1962, Foster Clark (S.A.) Limited made an offer to Brookers (Aust.) Limited for the purchase of the latter company's assets. The offer was discussed at a special meeting of creditors and authority to accept the offer was given by a special meeting of shareholders. The offer consisted of a sum of money for the purchase of assets, which was based on asset values as shown in the preceding year's published accounts, such sum to be adjusted to take account of certain changes in the assets position since the last balance date. The payment was to be made partly in cash and partly in shares in Foster Clark (S.A.) Limited. The payment of this sum to Brookers (Aust.) Limited would enable that company to discharge its obligations to the secured creditors and the balance would be available to be paid to the various unsecured creditors whose debts amounted to £281,000, and who included fruitgrowers, cannister-makers and other suppliers. These debts were incurred in 1957-58. Fruitgrowers had previously received approximately 70 per cent of amounts due to them, but no payments had previously been made in respect of other creditors. Final settlement between the companies has not yet been made because of disagreement as to the scope of adjustments to be made to the basic purchase price. As the principal of Foster Clark is now in Adelaide it may be possible to resolve this disagreement, failing which it will be submitted to arbitration. When this disagreement is resolved it should be possible to make a payment to creditors. However, as Brookers (Aust.) Limited have certain contingent liabilities it may be necessary to hold some moneys in escrow until final liability is determined. As to the matter of legislating to protect growers, I do not know of any practicable way in which creditors can be protected in respect of debts for goods supplied in the ordinary course of commercial business. In any case, the rights and obligations in the event of bankruptcy or an arrangement with creditors are matters under the constitutional authority of the Commonwealth.

PSYCHOLOGY BRANCH.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Has the Premier a reply to my question during the Loan Estimates debate regarding improvements to accommodation at the Psychology Branch of the Education Department?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Realizing that the present rented accommodation in Liverpool Building was not satisfactory, the Government approved the purchase of a building at Fitzroy Terrace, North Adelaide, in 1960. It is necessary for certain renovations to be carried out to house the Psychology Branch effectively, and this work was delayed to some extent by lack of funds. However, work on this building has now started and it is expected that it will be ready for occupation by the branch before the end of 1962.

MILLICENT WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question regarding the Millicent water supply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Work on the Millicent water supply scheme has made considerable progress. All the reticulation mains provided for in the original scheme have been laid with the exception of the steel main in the main street and one connecting main to the bores. The five bore holes have been drilled and one of these was equipped last summer with a pumping plant to pump to a temporary elevated tank to provide a water supply to the Housing Trust areas. Excavation for the 1,000,000-gallon surface tank has been completed and the lean concrete placed in position. Tenders are to be called for the construction of both the surface tank and the elevated tank. Tenders are also to be called for the supply and installation of the bore hole and main pumping plant. When the tanks and pumping plant have been completed the scheme will be able to function and physically it would be possible to complete this work and provide a supply by the end of 1963. The actual completion date will be determined by funds available. The estimated cost of the scheme is £281,000 and of this £99,000 had been spent to the end of June this year. The sum of £80,000 has been allocated on this year's Loan Estimates. I am pleased to inform the honourable member that, in spite of some difficulties in financing the department's works under the Loan programme, the full sum of £80,000 has been retained for this project.

TRAFFIC SIGNS.

Mr. LAWN: My question has reference to traffic signs on Park Terrace between South Terrace, Adelaide, and Goodwood, Unley and Parkside. In travelling from west to east there are about three signs along the road which require traffic to deviate and keep to the left. Motorists who know the road and are travelling in the evening know that on each of these three intersections is a sign to deviate. However, I have noticed that a number of motorists go straight through, because unless one knows the

road, one will not see the signs. They are away on the left side and are not lit. Will the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, take the matter up with his colleague to see if these signs can be illuminated?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, I will do that.

PORT PIRIE SCHOOLS.

Mr. McKEE: During the Loan Estimates debate I asked a question regarding the proposed Airdale Primary School and the Port Pirie Technical High School. Has the Premier now a reply?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Deputy Director of Education reports:

Proposed Airdale Primary School.—The need for a new primary school at Airdale to relieve the pressure on accommodation at Risdon Park has been recognized for some time. Additional timber rooms will be provided to cater for the increased enrolments. Consideration will be given to including a new primary school at Airdale in the next Loan programme.

Port Pirie Technical High School.—Plans for the erection of a new technical high school for boys and girls at Port Pirie have been prepared and approved by the Public Works Committee. A site of about 20 acres has already been purchased. Consideration will be given to including this work on the next Loan programme.

STURT HIGHWAY.

Mr. CURREN: I understand that the Minister of Works has a reply to my recent question regarding the Sturt Highway.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, informs me that negotiations for the acquisition of land are in hand, and it is proposed to carry out the realignment of this section as soon as the departmental gang has completed certain works in hand in that area, possibly towards the end of the 1962-63 financial year.

PENSIONER FLATS.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Has the Premier a reply to my question of August 16 relating to a Commonwealth subsidy for building pensioner flats in South Australia?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Chairman of the Housing Trust has supplied me with the following information:

The Housing Trust has built cottage flats for the following charitable organizations: Adelaide Benevolent and Strangers' Friend Society Incorporated. James Brown Memorial Trust. Laura and Alfred West Cottage Homes Incorporated. Grand Lodge of Freemasons. Renmark Cottage Homes Incorporated. Aged and Invalid Pensioners Homes Incorporated. Lutheran Homes Incorporated. S.A. Baptist Union Incorporated. St. Lawrence's Home for the Aged.

PENOLA HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. HARDING: During the debate on the Loan Estimates I raised the question of additions to the Penola High School. Has the Premier a reply?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The major additions being made to the Penola High School comprise a building of Mount Gambier stone, including the following:

1. A two-storey classroom wing of eight classrooms, stores, sick room, toilets and ablutions.

2. A single-storey portion containing three science rooms and stores, art room and store, stage, shelter area and toilets.

3. Administration wing, containing offices for the headmaster and deputy headmaster, general office, staff common room, library, book store and staff toilets.

4. A change-room wing.

In addition to the above, a domestic arts centre and a woodwork centre are being built.

SAVINGS BANK LOANS.

Mr. LAUCKE: The Savings Bank of South Australia has through the years been a very valued source of finance for both private and public developmental projects in this State. Does the Treasurer anticipate any variation in this source of finance consequent upon the entry into the savings bank field by trading banks?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I suppose it is inevitable that if there are more banks collecting the savings of the people there will be some reduction in the amounts deposited with the Savings Bank of South Australia. However, as far as I know, the bank is doing particularly well. It is giving the approximate, if not precisely the same, support that it gave previously in regard to Government, semi-government, and housing projects. I believe that the difference in its activities would be small and that it would not have to cut out the worthwhile features that the honourable member has mentioned.

ROAD HAZARD.

Mr. TAPPING: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my question of August 22 about the present tendency for scrap iron to be allowed to fall on roadways, particularly in my district?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, informs me that, in view of the provisions of section 783 (2) of the Local Government Act and section 141 of the Road Traffic Act, and of the fact that

councils may make by-laws in terms of section 667 (47) of the first-mentioned Act to provide that a person may not transport scrap, etc., unless the vehicle has a body complying with certain specified requirements calculated to confine the load, the law on this subject is adequate.

LYNTON PLATFORM.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways, a reply to my question of July 25 last about the construction of a permanent platform at Lynton?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Railways, confirms that Lynton is a growing area and that the patronage of the railways there is increasing. Permanent conventional type of platforms can be built at Lynton. The estimated cost of building earth-filled platforms—each 250ft. long, with concrete walls—for the "up" and "down" lines, exceeds £4,000. There is no provision on this year's Estimates for this work, but the Railways Commissioner has requested the Chief Engineer to give the project consideration when dealing with next year's Estimates.

BEACHPORT GROYNE.

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Premier a further reply to my question about the construction of a groyne at Beachport?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. I have made inquiries about the honourable member's question during the debate on the Loan Estimates and I find that the groynes already constructed at Beachport have been financed from a special line on the Revenue Estimates as their purpose was to protect roads and private property and to build up the beach for public use. The groyne now proposed to be constructed is in a somewhat different category as its main purpose is to protect the frontage of the Harbors Board's reserve, which includes the sheet piling adjacent to the jetty. For this reason the board has approved the construction of the new groyne as an item of Loan Expenditure. As in the case of the previous groynes, the work will be carried out by the district council under the board's supervision.

RED HILL PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. HALL: A year or so ago an application was made by residents of the Red Hill district and by the Primary School Committee for a school bus to serve the area to the west and south-west of that town, to convey students to and from the Red Hill Primary School. At that time the project was rejected by the department on various grounds, but local residents consider that, because of the special geographical features to the west of the town, this project should still be considered. The Transport Officer at that time promised personally to inspect the proposed bus route when he was in the vicinity, and thereby raise the matter once again for consideration. Has this inspection been made and, if not, will the Minister of Education find out if it is convenient for the Transport Officer to visit the Red Hill area once again to have this bus route considered?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I do not know whether an inspection has been made. I think probably that the then Transport Officer is the one who has now been promoted to Assistant Secretary of the department. I will ask the present Transport Officer (Mr. Hindmarsh) if he will make the inspection as soon as possible.

CLARENCE PARK STATION.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of August 9 about the Clarence Park railway station?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not appear to have the answer to that question. I will check that and will give it to the honourable member later, if not today on Tuesday.

DRINKING FACILITIES.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked him earlier this session about the unsatisfactory drinking facilities at the Port Pirie railway buildings?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It is my practice to let honourable members know when I have received replies from my colleagues in another place. I have advised members today of all the answers I have received, and the answer to the honourable member's question is not among them.

MITCHAM CROSSING.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways, a reply to my recent question about the Wattlebury Road crossing at Mitcham?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Railways, informs me that departmental records reveal that over a period of 11 years only two accidents involving trains have occurred at the Wattlebury Road level crossing. The crossing is equipped with automatic warning devices and the carriageway at

the actual crossing is approximately level. The approaches to the crossing are outside railway land and any question as to the desirability of modifying them should properly be taken up with the Mitcham Corporation. The Railways Commissioner recently received a suggestion that the crossing be closed and that the road traffic now using same be re-routed. The Commissioner was in accord with the suggestion which was referred to the Mitcham Corporation. However, the corporation expressed opposition to the proposal. Departmental policy regarding level crossings is governed by the relevant section of the South Australian Railways Commissioner's Act.

DAIRY CATTLE IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. BYWATERS: Does the Minister of Agriculture intend to bring down an amendment of the regulations under the Dairy Cattle Improvement Act this session?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This matter is under consideration, but I cannot make a statement about it yet as any proposed regulations would have to be referred to the Government for its perusal before promulgation.

MILLICENT SOUTH SCHOOL.

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Premier a further reply to my question concerning the construction of a new primary school at Millicent South, and the use of the old Millicent High School?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: A suitable site on which to erect this school has been purchased, and consideration will be given to the inclusion of this work in the next Loan programme. Regarding the old Millicent High School, the Minister of Education has stated that this is a matter of policy. I explained that to the honourable member at the time.

SCHOOL FENCING.

Mr. RICHES: Representations have been made to the Minister of Education and, in turn, to the Public Buildings Department, for fencing to be erected on land that has been made available by the Commonwealth Railways Department at the Port Augusta Central Primary School. Can the Minister of Works say when that area is likely to be fenced?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, briefly the position is that the matter has been referred to the Public Buildings Department, which is checking alignments and developing plans for the fencing. As soon as these plans have been completed and costs worked out, the work can proceed after approval is given.

ELIZABETH LIGHTING.

Mr. CLARK: Earlier this afternoon the Minister of Works replied to a question I asked recently through him of the Minister of Roads regarding lighting on the Main North Road through Elizabeth. I notice that the reply states that the Highways Department and the Road Traffic Board are aware of the poor lighting conditions existing on this section of the road. I believe that road reflectors might prove a great advantage if used on the sides of the road where it runs through this town. That would make it much easier for the driving public and would help to ensure that drivers did not miss the edge of the road, as can often happen in some places. Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Roads to study the possibility of such reflectors being installed on the Main North Road through Elizabeth?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

DR. GILLIS.

Mr. JENNINGS: The Premier might pay me the courtesy of remembering that during my Address in Reply speech I raised the question of a complaint all members had received from Dr. Gillis of the Morris Hospital. I have since had further correspondence from Dr. Gillis, and he told me that he had again taken the matter up and had again written to Cabinet. I assure the House this is not a matter I take up lightly, because I believe Public Service grievances should not be aired in this place. Obviously, Dr. Gillis believes this is the place in which to air his grievance and, as I represent Dr. Gillis and as the hospital at which he is Superintendent is in my district, I ask the Premier whether this matter has been further considered by Cabinet and whether he will give me an answer once for all?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This matter was closely examined by Cabinet and a decision deferred until it had further information. I assume that the member for Enfield is speaking of an appointment. Public Service appointments, as honourable members know, are subject to the Public Service Act and before a position is filled it is publicly advertised and anyone interested may apply for appointment. The applications are considered and, if necessary, they are finally dealt with by an appeal board. Therefore, when the matter comes to Cabinet it has either been the subject of a recommendation against which there has been no appeal, or it is a recommendation after an appeal has been considered and either upheld or disallowed by the Public Service Board. The Public Service Association

has always strongly supported this method of making appointments, and I believe the honourable member will see the inherent fairness in it.

Mr. Jennings: I am not arguing about that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I understand the honourable member is not querying that, but is seeking information. In this case the matter went to the appeal board, which did not uphold Dr. Gillis's appointment. Dr. Gillis was not recommended in the first place and he appealed against the recommendation that was made, but the appeal board rejected his appeal and the recommendation came to Cabinet with the backing of two authorities, the nominee being preferred by the appeal board. Cabinet considered the matter and found no grounds for disagreeing with the recommendation. That is where the matter stands. Following the rejection of the appeal an appointment was made by Cabinet.

COMPANY LAW.

Mr. BYWATERS: On August 15 the Premier moved in this House for the introduction of the Companies Bill. At that time a committee was formed, but since then we have heard no more of it. Can the Premier say whether the committee has met and when it is intended to introduce the Bill to enable members to have an opportunity to examine it? I understand it is an extensive Bill and therefore members will need some time to consider it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The committee met for only a short time but it has reached conclusions and the Bill will be brought before the House next week and the second reading given then. It is a big Bill. In addition, I hope to have for members next week a memorandum showing the old company law and the changes proposed in the relevant sections, so there will be a cross-section of the whole position for members' information. I hope that that will be available for members before the show adjournment, so that they will have probably three or four weeks in order to study any matters. The Bill is the outcome of long negotiations between the States seeking uniformity on company law. The Bill does not provide precisely for uniformity, but to all intents and purposes it follows the laws—which again are not all precisely the same—of the other States. The information I hope to provide will show members what clauses are to be altered and the extent to which the alterations will take place. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I think I should mention that the Government and I personally greatly appreciate the work of the Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman (Mr. Ludovici) in this matter. This officer has given almost unlimited time to what is a colossal task, and I think the way he will place it before members will be of great assistance to them in considering what is, from the point of view of a layman, a complicated matter and one which is not normally considered by us.

CRAYFISH.

Mr. TAPPING: I believe the Minister of Agriculture has a reply to the question I asked recently regarding crayfish exports.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Director of Fisheries and Game reports:

Export of South Australian crayfish tails are approximately 13 per cent of the Australian total. In 1961-62 total Australian exports were 9,100,000 lb. and of this South Australia was responsible for 1,200,000 lb. Western Australia's contribution was approximately 80 per cent of the total. All crayfish tails, whole cooked crayfish and fish of any kind are subject to inspection by the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry during processing and at point of shipment. All establishments, in which tails or any fish product are packed for export, are registered under Commonwealth Exports (Fish) Regulations. Quality of tails for export is therefore a matter controlled by Commonwealth authority.

The General Manager of the South Australian Fisheries Co-operative Ltd., who made the statement referred to by the member for Semaphore, has reported to the department and his report is being examined at present. As a result of that report, the Director of Fisheries and Game will get in touch with his counterpart in Western Australia to obtain the Western Australian comment on the matter. Should it be considered wise or necessary, I will raise the matter at the forthcoming meeting of Ministers in charge of fisheries to be held in Sydney during September.

MURRAY BRIDGE CROSSING.

Mr. BYWATERS: In July I asked a question regarding what is known as the 4-mile crossing south-east of Murray Bridge on the Melbourne railway line. At that time it was suggested that there should be road signs warning people of their approach to this crossing. The reply at that time was that the Commissioner of Highways would inquire, and that tenders would be called at an early date for the erection of a bridge over the crossing. Will the Minister of Works take this matter up again with his colleague to see whether the tender has been called for or let,

and whether the Commissioner of Highways has considered the possibility of painting approach signs on the roadway warning of this crossing, pending the erection of a bridge?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

PILOT VESSELS.

Mr. TAPPING: During the debate on the Loan Estimates I raised a question concerning the expenditure of £10,000 on improvements to pilot vessels. I believe the Premier has a reply.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. The £10,000 represents the purchase of two new engines for the pilot vessels *Sir Wallace Bruce* and *E. A. Farquhar.* That sum provides for the purchase price only, and it is not intended to carry out the installation of the new engines until the financial year 1963-64.

POULTRY CONFERENCE.

Mr. BYWATERS: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the officers who recently attended the poultry conference in Sydney have submitted their report, and, if they have, whether this report will be available to us?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have not seen the officers since the conference, but I will be seeing them and will ask them to furnish me with a report.

STATE BANK REPORT.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the annual report of the State Bank for the year ended June 30, 1962, together with balance sheets.

Ordered that report be printed.

ELECTRICITY (COUNTRY AREAS) SUBSIDY BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 3).

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the several departments and public services of the Government of South Australia during the year ending June 30, 1963.

In Committee of Supply.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That towards defraying the expenses of the establishments and public services of the State for the year ending June 30, 1963, a further sum of £8,000,000 be granted: provided that no payments for any establishment or service shall be made out of the said sum in excess of the rates voted for similar establishments and services on the Estimates for the financial year ended June 30, 1962, except increases of salaries or wages fixed or prescribed by any return made under any Act relating to the Public Service or by any regulation or by any award, order or determination of any court or other body empowered to fix or prescribe wages or salaries.

Motion carried.

Resolution adopted by the House, Bill founded in Committee of Ways and Means, introduced by the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, and read a first time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill follows the usual form of Supply Bills, and provides for the issue of a further £8,000,000 to enable the public services to function through September and into October. I anticipate that no further Supply Bill will be required this session, provided that the Appropriation Bill receives assent at much the same time as last year.

The Budget is now ready and I shall bring it down on Tuesday next. I understand that the Auditor-General's report has been completed, is being printed and will be made available to members on the first day they return here after the Royal Show adjournment. The report will be available to them before they are asked to participate in the Budget debate.

Clause 2 provides for the issue and application of the £8,000,000. Clause 3 provides for the payment of any increases in salaries or wages which may be authorized by any court or other body empowered to fix or prescribe salaries or wages. The Bill contains nothing unusual or unnecessary and the £8,000,000 will enable essential services to be carried on until after the Budget debate has been completed.

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

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 16. Page 568.)

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): At the outset I want to say how grateful all members should be for the introduction of a measure of this kind. Modern legislation on Aborigines in South Australia was long overdue. In fact, last year the Labor Party commenced discussions on this score, and these continued

until about a month ago. At the time the Minister of Works gave notice of this Bill the Labor Party already had a comprehensive measure ready for introduction this session to give effect to the petition that was presented to this House by me last year praying the House that legislation be introduced to provide that, in future, legislation on Aborigines should be only welfare legislation, in effect, and that all restrictions on Aborigines should be removed, which were restrictions by virtue of their race rather than the individual characteristics of the persons to whom these restrictions would be applied. That is the general principle in which we believe.

For a long time this has been the history of legislation in relation to Aborigines in most States: the attitude adopted toward Aborigines by the community was that they were a people unable to look after themselves who had to be treated as wayward children and whose lives had to be managed for them. It was commonly called protective legislation. Probably the most extensive series of so-called protections are those existing in the present Queensland Act, which contains provisions dating from the last century. I have known of administrative officers in various Aborigines' Departments who wished that they had the powers existing under the Queensland legislation. I believe that that view is wrong. I realize that the view that one should protect Aborigines is one that is not taken with any desire to be hurtful to the Aborigines, but out of consideration for them by those who express that view. At the same time, that view is completely wrong. We shall never have in South Australia either assimilation or integration of Aborigines, nor will it occur anywhere else in Australia, until Aborigines have a legislative framework in which they can be assimilated or integrated in the community. Assimilation and integration will never take place unless these people are simply subject to the same laws as operate for every other member of the community who has freedom from restriction. If they contravene the ordinary laws of the community they should be dealt with as ordinary members of the community.

It is vital that Aborigines be encouraged to stand on their own feet, but they never will while there is a continuance of protective legislation or a continuance of assistance known fairly accurately as the "hand-out" system.

What has been the history of part-Aborigines, who at the moment are subject to restrictions. They have two backgrounds: one is an Aboriginal culture, a very closely knit and complicated cultural and social pattern, and one that is completely incapable of being adapted to a society such as ours. When they come in contact with our society their norms are broken down very steadily and the people with whom they came in contact in the early days of the development of South Australia have unfortunately often been those who had not been successful as Europeans in our community and who loafed on the goodwill of the Aboriginal population. Those are the two strains of heredity that many of our part-Aboriginal people now have: the strain of the Aboriginal culture that has been broken down (and there has been nothing effective put in its place), and the strain from these people in the European community who were not successful in that community but who persisted to foist themselves on the goodwill of the Aboriginal population. This has produced an attitude wide-spread among some of the older part-Aborigines in South Australia that the community owes them a living and owes them facilities. They have a bitter distrust of the community, because it has not given them the facilities for the kind of assimilation and integration that many felt was their just due, and they adopted an attitude of resentment and said, "Why should we work? What opportunities are there for us? The community ought to provide for us." They have been encouraged in this attitude by the system of protection and hand-outs which has been the pattern of legislation in this State previously and which, unfortunately, is still the pattern in some other States, particularly so in Queensland.

We believe that the whole of the legislation that provides for special restrictions upon Aborigines should be removed. We do not believe that restrictions should be applied to Aborigines unless such Aborigines have some individual characteristic that places them in a class in the general community which has to have some restrictions placed upon it. Any restrictions that should be applied to Aborigines should also be applicable to every other person in the community who has those particular characteristics. In our view, that is the only basis for any sort of restriction.

Let me now turn to the provisions of the old Act, which my Party believes should go entirely. In that Act was a provision for an Aboriginal to come under the Act unless he got exemption. We do not believe in maintaining the principle of Aborigines as a people of a certain race or of a certain heredity being

subject to restriction, as Aborigines having to apply for exemption from those restrictions. Let me show what would happen under the protective legislation that exists in any matter at all. For a long time in South Australia there was no appeal against refusal by the Aborigines Board of applications for exemption. There was a provision in the Act for an appeal by an Aboriginal, but the average Aboriginal had no idea that it was there or how to go about bringing an appeal even if he knew it was there. This Act was passed in 1939. The regulations relating to appeals were not gazetted until last year. There have been no appeals in the intervening period. An examination of what actually was being done administratively reveals that, when an Aboriginal applied for exemption and the exemption was refused by the board, the Aboriginal was not told that he had the right of appeal. I have seen many letters of this kind. In no case was the Aboriginal told he had the right of appeal, and the one and only appeal was brought last year. It caused the gazetting of the regulations providing for appeals.

In that particular case the Aboriginal concerned was a man who was employed, and had been employed for some 10 years, by the Highways Department as a tractor driver. He was in charge, at the Highways Department camp at Lucindale, of a very valuable piece of Government equipment. He had a regular wage and lived in the camp, earning £17 a week. He had not asked the department for any sort of assistance for about 20 years. He was 53 and wanted his exemption. He appealed to the magistrate and his appeal was opposed, on one ground basically, by the Secretary of the department, who said that the man needed the protection of the department because if he fell ill the department could give him medical assistance which he would not so readily get were he not under the department; and, secondly, if he were unemployed he would get immediate assistance from the department for the three weeks' period before he got Commonwealth unemployment benefits. He further said that as he had no money saved up (he owned his own car) he really needed this assistance and, until he had some financial assets apart from his motor car, either in cash or in land, he ought not to be granted exemption from the Act.

The magistrate upheld that point of view. He said that this man did not have permanent assets other than his motor car, but he was earning £17 a week, was able to live at the standard of everybody else in the Highways Department, and his permanent assets were greater than those of most Europeans with whom he was working. However, he was to be kept under protection.

Let us see what actually was the benefit to him of that sort of thing. The benefit was stated to be assistance in medical expenses. What assistance does the department give? The first is that it does pay a private doctor's bill, but it does not often do this in the case of a man earning £17 a week. The second thing is that it will, if he goes to a Government hospital, request the Hospitals Department not to charge him, but that will be determined by the administrator of the hospital, depending upon his means. If he goes to a subsidized hospital, it will request the board of the subsidized hospital not to charge him, but the practice of the subsidized hospitals (I can give members some instances of this kind) is that where a man is earning a wage of this dimension, they do not make any allowance for him at all, but charge him the full rate. That was all the benefit that he was going to get there.

What was the benefit as far as unemployment pay was concerned? He would get three weeks' benefit in the intervening period before he got his Commonwealth social services—a colossal amount as a price to pay for permanent protection. It is said that he would not be able to feed himself during that period. He would be no less able to keep himself during that period than other people in the community who were not Aborigines.

The magistrate added another reason which was not raised by the department itself at all, and that was that since the man concerned associated with relatives in an Aborigines' camp who were not exempt and since there had been some drinking at that camp, although no such charge had ever been proved against this man, he had to satisfy the magistrate that he was apprised of the enormity and undesirability of giving liquor to non-exempt Aborigines or part-Aborigines. In other words, he had to prove to the magistrate that he would not in future commit an offence of which he had never been charged in all his 53 years. No such charge had ever been made against him, but he would have to prove to the magistrate that he would not do it in the future.

That is the other ground on which exemption was refused. Honourable members see the

sort of thing that can be maintained where a protective attitude is maintained in regard to exemptions and treatment. I believe it was wholly undesirable that that sort of thing should go on. We should not say that to people who want to be free and who have demonstrated their ability to live within the community according to its accepted standards. Here is the case of an Aboriginal placed under protection, despite the fact that he is better able to cater for himself than his workmates for themselves.

As this Bill stands, unfortunately, the exemption provisions are not swept away. They are removed in relation to part-Aborigines, but are retained in relation to full-bloods in certain areas. I do not believe that that is the basis upon which we should proceed. I have some suggestions to make to the Government on this score—to rewrite the provisions to see to it that assistance and protection are given to people who have certain individual characteristics, but so that those things should apply to anybody in the community who has those characteristics, and so that they should not be applied to Aborigines as Aborigines.

The second thing that we did not like about the old Act was the method of administration, and that method largely is maintained in the present proposals. I do not believe that it is desirable to have the Welfare Department administered by a board, with a Minister not directly responsible for the day-to-day working of the department and its administration. It is not responsible to Parliament for the day-to-day working of the board or its administration. We think it is undesirable that a Minister should be questioned upon some activity of the Aborigines Department and then give not his own reply but the reply of the board. That is not in accordance with the general principles of responsible Government and we believe that in fact the Minister should be directly responsible to Parliament for the administration. If he wants the advice of the board and it would obviously be of assistance to him, then he should have an advisory board. What is more, we believe that an advisory board should provide for Aboriginal representation. I know that the Minister's attitude is that he ought not to have restrictions placed upon the people whom he puts on the board and that he should put them on the board according to their individual ability, regardless of whether they are women, Aborigines, or people having any other particular qualifications at the time.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Provided they have qualifications.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes, but with great respect, while I agree with that general principle, I know that those people who are involved in women's organizations in South Australia do not for the most part like the idea, for instance, that a board must contain a certain number of women. They believe women should stand or fall by their individual abilities, and that is proper. But I know, from talking to Aborigines on the subject and discussing a measure of this kind with Aboriginal groups in South Australia and with Aborigines' organizations in most other States, that they feel strongly that where there has been no Aboriginal on a board (and there has been none in South Australia and this is the only State where there is an advisory board of this kind on which there is no Aboriginal) it is important from their point of view that an Aboriginal should be on the board and that a certain number of Aborigines should be on the board. I am not certain of the present position in Western Australia and Queensland, but in Victoria and New South Wales Aborigines are members of the boards. Mr. Leon is a member in New South Wales and Pastor Doug Nicholls is a member in Victoria. Aborigines feel strongly about this point and even if the Minister finds that he has nobody readily available that he would appoint to a board of this kind it is wise to have some Aboriginal there who will give Aborigines the feeling that their individual voices are going to be heard as a people.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I think the honourable member is aware that that matter is being considered.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I appreciate that but, originally, in the measure I was discussing last year with Aboriginal organizations I had not made that point, but I did make it as a result of strong representations on this score from Aborigines. The next question that we do not like about the old Act (and it is not provided for in this Bill) is the way in which Aborigines can be dealt with in relation to reserves. Here is a matter about which Aborigines all over Australia have felt very bitterly indeed. In practically every other predominantly European country where there is a coloured minority of indigenous people provision has been made to guarantee to those people property rights in their reserves, and when they are removed from a reserve, or any part of a reserve is disposed of, they are compensated. That is the case with Eskimos and Canadian and North American

Indians. In each of those cases treaty rights exist on property rights for the indigenous population in the reserves that have been declared. When the reserve is altered or acquired for any purpose, or when there is any sale, the sale has to be agreed to by the whole of the people and they are given compensation.

I appreciate the point that the Government has sought to ensure that Aborigines' reserves are provided in this State. The purchase of Yalata was a case of this kind when the natives were removed from Ooldea, but it is a fact that South Australian Aborigines have no proprietary rights in the major reserves. I am not certain what the attitude of the Government has been regarding certain small reserves not under day-to-day Government supervision but, certainly, in relation to the major reserves it has not been the policy to consider that the native has a proprietary right to the reserves. Indeed, for most of this century there has been share farming through the areas by European farmers.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Not entirely, by any means.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I am not suggesting it is on the whole of the reserves, but on part of the reserves. The protests about share farming at Point Pearce are long standing and I believe the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) has made representations on this score. From my reading of the history of Point Pearce, and I have a very old book on this subject, that is the case, and indeed only recently there were some Europeans share farming there.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I do not say there is still not some of it.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I am not suggesting that natives have not undertaken share farming, too, but I am suggesting that part of the reserve has been operated by European share farmers and the money paid to the department for administrative purposes. We aim to give proprietary rights to all natives on the reserves. In the American reserves, where there is any letting of any part of the property or where any mining right is established or minerals discovered, the royalties recovered are paid to the natives. In certain of the American and Canadian reserves the Red Indians have become very wealthy from the mineral and oil royalties they have received. The cry at practically every conference of Aborigines that I have attended (and I have attended many of them) has been that they have not been given some compensation. They ask, "Where have we been given some property rights in our reserves?" It is true that in South Australia there has been no removal of reserves from the Aborigines to the extent that has occurred in Queensland. Portion of the central Aboriginal reserve was affected by the Woomera Rocket Range.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: And it proved very beneficial, if I may say so.

Mr. DUNSTAN: That may be true, but at the same time the establishment of the Woomera Rocket Range did not directly provide compensation for the Aborigines on the reserve. Apart from that, there has been no major reserve taken from Aborigines in this State, but in Queensland we have the unfortunate example of Weipa where there has been no satisfactory compensation to the natives for the reserve that was removed from them. They were given a much smaller area down the coast away from their tribal ground and, although new quarters have been erected for them, they have not been directly paid compensation, nor are they getting any royalties at all from the bauxite on their old reserve. This business of giving no sort of proprietary rights to Aborigines gets them jumping and it is not surprising. The early provisions made for the province of South Australia stating that there should be some sort of compensation to the indigenous inhabitants have never been carried out. We believe there should be some guarantee of proprietary rights to Aborigines.

The third question we are concerned about is the question of the Government policy in relation to assimilation. It is the stated policy of most Government departments in Australia that Aborigines should be assimilated into the community. They should be educated to the stage where they can take their place in the general community of the State, indistinguishable from other members of that community apart from their different coloured skin. That is the general assimilation policy. Doubt upon the wisdom of that policy, as an overall policy for all Aborigines, has been cast by welfare officers, particularly welfare officers of the Commonwealth Department. They very cogently point to the fact that in numbers of cases the Aboriginal, although he is detribalized, still retains a very close feeling of family and of group; he does not want to be separated from family and group and put amongst what is still to him something of an alien community. He wants to be taken into the community as a group and maintain some of the features of his own way of life within the group.

This kind of policy of taking groups of Aborigines into a community but having them still living as a group is generally called integration into the community rather than assimilation into the community. I believe that in many cases this is wise. Let us take the position in relation to the two major Government reserves—Point Pearce and Point McLeay. As I understand the purpose of this Bill—and it appears very clearly from its provisions—the people who are on those reserves are all, so far as I am aware, part-Aborigines. The Minister may correct me if I am wrong, but I understand that there are no full-blood Aborigines there. Those part-Aborigines, under this provision, will have no rights on those reserves unless the board permits them to stay there. As I understand the policy of the department, they are to be got off the reserves as quickly as may be. There are some virtues in a policy of that kind, but I think there are also some hardships involved, and I believe that a mid-way course is preferable. Let us take the comparable position in Victoria, which has legislation of the kind that I think is wholly desirable, generally speaking.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: But they have very few or no full-bloods or primitives.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I am talking not about primitives at the moment but about groups of detribalized part-Aborigines who are living on reserves. Victoria has a large Government settlement at Lake Tyers, the only major Government settlement in Victoria. While there are groups of Aborigines elsewhere on small areas which have been declared reserves, Lake Tyers is the only major reserve comparable with Point Pearce or Point McLeay. The Aborigines at Lake Tyers still in fact retain some sort of group existence, and they are concerned to maintain it. The policy of the department, however, is to close Lake Tiers as a general Aboriginal reserve and to remove anybody other than the old Aborigines who cannot look after themselves. I do not think that method of dealing with them is desirable.

In our view, there are two things that have to be done in relation to reserves of this kind. First, we should try to see that the reserves are developed as co-operatives. At Point Pearce at present there is a small consumers' co-operative, but otherwise the reserves are not really run as co-operatives with individual farms in a co-operative selling venture. The reserves could be developed in that way. Admittedly, of course, there would be insufficient land there to develop them as co-operatives for all the population of the reserves. Therefore, I believe that it is preferable to retain the reserves as co-operatives in the way I have suggested for those who are capable of doing that, so that they may maintain their group entity, otherwise, to have the reserves for a limited period as open towns with committees of management amongst the Aborigines themselves and to develop a plan for each family to move off either as individual families or in groups to group schemes elsewhere.

There is a virtue in settling Aborigines in groups. While I know that some trouble can arise in that way, many Aborigines have expressed this view to me and it is one which is often very strongly put by Pastor Douglas Nicholls, who points out that it does not matter how far away the Aboriginal people are from their original home, there is a great feeling for place and group amongst the Aborigines, and they do wish to retain some kind of group culture even when it has been broken down as far as it has been at Point McLeay and Point Pearce. Even in those places now, although substantially detribalized, the people retain some of their group culture.

Having enunciated these general principles as to our view on this Bill, I propose to go through the individual clauses and suggest how our views would affect them. I stress to the Minister—and I know he appreciates the point of view of members on this side of the House—and to all Government members, that we are approaching this matter not in any way as a Party political measure. We do not believe that it should be the subject of Party politics at all.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: That is our view.

Mr. DUNSTAN: We appreciate that. What I think the House can well do in Committee is to get down to a discussion of the general principles to be applied and try to work out something constructive which we can all agree will be of benefit to the Aboriginal people in South Australia. It is with that end in view that I go through to make the suggestions and to show how we of the Opposition think the measure could be improved according to the general principles which I have sought to enunciate this afternoon. Clause 3 reads:

> "Aboriginal institution" means any mission station, orphanage, school, home, reserve, or other institution for the benefit, care, or promotion of the welfare of the Aboriginal inhabitants of the State.

However, clause 4 is as follows:

> Every person who is of full-blood descended from the original inhabitants of Australia, other than a person whose name is removed from the Register of Aborigines in pursuance

of section 17 of this Act, shall be deemed to be an Aboriginal within the meaning of this Act or any other Act.

The reserves mentioned in clause 3 are reserves for Aborigines, so it follows that institutions and reserves are only for Aborigines of full-blood. That is to be the purpose of these reserves: they are not for part-Aborigines. That is going to have a very considerable effect, generally speaking. It means that the definitions are going to deprive part-Aborigines of any rights at all in relation to reserves unless the Minister permits those part-Aborigines to live there; it is purely permissive. In the Bill, it is not for their purposes that the reserves or institutions are to be established. Already the people at Point Pearce are concerned about that situation.

I have told honourable members of the view so often expressed by Aborigines as to their lack of proprietary rights. I consider that there should be some alteration to the provision. The definitions in clause 3 are affected by the definitions in clause 4, which is the clause containing the vital definitions of ''full-blood Aborigines'' and ''part-Aborigines''. In our view there should be no definition of ''Aboriginal''. In the Northern Territory Welfare Ordinance the word ''Aboriginal'' does not appear. Under it provision is not made specifically for Aborigines. There is protective legislation applicable to wards with certain characteristics. Almost every other race of Aborigines has been excluded from the operation of the ordinance. The word ''Aboriginal'' does not occur anywhere and there is no definition of ''Aboriginal''.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I do not think there is any objection to the definition.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I do not suggest that the word ''Aboriginal'' be cut out. It was in the Bill that we prepared and I shall give the Minister a copy of that Bill at the close of this debate. We see no necessity to define ''Aboriginal'', because that is only needed if the sheep are to be separated from the goats.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You have to define the people to whom the legislation applies.

Mr. DUNSTAN: If the word ''Aboriginal'' were left in and it is said that the function of the board is to care for the welfare, benefit and advancement of Aborigines, there would be no need for the definition. It would then be at the discretion of the board. I think we could leave it to the administration by the Minister responsible for seeing to this matter. I see no need for a definition of ''Aboriginal''. The only real purpose of such a definition would be to give the Minister certain functions regarding part-Aborigines in reserves, to apply the liquor and other exemptions, and to apply the special protective provisions for full-blood Aborigines.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: In addition, there is special provision for assistance to Aborigines, which assistance is not available to any other person in the community. I assume that the honourable member wants to retain that?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Then we must define the people to whom we are giving the assistance.

Mr. DUNSTAN: If the word ''Aboriginal'' is mentioned it is sufficient, and that has been found to be so, from memory, in the Victorian legislation.

Mr. Jenkins: Is it important?

Mr. DUNSTAN: It is, because certain things flow from clause 4. The effect of the definitions in clause 4 is to retain restrictions in relation to certain people by virtue of their race. It is not by virtue of individual characteristics, but by virtue of certain heredity, and that is why we do not like the clause. Clause 5 refers to the constitution of the Aboriginal Affairs Board, which will be the administrative authority. We believe that that board should be advisory, and in clause 6 there should be provision for at least two Aborigines to be members of the board. The duties of the board, which are set out in clause 15, should be, in fact, the duties of the Minister. The function of the board should be to advise the Minister on those duties. We believe also that annual reports about the work should be presented by the Minister and not be reports by the board. In clause 15 there should be the right of the Minister to purchase houses and make contact with the Housing Trust for the erection of dwellings. There is such a provision in the present Act, but it does not go as far as we would like. I was exercised in my mind why the provision was not included.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It is.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Not quite in those terms.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It is wider in fact.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Does it mean that the board will be allowed to purchase houses and transfer them outright?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Yes, if necessary.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I am glad that the Minister feels that way, but on my reading of the other provisions I thought there was a limit on the powers that the board has,

as compared with the provisions in the previous Act, rather than no limit. Perhaps we should further consult with the Parliamentary Draftsman on this matter. In our measure we went further and made certain that the board had full powers. Clause 17 deals with the register of Aborigines. We do not agree that there should be such a register for the purposes appearing in this legislation. We think that the effect of the register on Aborigines under other provisions is undesirable. We think that a register is useful for administrative purposes, and that plans should be made for the development, integration and assimilation of each family or group of Aborigines, but we do not agree with the effect of the register on other provisions as they stand now. It is this effect only that requires the provision in clause 17 (3). That provides for an appeal. It would need only an appeal to remove a name from the register if being on the register placed an Aboriginal under a certain disability. We do not agree that the other provisions relating to disabilities should exist and therefore we do not see the need for the appeal. If the provision is retained, and the other provisions relating to disabilities remain in the legislation after it passes through Committee, we think the appeal provision should be wider than it is now, because there should be much more specifically set forth, for the special magistrate who hears the appeal, about the basis upon which removal from the register should be granted. The magistrate should not be able to do what the learned special magistrate did in the appeal to which I have referred. There should be closely set forth for him the basis upon which people should be granted exemption.

What are the conditions under which everybody should be allowed to get out from the special protective provisions of any legislation? Let me explain this to the Minister. If a magistrate simply has a discretion to make an order on the appeal as appears to him just, that is all; he has a broad discretion. Then it is his individual view that may well be affected by the view put by the department, on the hearing of the appeal, as to what is just and what is not. If the magistrate is not imbued (some are and some are not) with the necessity of removing the protection provisions at the earliest possible moment from the Aborigines, then it may not appear to him just to grant the exemption. To many magistrates in South Australia that I have talked to about it, it would have appeared just that the appeal should be allowed.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The whole significance of clause 17(2) is that the board shall remove.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I appreciate that. It is a question whether the Aboriginal is capable of accepting the full responsibilities of citizenship, and we have to be reasonably definitive on that score and not leave a too broad discretion in the hands of somebody who may not fully appreciate the policy of assimilation and integration. Many magistrates, unfortunately, are in no way informed upon this score. Some are and some are not. Let me turn to clause 18:

> The Governor may by proclamation—
> (a) declare any Crown lands to be reserved for Aborigines;
> (b) alter the boundaries of any reserve;
> (c) abolish any reserve.

In the first place, we believe that the Government should have power to declare other than Crown lands as reserves for Aborigines if arrangements can be made to that effect and it is desirable that that be done. We do not believe it should be restricted to Crown lands. Secondly, if there are to be alterations in the boundaries of a reserve or the abolition of a reserve, that should be done by legislation and not by proclamation by the Governor in Council. This again is a point of proprietary interest. Before the reserves are removed from the use of Aborigines, legislation should pass through this House so that we can see that there is some form of compensation payable to the Aborigines. I can see no reasonable excuse for not doing that. It is quite true that at the moment there have been no sorts of proprietary right established by Aborigines except a limited form of sharefarming on some reserves; otherwise, they have no proprietary rights. They are, in effect, licensees of Crown lands and lands belonging to or in the hands of the Aborigines Department.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Generations of Aborigines come and go on those reserves.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I appreciate all the difficulties of that matter. I know that, in the case of the Indian Treaty of Rights, the treaty was established a long time ago, maintaining the lines of the families, working out their proprietary rights and, although there are complications at times in working out the fractions of people with hereditary interests in some parts of the reserves, nevertheless they would be small problems compared with the problems that would arise if we tried something of the same sort here.

The only effective thing one can do is to say that, once a man has gone and lived permanently off a reserve as at the date of the passing of this Bill, it has gone beyond the possibility of giving him a proprietary right. I do not see what other decision one can make, and I do not think that saying that that is unfair should deprive those who still have some direct and physical relationship with the reserves of some sort of compensation in the future.

Mr. Jenkins: It may be compensation to some degree by doing something better?

Mr. DUNSTAN: That may be provided by legislation. I do not suggest that we should write out a code for compensation but that we should simply say that, under this legislation, reserves will be maintained for Aborigines and, if there is to be any alteration of the reserves, it will be done by legislation so that the House will see that some form of compensation or reward is given to the Aboriginal who is deserving of it; and from this date forward we have a list of those people who have some rights in relation to reserves.

Mr. Jenkins: That would create an interesting position.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes. We are not disputing the advisability of a register; all we are saying is that the register should not be in for the purposes that at the moment it is in. There are other uses of the register and that is why we are opposed to other clauses of the Bill, which, once removed, would remove the necessity of clause 17 (3), the appeal clause.

We are wholly opposed to clause 20. This is the clause under which any Aboriginal—that is, a full-blood who is within the protection provisions that would be continued—may be kept within the boundaries of an institution or removed from one Aboriginal institution to another. If the Aboriginal does not obey the orders of the Minister in this regard, he is guilty of an offence. There is no appeal, no right of *habeas corpus*. In fact, he may be ordered about. I appreciate the purpose of the Minister in this regard. I know what he would say on this score so well: assume a full-blood comes down from a central reserve, or even from Yalata; he is down here in the city and entirely down on his uppers, unable to look after himself and getting into some sort of trouble with the police from time to time, and we ought to be able to send him back to a place where he will be looked after—that is the purpose of it. I do not think that this is the sort of thing we ought to do. I do not believe in saying that an Aboriginal shall be subject to some special restriction of that kind if he has some hereditary characteristic.

If the Minister maintains that certain classes of people are unable to live according to the generally accepted standards of the community, an order should be made that they be removed and kept within an asylum or an institution. However, that provision could be inserted in other legislation and applied to anybody in the community possessing those characteristics. We have the Aged and Infirm Persons' Property Act to cater for certain people and a similar provision could be made, but I do not believe we should subject our Aborigines to this treatment, because even in the hands of the most benevolent administrator unfortunate incidents could occur.

This provision is contained in the Queensland legislation and there has been outcry after outcry at the removal of Aborigines from one institution to another at the order of the Director. Those natives are removed to Palm Island and other places from time to time. It is not proper that an Aboriginal who is in a reserve or institution should suddenly, without any right of appeal, be told that for his benefit he must go from here to there and that, if he does not comply, he will commit an offence.

Mr. Jenkins: Under the conditions you have mentioned it might be kinder to put him in a reserve than to hold him under some other form of detention.

Mr. DUNSTAN: By removing the Aboriginal to an institution we are doing just that. I do not see why provision cannot be made under other legislation for the removal of a person to a reserve for Aborigines if he is an appropriate person, provided that the basis upon which that is done is a general provision applying to any person possessing certain characteristics and needing help.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: How could general conditions apply?

Mr. DUNSTAN: If some direction of that kind were required a general provision could provide for an order to be made removing a person and keeping him in a certain institution if he could not care for himself. I do not think that is necessary or desirable, but if protection of this kind is desirable we could provide that a primitive person who could not live according to the generally accepted standards of a community might, by order of a court of summary jurisdiction, be removed to an institution where he could be cared for. No order need be made against a person other than

a person for whom an Aboriginal institution is maintained. What court would ever be so stupid as to order anyone else there?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You said the provision of Aboriginal reserves was too rigid and should be widened.

Mr. DUNSTAN: When I gave notice of this motion it was obvious that there would be many amendments. However, to give the overall picture to the Minister perhaps it might be wise to hand him our original suggestions.

Mr. Jenkins: There must be considerable compromise in these things.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I hope we will be able to arrive at something to satisfy all concerned, or go a fair way towards doing that. I am trying not to be difficult with the Minister on this, but to advance the most constructive suggestions. I would prefer not to have any provision of this kind applicable to Aborigines or anyone else. I do not believe people should be pushed around. Even if this were for their benefit I believe it preferable to provide that Aborigines should be left to live according to the generally accepted conditions in the community and if they find difficulty in doing that in future it would be better for them to face these difficulties. Welfare facilities will be available to the Aboriginal and we have provisions for people who leave reserves. If the people wish to return to the reserves, orders are rarely made in their case, but certain orders are extant. I know that certain people leave and the department wishes them to return to the reserves, and all the department does is to exercise a little economic pressure and that works. I do not think it is necessary to implement provisions that cut right across *habeas corpus* and ordinary liberties.

We believe we should allow Aborigines to be citizens in the fullest sense, and that does not only mean that they should have voting rights. It means that the same provisions should apply to them as apply to every other citizen. At a time when we are faced with demands in the United Nations Organization for bringing independence to New Guinea, the election of a representative Legislature within two years in that country, and the removal of all restrictions on citizenship, how can we maintain that Aborigines should be subjected to special legislation of this kind?

Indeed, the legislative disabilities under which Aborigines have suffered have received attention overseas both in the name of the general principles we have accepted in signing the United Nations Charter and the policy already expressed in the United Nations Trusteeship Council of the United Nations Minorities Commission, and we should not accept provisions of this type however benevolently they are intended.

As it stands, I have no objection to clause 23, but it is only because of the effect of the earlier provision that clause 23 worries me. This deals with persons who can be lawfully on a reserve and with people who cannot be lawfully on a reserve. It is clear under this provision as it stands, together with the definition of "Aboriginal" in the earlier part of the Act, that part-Aborigines have no rights to be on reserves except by special permission.

Dealing with clause 25, I believe that this provision should not specifically relate to Aborigines, but that we should use this wording to amend the Health Act, which would be perfectly easy, by writing this provision into that Act. A provision that the person to be medically examined shall be a person living in primitive conditions and not according to the generally accepted standards of the community should be sufficient. The board would desire to give notice in writing for their examination under this health provision and not because of anything in the nature of race or personal characteristic.

I do not believe that clause 29 should be there, either. I know that it does happen from time to time—and this is, in effect, a re-enactment of certain provisions of the old Act—that Aborigines come from outback areas and proceed to erect humpies and wurlies on the edge of towns where they are a health menace to the townspeople and, indeed, a menace to themselves. They can better be catered for elsewhere. But, Sir, I believe that the ordinary health provisions should be applied in relation to them. We should not simply tell them to depart from an Aboriginal camp, but if they are in a camp which is a health menace, near or on the edge of a township, then the local board of health should take action in relation to them.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: In what way?

Mr. DUNSTAN: By declaring that there is an insanitary condition. That would result in the demolition of the camp, and the Aborigines would have to move off somewhere else; if they did not, they could be prosecuted. We ought not simply to say, "There has to be some special provision for Aborigines." Why not operate the general laws in the community, and not say that Aborigines should do certain things and be subject to certain disabilities?

If they are to be ordinary citizens of the community, let the ordinary laws applicable in the community be applied, and if they did not comply with those provisions, then they could be prosecuted.

Mr. Jenkins: I think this clause almost parallels local government.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes, local government has powers now. What is the necessity of operating this clause rather than the ordinary local government clause?

Mr. Jenkins: Perhaps it would relieve local government of some responsibilities.

Mr. DUNSTAN: The sooner Aborigines know what the powers of local government are, the sooner they are going to become citizens. It is better for them to have the ordinary laws operated for them under ordinary administrative provisions than for them to feel that here is some department ordering them about under the provisions of this Bill. Why should it be the responsibility of the Minister to take this action? It should be the responsibility of local government to act in relation to its own area.

Regarding offences against female Aborigines (dealt with in clause 30), I understand that the Minister has had some discussions about this matter. I do not believe there is any necessity any longer for a special provision of this kind in relation to female Aborigines. Let us trace the history of this provision. Tribal and semi-tribal Aborigines have entirely different codes of sexual conduct from the general community; theirs is much more rigid in many ways. As most of the early investigations disclose, it was proper in certain cases for a woman to have intercourse with somebody other than the tribal husband; that was lawful and desirable within their Aboriginal community. There were certain people that the female Aboriginal absolutely must not have intercourse with, and that was a rigid code. It was not so much that infringement of that was regarded as a matter of sexual jealously, but it was an offence against the traditions and laws and spirits of the tribe for a female to have intercourse with somebody who was within the prohibited degrees. However, it was common that she be offered by the tribal husband to somebody who was not within the prohibited degrees, as a matter of sheer hospitality, and no European was within those prohibited degrees.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It was a blood relationship embargo.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes, and therefore numbers of people who came here in the early days, and did not mind much what advantage they took of the Aborigines, proceeded to take advantage of that fact, and the old provision that existed for such a long time and was in the 1939 Act was there because of the depredations of those people upon tribal and semi-tribal Aborigines, particularly as according to the beliefs of many of the South Australian and Central Australian tribes intercourse had no relationship at all to child-bearing: they believed it bore no relationship whatever.

Mr. Jenkins: It was to improve public relations.

Mr. DUNSTAN: That is why this provision and the even wider one that it was an offence to consort with a female Aboriginal were in the old Act and why they had existed in our legislation for such a long time. What is the position now? That old series of tribal norms have gone by the board, except in the case of our tribal Aborigines who are now in a situation where depredations by the general community upon them of this kind are unlikely to occur. In these circumstances, I see no special need any longer for a section of this kind. I think the general provisions of the law relating to the protection of women can be adequate protection to female Aborigines.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I would agree with you on that point.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I appreciate the Minister's agreement. The next clause that I am not happy about concerns the curatorship of Aborigines' estates. I believe that there is no need for a provision of this kind. If there is consent by the Aboriginal person for the taking over of the administration of his affairs in this State, that can be done without legislation by a simple power of attorney. There is no difficulty about that. The only thing that could arise is the taking over of an estate without consent. Again, I do not believe that this should be a provision that applies to Aborigines by virtue of their race. We have on the Statute Book at the moment the Aged and Infirm Persons' Property Act. If it is thought that there are certain Aborigines who need the protection of an order giving curatorship of their estates to somebody like the Public Trustee or the Minister, then a simple amendment to the Aged and Infirm Persons' Property Act, saying that an order can be made where people live in primitive conditions and not according to the generally accepted standards of the community, would meet the position and would be applicable to everybody who had those individual characteristics.

The next matter I want to deal with is the question of the liquor provisions. On this score, the Minister in some ways has gone rather further than members of my Party were willing to go. What he has done in the Bill is to repeal sections 172 and 173 of the Licensing Act by deleting all reference to Aborigines in the Licensing Act entirely.

Mr. Jenkins: That is in clause 33?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes. Then he puts in a restriction on the sale of liquor to Aborigines—and that will be full-blood Aborigines—in certain parts of the State to be proclaimed. In accordance with the general view which we took, that there should be no restrictions on the basis of race but rather on the basis of individual characteristics, we believed that a preferable provision would be something akin to that in the Northern Territory Welfare Ordinances. It could be done by enlarging the other section of the Licensing Act commonly known as the ''Blackfellows' section''. It really does not apply to Aborigines, but it has become well-known that people are put under the ''Blackfellows' Act''. Section 179 of the Licensing Act provides that a court of summary jurisdiction may upon complaint make a non-consumption order. Under it a man may not be supplied with intoxicating liquor if he habitually misuses liquor. We believe that the provision should be enlarged to enable the court to make such orders until further notice, and not for a limited period as under the Act. An additional qualification could be that the court be satisfied that the person lives in primitive conditions or is unable to live according to the generally accepted standard of the community and appears to require protection from the consumption of alcohol. Individual orders could be made in relation to the people to be covered.

This is basically the form of the Northern Territory Welfare Ordinance. In the Northern Territory they have made about 15,000 declarations, and each declaration is made on the basis of individual characteristics. It is done within the characteristics prescribed by the ordinance. I believe that would be proper here. We proposed to repeal sections 172 and 173 in relation to such parts of the State as were to be proclaimed, so that there would be a gradual repeal over the State as other provisions came into force.

Mr. Quirke: Would an Aboriginal free to drink and supplying liquor to others not free to drink be liable to penalties as now?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Mr. Quirke: That would be difficult because Aborigines share everything.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I appreciate that. Some Aborigines need some kind of protection. It is not because they are Aborigines that they need it, but because they are living in primitive conditions and have not yet reached the stage of living in the generally accepted standard of the community, and are not used to the consumption of alcohol. I have heard it said that there is a physiological disability amongst Aborigines through drinking alcohol, but from every investigation made that has been found to be not true.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The police do not accept that.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Doctors and anthropologists have gone into this thing carefully. I suggest that an Aboriginal not accustomed to the consumption of alcohol, or one who has become accustomed to it and is living in a community where he is expected according to the rules to conduct himself properly, but has not accepted those new norms, has his inhibitions broken down by the consumption of alcohol more than the ordinary person. He has some norms to throw away and once the inhibitions have gone he becomes wild. There is much excitement from the dances and sacred ceremonies amongst the tribes and once the tribal norms of an Aboriginal are cut away he will go in for far wilder activities than would a European living under our conditions. That is supported by Professor Elkin and others who have made a close study of the anthropology of Aborigines.

Mr. Quirke: Often the Aboriginal thinks he can drink any quantity and any kind of alcohol, which makes the position difficult.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I appreciate that. I believe that we should go as far, at any rate, as the Labor Party wants to go. The Minister's measure goes farther. However, the only real difference is that it is proposed to have individual non-consumption orders according to natural characteristics.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It will not work.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I think it will. It does in the Northern Territory. As far as the present law is concerned, I agree with the view of the Minister that there must be a substantial alteration to the present licensing provisions. This is the position of part-Aborigines and Aborigines who have been detribalized. If in this State they want to consume liquor they get it, and they get it under the worst possible circumstances. Members should

go to Point Pearce and see the amount of drinking that takes place amongst Aborigines. On my last trip there a utility turned over on the way down. It contained 10 flagons of wine. The Aborigines buy the flagons at 8s. each and sell them at £3 each. It is rotten stuff. The member for Burra would be scarified to think that anyone would prefer it even to methylated spirits. These people can get liquor and they will get it. They drink it surreptitiously and in circumstances where they get as much as they can down as quickly as they can. They are not taught or trained to consume liquor under ordinary and reasonable circumstances, and they need the ordinary protection of the Licensing Act. It is a big problem. This sort of prohibition in relation to native people has been found to be unworkable all around the globe. The restrictions have been lifted in some places. They have been lifted in Fiji where now there are no restrictions on the consumption of alcohol by indigenous people.

Mr. Jenkins: There is freedom from restriction for all of them?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes, and it works. We said that if part-Aborigines living in primitive circumstances should have non-consumption orders made against them it should be done, but the Minister says it is unworkable. It is something to think about in Committee. I agree with the Minister that the present Licensing Act provisions are undesirable and ineffective. It produces over-indulgence in alcohol by part-Aborigines and detribalized Aborigines under the worst possible circumstances. It is being widely evaded at present instead of the Aborigines being trained to drink liquor in reasonable circumstances, with all the protections of the Licensing Act. There is no provision for it in the Act at the moment, but I propose we should amend the regulation provision to give power to the Government to provide canteens on some reserves, notwithstanding the provisions of the Licensing Act. I have heard this suggested by responsible officers of the department itself. They feel that this is some way around the difficulty, that, if the Aborigines had a canteen on the reserve and they could get a certain amount of liquor that they could drink in reasonable circumstances and not be placed in a position where they would be guilty of going off to have a surreptitious beano, it would be possible to bring up a generation of Aboriginal people to whom alcohol was not the scourge it is for so many Aborigines in Australia now.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: They would not be in a declared area. They could go off that reserve and be allowed to have a drink.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I appreciate that, but it may be of additional assistance, which again would have to be an administrative decision for the Government to make. I propose that we write into the regulations power for the Government, if it thought it advisable after an examination of the position, to provide canteens on reserves under the provisions of the Licensing Act. It could not be done tomorrow but it would be a useful power for the Minister to have in the future.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It could be put into the regulations some time later, but not now.

Mr. DUNSTAN: If that is the feeling of the Minister, my feeling is that we are now dealing with the consolidation of legislation and there would be no harm in the Minister having that regulation-making power, even if he did not intend to make any regulations about it at the moment.

I appreciate the courtesy and attention I have been accorded by the Minister and members of the House for this, I think, the longest speech I have ever burdened the House with. But I believe this is a vital measure for the future of this State. I sincerely hope that the Bill will pass its second reading and that, when we get into Committee, we shall be able to iron out the differences between ourselves and get a constructive suggestion that can be a model for legislation of this kind to the other States.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): In supporting this Bill, I congratulate the Minister who introduced it. It is the sort of Bill that we would have expected him to introduce. Reading it through, one cannot help but be impressed by the thoughtful and studious way in which he has approached the problems applying to Aborigines. I may add that, all through the Bill, one sees a sign of strong Christian principles.

I also pay a tribute to those people who, for many years, have been interested in the welfare of Aboriginal peoples, have made their cause their own, and have in many ways supported them, established homes and looked after their interests. The Minister, in drawing up this Bill, would, I believe, have had many discussions with people who have had the interest and welfare of the Aborigines at heart. I think, as I am sure most of us do, that this is an enlightened piece of legislation very well suited to today's changing conditions.

We have to remember that in Australia today we are welcoming yearly to our shores many thousands of people from other countries and we are, after an appropriate period, admitting them to citizenship of the Commonwealth, with the full rights pertaining to that citizenship. We have in our midst many people of varying nationalities. This new attitude of the community as exemplified in this Bill (as the Minister himself mentioned when he introduced it) is demonstrated by giving the Aboriginal peoples of Australia the dignity of race, in so far as they are, throughout the Bill, mentioned with a capital "A". This places them on much the same level as peoples outside Australia—for instance, Malayans, Maoris, New Guineans and people like that, who are always referred to in this way. It is only right that the original people of Australia, who were here long before the white people came, should be given this dignity.

In debating this Bill, I think it does us no harm to go back and look for a moment at the part played in the early history of Australia by the Aboriginal peoples of this continent. I am speaking now from experience because, prior to coming to Adelaide, before the last war I lived on cattle stations in the West Kimberley area in northern Western Australia, and also in Queensland. Therefore, I have had many opportunities to see the part played by the Aboriginal peoples in the development of that industry in the northern part of Australia. The pastoral industry owes much to the Aboriginal stockmen, in particular, employed on cattle stations. They make the most wonderful stockmen, as I think most honourable members with experience of the outback areas of Australia will appreciate.

In the very early days of exploration in Australia, it was to the Aboriginal peoples that the explorers looked for much of the heavy work associated with expeditions of exploration in the interior of Australia. Most people engaged in the industry that employs Aboriginal peoples in Australia will pay tribute to the great loyalty, and indeed friendship, shown to them by the Aboriginal peoples. This has been my own experience. I can recall the loyalty of these Aboriginal peoples who worked for my husband in the pastoral industry.

Another part played by the Aborigines, for which we are eternally grateful, is their wonderful instincts in the tracking of people lost in the interior. To them we owe a debt of gratitude. I can speak from my own experience whilst in Western Australia and Queensland. It is interesting to mention the attitude adopted towards the Aboriginal workers in Western Australia on most of the stations in the northern part of that State. The Aborigines themselves come to live on the stations and learn to look to the owners of the stations for their very existence. They are employed by them and, in return, they are provided with food, clothing, and various amenities. When they go "walkabout", as all Aborigines do at some time, they are given means of sustenance for the time they are away from the stations.

When I was in Western Australia, prior to the Second World War, Aborigines were not actually paid for their labour, and in Queensland, where I also spent some time, the Aborigines also were not actually paid, but money was credited to their account and paid to the Native Affairs Department. If an Aboriginal needed funds he had to obtain a signed statement from his station boss and present it to the nearest police station to substantiate his claim for the money he required. I well remember that just prior to the Second World War about £900,000 was standing to the credit of Aborigines in Queensland and that money had accumulated over the years. At this stage I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.57 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 4, at 2 p.m.