HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, October 17, 1962.

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

QUESTIONS.

KANGAROO ISLAND FREIGHT.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: In view of the isolation that confronts many of the new settlers on Kangaroo Island, can the Premier say whether the Government intends to subsidize freights on goods associated with primary production that are carried to or from the island?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As the Leader's question involves the Government's financial policy, I ask him to put it on notice.

SCHOOL DENTAL SERVICES.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: I have had many requests from constituents in my district, particularly parents of schoolchildren, for a dental clinic to be sent through the area more often than at present. Many schools in my district are situated hundreds of miles from a resident dentist, and the children receive no dental attention. Will the Minister of Education take this matter up with the appropriate authority?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to discuss the matter with my colleague, the Minister of Health, because several years ago the schools' medical and dental services were taken over by the Public Health Department. I know that Sir Lyell McEwin is interested in this matter and that he has made extensive improvements in our school dental services, and I am sure he would be particularly interested in serving the more remote areas of the State.

ELECTRICITY TRUST DEPOT.

Mr. JENNINGS: Some time ago I asked the Premier a question concerning complaints I had received about the proposed construction of an Electricity Trust maintenance depot in my area. I understand the Premier now has a reply.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The General Manager of the Electricity Trust reports:

The Electricity Trust provides a service direct to residential premises 24 hours a day. It must necessarily have maintenance facilities located close to where its service is provided. Depots have therefore been established in residential areas, but the trust is always conscious of the need to conform to the standards of the district, and its depots are planned with this in mind. Existing depots in areas such as Linden Park, Mitcham and Kurralta Park have been designed in this way and have caused no inconvenience. The new depot at Enfield will provide a service to the surrounding community and will be designed taking into account the nature of the locality.

HOSPITAL DISPENSARY.

Mr. DUNSTAN: My question is directed to the Premier, who represents the Minister of Health in this Chamber. Is he aware that in the new east wing of the Royal Adelaide Hospital an area has been provided for the new dispensary and that in the centre of that area is a room provided with an outlet pipe in the middle to take the waste from the floor and keep the area in a sterile condition? Is he aware that the outlet to the pipe has been connected to sewerage pipes containing human effluent at a sufficiently short distance to cause a flow-back? Is he aware that yesterday the sterile room in the dispensary was flooded with human excreta to a depth of four inches and that in consequence the whole area is unsterile, and it appears that it may never be put in a sufficiently sterile condition to be used for the purpose for which it was designed? Is he aware that flow-backs of effluent have occurred in other sections of this building, though not to such a serious extent? Will he ascertain the position in relation to this matter and what can be done to remedy it? Will he also inquire whether the Administrator of the hospital has directed that this matter be treated as a confidential matter not to be made public and, if the Administrator has so directed, will the Premier ascertain what aspects of the matter would be declared confidential and not for release to the public?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the honourable member will put his question on notice, I will get the information for him.

ABORIGINES' HOUSES.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Works, in his capacity as Minister in charge of Aboriginal welfare, a reply to a question I asked last week regarding the Government's proposals to house Aboriginal families at Port Pirie?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I noticed that this matter was referred to in this morning's press and that the honourable member had made some comment to the press about it, no doubt after his comment had been sought. I also noticed that I was reported in the same article as having been unwilling or having declined to comment. I admit that I declined to comment, and I declined for the specific

reason that I believed that far too much comment on this matter had already been made and that the people most concerned—the Aboriginal families—had been somewhat disturbed at the various statements made. I believe it is correct to say that these people have been discussed in the press, at council meetings, at public meetings and in various other ways, but it seems to me that little regard has been paid to their position in the matter; it looks as though they have been pushed around like marionettes in a puppet show. The result of it all has been that the people themselves now feel that for various reasons they are unwelcome in certain places and they have displayed some reluctance to accept the offers that the Aborigines Department has made to them regarding housing and employment in various places.

Therefore, the department has had some difficulty in locating families prepared to go to Port Pirie. It is also a fact that the prospective employer who had been approached in regard to employing Aboriginal breadwinners has said that he cannot place the same number as he originally expected he might be able to. I understand, however, that he has agreed to put on one man in his yard and probably to employ a second one later if the first experiment proves successful. However, I say definitely there is no change of Government policy in this matter. The Housing Trust has houses it is prepared to make available on a normal rental basis to Aboriginal families and has, I understand, already interviewed one family with a view to housing it at Port Pirie. So that, within the limits of available employment and the willingness of Aboriginal families to take up such employment and such housing, the policy as previously announced will be continued.

BEEF CATTLE ROADS.

Mr. CASEY: Several days ago there appeared in the *Advertiser* a report dealing with the Commonwealth Government's granting the Queensland Government £3,300,000 for the sealing of beef cattle roads in that State. In my electoral district the biggest cattle-fattening area in the State of South Australia uses the Birdsville track and the Strzelecki Creek track, which are essential beef cattle roads and vital to the cattle industry in South Australia. It appears to me that the South Australian people are missing out all along the line in these grants from the Commonwealth Government. If he has not already done so, will the Premier take up this matter with the Prime Minister to see whether near equality cannot be achieved in the granting of money for beef cattle roads, not only for Queensland but for South Australia?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This matter has been the subject of correspondence between the State Government and the Prime Minister but, since the Commonwealth announcement that it intended to help build beef cattle roads in the Northern Territory and Queensland, I believe the Commonwealth policy was approved after a report had been obtained on the relevant numbers of cattle that would be sent to various ports. I think the report was favourable to work being undertaken in South Australia because it has long been recognized that the Marree track particularly and, more recently, the Strzelecki Creek track have been valuable outlets for inland cattle. When the correspondence with the Prime Minister was initiated, I pointed out to him that, if the roads in Queensland were of a high standard or were improved, they would inevitably attract the cattle from South Australia. While South Australia is spending much money from its own resources on improving the Marree track and the Strzelecki Creek track, it would, because of the enormous distances involved, be too great an expense for the State to contemplate, for instance, the sealing of those roads.

I received a letter more recently from the Prime Minister informing me that the Commonwealth desired its money to go as far as possible and that it was not likely that the roads would be brought up to more than a trafficable state. In view of the announcement I saw in the press, however, I have written to the Prime Minister and asked him whether he would again consider advances or similar treatment for South Australia as has been provided for Queensland. When I receive the Prime Minister's reply, I shall tell the honourable member and make available the correspondence, if necessary, to the House.

ROYAL TOUR.

Mr. COUMBE: I understand that earlier this week the Premier had a conference with officials concerned with next year's Royal tour and visit of Her Majesty the Queen and His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh to this State. Can the Premier say whether it is intended that Her Majesty shall open a special session of this Parliament, as she did on her previous visit?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The various functions being arranged in South

Australia have not yet been approved by Her Majesty and, consequently, are not yet available for publication; but I can say that no function is proposed for this Parliament, or for any other State Parliament in Australia. Because of the short period available, I understand the view has been expressed by Buckingham Palace that the time should be made available for functions where the largest number of people would benefit from the visit. So that, as far as I know, no function is proposed in this building in connection with the Royal visit.

WHYALLA BRIDGES.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Works obtained a reply from the Minister of Roads to a recent question of mine about two bridges being constructed at Whyalla, as to whether the plans and specifications could be submitted to the Whyalla City Commission?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not appear to have the information the honourable member seeks. I will ask the Premier whether, as Acting Minister of Roads, he will endeavour to obtain the information for the honourable member.

PUGHOLE NUISANCE.

Mr. LAWN: Yesterday I received a deputation which complained about a nuisance that is occurring in the Thebarton subdivision of my district. I was presented with the following petition signed by 116 of my constituents:

We, the undersigned, wish to bring to your notice the unhealthy conditions which exist around the Thebarton area. Rubbish is burned in an old pughole daily and smoke and smell nuisance is most objectionable. We find that it interferes with the health of many children in the district and we respectfully ask your co-operation and action in this matter.

The pughole in question is situated in West Thebarton Road, West Thebarton. I have been informed that doctors' certificates have been issued concerning this problem. I have one which states:

This is to certify that the children of 35 West Thebarton Road, West Thebarton, are subject to frequent attacks of severe and acute bronchitis. It is my opinion that the frequently smoke-laden atmosphere around their homes renders them much more prone to bronchitis.

This matter was ventilated before the Thebarton council and according to press reports the council considered that the Local Government Act did not give it sufficient authority. This matter has been referred to the Municipal Association with a view to its approaching the Government to amend the Act to give councils the necessary authority. As a matter of fact, this pughole is owned by a councillor and the fire brigade visits it occasionally when the burning rubbish erupts into flame. When the flames die down the brigade disappears. Section 52 of the Health Act states:

The expression "'insanitary condition'' includes every breach or non-observance of any of the sanitary provisions of this Act, and also every condition declared to be an insanitary condition pursuant to section 58.

Section 58 states:

Any local board, upon being satisfied that it is proper so to do, may serve a notice requiring the removal or amendment of any condition which the local board declares to be an insanitary condition.

Will the Premier ask the Crown Law Department whether or not the Local Government Act gives councils sufficient power to deal with instances of the type I have mentioned, and, if not, whether the matter could be covered by the sections of the Health Act I have quoted?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I should think that the first thing to do would be to obtain an official report on the extent of the nuisance and whether it constitutes a health hazard. If the provisions of the Health Act are to be applied, obviously the conditions would have to be such as to require their application. If the honourable member will supply me with the correspondence he has on this matter so that I can identify the locality, I will refer it to the health authorities and obtain a report from them. If it is then necessary, I will do what the honourable member has suggested and refer it to the Crown Solicitor. It may be that when the health authorities examine the nuisance they will, of their own volition, take action.

SEMAPHORE CARNIVAL.

Mr. TAPPING: For many years it has been the practice of a committee at Semaphore to conduct an illuminated carnival annually in aid of charity. I believe that, as the railway terminal is at the scene of the activities, the Railways Department could offer some inducement to get more people to the Semaphore beach. Will the Premier, as Acting Minister of Railways, confer with the Railways Commissioner to ascertain whether the department would consider providing excursion fares during the carnival period to boost railway revenue and to provide a fillip to the carnival?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes.

MANNUM FERRY.

Mr. BYWATERS: In last Friday's *Murray Valley Standard,* under the heading "Ferry Delays Hindered Holiday Traffic", the following appeared:

A near record influx of tourists and visitors made Mannum a very busy town during the last weekend and once more demonstrated the inability of the ferry to cope with heavy holiday traffic . . . Despite hard and efficient work by the ferry operators there were almost constant delays at the ferry, with some motorists having to wait more than 1¼ hours to cross the river. Many Mannum residents feel that the restrictions imposed by the small capacity of the ferry are holding the town back considerably in its development as a tourist attraction.

I know from experience that long delays occur at the ferry on Sundays and during holiday weekends. When returning from a holiday weekend I have known the waiting time to be much longer than that stated in the article. Will the Premier ask the Highways Department whether an additional ferry could be located at Mannum, particularly as the approaches provided for a former ferry are still available? I point out that two additional ferries will become available when the Blanchetown bridge replaces the Blanchetown ferry service.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will have this matter examined. True, when the Blanchetown bridge is completed it will relieve two of our largest ferries of service there, and it may be possible to afford some relief to Mannum. I thought that the honourable member was going to ask for a bridge at Mannum.

Mr. Bywaters: I should like to, but I am not game enough.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I think the honourable member will realize that when the question of bridges on the river is considered, we have to remember that Murray Bridge is near Mannum and that other places probably have a greater need for bridging. I will have his question examined.

BUTTER.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: According to the current *Quarterly Review of Agricultural Economics,* in recent years there has been a marked decline in the Australian consumption per capita of butter. Between 1954-55 and 1960-61 the consumption fell from 30.2 lb. to 25.1 lb. and a further decline occurred in 1961-62 to 23.3 lb. Despite the growth of population the aggregate consumption has also decreased from about 122,500 tons in 1954-55 to just under 115,000 tons in 1961-62. Such a decline on the relatively profitable domestic market has serious implications for the Australian dairying industry. Can the Minister of Agriculture explain this alarming trend?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I cannot explain it at all but some explanation is undoubtedly found in the greatly increased quantities of table margarine that have been manufactured in the Eastern States. New South Wales and Queensland, particularly, increased their margarine production tremendously a few years ago, although Victoria, South Australia, Tasmania and Western Australia have adhered to the quotas previously agreed upon. That is one reason for the situation, but it is probably not the only reason. I will get a considered reply for the honourable member as soon as possible.

MITCHELL PARK SCHOOL.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question concerning additional land for the Mitchell Park Primary School?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yes. Cabinet has approved of the purchase from the Railways Commissioner of an area of about 2½ acres as an addition to the site of the Mitchell Park Primary School. The Education Department already owns an area of approximately five acres north of the Sturt Road in Bradley Grove and adjacent to Tonsley Park as a site for a future primary school, and nearby has a site of two acres for a future infant school.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the need for portable buildings at the Mitchell Park Primary School?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yes. The Works Manager of the Finsbury Works Branch of the Public Buildings Department proposes to commence next week to dismantle a dual classroom unit at another school in readiness for transfer and re-erection at the Mitchell Park school. The suggestion that the rooms should be erected close to the primary section and not the infant section of the school presents difficulties. The use of such a site would cut the existing playing area off from the additional land that is being purchased from the Railways Commissioner. It is proposed, therefore, to join the new rooms to the existing dual unit close to the northern fence of the property, making a compact building unit.

MURRAY BRIDGE SOUTH SCHOOL.

Mr. BYWATERS: Recently I asked the Minister of Education a question relating to a house from Radium Hill being re-erected on land adjacent to the new Murray Bridge South Primary School. I believe the Minister has a reply.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yes. Some eight or nine prefabricated aluminium houses have been earmarked for re-erection at departmental schools on transfer from Radium Hill. It is proposed to place one of these residences on portion of the extensive grounds of the Murray Bridge South Primary School. The site suggested is a triangular area east of the proposed school oval and the house will be separated from the school proper by the oval. This area is not required for use by the school and will not impede the use of the school oval when that is developed. The house will be equipped with all the normal facilities including four built-in cupboards and a linen cupboard and cloak cupboard. Additional improvements such as a water service and wall insulation will be installed. Painting will ensure a good appearance. The materials have already been placed on the site for the house, which will be required at the beginning of 1963.

PORT PIRIE OFFICES.

Mr. McKEE: I notice in the *Government Gazette* that tenders are being called by the Engineering and Water Supply Department for the erection of new office buildings at Port Pirie. Can the Minister of Works inform the House of the proposed structure of these buildings, the site, and the approximate cost?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I cannot give the honourable member precise information without recourse to the department, but I shall obtain the information for him.

MURRAY BRIDGE PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. BYWATERS: Recently I asked the Minister of Education a question relating to the Murray Bridge Primary School and land made available by the Murray Bridge corporation to the Education Department for this school. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The Director of the Public Buildings Department reports:

An overall scheme for the development of the land leased from the Murray Bridge corporation has been completed and estimates prepared for approval of funds. The work includes fencing, grading, and paving agreed areas of the land leased from the corporation, and fencing, grading and filling the playground for oval development. Tenders for this work can be called as soon as expenditure of funds has been approved. The adjacent areas have been surveyed and a scheme will be prepared for levelling and fencing. It is pointed out, however, that due to the steep grades of portion of this land, it may not be practicable to carry out extensive development for additional oval purposes.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I understand that six councils in the metropolitan area, including the Adelaide City Council, provide the service required under section 40 of the Weights and Measures Act, and that one person attends to the requirements of the remainder of the State. Will the Acting Minister of Lands examine this position and ascertain whether it is practicable for the local government bodies throughout the State to act similarly under that legislation?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I shall examine the position.

GOLDEN GROVE BRICKWORKS.

Mr. LAUCKE: I referred last week to the proposed establishment of a major brickmaking industry at Golden Grove and the need for a water supply to be made available to it. I understand that the directors of this company, some of whom reside in Melbourne, will be in Adelaide next week. Will the Minister of Works by then be able to give firm assurances to these gentlemen concerning this water supply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have asked the Engineering and Water Supply Department to examine this matter, and this morning I had some more specific discussions with the Engineer for Water Supply on the subject. The industry proposed to be established is an important one. If the executives of the firm were in Adelaide and desired to see me, I should be happy to see them and I believe I could discuss some firm proposed arrangement with them. If the honourable member tells me when it would be convenient for the principals to see me, I should be pleased to see them.

APPRENTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 10. Page 1391.)

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): I support the Bill, which is a genuine attempt by the Opposition to do something about a problem which all associated with the situation know is really urgent. I believe that the member

for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) stated a case for the Opposition, in association with the Leader, which went a long way towards convincing many people of the need for these amendments, so much so that members on both sides have stated that there is a real need for something to be done about this important legislation. Members opposite, including the Premier, the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) and the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip), have said that they will not support the second reading although they have admitted that an improvement is needed in this important legislation. There is no doubt that improvement is needed, yet the Government will not accept this Bill. On many occasions members on this side of the House have felt the same way about legislation introduced by the Government but, because they have agreed with some parts, they have supported the second reading and have endeavoured in Committee to correct the parts with which they have not agreed. That is something that I should like the Government to consider on this occasion, as everyone knows some amendment is necessary to the legislation. The Bill has the support of the Trades and Labor Council, the body directly concerned with the welfare of apprentices.

About four years ago, when the late Mr. O'Halloran as Leader of the Opposition introduced a similar Bill, the Premier said he favoured some parts of it but that he would vote against the second reading although he hoped the matter would not go to a vote. He said:

> Unfortunately the Bill may increase it, and that is the opinion of competent authorities who are handling these matters every day of the week. If the Bill were put to a vote I would oppose it, but if it were held over the Government would be prepared to submit the whole matter to the Apprentices Board for report. I should be loth to vote against the Bill, for the reasons I have given.

That was four years ago but still nothing has been done by the Government about this important matter. Worse than that, at the Premiers' Conference in 1950 it was decided that something should be done. A committee headed by Mr. Justice Wright was then formed and in 1954 it brought down a report that contained some of the things we have suggested in this measure. The member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) mentioned much of what the report contained. Here again the Opposition is endeavouring to do something of advantage on a matter recognized by all as being important. This matter has gone on for some years but the Government has not attempted to do anything about it, although the Opposition has twice endeavoured to do something to improve matters. The now famous quotation of the Duke of Edinburgh might be applicable on this occasion!

The Premier said he was concerned because employers would not employ apprentices. That is happening now and I do not think the Bill will alter the position much. I know of employers, who are not prepared to train apprentices. Many apprentices who sign indentures fall by the wayside mainly because of frustration. Schooling carried out in the employer's time rather than partly in the employee's own time, as at present, has been mentioned in this debate. Possibly one of the strongest objections to this Bill has been that it provides for training for 12 hours in the employer's time. I think perhaps there may be a valid reason for complaint in this regard, and in saying that I am not speaking for the Trades and Labor Council or any member on this side of the House. When this Bill goes into Committee, members opposite can move to amend this. I should like the Bill to go into Committee so that at least part of what we require might be achieved.

The member for Whyalla also said that many apprentices, particularly in the early stages of training, were away from home all day at work and attending school at night. Time spent in travelling to and from their homes and waiting for transport often necessitates their absence from home for 13 or 14 hours, which is not a good thing for a lad of 16. The position in the country is worse than in the city. As the father of a former apprentice who is now a tradesman, I know what takes place regarding correspondence lessons sent to country apprentices. The assignments are spread over the first three years and can be extended. In almost every case they are done in the employee's time, often without supervision. It is difficult in the early stages of apprenticeship for a lad to complete these assignments, some of which are almost impossible. No assistance was given my son by the employer, who was not a mechanic and probably did not know anything about the automotive industry in which my son was employed, so the foreman, who was not in any way connected with the ownership of the firm, had to be relied on to assist. Because of this no tuition was given and it was extremely difficult for him to carry out his assignments.

When assignments in the early stages of little training is given them. That is the way apprenticeship are difficult, often the apprentice's heart is broken. I referred to this last week when the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) was speaking and I interjected. I do not want the honourable member to think I was referring to him personally, but I know that many country apprentices, particularly in the automotive trade, are given menial tasks in the early stages and sometimes even in the later stages of apprenticeship. They do such work as serving petrol, greasing cars, sweeping floors and so on; to discourage apprentices because, if they have set their minds on becoming motor mechanics or something else, if they are not given some parts of the work they often throw in the sponge. I have known several who have done this, and probably other country members will know this is so. We cannot afford this sort of thing. In the automotive trade particularly, it is the obligation of the employer to ensure that he turns out a good tradesman because drivers place their lives in the hands of so-called mechanics some of whom, although they complete their apprenticeship, are not equipped as they should be. Many of them have to gain experience after their apprenticeship has been completed. So many lads who are treated as messenger boys give up and are disgruntled. In some cases there is much discontent in the home because the lad has not made the grade. Perhaps the lad has not confided in his guardian or father who has signed the other section of the paper, and the father does not know the full story behind it. All he knows is that he has a disgruntled child who is not happy in his employment and, when the employer suggests that the lad is unfit for the work, the indenture is cancelled. So many times does this happen that we are losing good tradesmen. What is worse, the lad concerned has worked for a low salary for perhaps three or four years without the advantages that some of his companions have enjoyed in dead-end jobs where they have earned large sums. He has sacrificed much time but still does not come out as a tradesman. This sort of thing needs to be tidied up.

In relation to country apprentices, it is not unjust to ask that the apprenticeship assignments by correspondence be done in the employer's time. In fact, some of this work could be done on a more practical footing than by means of the papers that are set, because some of them are difficult for a lad on the technical side with no previous experience. Some of the things required of the apprentices are not elementary but quite advanced. As I have already said, the lad becomes concerned because he cannot do the work. He is dubbed a failure without being given a fair trial and, because of this, he is an apprentice lost to the industry.

Another point arising from the Bill is the educational standard set, which is most important. It prevents many lads going on if they have not some qualifications in secondary education. Frequently, it happens in the country that lads have only a choice of academic subjects, but they are not cut out for that sort of work, and they give up in the early stages of their secondary education rather than be dubbed failures. We in the country lack many facilities for secondary education. A lad is not a failure merely because he cannot handle academic subjects. Many turn out to be successful in later years but, because they are not able to handle these subjects at school, they are regarded as failures. This attitude is unjust and should be rectified, particularly in country towns where apprentices could have the advantage of other educational standards rather than the highly academic standards provided now. I believe there is a move towards this but it is rather slow, and some of our apprentices have suffered. Although country apprentices have the advantage of a fortnight's trade school in Adelaide, they are penalized to a great extent by the fact that they have not the facilities available to them for the theory side of their assignment. Areas such as Murray Bridge, Tailem Bend or Mannum could easily be brought under the city set-up. Fares could be arranged so that they could come to Adelaide and spend their time as I have suggested. It need not be weekly; it could be done monthly, to use some city facilities. To rely entirely upon correspondence is difficult for them.

I have mentioned some cases affecting people I have been concerned with. I realize that this Bill will not go all the way to do all that is required for the apprentices but it is an improvement, and the Opposition has shown its concern by introducing amending legislation to cover these points. Not only are we concerned about the situation that arises now but we are concerned for the future, because we know that Australia will depend to a great extent upon its technical knowledge. We know, too, that there is a need for more skilled tradesmen and that many children leaving school still go into dead-end jobs. A lad may

not be able to go on to higher education; he may not have the ability to absorb academic subjects but he could be well fitted for industrial work. We have an obligation to these lads and to the people with whom they are directly connected. There is an urgent need to amend the Act, to try to bring about something a little better for the future of Australia in its technical life. I support the Bill and even at this stage make this plea: that the Government consider having this measure further debated by passing the second reading, so that the provisions to which it agrees may be given effect to.

Mr. FRED WALSH (West Torrens): I support the second reading and echo the sentiments expressed by the member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters): I hope the Bill will at least pass its second reading and reach the Committee stage because, although some members opposite have expressed their opposition to it, they support some clauses and, if they are sincere in their expressions, they will at least vote for the second reading and then endeavour to amend the Bill in Committee. Possibly they could accept some amendments suggested by members on this side.

The trade union movement has been critical of the lack of interest on the part of the employers as a group, both in this State and in other States (even internationally, for that matter), in the training of apprentices. It has felt for some years that this will ultimately react against industry generally. The training of apprentices has been considered by the International Labour Organization, and I believe recommendations have been carried there and have been taken seriously by certain member States. Unfortunately, however, Australia has never seriously considered many of the conventions or recommendations adopted by the I.L.O. and has a poor record in that regard. One reason why Australia and possibly some of the other more highly industrialized countries have not taken this matter seriously enough is the fact that, with the advent of more highly mechanized industry and automation, there is perhaps not the same need, in their opinion, for apprentices as there used to be in the days of hand crafts. That may or may not be true. Perhaps those more acquainted with apprentices than I am know better, but certainly the metal and building industries still need apprentices. Some members opposite, particularly the members for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) and Torrens (Mr. Coumbe), spoke about the restrictions placed on employers in the matter of the apprenticeship quota. No restrictions are contained in the Bill, nor are there any in the Act.

Mr. Heaslip: In the award.

Mr. FRED WALSH: The honourable member was wrong in his interpretation of the award. He insisted that the ratio of apprentices to skilled tradesmen was one to three, but if he examines the award he will find in some sections provision for a lesser ratio. Indeed, in some instances, the ratio is one to two by arrangement. The award states that the proportion of apprentices who may be taken on by an employer shall not exceed one apprentice to every three or fraction of three tradesmen in the trade concerned. By arrangement the ratio may be even less than that. Surely that indicates that no undue restrictions apply in that award. There are no restrictions in the Bill. The honourable member posed as an authority on the Metal Trades Award. He also said that he was connected with the graphic arts and bookbinding industries. He is like pepper and salt: he is in everything. I have yet to learn of anything with which he is not connected. I believe that bookbinding is part of the printing industry. He will find, on examination of the award covering that industry, that he is not restricted to the extent he argued he was. Unfortunately, whenever we introduce legislation he tends to envisage rising production costs and immediately opposes it. Although he said that restrictions were imposed on the employment of apprentices, no restrictions are mentioned in the Bill.

The Government is doing the right thing at Islington in employing apprentices. One had only to examine the display in the Labor Day procession to appreciate the quality of the work being done at Islington. It reflects credit to the apprentices. Much credit is also due to the Minister of Industry and to the Minister of Education for their advocacy in urging employers to employ as many apprentices as possible. If employers took up the challenge some good might result. The Bill seeks to empower the board to inspect premises to determine whether they are suitable for the employment of apprentices. The Premier said that this provision was unnecessary, but he admitted that some employers, who were not qualified tradesmen, employed apprentices. Surely that situation should be corrected! The Bill seeks to ensure that those given the right to indenture apprentices are properly qualified tradesmen. The Premier should permit this

Bill to pass the second reading and in Committee seek to make any necessary amendments. The Premier also admitted that in two other States provision exists whereby apprentices can be trained in the employers' time. Although we have sought a similar provision he opposes it. I point out that our proposed amendment to section 18 of the principal Act states:

Provided further that any apprentice who has failed to reach the required standard after the third year of his apprenticeship may be required to attend such technical school or class for instruction outside the normal hours of his employment.

If an apprentice does not reach the required standard he is obliged to attend school for instruction outside the normal hours of his employment. That is a sort of penalty if he has not reached that required standard. We say that up to that stage the tuition should be in his employer's time. We then make a further proviso in clause 5 that it shall be optional. If he wishes to attend outside the employer's time we have no objection to his doing so; that should be optional, so the provision is there, and there can be no objection to that.

I think both the members for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) and Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) said that apprentices were certainly not cheap labour. It is admitted that for the first year and perhaps the second year it is not cheap labour, for there is a certain amount of wastage or spoilage in the materials. However, we must remember that after that period they become useful, and they are still on low wages for the third and fourth years. They are then gainfully employed and are not spoiling or wasting materials but making things. They are then of considerable value to the employer, and at the same time they are employed at much cheaper rates than they would be under normal conditions in relation to journeymen's wages. I therefore contend that they are cheap labour for an employer.

I would not like to pit my knowledge against that of the member for Torrens in this matter, because he has been an apprentice, has been employing apprentices, and is a manufacturer. However, I put the position from my Party's point of view and from a layman's point of view, and I consider that apprentices afford cheap labour after the first and second years. I have a grandson who has been apprenticed, and I know that he had to be protected by his trade union because of personal feeling between him and his employer. He now has a very good job with a Sydney newspaper. It is not a question of his not having the ability, otherwise he would not have that job. In that instance it was simply a question of personality. That is where the question of the Apprentices Board arises. It is there for the protection of the individual, and, incidentally, for the employer also. The board determines whether it is the employer or the apprentice who is in the right. Taking all things into account, and having regard to the excellent case put forward by the Leader in his explanation and by the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday), I believe that the House should carry the second reading. If a member objects to any clause, the Opposition will consider any suggested amendment in Committee.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): There is nothing wrong with this Bill except the provision for 12 hours' tuition in the metropolitan area and six hours in the country. The Bill has much to commend it, but I cannot agree on the provision for 12 hours' study. It has been freely stated here, both by the Opposition and by Government members, that it is difficult to get people to employ apprentices. At present, apprentices are required to spend only half a day at a trade school. That is to be altered to the equivalent of 1½ days. Who will be induced to take on apprentices as a result of the provision? I think a different approach altogether is needed.

If a period of 12 hours at a trades school in the city is needed each week, how is six hours on correspondence work good enough for the apprentices in the country? I cannot reconcile that at all. It is obvious that the boy who is in the country is not necessarily quicker at learning, and certainly in most instances the materials and the machine that he has at hand on which he can learn his trade are inferior. He has no trade school with all the marvellous equipment that those schools have today or devoted people to instruct him. There is much less equipment in the country in every way. Where is the apprentice in the country going to do his six hours' correspondence work or practical work in the employer's time? He can only do it in the place where he is working: he does not go to a trade school. Honourable members have heard me speak on this subject a number of times. I have pleaded for better facilities for apprentices in the country, but up to the present they have not been provided. There is now an indication that the matter is being looked at. In his speech the Premier said:

The Commonwealth Arbitration Commission is seriously taking up the problem, with the active assistance of both employers and employees, on a national basis.

If that is correct, therein lies the solution to this problem. I do not think this Bill will solve the problem regarding boys who live in country areas. I want honourable members to understand that I am not speaking without first-hand knowledge, because I have a boy in the last year of his apprenticeship. I know that boys have to be sent down to town and boarded; they have to live alone at the most impressionable period of their lives; they have nobody to refer to, and just have to work at their jobs as apprentices, go to school at night, and carry on under their own steam.

That is where a tremendous number of boys fall by the wayside. Six hours in the country in the place where the apprentice works, which is the only practical place for him other than his home, is not sufficient. It appears that this matter is loaded in favour of the apprentice who lives in the city. There are no facilities under the present apprenticeship arrangement for taking a boy from the country, putting him down here under some form of control, and giving him the same opportunities, or of taking his trade training to the country where he can learn it under competent instructors more than a fortnight in every year. Some apprentices in the city attend school for a full day, usually on Monday; my son does that. He then attends school one night a week.

I do not think there is any disadvantage in sending a boy, who has had a half-day's or six hours' school training in the day-time, to school on one night a week. Who are these unfortunate jaded and over-worked individuals who cannot go to school one night a week? Thousands of people do this not because they are apprentices but because they want to fit themselves for their avocations. What is a boy losing by attending school? Probably all he is being deprived of is looking at television, going to the pictures, or something of that nature. There is in this an element of self-responsibility that the boy concerned with learning his trade must have inculcated in him. He has the advantages of apprenticeship. If the people who employ him are good people they will look after their part of the job, but he is responsible for himself and this responsibility must be taught him by demanding that he attend school one night a week.

These schools are conducted rigidly. If a boy does not attend he is in trouble and is expected to make up the time he misses. I do not disagree with this because it embodies the very principle I am enunciating—some responsibility on the part of the apprentice. This is a pressing problem and it needs more than this application; it needs an entirely new vision. I think it could be arranged that a boy would be required to attend trade school for 12 months before being apprenticed so that he would be fitted for his job and know exactly what he was going into. That would save much of the wastage caused by youngsters, becoming discouraged in the first two years before they had learnt anything. If they were trained before being apprenticed, I think they would be far more efficient, and I am not certain that it would cost much more than the present system. We are spending millions of pounds to provide buildings for primary and secondary education and after children are turned out of school at 14 or on passing the Intermediate examination the responsibility finishes and they are on their own. This Bill requires that the employer take up that responsibility for 12 hours a week. I do not think that is the way to handle the problem: it is a piecemeal attempt, and I want to see a far better approach. Regarding country boys, with correspondence courses it would be possible to have mobile equipment that could go to certain centres at which boys could attend on, say, one day a month in order to give them the mental impetus to take up their work.

Mr. Clark: They are good correspondence courses.

Mr. QUIRKE: I do not deny that. If a boy were studying electronics by correspondence, what earthly use would I be to him? I would not know the first thing about the subject so I could not answer his questions or help him in any way. If he were employed in a small business in a country town his employer would not have time at night to assist him so he would be left on his own. If his questions could be answered by practical demonstration at more frequent intervals, this would greatly assist him. I do not see any reason why, if we are earnest in our desires to have fully trained personnel, this cannot be done. I think it must be done. If a son of the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) were studying something, as an ex-schoolteacher the honourable member could probably give him wonderful assistance.

Mr. Clark: I did a good deal of that.

Mr. QUIRKE: I know that, and I could do so if I had a knowledge of the subject, but who has knowledge of the subject? These boys attend trade school for a fortnight and handle the beautiful equipment there, after which they return to something that is not nearly as good. Discouragement then sets in. This is a tremendous task and I think the only way to handle it is on a national basis in the interests of the national fitness of people to do work and so stop this shocking wastage. There is a wastage from country areas, but from my knowledge and inquiries of people at trade schools and of my son I know there is also a terrific wastage in Adelaide. Many boys do not see the distance. Whether that is because they are not compelled by their parents to keep up the work or whatever the reason is, that wastage occurs.

Mr. Loveday: I think the wastage is greatest in country garages.

Mr. QUIRKE: I do not doubt that for one moment. The member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) spoke about apprentices in the automotive industry where the work is mainly on servicing cars, and the boys do that work.

Mr. Clark: In big garages they often spend four years greasing cars.

Mr. QUIRKE: That is no good. There must be a wider approach and the equipment they work on as apprentices should be the equipment they will use when they are practical tradesmen. The educational standard of apprentices has been mentioned, and I have had some experience of this. Some firms employ consultants to interview all applicants for apprenticeship and report to the employer whether they are suitable or not. I disagree with that entirely. If two of these brainwashers tested each other for their I.Q., probably both would fail. I think it is entirely wrong to put this over a boy of 15. The man who did the woodwork in this Chamber probably had no more than a primary school education. I do not know what educational standards those who built this House had, but they left behind a practical illustration of the skill they attained in their work. Whilst I do not disagree that the highest educational qualification should be there if the child can get it, I do not agree that anybody who fails in English and passes in mathematics should be denied the right of an apprenticeship. That is just too silly for words. That is not done now but there are some people who think it is necessary to do that.

Mr. Loveday: We are not suggesting that.

Mr. QUIRKE: I know, but the honourable member knows that some people hold the view today that, unless a boy can achieve the Intermediate or Leaving standard, he is not fitted for any apprenticeship. I do not agree with that—that is wrong. Some of the finest craftsmen would possibly be denied the opportunity to practise their craft if we allowed that sort of thing to creep in.

Mr. Riches: That is the rule in many places.

Mr. QUIRKE: Do you agree with it?

Mr. Riches: No, but it is the rule; it is operating.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, and everybody should be on his guard against it—not that I disagree with education. Everybody should be educated to the limit of his or her capacity to learn.

Mr. Loveday: These standards are set by a competent authority.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, I agree with that, but boys should be given that opportunity. I have seen this happen, and some people are operating in this way now. They are doing a disservice to themselves and to the young people of this country because, even though one can pass an Intermediate examination, it does not mean that he will be a good craftsman. I could give dozens of instances, from my personal knowledge, of boys classed as failures at school who today are running businesses or are craftsmen of considerable skill.

We have to watch that; it is creeping in. I do not know who is responsible for it but, wherever I see it, I fight against it because those people are doing a great disservice to the young people of this country. But, rather than tamper with the existing set-up with its many deficiencies, I would sooner get together, consider the Premier's suggestion, iron out the problem and draw up something that would really train our young people. This present piecemeal system discourages the boys and does not evoke the sympathy of the employer. A period of 12 hours will not do it. If he is entitled to 12 hours, I will not have it that six hours of correspondence is sufficient for the boy in the country. Consider my first suggestion that, if we are going to have fully trained apprentices, we must instil in them a love of the craft or job they are undertaking by training them wholly and solely for that job for the first 12 months before they take that apprenticeship. It is not beyond the capacity of Australia to pay for this, and the nation will recoup its expenditure in that direction a hundredfold in the skilled tradesmen it will turn out under such a system.

I cannot see my way clear to support this Bill, but I want members opposite to know that I fully sympathize with a complete re-orientation of the apprenticeship system that will start something entirely new. I do not think this Bill will bring about the improvement necessary, and much improvement is necessary. The present method of application by many people who employ apprentices is wrong. The boys become discouraged, not necessarily because they have no will to succeed but because a youngster's ardour can be killed when he is still in his most impressionable and immature years. I say that with regret. I do not think this Bill is any good and it is not my usual practice to vote for measures of that type.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): If the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) had paid a little more attention to clause 7, many of his misgivings would have been dispelled, because the question of apprenticeship standards is dealt with in paragraph (*b*). I gave an illustration of this when I cited the case of a contractor with whom I had been speaking about the standard of efficiency required from a lad who desired to become a carpenter and who, had he taken notice of his employer, would have been trained in bricklaying or solid plastering. Clause 7 deals with that point too. The honourable member mentioned abuses of the apprenticeship training system, in that a trainee is called upon to do labouring work that would normally be beyond his scope. This clause provides that no person shall take any apprentice in any trade to which the Act applies until certain things have been examined by the appropriate authority.

Even when we, on this side of the House, attempt to deal with matters of advantage to members opposite, we still fail to convince them. The general trend of this debate has indicated the uncertainty of members opposite: in one breath they approve of our attempt and in the next breath they say it does not meet their requirements and they are not prepared to support the second reading. I take the view that, if there is something valuable in the attempt, at least let members opposite support the second reading and permit the Bill to reach Committee.

The member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) did not quite hear what the member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh) said about the quota system for apprentices. The question of the ratio of apprentices is entirely a matter for industrial awards and, in many cases, provision is made for one apprentice to every two journeymen, or part thereof; so it is possible to have two apprentices to three journeymen. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) raised several points and, although we recognize his knowledge of the metal trades industry, the matter of placing apprentices on machines to be trained will always demand a commonsense approach and certainly a first-year apprentice would not be given the same scope on a machine as an apprentice in his fourth or fifth year. I have every reason to believe that by extending the training period at school, it would be to the advantage of the employer in the long run both as regards instruction on any machinery involved and in the acquiring of trade techniques by apprentices in the various trades. No matter what legislation is provided to improve apprenticeship training, we must realize that wherever an apprentice is engaged in industry, he must be under adequate supervision if the employer is going to do reasonable justice to the training of the apprentice, but it has never been the intention of this Bill for the Apprentices Board to suggest to employers how they should run their businesses.

All members agree that if this State is to advance we must have apprentices. The Bill is aimed at improving the standard of apprentices, but if some of its provisions are not acceptable they can be amended in Committee. This State has lost out in securing apprentices, and had it not been for immigration we would have been sadly short of many tradesmen. We are not seeking to tell employers how to manage their businesses; we are seeking to provide proper training for apprentices. Craftsmanship of the type that was generally expected years ago is not called for today. Indeed, some people prefer plainer workmanship. That is an unfortunate trend, but nevertheless skilled and competent tradesmen are required to perform much of the work necessary in this State. If this State is to advance there must be a united approach by the Government and employers in industry generally to see that adequate apprenticeship training is carried out and that more apprentices are encouraged to become skilled in the various trades.

Piece-work has had a detrimental effect on the apprenticeship system. Where contract work is let, not less than the appropriate award rates provided by the Arbitration Court should be paid. The present labour-only system is largely responsible for the fact that apprentices are not being properly trained. The

Government admits that this Bill has some merit, so it should support the second reading and in Committee make amendments.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Jenkins, Laucke, Millhouse, and Nankivell, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Ralston. No—Sir Cecil Hincks.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Second reading thus negatived.

LOANS TO PRODUCERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

EXPLOSIVES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

MINES AND WORKS INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Committee's report adopted.

STOCK DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Stock Diseases Act, 1934-61. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes three amendments to the principal Act. The first amendment is made by clause 3 of the Bill which will add to the definition of "animal product" honey, bees-wax, and all raw, partially cooked, manufactured, or processed, animal products. The definition at the moment covers only meat, fat, milk, whey, cream, butter, cheese, eggs and stock semen. The reason for the amendment is that the present definition cannot be construed to include manufactured meats such as salami, metwurst and the like. Health certificates in respect of such goods from other States where swine fever may be present cannot be required under the Act, and in effect this means that their entry into the State cannot be prevented. It is considered that there is a serious risk of the introduction of swine fever through the uncontrolled introduction of such goods. At the same time, it is considered desirable to widen the definition to cover honey and bees-wax since bees are now declared to be stock for the purposes of the Act.

In amplification of that amendment, I point out that at present the State is free from swine fever, which is a serious disease in swine. We have not had an outbreak since the Second World War. However, there have been serious outbreaks in New South Wales. In that State many of the outbreaks developed in mild forms, and in a way that is more serious because of the difficulty of diagnosing the disease. I think there have been more than 150 outbreaks in that State, and much compensation has been paid. So far as I know Queensland, which has strict regulations, is free of the disease. Victoria has had only one outbreak, and I think that originated from a New South Wales property. Western Australia is free of the disease. This State, under this Bill, is introducing a provision that will make us even safer than we are at present.

Clause 4 will add to the regulation-making power a new power to make regulations authorizing the Minister to require an owner of stock to sell for the purpose of slaughter any quarantined stock or any stock which have been exposed to infection. This is designed primarily to cover foot-rot. Stock affected with this disease remain under quarantine for an indefinite period while the owner cannot be forced to take effective steps for the eradication of the disease. It appears that foot-rot can be eradicated from any property within three years, and the effect of the amendment will be to permit regulations to give the Minister adequate powers to require such stock to be sold for slaughter unless proper steps for the eradication of the disease are taken.

Foot-rot was made a notifiable disease some years ago, since when the campaign against it has been remarkably successful and has exceeded the expectations of anyone connected with eradicating it. Although many properties are still under quarantine, this does not mean that they have a serious foot-rot problem; it means that they have had it and that it may not be recurring. If that is the position, they will also be free. The disease is confined largely to the south-eastern area of the State, although that does not mean there are not outbreaks elsewhere. We are making good progress since the disease was made notifiable.

It is possible that it has affected several generations of sheep and, where properties have sheep chronically affected, slaughter may be required. It may be that so many animals are affected that slaughter is not practicable and eradication is the only economic means, but, as the disease contracts in its effect, it may be advisable for the safety of other flocks to have stock slaughtered more readily than previously.

Under the existing Act there is power for regulations to be made for the slaughter of stock under quarantine by order out of hand, provided that the regulation is made. However, the Act does not enable the authorities to have a regulation ordering the sale of sheep for slaughter; they can order slaughter only on the property. This Bill provides a concession in this respect. It is not intended that any order shall be given lightly for the sheep to be destroyed on the property with loss to the owner. We can in this Bill go to the owner and say that, as his sheep have been affected for, say, three years, it is time that something was done or the disease will spread, and that he should sell the sheep for slaughter. He will then be able to sell them instead of losing them. That is the purpose of this Bill.

Clause 5 inserts a new subsection into section 19 of the principal Act which requires owners of diseased stock, under penalty, to notify the Chief Inspector, to keep the stock from coming into contact with stock belonging to others and if so ordered to destroy diseased stock. The new subsection will provide that proof that stock are in fact diseased shall in any proceedings be *prima facie* evidence that the owner knew or suspected that the stock were diseased. It was decided earlier this year that, in order to succeed in proceedings under section 19, the prosecution must prove actual knowledge or actual suspicion on the part of the stockowner, which makes it extremely difficult to police the Act. The new subsection will materially assist in the enforcement of section 19.

One of the outstanding features of the campaign against foot-rot has been the co-operation of stockowners. It has been remarkable that stockowners as a body have not attempted to evade the provisions of the Act. They have almost always tried to co-operate with the department and in return have received much assistance. None of them has anything to fear by notifying the department. On the other hand, there have been some deliberate evasions; these are the type that we are attempting to deal with in this Bill.

Mr. BYWATERS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture) moved:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): When some weeks ago I obtained leave to continue my remarks on the original Bill, I was developing the theme that the Aboriginal peoples were emerging from their semi-nomadic state and the conditions in which they had been living, and that the Second World War, too, had helped them emerge from these conditions because in the northern parts of Australia they had been employed in all sorts of positions (although some of them were menial positions) in connection with the armed services of both our own country and our allies, the United States of America. Not long ago I read in the paper that a ceremony had taken place at Darwin (rather belatedly) where the Royal Australian Navy had presented cheques to several Aborigines who had been engaged during the war as coast-watchers on our northern shores. This was just one indication that they had played a small, albeit important, part in the war. Of course, some of the Aborigines used their money wisely and bought sensibly, but others did not know and perhaps frittered away the money they had won working for the armed services.

However, this pointed to the necessity for some change in attitude towards the Aborignal peoples because they had learnt the value of money in many instances and at least they had known what it was to have money of their own to spend as they wished. I think, therefore, that we as Australian people realize that these native peoples have certain rights and because of that I think it is a good thing that an entirely new Bill has been introduced to deal with the place of Aboriginal people in the community. I think that it gives members of this House and the people of South Australia an entirely new concept of their obligations and responsibilities to the original inhabitants of Australia and that it shows the trend of thought among people who have always been concerned with the welfare of the native peoples and who have the knowledge and attitude necessary to effect reforms in this direction. This is the attitude that has been adopted by the Minister, which I personally think is the

correct attitude. We know that, since the Bill was originally introduced, certain amendments have been made and some clauses that were in the Bill originally submitted to the House have been deleted, while alterations have been made in other ways.

First, I should like to deal with the board. This matter was dealt with by the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan), who preceded me in speaking on this Bill. I agree with him that, as with all boards set up for the purpose of direction of one section of the community or an industry, usually on a board are people most concerned with what the board is to control. We see many instances of that. However, even though it is desirable that there be Aboriginal representatives on this board, they should not be there just because they are Aborigines: they should be there because they are enlightened. They probably have a contribution to make and they must in a general way represent their people and be effective as representatives of their people. In the same way I do not think that there should, of necessity, be women on boards. They should be there only by virtue of the contribution they can make. Therefore, I support the idea of Aboriginal representatives on the board provided they have a really worthwhile contribution to make.

Another point that interests me is that, after being a representative on the board for two consecutive terms, there must then be a period of at least four years before he or she can be re-elected a member of the board. That is a good thing. This in no way detracts from the services that a person serving for two terms has given to the board in the interests of the Aborigines. We know that all the time research is being carried out into the matter of the Aboriginal, his attitudes and his assimilation into the community, and, over a period of eight years, interesting developments can take place and people can be given a place on the board because they have made a study of a particular aspect of the conditions of these people, which I think is a good thing. It in no way detracts from the services given by certain people but it affords an opportunity for new blood and new thought to be brought on to the board. This can be applied to many boards as our attitudes change from day to day.

Mr. Riches: How long do you think it would take a person to qualify for membership of the board?

Mrs. STEELE: Much study of the subject of anthropology is taking place these days and, whereas a person may not be eligible to be appointed at a particular time even though he or she has made a study of this matter, the fact that the personnel of the board can be changed gives that person an opportunity to serve and make a contribution, and that is important.

The member for Norwood said control should be the direct responsibility of the Minister, but I cannot see how that could possibly be. Ministers are responsible for so many departments and it is unreal to expect a Minister to take the day-to-day responsibility for the administration of this specialized department. We are fortunate in that the Minister in charge of this Bill is familiar with all the aspects of the control of Aborigines and we know he has made extensive tours and has the interests of these people much at heart. Instead of the board's being responsible to the Minister, the honourable member for Norwood wanted the Minister—

Mr. Riches: We only expect the Minister to look after this department in the same way as the Minister of Education looks after his department.

Mrs. STEELE: The member for Norwood wanted the Minister to be responsible for the day-to-day administration, but that is not possible. We realize the duties that Ministers undertake.

Both in this Bill and in the original one (on which I did more work than on this one) I considered that certain clauses were incompatible with our desire to assimilate the Aborigines into the community but, on reflection, I realize that we have to have some sort of control over the more nomadic and primitive types of Aboriginal. Therefore, it is better to have these clauses in the Bill so that they may be applied if necessary. For instance, the question may arise whether people could be refused admission to reserves or whether they could be kept outside the boundaries of Aboriginal institutions. That kind of thing seems somewhat incompatible with the general trend of the Bill but I still consider, on reflection, that those clauses are better retained for dealing with the type of Aboriginal to whom it might apply.

As regards medical examination of Aborigines, I realize that, when dealing with primitive peoples, we need some control over their health and we must be able to direct those who do not understand hygiene; so I consider that, for its value in applying to the individual Aboriginal requiring medical examination, it is much better to have this provision in the Bill.

I refer now to the reserves, and particularly to the Gerard Reserve. I cannot help feeling after studying some reports and articles I have read on this matter that, if we had more reserves of this type, we should be able to do much more for these people whose welfare we have at heart. Of course, the whole key to the assimilation of the Aboriginal into the community is education. At this particular mission we have the ideal set-up. A kindergarten is provided and the children, after attending that kindergarten, are taken by bus to the nearby primary school at Winkie. Some of the Aboriginal youths living on the reserve attend the high school. The men are trained on the property in all types of farm work suited to the locality, and they also attend adult education classes in Renmark. Their fees for attending the adult education courses are paid by the department. I understand that many of them have chosen welding, because they feel that it will be useful to them in their work. As a matter of interest, they are the first Aborigines to participate in adult education in South Australia. The women are trained in home and personal hygiene and the care of children. This is somewhat more difficult because some primitive families live on the reserve. Personal pride is being fostered in these Aborigines. Some houses from Radium Hill have been transported to the reserve and they are being allocated to eligible families.

Many of the men are employed by local fruitgrowers and as a result of regular employment many have their own cars, dress well and live in decent homes. Probably their greatest gain is that they are accepted in the community. In many sporting teams there are Aborigines, and they are accepted by their fellow players. The training of men on the reserve takes the form of a five-year apprenticeship, and some of the men are being paid the basic wage. When dealing with Aboriginal people we must realize that their traditional instinct is to often go walk-about. We must train them to realize that if they accept work they must be amenable to discipline and they cannot absent themselves from work as the spirit takes them. We must appreciate that this is one of the difficulties that Aborigines face and we must do what we can to train them and to persuade them that if they are to be accepted in a white European community they must be prepared to conform to our way of life.

I have received a most interesting journal published recently—a *Current Affairs Bulletin* —in which it states that the openings for unskilled labour in rural areas are becoming fewer and that the first people to suffer as a result are the Aborigines who are untrained and therefore not acceptable as employees. This is a matter that the various State Aborigines departments are investigating at present because it is a problem that affects Aborigines greatly. It has been suggested that much research should be undertaken in trying to find a solution to this problem. We must remember that if Aboriginal people have to move around seeking employment, the family suffers and children do not attend school regularly. As I mentioned earlier, one of the means by which we can train these people to accept assimilation is education. If the men cannot get work and have to move around the country the children are not receiving the necessary education. The way in which the natives are trained on our reserves will play an important part in assimilating Aborigines into our community.

It is interesting to note that recently surveys were made of two reserves in New South Wales and one in South Australia and that it was discovered that the South Australian Aborigines provided a sharp contrast to those from other reserves. The dark people who live in Adelaide have come from different parts of the State and from the Northern Territory because they want to live here and take advantage of the range of jobs offering for unskilled workers. It was interesting to read that the Aborigines in Adelaide considered that they were assimilated and that they had no connection at all with the people who lived in the country and whom they regarded as being under the care of a department. Their acceptance in our community must be based on their ability to be assimilated into the community as normal citizens with their own contribution to make. That is why I believe that if the training that has been provided at Aboriginal reserves proves successful, other natives will seek the same training and their rate of assimilation will be greatly accelerated. Two clauses that were in the previous Bill have been deleted. One referred to Aborigines camping outside country towns. I believe this provision is well left out, because that can be dealt with under another Act.

Mr. Riches: How can it be dealt with?

Mrs. STEELE: I think that the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) pointed out that under the Local Government Act the local

council outside whose town the Aborigines camped could take action to prevent it.

Mr. Riches: With great respect I can refer to areas where that cannot be done.

Mrs. STEELE: It will be interesting to hear the honourable member speak of this later.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The Health Act can deal with it.

Mr. Riches: I do not think so. I can refer to problems that will arise immediately.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs. STEELE: The other clause that was deleted—I think it was clause 30—caused me some concern when I first saw it because I thought it was incompatible with the remainder of the Bill, but on reflection I wondered whether, like clauses 20 to 25, it would not be better to leave it in so that the Minister had power to implement the provisions. However, it has been left out of this Bill, which is perhaps just as well if we are to give the Aborigines the chance of being assimilated into our community. However, I received several telephone calls from people who are tremendously interested in Aboriginal welfare, and those people put various points to me as to why they thought this clause was a good one. Why I had wondered whether it was as well left there was that when one goes to Western Australia—I have not seen evidence of the problem here—one is very much aware of the half-caste problem in that State. I think it is probably as bad there as anywhere else in Australia.

I must admit that in the part of Western Australia which I visited there is a tremendous concentration of half-caste families living in the most deplorable conditions on reserves just outside country towns, and one cannot help, as an Australian, having a somewhat guilty national conscience, as it were, for our race because of the conditions that exist. On the other hand, of course, we all know that native girls can make themselves very attractive and very desirable to white men, and therefore I consider that many of the resultant effects are perhaps due to the native peoples themselves, too. However, I think the Minister has acted wisely in deleting the provision from the Bill.

Clause 31 repeals certain sections of the Licensing Act. This is something to which much thought has been given, not only by people here in Australia but also by other people who have to deal with a native minority. I remember that last year when I was in New Guinea the difficulty of solving this problem was exercising the minds not only of the authorities but of responsible people and citizens in the various towns. The opinion of many people who had lived there a long time was that sooner or later this change had to come, that the community had to be prepared for a period during which many things that it would not like would probably happen, but that in the interests of the community, both indigenous and European, it would be better for those changes to be introduced.

I was interested to read in the *Advertiser* of the lifting of the ban, subject to certain conditions, against natives in New Guinea having liquor. I think it was today's *Advertiser* that reported that native people in New Guinea could now be served with any kind of liquor in hotels but that the only thing they could take away was beer. I have on several occasions seen natives very much under the influence, with a large flagon of wine by their side. I guess it was very cheap wine, not having come from the Barossa Valley. If one has ever had the opportunity to witness such things one can appreciate that it is far better for Aborigines to be able to obtain liquor easily than it is for them to be in this objectionable state. I think people realize that at present they are treated as being definitely inferior in this respect. When all is said and done, here in South Australia we do give the Aboriginal the right to vote provided he meets certain qualifications, such as being able to give a fixed address or an address as his place of abode. He also has the right to own property of any description, and he has the right to apply to authority or to institutions for assistance. However, in giving the Aboriginal these rights we expect him to accept the same responsibilities as other citizens and to observe the law. As we have given Aborigines those rights I think it is only consistent that we should give them the right to be able to obtain liquor. After a certain period has elapsed, in which I am sure we will find the same things happening as happened in New Guinea, I think the Aborigines will settle down and that probably it will prove that it has been perfectly all right for them to be given this privilege.

I remember being told when I was in New Guinea that when the natives there were first given the right to drive motor vehicles there was a period during which there was a spate of accidents. Now almost every taxi there is being driven by a native citizen. I consider that the decision to permit South Australian Aborigines to have liquor has been taken only after much thought and a true appreciation of

the situation by the Minister over many years. The repeal of these provisions of the Licensing Act is a step in the right direction. The provision contains an exception in so far as the primitive Aboriginal in certain areas to be proclaimed will not be able to obtain liquor. I agree with that arrangement. The people who are in a position to supply liquor in those areas will be well aware of the law, and I think it is appropriate that they should be severely punished if they transgress in this respect.

I mentioned a little while ago that the Aboriginal people were able to own their own houses. It is very interesting to realize how many houses have been provided here for Aboriginal people. On checking the figures I discovered that at the end of June this year 105 Aboriginal families were living in houses throughout South Australia. These houses are sold by the Housing Trust to the Aborigines Deparment, which manages the houses and lets them to approved families.

Mr. Jenkins: Aborigines live in houses other than Housing Trust houses.

Mrs. STEELE: I realize that, but I was referring to the efforts made by the Aborigines Department to house these people. In many instances these Aborigines are freely accepted, but I always think it a great pity when residents in areas where Aborigines have their houses do not try to make more of an effort to accept these Aborigines than they do. I consider that this is one of those things in which Australians will have to be educated, so that they will know the best thing to do and the best way to accept these Aboriginal families. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): Mr. Acting Speaker, I am sure that all members of the House welcome the advent of this Bill because of its liberal nature and its tremendous departure from past legislation dealing with Aborigines. In fact, when one looks at the past legislation one is struck by the fact that since the Colony was first settled very little has been done about improving the legislation regarding Aborigines in this State. I welcome this Bill, which goes a long way compared with what has been done in the past. The member for Norwood in his excellent speech pointed out that this was not a Party-political matter and welcomed the tenor of the Bill. Admittedly, it does not go as far in some directions as we would like, but I am sure that when it reaches Committee various points in some clauses will be dealt with adequately. As a result, I do not intend to deal with all clauses at length, although I intend to give one or two matters my attention. In introducing the Bill, the Minister said:

It is obviously necessary to define the people to whom the Bill applies. . . . The term "Aboriginal" in the Bill refers only to the full-blood descendants of the original inhabitants of Australia; persons of less than full-blood who are of Aboriginal descent are defined as persons of Aboriginal blood. . . . The word "Aboriginal", wherever appearing in the Act, commences with a capital letter "A". The purpose of this apparently small matter is to recognize the status of the Aboriginal inhabitants of this country in the same manner as the like courtesy and recognition are extended to the native populations of other countries.

He was in some difficulty here, because Europeans are known as Australians. He referred to Maoris, Papuans, Americans, Danes, and so on, but the original people in those countries were called "aborigines", so when we call our people "Aborigines" we are not giving them the term they really deserve. They really deserve the term "Australians".

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: They are very proud of the term all the same.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Yes, because we have given them the name, but they deserve the term "Australians" and not "Aborigines".

Mr. Fred Walsh: They were here before we were.

Mr. LOVEDAY: That is so, but I suppose Papuans were there before Europeans. "Aboriginal" means an indigenous native of a country, and it probably is the best way out of the difficulty. The whole tenor of the legislation is to get away as far as possible from restrictions and the protective type of legislation that has been on our Statute Book in the past, with a view to giving Aboriginal people a sense of responsibility and a sense that they are really becoming citizens of this country, which I think is a most desirable objective. The member for Norwood said that it was desirable that there be persons of Aboriginal blood on the board; I think he suggested that there be two. He also said that the Minister had this matter in hand but that there was probably some difficulty in finding people with the requisite qualifications. As the Bill is framed, it does not preclude people of Aboriginal blood from being on the board, but unless the definition indicates this I think it is unlikely that such people will be on the board for a long time.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I think that is not correct.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I have that feeling from looking back on the past history of this matter, but I may be wrong. I suppose the reason why some of us would like this included in the Bill is that we fear that when people are selected for this board it may be said that there are many people with higher qualifications than one might consider to be possessed by anyone of Aboriginal blood. There may be a tendency when considering what are the necessary qualifications to overlook that a person of Aboriginal blood has probably a far greater understanding of the needs and ways of his own people than anyone else would have. An Aboriginal may not have certain other qualifications considered desirable of a member of this board, but I consider there is a danger that the importance of having people on the board who by virtue of race understand the inner feelings and outlook of the people of that race will be overlooked. It would be advisable to make it obligatory that the board include two or three persons of Aboriginal blood even if it meant increasing the membership of the board. In the Bill that members on this side had in mind it was proposed that the board consist of eight persons, whereas this Bill provides for a board of seven including a chairman. This matter could, I think, be considered in Committee.

In this debate some remarks have been made about securing property rights to Aborigines generally, which is an important matter that presents great difficulty. It has been said that if the reserves we now have were to be made over to Aborigines it would be impossible to trace the various descendants and establish what share they should have in property rights of reserves used by Aboriginal people. However, I do not think that is the correct approach; I think it is impossible. The problem could be met in time when Aboriginal people recognize and establish group organizations that could have property rights in these reserves and possibly even more property rights in other reserves. Many people imagine that because Aborigines lived by hunting they have no real property right in the land, but that is a misapprehension. When one looks at the history of the matter, it is clear that they had in their own minds clearly established property rights in the areas in which they hunted. The first European contact with Aborigines in Australia was made in the seventeenth century, when there were about 600 tribes with well-defined tribal areas although they had many languages, modes of living and religious beliefs. At that time they probably numbered 300,000 people, which has since been reduced to 75,000 or 100,000, although no proper census has ever been taken.

The British Government in the early days of the colonies instructed the early Governors to treat Aborigines with kindness and consideration but there was a complete misunderstanding of the great gap between the two cultures. The failure of Aborigines to accept European civilization was said to be due to their inferior intelligence and their barbaric habits. I think we can have quite a salutary thought in this regard. I believe that a Roman general named Cicero in 52 A.D. sent a despatch from Britain to Rome in which he said that the natives there were so stupid that he was sure that they would never learn anything. I do not think there is anything particularly wrong with the Aborigines in Australia in that regard.

Possession of the land soon became the real issue and conflict was inevitable. Deprived of their land, the Aborigines were forced into other and often hostile tribal areas and sought relief by attacking the white man and his stock. In 1797 an "open season" was declared, and after any so-called outrage the Aborigines were to be destroyed wherever met with. During this period the Tasmanian Aborigines were virtually exterminated. This was called the "process of pacification" and briefly interrupted (and only in certain areas) by the policy of "protection" being applied by Governor Gipps. A Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1836 asserted "the incontrovertible rights of the Aborigines to their own soil" and Governor Gipps provided for the appointment of protectors, the establishment of permanent settlements to teach the Aborigines the spirit of acquisition and consequent civilization, the establishment of schools run by missionaries, and children to be separated from their parents, the idea being that they would more quickly acquire European habits. But squatter resistance prevented the full implementation of that policy, and in 1848 protection was abandoned.

"Pacification" wih firearms and poison continued. I believe there was only one case recorded of a white man's suffering the death penalty for killing Aborigines. The policy of extermination was particularly severe in Queensland, where the Aboriginal population declined from 100,000 at the time of white settlement to 15,000 in about 1900. Two-thirds of the survivors fled to the Cape York Peninsula, which was unattractive to settlers. With the decline of the Aboriginal population the

idea of humanitarian protection was promoted again. Aboriginal labour was required for the cattle industry. Victoria and Western Australia appointed Aborigines protection boards. It is interesting to note that when responsible government was granted to Western Australia in 1890, the control of the Aboriginal policy was reserved for the British Government and the board was directly responsible to the Governor. The Constitution Act provided that one per cent of the gross revenue or £5,000, whichever was the greater, should be set aside annually for native welfare, but that provision was repealed in 1897 as soon as control of native affairs passed to the Western Australian Government. I point out these matters because they show that as soon as the opportunity occurred everyone lost sight of the fact that these people had certain rights, which were gradually being whittled away.

The other States took similar action, the dominating pattern being "segregation" and making the passing of our Aborigines as gentle and as peaceful as possible, as was said by Daisy Bates. Another authority said, "keeping them by the aid of moral training free from vice and sin". I am afraid that the actions of the people at the time did not measure up to what they hoped to obtain by the training of the Aborigines. Early in this century it was accepted that the Aborigines need not die out, and the policy of assimilation became accepted officially.

I want to deal now with what has been the history of this matter in South Australia. On the first formation of the Colony in 1836 the Resident Commissioner was instructed:

That His Majesty's Government has appointed an officer whose special duty it will be to protect the interests of the Aboriginal. You will see that no lands which the natives may possess in occupation or enjoyment be offered for sale until previously ceded by the natives to yourself.

It is interesting to notice in a little booklet issued in June-July, 1962, under the title of *On Aboriginal Affairs,* that when South Australia was established as a Colony by a private company in London the principle of justice was fully recognized. The booklet referred to also included the following:

In referring to the formation of a fund for the future sustenance of the natives, they thus propounded their scheme: "It is proposed that such lands as may be ceded by the natives to the Colonization Commissioners shall be sold under the condition—that for every 80 acres conveyed, the party to whom this conveyance is made shall pay four-fifths, or 64 acres only; the conveyance to be made subject to a stipulation, that at the expiration of a term of years (hereafter to be decided), the lands so conveyed shall be divided into five equal parts. One of these parts, or 16 acres, to be resumed for a reserve for the use of the Aborigines: and the remaining four parts, or 64 acres to remain as his freehold."

However, this was not observed. What happened was that the people concerned took the land for their own use. The booklet also included:

A gentleman, one of that noble body, the Society of Friends, wrote to the Adelaide paper on September 9, 1838, and stated that he had paid into the Government the sum of £3 16s. 6d., this being interest at the rate of 10 per cent upon this aforesaid one-fifth portion of his land, and had desired that that amount be devoted to the benefit of Aborigines. He says "I beg leave to pay the above sum for that purpose, seeing the Commissioners as yet have neither fulfilled their pledge in this respect to the public, or carried out the moral principle signified . . ."

The land was filched from the Aborigines despite the provisions laid down by well-meaning people overseas. When the Crown Colony was instituted 10 per cent of the proceeds of sales of all waste land was set aside for the benefit of Aborigines. This was found to be more than sufficient and the procedure was abandoned. In its place it was decided that only an amount sufficient to meet the absolute necessities be drawn from General Revenue. Then there developed the system of "handouts" to the natives, who rapidly became parasitical on the rest of the community as a result. Once again these well-meaning people were always talking about what attempts should be made to Christianize the Aborigines, but they forgot many of the more important things regarding their material welfare.

There have been two inquiries in South Australia regarding Aboriginal welfare since the Colony was established. The first was a Legislative Council Select Committee, the report of which can be found in *Parliamentary Papers,* Volume 3, No. 165, dated 1860. This is an extract from that report:

The subject referred to this Committee is one embracing the whole question of the responsibilities of civilized nations in taking possession of territory previously occupied by nomadic and uncivilized tribes who, despite any questions of law or expediency, had an equitable title to the lands they occupied, and of which they are virtually dispossessed. In a utilitarian sense, it may be argued that the Aborigines were not making the best use of the land; at the same time, they were enabled, while in undisturbed possession, to supply all their physical necessities, and of this ability they are deprived by our occupation of their inheritance.

The committee pointed out also that they lost much and gained little or nothing by right of occupation; they were fast decreasing in numbers; they had a partial assumption of semi-civilized habits and that, as the result of the European occupation, syphilis had been introduced and there was promiscuous intercourse of sexes with disastrous results. The committee recommended that a Chief Protector and a Sub-Protector be appointed. Once again it advocated a complete separation of the children from their parents and tribe for training and Christianizing.

It is interesting to note that in the course of this committee's work it examined only three Aborigines despite the importance of this matter to the Aborigines. The committee examined as witnesses two men and one woman from Port Lincoln and subjected them to a brief examination. No attempt was made to examine the witnesses in their own language, and I have examined the committee's report and have found that no real information was secured from them, one of the main reasons being that the witnesses had such a poor knowledge of the English language. Despite the importance of this question to those people no real attempt was made to obtain from them their ideas on the matters the committee was inquiring into.

The committee considered that the Aborigines were doomed to extinction and this consideration probably had an effect on its report, particularly its views on Aborigines' property rights although there is little evidence in the committee's report that much consideration was given to that aspect at all. Going from that point to the present time, I stress that even today there seems to be little recognition of the claim these people have to the soil. I was pleased to notice that recently the Minister prevented a prospector from travelling through the North-West Reserve in my electorate, but I think the Minister would admit that even today it is not considered that that reserve is absolutely inviolate. Admittedly the passage of people is well controlled but, nevertheless, as the Minister said, something might be found, such as minerals, in that area, which would mean that eventually the Europeans would go in. I previously brought up in this House the question of placing an observatory on one of the so-called mountains, of about 4,000ft. in height, in that area.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Mount Woodroffe is higher than that.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I pointed out that there were some mountains outside the native reserve, but I received no satisfactory answer to my question. In other words, if we wish to place an observatory in that native reserve one will probably be established there. We do not even recognize the inviolability of the few remaining reserves even though they are so far removed. We are not prepared to do that because of the potential value of an observatory on the mountain in that area or the potential value of some mineral that may be discovered.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Dealing with that point, I think Mount Woodroffe is the highest mountain in South Australia and no other mountain anywhere near it is as high except others that are also in Northern Territory or South Australian reserves.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Before I asked that question I examined a map and if the Minister glances at the map he will see that three or four mountains (to the best of my recollection) are just as high as (or almost as high as) Mount Woodroffe and they are just outside the eastern border of the reserve.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I should like to know their names.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I do not remember the names because I examined the map some time ago, but I went into the question thoroughly at the time. The next examination of Aboriginal affairs took place by means of a Royal Commission in 1912 just after the first Aborigines Act was passed and, here again, little better attention was given to the attitude of Aborigines to their own affairs. This report shows once again that little was done to find out what they wanted in respect of their own affairs. The Royal Commission issued two reports (a progress report and a final report) and out of a total of 171 pages in the two reports less than two and a half pages were devoted to the evidence given by Aboriginal witnesses. The Commission examined 77 witnesses and only six out of that 77 were Aborigines, two being from Mount Serle and four from Koonibba. The Commission visited the mission stations at Point Pearce and Point McLeay and it also visited Queensland and New South Wales in the course of its investigations. Some reports were made concerning the two reserves I mentioned, and they make interesting reading. The report was that Point McLeay was not a success financially or otherwise and that the natives were discontented because they could not get more work to do at the station.

The Commission reported that Point Pearce was a commercial success, that 3,000 acres was under crop, but only 1,000 acres was

worked by the native population, the other 2,000 acres being worked on shares by white farmers in the neighbourhood. The Commission said that more use might be made of the natives for farming operations. I wish to comment on this. When the honourable member for Norwood and I visited Point Pearce in 1956 we found that even then a large portion of this reserve was being share-farmed by white farmers in the neighbourhood. I believe, from an interjection made when the Minister was speaking earlier in this debate, that this practice has not altogther yet been abandoned. That shows what little respect we have in connection with these reserves which were made available to the Aborigines so that they could develop themselves. We could not even let them have their own reserves in full!

The Commission went on to say that the education of the younger children was now satisfactorily carried out at Point McLeay and Point Pearce, but boys and girls from 13 to 18 years of age were practically neglected and were allowed to waste the most important years of their lives. Here again I refer to something that I am glad has now been improved to some extent. What I want to say is that little was done from the time when the Colony was settled right up to a few years ago. These people were neglected. On the occasion of the visit I mentioned, the member for Norwood and I received complaints about the way the teenagers were behaving and we were shown a list of the prosecutions for the previous year. However, it was admitted that when the children reached the age of 14 years they left the primary school and had no opportunity to go farther; they simply depended on odd jobs.

I think that position has since been rectified, but at that time the children could not get regular permanent work on the reserve until, I believe, they reached the age of 18 years or were married. In other words, there was a premium on getting married at an exceptionally early age. I believe that both Mr. Dunstan and I felt that the reason for the long list of prosecutions was simply that these teenagers were at a loose end and had no regular employment. The same position existed in 1912 as in 1956. Incidentally, the 1912 Commission advocated technical trade education for boys, and domestic skills for girls. We still advocate that. It also advocated that the system of share-farming at Point Pearce be gradually abolished. How gradually?

The commission urged that children of 10 years and over be removed from their parents and times fixed for the parents to have access to them. It advocated also that earnings be controlled as in Queensland. It pointed out that in considering the cost of Government assistance to Aborigines it should be remembered that the lands formerly occupied or set aside for the use of Aborigines, but now otherwise dealt with, had an unimproved value of £73,433 all over the State. These lands included 15,455 acres at Poonindie, which is valuable agricultural land.

I am putting particular emphasis on the property rights question, and the rights of the Aborigines as regards land, because I feel that, although there is nothing in the Bill on the matter (and it would be almost impossible to include something) we should be considering the matter with a view to seeing that the Aborigines have every opportunity to build up a group organization that could have priority rights in their reserves in the future. I believe this is the only practical way of giving property rights to the Aborigines as a people. There could be established a group that would be their representative as a race in connection with property rights. For many people this may seem a minor matter and not of practical importance, but, on the other hand, I believe if we were to ask these people they would welcome it, and as a race they would feel it to be a matter of importance. They would have a feeling that their rights in this direction had been recognized, even if belatedly, and that they had a security in land they could call their own. The question of division between descendants is neither a practical proposition nor of interest to them. All people of every race like to feel that they have something in the way of land to be called their own. This has been brought out in recent years because of the movements that have occurred. However small or belated this recognition may be in comparison with what they originally had, it would be a worthwhile step.

Although there is much scientific literature on Aborigines I have noticed in my reading that there has been little of what I call "technical research" on this matter. The best literature of this character that I have been able to find was published by Mrs. F. Gale. She has done valuable research work and has embodied her findings and the results of her investigations in a book entitled *The Part Aborigines of South Australia.* It is a valuable and thorough study of the position over many years. I feel that the Bill would be improved

by having a special provision that research work should be carried out. I say that because it is easy to talk about this matter in Parliament from some points of view, but it is a complex question, and the Minister recognizes that. It has many facets. We are dealing with people in many diverse conditions. What applies to one group does not apply to another. I feel that research is badly needed.

Mrs. Gale points to the diversity of the problem of assimilation. She refers to six distinct regions where Aborigines live in different circumstances. She classifies them as follows. First, there are the primitive or tribal Aborigines in the North-West Reserve and the northern cattle areas. Secondly, there are the areas south of these areas carrying sheep. Thirdly, there are the detribalized groups, such as are found around the opal areas and the northern towns. They are the fringe dwellers. Fourthly, there are the Aborigines on Eyre Peninsula who do not seem to mix well with Aborigines from the northern areas. Fifthly, there is the group around Adelaide, and sixthly, the group in the South-East.

These can be divided into three categories. Mrs. Gale pointed out to me the differences in the percentages of the different types of people in these groups. If we take the northern area and the North-West Reserve as being the first group there are 43 per cent full-bloods, 28 per cent mixed and 29 per cent white. The second group includes the Andamooka opal field and covers an area roughly from a point above Ceduna going to the north of Lake Torrens and east to the border. It has four per cent full-bloods, 20 per cent mixed and 76 per cent white. The next group covers an area south of the line drawn from about Ceduna just under Port Augusta and across eastwards to the border. It has 98.87 per cent white, 1.3 per cent mixed and almost no full-bloods. These are interesting figures, because they show that the problem of assimilation, so termed, is a different problem in each place, particularly when we remember the differing conditions that pertain in each area. That is why I suggest that further research is needed to reach a satisfactory solution when dealing with the groups in these areas.

Whilst speaking of assimilation I draw attention to the fact that Mr. Dunstan used the words "assimilation" and "integration". I agree with him regarding the use of both words. I am sure some people of Aboriginal blood will never be assimilated, although they could be integrated into the community. The importance of enabling them to build up groups must be recognized, just as the importance of this process has been recognized by people in other countries who have had the problem of dealing with similar minority groups. In other words, we have to recognize that all of these people will never be assimilated: some will and some will not. If we look at the figures that I quoted for the north-west of the State, obviously assimilation in that area is virtually impossible because most people there are not white people—who represent only 29 per cent of the population in the area mentioned in Mrs. Gale's figures. Further, anyone who has had personal contact with these people realizes that they have no desire to be assimilated in the sense that they would be absorbed into a European community and acquire all the habits of a European civilization. They have no desire to do that and, in the circumstances in which they are living, it is impossible that that should be the case.

As regards assisting the Aboriginal who is not likely to be assimilated but who could be integrated into a community, I point out that we have so long taken it for granted that we are the ones who have everything to offer. We have certainly recognized the Aboringinal's ability at tracking but we fail to appreciate his knowledge of medicinal properties of plants, of seasonal patterns, of animal habits and also his methods of imparting knowledge to small children and his ability to cope with a wide variety of problems with a minimum of technical aids. I think it is time we recognized that we are not the ones who have everything to offer, that they have something that they can offer to us if we can only recognize the value of it. There is no biological ground for supposing that the Aboriginal is less intelligent than anyone else. Given equal opportunity and a favourable home environment, the Aboriginal child will do as well as anyone else at school.

It is interesting to note that Mrs. Gale in her research work compared what had been done in schools where the Aboriginal children were segregated with what had been done in schools where they were integrated. The progress of Aboriginal children in segregated schools is much slower than that of Aboriginal children in the integrated schools, and it was made clear through her investigations that, where the Aboriginal child had a home background in any way comparable with that of the white child, the progress of the Aboriginal child in an integrated school was just as good as that of the average white child. A careful examination of the class results showed clearly

that, where those comparable advantages of home background existed, the Aboriginal child could go to the top of the class if that child had the same ability as the white child; some children would be only in the middle of the class and some would be lower down. In other words, irrespective of colour, provided the home background was relatively similar the Aboriginal children could do just as well as the white children. In fact, there was an interesting report in the *South Australian Teachers' Journal* of December, 1961, which pointed out:

Most teachers report that progress is slower than that of white children and inclined to be limited to the lower grades of the primary school. Many of these children enter Grade I very shy and "not able to carry on any conversation at all. Monosyllables are common and speech very abrupt."

This was due simply to the unfortunate background of the children in question and not to any biological difference. Given an equal opportunity, investigations have shown that they can do just as well as the children of any other colour.

I turn now to another aspect of this matter. The Bill that we would have introduced but for the fact that the Minister introduced his Bill would have provided for the election of committees by residents on reserves to assist in the management of the reserves. This is a particularly important matter. If we are going to establish the Aborigines with a sense of responsibility as citizens, we have to give them the opportunity to learn, as groups, the management of their own affairs. The opportunity to do that is provided in the reserves if only we will recognize the opportunity there and provide for the election of committees of the residents by the residents so that they can learn the management of their reserves. If we are going to push ahead with the objectives of this form of legislation, we shall have to do something along these lines. Already at Point Pearce a co-operative run by the residents themselves has proved successful. In fact, the history of co-operative ventures run by Aborigines throughout Australia shows that they are particularly suited to this sort of work.

In Queensland there are a number of co-operative bodies run by Aborigines themselves. One, in particular, is called Numbahging (Cabbage Tree Island). It is the Aborigines Rural Co-operative, and early this year it paid its first dividend. In November it will harvest its first crop of sugar cane. The co-operative also leases 1,500 acres on the mainland. It runs a co-operative store with a bank and post office, with the first Aboriginal to become a postmaster. I need give no further examples, but I point out that similar things can be done on our reserves. It is interesting to note that the goodwill of the people in that area has manifested itself in that they are assisting the Aborigines in this work.

In New South Wales we find a similar picture. There are co-operatives at Condobolin, Murrin Bridge and Tabulam. In residence at Tranby (at Glebe) are 10 scholarship holders from Mitchell River (Cape York), Tabulam, Cabbage Tree Island, Raleigh, Torres Strait Islands and Kempsey.

The Minister for Territories (Mr. Paul Hasluck) is setting up a pilot consumers' co-operative in the Northern Territory. The idea is to have trained Aboriginal assistants going out to instruct other people in how to run co-operatives, and Aboriginal women are being trained as typistes, secretaries and store managers. All this points to what can be done in this State if only we will be a little more enthusiastic about it than we have been in the past. At the Lockhart River Mission the first Aboriginal Christian co-operative society has been established. It is run by a board of directors, all of whom are Aborigines, and the men and women have equal voting powers. Then, of course, there is the well known Pindan co-operative in Western Australia. This is described in the *Current Affairs Bulletin*, Volume 23, of December 1, 1958, as follows:

The persistence of the Aborigines in this enterprise and the success of co-operatives in other places suggests that this is a form of organization which accords with their traditional values and suits their temperament. Producer and consumer co-operatives may well flourish in places where they have never been tried.

Mary Durack, who is an expert in this field, is reported in the *S.A. Teachers' Journal* of August, 1961, as saying:

The lack of purpose and corroding idleness of groups of detribalized or partly detribalized adult natives, unable or unwilling to find employment within a system that holds no meaning for them and in which they find themselves divested of all authority, is one of the most tragic features of the culture clash. Co-operatives organized on a basis of group ownership readily understandable to the Aboriginal move forward from a point of motivation arising from the people themselves and give ample scope for the reinvestment of authority in the elders now seen as a basic need.

I regard this as a significant quotation because in the few words—"a point of motivation

arising from the people themselves and give ample scope for the reinvestment of authority in the elders''—are expressed a number of extremely important points. These are the things that the Aboriginal has been missing as a result of the complete break-up of his culture and the loss of his land and the loss of all authority. We hope that the Bill will be altered in this regard and that provision will be made so that the reserves may soon come under the management of these people themselves. We must train them in these ways that are so important if they are to be assimilated in our civilization.

I shall deal generally with the provisions regarding the consumption of liquor. We can get down to the finer points during the Committee stages of the Bill. In my experience with the Aborigines in my district I have found that they have had access to liquor under the worst possible conditions. They have had sold to them wine adulterated with methylated spirits, boot polish and all manner of things. They have been charged fantastic prices—£5 a flagon. This is supplied to them by people who deserve the heaviest penalties. This liquor is consumed with the utmost rapidity under the worst conditions. It is no wonder that people get the idea that these people cannot hold their liquor. This is a complete misconception. I have no doubt that if we were to remove the barriers that apply at present there could be trouble for a time, but I am also certain that if all these prohibitions were removed we would soon have a totally different set of conditions prevailing in the Aboriginal's approach to liquor. As it is, he is afraid of being caught and he is consuming this vile stuff as quickly as possible and, of course, at intervals. If the white man were to do the same he would react similarly and he would earn the scorn of the community and be said to be unfit to drink.

Mr. Riches: White men drink methylated spirits now, and giving them access to it doesn't stop them.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Admittedly, but I am sure that the prohibitions that exist have not been of value in solving this particular problem. Those who have examined this problem are satisfied that the prohibitions have failed. I have discussed this subject with members of the Police Force who have been closely connected with this matter and I have been interested to hear that they are of the same mind. A welfare officer with whom I discussed this went so far as to say that he believed that even where there are full-bloods on a reserve, if a canteen were provided and liquor made available at certain times it would be a good thing because the people would no longer feel that they were under a prohibition and they would learn to handle drink properly, and this would be desirable from all points of view. They would no longer be a trade for these people who sell them vile stuff at prohibitive prices. I can visualize difficulties in removing the prohibitions, but I believe that they can be overcome.

One of the most valuable pieces of publicity that we have had on this question appeared in the *Sunday Mail* when the Acting Secretary of the Aborigines Department (Mr. Miller) referred to the number of people of Aboriginal blood who had been successful in various walks of life. I do not intend to read that article now, but I draw members' attention to it because if anyone has any doubt about the success of what the Bill proposes the article will remove it. Regarding the record of families that have been assimilated Mr. Miller said:

> We do know that the failures would not exceed one or two per cent.

He was referring to the settlement of families in various towns throughout the State. I recall that in the *Advertiser* of Tuesday, November 4, 1958, an article on the front page described the experiences of a 17-year old Aboriginal boy who was then attending the Goodwood Boys Technical High School. He wanted to go to the Adelaide Teachers College. He was keen on literature. He had been abandoned when a few months old under a coolibah tree near Katherine. He was reported as saying that he wanted to teach people of his own race that they must not be afraid to face up to their responsibilities as human beings. He had left school to work as a junior porter in the South Australian Railways Department, but he felt that he had to return to school to achieve his ambition. Surely, nothing could tell a better story regarding the possibilities of people of this race than that little story about what that boy wanted to do. I think it shows conclusively that there are tremendous possibilities in this direction. On several occasions I have urged the Minister that we should be training young men of the Aboriginal race to be welfare officers of the department. The sooner we do that the better, because I am sure that if we had welfare officers from the department they would be received very well by people of their own race and would probably be more effective than many people who have acted in that capacity in the past because they would have

that understanding and sympathy that is so necessary.

We have one or two excellent welfare officers in my district at present, and they are doing a remarkably good job; in fact, they are adopting quite a different approach from the old approach to the problems in their areas. However, I still think we could go even better by training young Aboriginal men in this job. I am not suggesting that we reduce the standards, but I am satisfied that given the right selection we could get men of equivalent standards who could do the job.

I hope that when the Bill reaches Committee the amendments that will be moved by the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) will receive the very thorough consideration that they deserve. Our only desire is to make this Bill as practicable and as good as possible. This is a wonderful opportunity to do something for the Aboriginal race, a greater opportunity than has existed for many years. If members look at what I have outlined regarding the past history of this matter, I think they will realize that it is time these steps were taken. Not only should the Bill be made as good as possible, but the policy in many directions should be greatly improved over what it has been in the past. We cannot in a Bill lay down everything regarding policy, but we can give the broad outline. So much depends on the people who are administering the Act, their intentions, and whether they are enthusiastic about moving in the directions that we all desire. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. JENKINS (Stirling): I support the Bill, which is designed to repeal the old Act and to provide for full citizenship rights for our native population, except for exemptions in the case of full-blood Aborigines. I was interested to hear the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) say that our Aborigines should be called Australians and not Aborigines. I consider that there is nothing derogatory whatever in the name "Aboriginal", for if we look at the definition of "Aboriginal" we see that it means the original inhabitants of a country. The Aborigines were the original inhabitants of Australia before it was discovered by the white people, and therefore I should think that "Aborigines" would be a good and fitting name.

I am sure that the Minister (who has made a study of the problem, has travelled much, and has taken a personal interest in Aborigines, as well as having had the experience of administering the Act for some years) has embodied in the Bill what he considers to be in the best interests of our natives. I am sure that this move towards native independence will be generally well accepted. However, the provisions granting privileges and independence, or full citizenship rights, welcome as they may be, will place the onus of responsibility on the natives; they will gain certain rights, but will be subject to the same laws as our white population.

The liquor problem may create the most controversial portion of this Bill. Those of our natives who are exempted under the Act and who have access to liquor are mostly well-behaved, but those not exempted under the Act will now have freedom and unrestricted access suddenly to something they have not been accustomed to, and this may cause some problems at first, both for themselves and for others. However, it is up to everyone to help these people wherever possible, to be tolerant and understanding towards them, and to assist in their assimilation rather than to let them go and get into trouble and have to pay the penalty. The Port Pirie instance of people objecting to Aborigines occupying houses in their street is an example of intolerance that we sometimes have to face up to. I think that is something we shall have to watch carefully in future and do our utmost to overcome.

The new liquor provision will remove the temptation for illegal supply, and this is a good feature of the Bill. It will mean that cheap adulterated rubbish that in the past has been surreptitiously supplied to natives illegally will no longer be sold to these people. The member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) covered that point adequately, and I concur in what he said. Those people will be able to drink what they desire quite openly, and if they overstep the mark they must put up with the consequences. I was glad to hear the Minister say that church organizations generally do not oppose the Bill.

Any legislation that is designed to improve social conditions and bring into the open or legalize any customs which, when abused, have resulted in degradation of our natives, is good legislation, and I commend the Minister for bringing down such a Bill. Of course, the Bill imposes restrictions on full-blood Aborigines, and probably some problems will still exist in that respect. Those natives who live in my district and who are exempted under the Act are well-behaved and are no discredit to the community, and I am sure that they will be a great help to those who will be granted more freedom as a result of this Bill.

I commend the Minister and the Engineering and Water Supply Department for employing native members of our community on developmental work. Natives were so employed on pipe-laying work on a water scheme in the Encounter Bay water district and they proved worthy of their jobs. So far as I could ascertain, those natives were respected by their white workmates. I give full credit to the Minister and to that department for their action in providing employment for Aborigines. To benefit fully from this Act, natives must receive full award wages so that they can attain to a reasonable standard of living, own their own houses and enjoy other conditions. It will take years for the fringe native people, who have lived in settlements and outside town boundaries and have received handouts without having to earn them, to settle down to new conditions. The temptation to leave a job and return only when funds or rations run low seems to be a characteristic of these people, and I do not know how that will be overcome. However, doubtless it will be overcome in time.

Mr. Riches: It could be overcome by continuity of employment from the day they leave school.

Mr. JENKINS: That may be, but it seems to be a characteristic of the native people that as soon as they get a few pounds they want to spend it, and they do not bother to come back to work until they have run out of money. I think the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) has had some experience of that. I have certainly had experience of it; the corporation with which I am associated employs Aborigines, and we find that very often they will come and work for a few days, earn a few pounds, and then they will not be seen again until they run out—

Mr. Riches: Sometimes they are sacked.

Mr. JENKINS: In the case I am referring to they were sacked only because they would not continue with their employment and it was unfair to the other employees. Education and training of native children is of the greatest importance. I think it may take generations to overcome some of these problems. I heard at the weekend of a family in my district who have set a wonderful example. Although these people have three sons of their own, they have adopted an Aboriginal girl and are fostering three other Aborigines. That is a wonderful thing and, if there were more of it, it would be advantageous to our native people. It seems to me that we cannot preserve our full-blood or nomad Aborigines even though we declare areas provided in the Bill, because when we look at the development in our bush and inland country, at the mineral and oil exploration going on, and at the beef road construction, we can see that it will not be many years before our hinterland will be populated and our nomad tribes will become in turn fringe inhabitants who are no longer full-blood Aborigines. That may be a long way ahead, but I think it will come about eventually.

This Bill will mean full citizenship rights—marriage, social services, home ownership and medical benefits. One of the questions that will arise is whether we can wean Aborigines away from handouts and create self-reliance, ability to earn, responsibility to the family and interest in community affairs. I believe we can. These things mean an all-out conscious effort and a desire to help by all people—employers, unions, churches and individuals. Unless we do these things our natives will be degraded under-dogs, and assimilation in its true sense will be a long way off.

The member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) has indicated several amendments, and it appears that the Bill may emerge in a somewhat different form from what was intended by the Minister. I hope it stands substantially as it is. However, I am sure that there is no great difference in intention on either side of this House and that with goodwill and the object of seeing improvement to the lot of our Aborigines brought about this Bill can and will be one about which members of this House will be proud. The member for Norwood said:

> 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.

No doubt he is correct, but that is exactly the reason for which this Bill was introduced—for natives other than full-blood Aborigines. The transition stage may well be painful for many families of part-Aborigines.

I turn now to clauses 21 and 22. Clause 21 provides that the Minister may, on the

recommendation of the board and the Surveyor-General, allot to any Aboriginal or person of Aboriginal blood any Crown lands available for settlement. Clause 22 contains a provision for further assistance. These provisions are a good idea and I suggest that consideration could well be given wherever possible to a kind of community farming venture, which would be a training ground preparatory to settlement on the land of suitable families similar to the way in which ex-servicemen were employed by the Land Development Executive on the land they would ultimately occupy when allotted blocks. I think grazing would probably be one of the easiest types of land settlement that could be provided for Aboriginal families. This could take care of only portion of those who come under the freedoms of this Bill, but some have already had experience in farming as share farmers and of being employed as stockmen, shearers, and so on. This would help implement clauses 21 and 22.

I have no intention of dealing with the Bill clause by clause as this can well be done in Committee. I hope the Bill will emerge as an Act capable of administration in a commonsense manner and that it will be a compromise between idealism and reality. I support the second reading.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): In supporting the second reading, I congratulate the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) and the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) on their contributions to the debate. I join with both these members in saying that this up-to-date legislation is long overdue. For that reason, I believe the Bill is most important. Members of this Parliament, whether of the Government or Opposition, are asked to pass legislation involving the future of thousands of human beings. I emphasize the words "human beings" because I believe members of the white community conveniently forget that the dark races, and particularly the black races, are human beings like them. I say emphatically that God did not make a mistake when he created each and every one of us, yet many of us are still reluctant to admit this.

I have read this Bill and the original measure many times but I am still at a loss to understand why clause 4 should define who are to be classed as Aborigines and who are not. In places such as Russia, South Africa and America there is striking evidence of racial discrimination which is the barrier between coloured people and white people. This barrier also exists between half-castes (classed as part-blood) and whites. This trouble is being experienced in America. Books written by such great authors as Sinclair Lewis indicate emphatically that racial discrimination includes not only full-blood but part-blood people. I have read a book called *Kingsblood Royal* by Sinclair Lewis, which gives striking evidence of the racial feud going on within the Americas where people who have even the slightest trace of coloured blood in their veins are subject to humiliation. I cannot see how we can differentiate between full-blood and part-blood Aborigines.

[*Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.*]

Mr. CASEY: In my electoral district which extends to the Northern Territory border and across to the Queensland border, embracing in part also the New South Wales border, live a number of Aborigines and I cannot see how full-blood Aborigines can be separated or differentiated from half-bloods in that area. In those areas we have mixed bloods living together as family units. Those people are more or less brought up in semi-tribal rites and what belongs to one belongs to all. Therefore, I cannot see how clause 4 can be regarded as a necessity. That is one clause that does some harm to the Bill and it is the only clause, speaking from my own personal experience in the north, that would have any effect on these people. It would affect the part-bloods and the full-bloods living in the area. In those circumstances the word "Aborigine" or "Aboriginal" could be left in but made to apply to all these people.

This has been mentioned by several other speakers, and I wish to give my views on the question. Clause 6 provides for seven members, including a chairman, to constitute the Aboriginal Affairs Board. Irrespective of the type of board set up, the people who are its members must be able to speak with much authority on matters coming before them. Therefore, who would be better fitted for that task than Aborigines provided that they have the necessary qualifications. I do not for one moment suggest that we could go into the street and pick up any Aboriginal and ask him to be a member of the board, but we have Aborigines in the community either full-bloods or part-Aborigines with enough interest in their own people's welfare to make them an asset on such a board. I believe that provision could be made for at least one or maybe two, depending on the Minister's views, of these people to be members of the board.

We hear much about educating Aborigines in this State and primarily this Bill is concerned with Aborigines in South Australia. Rather than look outside the State we should regard this question from a State viewpoint, taking as our example what has happened in other States on this question. My own experience in the northern areas, in which most of the nomadic people of this State live, is that these people should be assimilated. That is the best way of educating them into our community. What follows after that would be a matter of education. When explaining the Bill the Minister said that in the field of education the Aborigines Department had concluded an agreement for the Education Department to take over the entire responsibility for the education of all Aboriginal children. We have that word "Aboriginal" creeping in again, but clause 4 necessarily means that they would be full-bloods.

That brings me back to the old argument when we have full-bloods and part-Aborigines living together as a family unit. Under the wording of the clause only full-bloods would be the responsibility of the Education Department. We should not differentiate between full-bloods and part-bloods. The northern areas contain many places where quite a few Aborigines could be assimilated into the community and the Aborigines Department has done a reasonably good job in providing houses in certain isolated and sparsely populated areas and towns such as Beltana where two houses have been erected for Aborigines. Those children are being educated at the Beltana school and are being assimilated into the community. That trend could be further developed. Farther north, at Copley, the department has provided houses for Aboriginal families living in that area. Earlier this year I made application on behalf of an Aboriginal for a house to be erected for him in Copley township so that his children could attend the Leigh Creek school. Many families in that area live in primitive housing, but they are good citizens and would be an asset to the community because their wives and families could be assimilated with the white community and the children would be able to attend the schools.

In most cases the men work on adjacent stations. That is the normal procedure with most Aborigines in that area. They work on sheep or cattle stations and some even work on plant controlled by the Engineering and Water Supply Department in that area. In places farther north, such as Marree, we have seen the department providing houses although not to the extent that they are provided farther south. This is because the natives are a little less educated although some of the full-blood Aborigines in Marree work for the Commonwealth Railways Department and live in Commonwealth houses. I know those people personally and without hesitation can vouch for their worth in the community. My opinion is also shared by people working with them on the Commonwealth Railways. The farther north we travel the less educated are the Aborigines. Around Oodnadatta and the Finke River nomadic tribes come in periodically and then go out again. A few families live at Oodnadatta and the children attend the local school. The problem could be solved by assimilation, followed by education. I am concerned about the Neppabunna mission station in my district, which is controlled by a religious body that is doing a good job but is handicapped by the facilities available at the station. Although good housing is provided under the supervision of the two people responsible for conducting the mission, the educational facilities are poor. Following on the Minister's statement that the Education Department had agreed to take over the responsibility of educating the children I asked him to inquire whether a qualified teacher could not be made available. Perhaps it would be better to move the children into the township of Copley where they could mix with the white community. It would be only 40 miles away, which is not far in that vast area. We want to get these people assimilated with white people, and the sooner it is done in a practical way the easier it will be for them to become better citizens.

Clause 31, which deals with the selling of liquor, contains much merit. With the member for Whyalla, I favour the establishment of canteens on reserves, but in my opinion, as an experiment, instead of selling all types of intoxicating liquors in canteens perhaps beer only could be sold, and not spirits and wines also. Australian wines are particularly fortified.

Mr. Quirke: No different from the French importation!

Mr. CASEY: I understand that Australian wines have a greater alcoholic content than European wines. The poorer qualities of wine that would probably be taken into the area in bulk would have a degrading effect on the people who drank it in large quantities, and that would apply to whites as well.

Mr. Quirke: Your idea about beer is a good one. It would be better than wines.

Mr. CASEY: I thank the honourable member, because he comes from the best wine grape-growing area in South Australia. Abuse is likely when people are not educated to drink wines and spirits, and they become practically uncontrollable. I have seen instances where Aborigines have lent themselves too deeply to the consumption of wines and have not been responsible for their actions. I ask the Minister to consider this matter. If we are to allow these coloured people to drink liquor, let us start with beer. On some Government fields that position exists now. For instance, at Leigh Creek beer and stout are sold but not wines and spirits. That applied also at Radium Hill. I understand it is because of possible abuse, which can lead to much trouble. Rather than have that, people have consumed only beer and stout, and in consequence there has been little trouble on the fields. I do not say that wines and spirits do not get in, because I know that some people have taken in wines and spirits to be consumed in their homes on special occasions.

In Committee many amendments will be moved and they warrant much consideration. The Bill represents good legislation for the native population. It is long overdue and now that it has been introduced let us give each matter special consideration in order to help the Aborigines. We hold the reins for the future of the Aborigines and it is a great responsibility to carry. Although the Minister has done a good job in drafting the Bill, I do not agree with some provisions in it. The Opposition is here not only to criticize the legislation but to help the Government by presenting constructive material that will benefit the Aboriginal population. If we consider everything with the one basic principle in mind of helping the natives, the Bill can be made better than it is now. I support the Bill and sincerely hope that the Minister will consider the amendments when it reaches Committee.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): At this stage I wish to make just a few general observations on this Bill. First, I congratulate the Minister on what is a most enlightened and desirable approach to the affairs of the Aborigines and persons of Aboriginal descent. His second reading explanation appealed to me as being one of the finest expositions ever of wise and kindly understanding of human needs as they affect the Aboriginal population of the State. The best in any person, whatever his colour or creed, will never be brought out in an atmosphere of patronizing condescension.

Hitherto we have been prone, as a people, to be condescending to the Aboriginals of this continent in a way that has not assisted them to attain that degree of self-respect so necessary as a basis for equality with the other citizens of this nation. Self-respect, strength of character and moral fibre are promoted when human beings experience acceptance by their fellows. In the provisions of this Bill, looking at them generally, I can see that we are now approaching a stage where it is the firm intention of the Government (and, I trust, of the people) to receive the Aborigines into our community on equal terms, giving them the freedoms within our laws, and at the same time expecting them to realize their responsibility to abide by our laws or take the consequences of trespassing against them.

This is the foundation so necessary to place the Aboriginal on a footing that will enable him to take his place in the community. It is time we removed the stigma from our own administration of earlier years. Recently, there has been a better approach to their needs, but this legislation will remove that stigma (a harsh word, but it applies fairly well) of our attitude towards the original inhabitants of this country of not according them a rightful place as human beings in our society. The Minister said in his second reading explanation:

> The present Bill abolishes all restrictions and restraints on Aborigines as citizens, except for some primitive full-blood people in certain areas to be defined. It provides the machinery for rendering special assistance to Aborigines during their developmental years and to promote their assimilation. It places all Aborigines under the same legal provisions as other South Australian citizens, with the same opportunities and the same responsibilities.

That paragraph sums up the whole purpose of this Bill. I am pleased to observe this quite new approach. My purpose in speaking at all was to take the opportunity of expressing to the Minister my admiration for his approach in this matter as portrayed in the provisions of the Bill, which are humanitarian and observe the humanities to a far greater degree than has hitherto applied to this important problem of securing to our native population their rightful chance in our society.

Full citizenship as offered to the Aborigines under these provisions will lead to an elevation of their own personal desires to be found worthy of the trusts reposed in them. That is the crux of the whole situation and, when this Bill is passed and becomes law, those whose lives are so deeply affected by this legislation will attain their rightful place, so much so that possibly we ourselves shall be surprised

that so much can be achieved when the right foundations are provided for progressive improvement in the lot of a people which, so far, has not been very happy. When we view the history of Aborigines and note their close attention to tribal law and the whole tenor of their conduct as a people when divorced from the ill-effects of contact with white people, we can see a very proud and lovely background to the way of living of those people. They were no doubt very backward; they were nomads and had no permanent place for growing food. They were pitiful nomads with difficult terrain on which to roam, but they did observe magnificently their own tribal laws. It was the white man's contact with them that really brought this proud people to such a pitiful condition. It is our duty to ensure that, as far as we can, we make amends for that hurt and harm caused them—not by the good people of our race but by the bad—which have so horribly affected the general well-being of the Aborigines.

Mr. Hutchens: And the lack of understanding that all men were created equal.

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes. Whatever colour we may be, we are human beings. It is vitally important to remember that. The dignity of man applies to a dark-complexioned person just as it does to a white man. I speak this evening purely from a general observation of the intentions and aspirations of this Bill. I say that this is the finest approach thus far made towards rehabilitating in many ways the Aboriginal and raising him to the status to which he is entitled. We should do our utmost to ensure a better and fairer assimilation of these people. As individauls we must accept them into our communities. After all, they were the original residents of Australia. I congratulate the Minister on his humane approach to this vitally important problem and I hope that this legislation will achieve its objectives. I support the second reading.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I regret that I do not know sufficient about the subject to be able to speak with authority. I congratulate the Minister on introducing this Bill, which is a symbol of his sympathy for the people that it aims to help. It is interesting and gratifying to note that the members most closely connected with this problem speak with equal sympathy. The member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) has an academic approach to this subject and he elucidated the legal aspects clearly and fairly. At this stage I do not claim to have analysed his proposed amendments and I will require his explanation of them before I decide whether to accept them or the Minister's proposals.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member would not be in order in discussing the amendments, because they have not been moved yet.

Mr. QUIRKE: I do not intend to. I will scrutinize them closely when they are moved. I sincerely thank the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) for his speech which, although long, was not wearisome. It was educational and he fully explained every aspect of the problem with which he dealt. The member for Frome (Mr. Casey) also made a fine contribution to this debate. Many of us are not familiar with the problems under discussion and those who have spoken have shown that they speak with authority and we must be guided by them. Those members of Parliament who are closely connected with this subject are sympathetic to the Bill's aims and to those people it seeks to help. The white man is responsible for the degradation of our Aborigines. The Aborigines did not degrade themselves; we did. If any uplift is needed it is our responsibility to provide it. Members have recognized our responsibilities in that regard. This is not a Party political matter. We must assure the Minister that we are all prepared to help uplift the people that we have pulled down and that we all seek their restoration to a status similar to our own.

The member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) and other members have referred to the drink problem. All members know that I am a winemaker, but I would not like wine to be supplied to Aborigines. It is all very well to speak of easing the prohibition on the consumption of liquor by Aborigines, but if they are to drink alcohol let it be beer. They should be broken in, as it were, to drinking. It is the nature of Aborigines when they drink to drink their fill. If they want to drink beer they will drink it as we do, in large quantities. If they want to drink wine, they will drink their fill of that, too. If liquor is ever permitted into reserves, it should be beer. We should not permit them to drink wine and spirits until they learn to appreciate that a quarter of an inch of spirits or an inch of wine is equal to what we call a butcher of beer. I agree that no penalty is too severe for those persons who provide Aborigines with the dope—and it is nothing more than that—mentioned by the member for Whyalla.

I realize that Aboriginal families are being established in various country towns. They are good people. Those natives are employed by councils, by the Railways Department, and by others, and they are willing workers; I do not

know of one who is a failure. However, from my own observation I would say that it is wrong to have only one Aboriginal family in a town such as Clare, for instance; there should be at least two families, and they should live not side by side but at different ends of the town. At times these people crave for their own mutual association, and to have only one family with a completely different outlook in many respects in a town is wrong; another family should be brought in from an entirely different area. The town of Clare does not resent the good family that is there today, and it would not resent another one. One Aboriginal family should not be left entirely on its own, for these people cannot be assimilated in that way. At times these people want to come together with someone of their own race, because they get very lonely when first moved into a town. I put that forward as my own observation, and I think that on an analysis of the subject honourable members will realize that that is correct.

I am not conversant with this subject, and as I said earlier, I regret that, because I consider that we should all be fully conversant with it, for we owe these people much. What we have taken from them we can never adequately repay, but we must do our best. If this is the first measure that aims at uplifting these people and bringing them back at least to the natural dignity that they once had, then we must approach the subject sympathetically, without any political leaning but as a Parliament unitedly endeavouring to do the best we can for the people who deserve the best that we can give them.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): I rise with some trepidation in addressing myself to this Bill because, like the member for Burra, I admit that I am no expert on the matter. I have had some 30 years or more of association with some Aborigines, but the more I have associated with them and the more I have tried to understand them the more I am convinced of how little I really know about them. I am of the opinion that if there is an Aboriginal problem it cannot be accepted as one problem, for different circumstances are associated with every different locality in which Aborigines may find themselves placed. What can be true of a settlement in one area may not be true at all of another settlement. However, I am sure that it is a problem that cannot be solved merely by an Act of Parliament. I believe that attitudes of mind on the part of the Aboriginal people themselves and the attitudes of mind on the part of the white people who are their neighbours are important if there is to be a happy association and relationship between the two.

I pay a tribute to those who have addressed themselves to this debate, because I think the contributions have been of a very high standard. This House is indebted to those who have made a study of the past history of Aborigines and of this legislation, and who have examined the wording and phraseology of the various clauses in an attempt to see that people overseas do not get the wrong impression of the white people's attitude towards Aborigines. Quite frankly, I have not done that, but have left it to others. However, from the addresses that have been given in this debate I have a feeling that those members have made that study carefully and at great length; I believe that they have made speeches showing discernment and judgment. I shall not attempt to analyse the Bill before us from that point of view.

I wish to make one or two observations that arise purely out of my own conversations with and knowledge of Aborigines and of the work that has been carried out amongst them. I do not suggest for one moment that those I have spoken to necessarily are representative of all Aboriginal people, for I am sure that we cannot group Aborigines any more than we can group any other people. I believe that this Bill is evidence of the Minister's desire to give the Aborigines a better deal. I know that the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) has interested himself in Aborigines, not merely for the purpose of this debate. He has made a study of the problem, has attended conferences with Aborigines, and has visited the missions. I know that his desire is to speak for Aborigines in trying to achieve a better deal.

I think the district of the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) now embraces a number of Aborigines who have moved from one location to another. Those that were moved from Ooldea were nomadic people, the very people with whom Daisy Bates lived and worked; they were transplanted from there because they were starved out, as other Aborigines are being starved out, of their native grounds, not necessarily because white people have gone into those places but because white people definitely have interfered with the game upon which they lived, and seasons have taken their water. Those people have had to come in to the fringe areas in order to exist, and having come in and tasted our food and sweet meats and sugar they are

not prepared to go back or happy to go back hunting again and living solely in that way.

Those people were taken to Yalata (the station which was purchased by the Government after much debate in this place) where there was still a quantity of native game. Members will recall the agitation when they were moved. First, the white folk in that area said that this was not a suitable place for a mission and that it did not possess sufficient water or game, and other steps were taken to prevent their going there. I can remember the then member for that district, who was a Minister, standing in this House and telling us that he had received a wire from the West Coast saying that there would be a civil war if the Aborigines were taken to Yalata. They were not there long before there was a different kind of representation from this area. This station, which had not been regarded as suitable for a mission, then became a valuable station so good that it was too good for Aborigines, and people wanted to have it subdivided and let out to white people to run their flocks. That is indicative of the attitude of many people towards Aborigines, and unfortunately it is indicative of some people's attitude today.

In order that any policy of assimilation and integration can be successful, it is necessary to recognize that there are two parties to the matter. It is just as important to concentrate on re-orientating the thinking and attitude of the people who are to receive Aborigines as it is to educate Aborigines to take their place. With all the goodwill in the world that is not easy, and I am not sure that I can criticize those who see the matter differently from the way I see it. If this attempt at assimilation fails a situation could grow in our community and in the fringe areas that would make us just as much ashamed as America is ashamed of some situations that have arisen there. I have good reason for saying this; this statement is not made lightly.

I believe this Bill is welcomed in every part of the State by all organizations that have worked in the interests of Aborigines. If there is some part with which they do not agree there is much with which they do agree, believing that the measure means a better deal for Aborigines. It has been said in the debate that the past attitude has been wrong and that it has been an attitude of hand-outs. In my experience I have not seen these hand-outs. The Aborigines I have been amongst have never had an opportunity to make good and nothing they have received can be regarded as a hand-out. True, when work has not been available in the locality that I know, the Government has issued enough rations to keep body and soul together. That has been done for white people, and there was a time when I had to accept that type of treatment. I do not know that it was demoralizing; I do not believe we can regard it as a hand-out and say that out of a benevolent and kindly attitude of the State we have been over-generous to Aborigines. I have not seen this. If any criticism is to be made it is that we have been niggardly towards Aborigines and that they have not had a chance.

South Australia expects that arising from this new move there will be a new deal, and I believe this is possible if we can get the co-operation of all our people. If this matter is handled sensibly and constructively with an understanding of the difficulties associated with assimilating and integrating these people, some Aborigines will be able to take their places in our way of life and stand on their own feet without needing outside help to protect them from those who would exploit them, but others still need that protection. I have seen too much exploitation to think otherwise. When some Aborigines get their pay envelopes, they are taken off them within a day or two by white people; these people need some protection. I would support a restriction in a Bill such as this measure on the operations of the white people, not the Aborigines. This Bill proposes lifting some restrictions but, despite what some people think, this will not free the Aborigines. It will lift restrictions from white people and we shall be saying to Aborigines, "You must stand on your own feet without protection. Nobody has any right to stand up for you. If you are foolish enough to let people take you down the only redress you have is the redress that white people have."

Some time ago I was interested in a young lady at a mission station which I had visited many times. This girl was brought there from the outback after being deserted by her tribe. When she arrived she had no clothing, was blind and was suffering from malnutrition. Nobody could speak her language and she could not speak English. The ladies there had to give her a name; they called her Wendy. They had to guess her age, which they decided was about 10. I saw this girl undergo medical treatment and have daily massage by the sisters until her eyes, which had turned inside out, were turned so that the pupils, which formerly

were not visible, could be seen. Her sight was restored, and she was taught at the mission. There came the day when she was to be married and I was asked to give her away. The idea was to popularize Christian weddings. People at this mission had been completely cut off from tribal custom, they were not observing marriage of any kind, and many were the sad stories as a result of women being left without family protection and not observing either tribal law or our law.

It was thought that in this case it would be a good thing to popularize the idea of Christian marriage, and there was a wedding and a great celebration. This girl made her own frock and her wedding cake and the young man who came from the north to marry her was a fine fellow. After the wedding some of the older citizens thought it would be a good idea if they were married too, and some of them were. One couple went to the Methodist minister, who was a lawyer, to be married. Twelve months later the Aboriginal came back and said that his wife had left him and asked what he was to do about it. We have been told that these people possess all the rights that we have. The minister could have told him to consult a lawyer with a view to approaching the courts where he could obtain redress. That would not have satisfied this man. When asked, he said that he did not know where his wife was. It was suggested that he should talk to her to see if she would return, but he said she would not come back. He asked what he should do under our law, because under his law he would have speared the male offender. Under our law he could have taken that man to court and sued him. That does not give these people much comfort when they are told that they have the same right of access to the law as we have. There must be much more understanding in that and in other respects. Somebody is needed to take a personal interest in these people and bring them to the stage where they can fend for themselves.

It is not always possible to tell them that they have to accept this responsibility, but I believe that in one generation we can achieve that result. I have observed the work carried out amongst Aboriginal children and that has convinced me that if they are given the opportunity to attend school at the same age as our children, receive the same opportunities throughout and, when they have finished school, are given employment, they will make good.

Mr. Nankivell: Don't you think that is the most important point?

Mr. RICHES: That is the important thing—to provide constructive and interesting employment when they leave school, but so far we have not been able to do that. Where that does not take place, where we have this enforced idleness in the teenage years, where, after schooling, no work is available for them except as hewers of wood and carriers of water, where the last one on is the first one off, and where they are only called on if the season brings about a shortage of labour, I do not care what is the colour of a man's skin: we shall have the same result. I suggest that if the member for Stirling has found that Aborigines do not show an inclination to stay on a job that is the reason. Those of us who can remember the depression years, when we could not provide gainful employment to our young men in their formative years, know that we had the same trouble with them. It is an economic problem. This claim can be substantiated—that of all the children who have passed through the Umeewarra Mission not one has gone bush. That is a challenge. Every one of them has made good.

Mr. Quirke: Did they come from the bush?

Mr. RICHES: Yes, and I pay a tribute to the department for its work at Umeewarra. There we are able to see every phase of South Australia's policy on the assimilation of Aborigines. We have the Aborigines coming in from the outback where they built and lived in wurlies. Recently the Government provided two-room houses in which they could live and, after having become used to living indoors, several of the families were provided with houses in the town by the Aborigines Department. Substantial opinion was to the effect that they were better off living in wurlies. However, every one of those Aborigines made good because they were given the opportunity to do so. If some of them had been placed straight into the towns we would have had all kinds of trouble.

This assimilation programme has proved such a success that the native population is growing so rapidly that it is not possible for the Government to meet the demand for housing. Approximately 400 Aborigines live in and around Port Augusta and that represents a sizeable community. Many of them attend the picture shows and concerts, walk about the streets, attend our churches and generally are accepted into the community life. As far as I have been able to ascertain every one of those people has been well-behaved and well-received and there has been a commendable tolerance. Children from the mission who are able to take their place with the white children are brought

into the white schools and are treated in every respect in the same way as white children. All that has been achieved under the present legislation and it has not been found necessary to alter the law to make those changes. Another big change made, commencing from January, 1962, related to the education of Aboriginal children. It was found possible under the Act for the Education Department to accept the responsibility of taking Aboriginal children, to appoint departmental teachers at schools and to arrange departmental oversight and co-operation at all the missions. That, too, has been done under the existing legislation.

The Bill seeks to give impetus to that movement, the necessity for which has been recognized by the department and the effectiveness of which was reported on in the most recent *Sunday Mail* and referred to in some detail by the member for Whyalla. Under this Bill we expect to have the same progressive approach as we have had in the last two or three years. We are entrusting the administration with powers, and the success of the legislation depends on sympathetic understanding and strong administration with adequate power to deal with problems as they arise. On the other hand, much depends on the attitude of the people amongst whom we expect the Aborigines to become assimilated. So far, experiments at Port Augusta have been successful because of the good behaviour of the Aborigines. If this had not been so, the move for assimilation could have been set back for years. The Aborigines must be careful to see that their actions are above reproach. In Port Augusta we are accustomed to Aborigines being in the streets, and we welcome it, but if an Aboriginal should be under the influence of intoxicating liquor no mother would allow her children to go out into the street where he was. We have not had such a situation at Port Augusta and I hope we never shall. The Aborigines who attend town hall functions are well-behaved and cleanly dressed. It would be easy to build up an objection to them if they were not so well-behaved and dressed.

Last week the local newspaper contained a leading article expressing concern that a part-Aboriginal woman had been allowed to enter the women's ward at the Port Augusta Hospital. The Ministers' Fraternal of the town wrote a letter in reply to the leading article and expressed its disagreement with the objection that a white woman had to share the same ward as a part-Aboriginal. The fraternal said:

Surely this is an unjust reason. Are we to infer that you are not in favour of Aborigines sharing hospital accommodation with white patients?

A footnote in black type said:

The writers of this letter have asked a question and therefore they are entitled to a reply. The question is, "Are we to infer that you are not in favour of Aborigines sharing hospital accommodation with white patients?" My answer is an emphatic "Yes."

That brought forth letters to the editor of the newspaper, and they were published in the following issue. It shows that at Port Augusta there is a prejudice which could express itself more forcibly, and assimilation could be set back many years if the matter is not handled with tact. The recent incident at Port Pirie has shown how difficult it is to settle Aborigines in any community where they are not wanted. They are wanted at Port Augusta. We have a town hall, equal to any town hall in South Australia. When picture shows are held in it the Aborigines sit in the front seats. When the South Australian Symphony Orchestra, or a body of that description, comes to a town the front seats are usually the most expensive seats, but at Port Augusta tickets for the front seats cannot be given away. The people who would not sit in the front seats would deny that they had a strong objection to Aborigines. The position at Port Augusta is real and cannot be overlooked. It could happen anywhere. We must consider the matter carefully.

One provision has been taken out of the Bill. I hope it is a good move, but it must be replaced with another authority; otherwise there will be difficulties. I refer to the provision giving the department power to ask an Aboriginal family to move from one place to another. At Port Augusta the department has not only built houses for Aborigines, but whilst the Aborigines have been living in wurlies it has built showers, ablution blocks and toilets for them so that there would be some semblance of hygiene. Coloured people often come to the outskirts of Port Augusta where they stay without any thoughts of health and hygiene. In the past that situation has been dealt with by officers of the department, because they can talk to the natives in their own language and persuade them to go elsewhere. If necessary the department has helped to find accommodation for them. Some have been given rent-free houses, some have been assisted in the payment of rent, and some have been accommodated on stations. Under the Bill there will be no power to do this. It will be said that councils should do the work, but in some areas there are no councils. This is

the sort of thing that has happened on the outskirts of Port Augusta. Last week I saw two settlements that had grown up in the last two months. The next alternative is to get the health inspector to serve them with a notice. They are trespassing; they are on open ground. The two I saw a fortnight ago happened to be on land that "land sharks" got hold of at the turn of the century and sold to unsuspecting people in other States who have long since lost interest in it. Some of them may be paying rates on it but the Aborigines certainly did not own the land and the landholder, if interested, could move them off.

Mr. Nankivell: Under the new Act that would be the only means by which you could shift them.

Mr. RICHES: Somebody could get in touch with the Central Board of Health in Adelaide, which could issue notices that they were not complying with the health regulations.

Mr. Dunstan: The board has power to declare that the land is in an insanitary condition.

Mr. RICHES: I think that is what would have to be done. The clause has been struck out of the Bill. The same power will still have to be exercised, and, I suggest, by the same officers if it is to be a success. Perhaps an arrangement could be made for the Welfare Officer of the Aborigines Department to be given some authority by the Public Health Department in this matter. It could be done.

Mr. Dunstan: The Minister has undertaken to follow that procedure. It is an Act that applies to everybody in the same way; it is not discriminatory.

Mr. RICHES: That could not apply to everybody in the same way because, if the Aboriginal Welfare Officer spoke to any white person about a health matter, that person would want to know what his qualifications were as a health inspector. His rights could be challenged at law.

Mr. Dunstan: If authorized by the Central Board of Health it would be all right.

Mr. RICHES: It is a sort of face-saving provision rather than any alteration in the practice to be followed. I hope it will work all right but I have some misgivings about it. There are several things about this Bill that are more or less experimental and depend heavily upon administration. It is fair to give the Bill a trial and, if any part of the new proposals do not work, this House may take action later, if necessary. I do not know that legislative action is so much necessary as a proper approach from the department, the department's being given sufficient funds to do the job, and the officers being told that they are expected to give Aborigines a new deal. Most of the officers are dedicated men.

One of the big alterations which could be made, and which I hope the House will consider seriously, is that by which the department would be more directly responsible to this House than hitherto. I propose to support the foreshadowed amendments placing the department more directly under the Minister's control. This point has not yet been answered satisfactorily but perhaps some valid reasoning will emanate from those members who speak in Committee. The number of Aborigines in South Australia is infinitesimal compared with the number of children under the Education Department—and that department is placed under a Minister, who administers it quite well (if I may say so) and is responsible to this House for his administration of it. If the Bill were amended in the way suggested by the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) so that there was a more direct approach through the Minister, this department might well function more smoothly and efficiently in the future.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is not in order in discussing amendments at this stage. They have not yet been moved.

Mr. RICHES: I indicate my support for the Bill and I welcome it, as I think every section of the community does, and look forward to a constructive discussion when we move into Committee.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): I, too, support this measure because we, as both citizens and a Parliament, have a long overdue obligation to the Aborigines. The Government cannot be credited with the introduction of this Bill. It has been in office for about 30 years and so has had ample opportunity before now to do something for these people. Today there is much concern not only in Australia but in various parts of the world about the coloured races. There has to be a reason why we or the Government have decided at this stage to introduce a measure to do something for the Aborigines. As Christians, we have not fulfilled our obligation to them. I suppose honourable members on both sides of this House know that the Aborigines have been belted from pillar to post and exploited by experts.

As a boy, I was reared alongside one of the biggest Aboriginal missions in the Commonwealth. It was then called the Baramba Mission; it is now known as the Cherburg

Mission. From that mission came Eddie Gilbert, the fast bowler whom Gil Langley would probably know; Harold Blair, who is well-known as a singer; Gerry Gerome, a triple champion boxer of Australia; Ronnie Richards, who fought and, I think, brought some fame to Australia; and Lieut. Saunders, under whom many Australian soldiers were happy to serve. He was a fine man, respected by everybody who served with him. I cite these people because, when we see what they have achieved, we know that there is no fear of what their kinsfolk can achieve; but, for some reason, we have paid no attention to them and have kept them down. I know the reason: it is colour. When we look at the black men and say they are black, they have every reason to look at us and say we are white. One has only to listen when coloured people are being discussed to realize that they are regarded as inferior. I have heard people say how easily coloured people can be talked out of something. That situation applies because we have not given our Aborigines an opportunity to prove what they can do. I sincerely hope that when this Bill becomes law it will be adequately policed so that there will not be a repetition of what happened at Port Pirie. I do not know what went wrong there, but something did. The Government intended to settle Aboriginal people in Risdon Park, but the proposal suddenly lapsed. I asked the Minister what had happened, but the Minister was evasive and did not give a satisfactory reply until today. The petitioners who opposed the proposal were few in number and they did not have the sympathy of the people at Port Pirie generally. The Bill has my blessing; I support it and hope that it will be adequately enforced.

Bill read a second time.

Mr. DUNSTAN moved:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider amendments relating to prohibition of consumption of liquor by certain persons, the functions of the board, the formation of any subsidy payments to Aborigines welfare organizations, the duties of the Minister, reserves and election of committees of management thereof, education of Aborigines, the powers of officers of the department, and the provision of canteens on reserves.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I rise on a point of order. Is this instruction in order?

The SPEAKER: I have given this matter some consideration and I have noted that this motion for an instruction embraces a considerable number and diversity of subjects and would appear to warrant the introduction of a separate Bill. However, precedents can be found to support an instruction for such extensive purposes, and therefore the motion cannot be held to be inadmissible. The use of instructions is one of a number of subjects being brought before the Standing Orders Committee, but the print of the amendments proposed to be covered by the instruction is not available, or was not available until a few moments ago. I point out to the House that its agreement to the instruction moved by the member for Norwood will not operate to authorize the consideration of any amendment which might otherwise be out of order. The motion is therefore in order. Is it seconded?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I second the motion.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4.

Mr. DUNSTAN: This is the first clause to which I take exception. Many of the subsequent objections taken in amendments turn on this clause. As outlined by members, it is clear that we do not agree that there should be a retention of special restrictions upon Aborigines by virtue of their race and we do not agree that there should be a differentiation between Aborigines of the full-blood and those of the part-blood in placing restrictions upon them. What the Minister here proposes to do is to separate two classes of Aboriginal people, making some subject to certain restrictions on the ground that they are more likely to be in primitive or nomadic conditions, and excluding others from the restrictive provisions of the Bill. Let us examine the restrictive provisions that will apply to those Aborigines who are of the full-blood and who have not obtained exemptions. I submit that these restrictions can be coped with in the ordinary social provisions of our other legislation; that any restrictions that need to be placed upon Aborigines can be dealt with as if they were other people in the community and that there is no need to place special restrictions on them under the Act because they are Aborigines.

If we examine the Bill to see what the effects of the first part of this clause will be upon Aborigines—that is, Aborigines of the full-blood who are not exempt—the first will be that they will be on the register of Aborigines and will have to apply for exemption if they want to get off it. That, in turn, means that once they are on the register and have not exemptions they may be removed to reserves if the Minister or the board deems fit, and they can be kept there. They may be examined and

compulsorily treated if they have some contagious or infectious disease. As I understand the Minister's proposals, the main purpose of this is to enable inspections for venereal disease. The old venereal disease provision has not been repeated in its original terms. They may have their estates administered by the board without their authority if a special magistrate orders that protection. They are the restrictions that may be placed upon Aborigines of the full-blood.

We do not agree that removal to an institution is necessary. Cases cited to us where an Aboriginal is to be required to be in an institution are those where he needs to be there to ensure that his children are looked after. However, that can be coped with under the Maintenance Act, as I shall explain later. We do not agree that any other Aboriginal should be enforced to be kept within an institution; in effect, it is imprisonment within an institution, and we do not agree to that restriction.

There is full power to make regulations under the Health Act to cope with everything that is necessary for the treatment of contagious and infectious diseases without having a specific provision for Aborigines. No difficulty is experienced in respect of the curatorship of Aborigines' estates where Aborigines consent, and in fact consent is often given to the present board to take control of Aborigines' estates. However, if an Aboriginal is sufficiently determined that he does not want the board or the Minister to administer his estate, then our attitude is that there should be no power to take over his estate. If he wants to do it for himself he should be given that right, even though he may make a mess of it, because otherwise we are not going to get effective assimilation or integration. If those people want the right to administer their own property they should be given the right, like anybody else in the community.

Those are the only three things in which the Minister believes some differentiation is required between Aborigines of the part-blood and Aborigines of the full-blood. In our view, each one of those restrictions is unnecessary as a specific restriction upon Aborigines by virtue of their race. Therefore, we see no reason for this definition. In fact, we see no need for a definition in the Act at all as to which people are Aborigines or persons of Aboriginal blood. Within the Victorian Act, which has removed all restrictive provisions from Aborigines in that State, there is no definition. There need be no definition here, if all the Act is providing is a department to assist people who are in need of help. We do not need to define Aborigines. It will be within the administration of the department to treat people whom it calls Aborigines or persons of Aboriginal blood, and no case can arise where it is necessary to differentiate between those people and other people in the community. Therefore, we believe that a definition clause is unnecessary.

There is the further point that if the Minister's contention is correct and we need to differentiate between people who are in primitive or nomadic conditions and other Aborigines in the community, then this is an illogical division. Plenty of people of the full-blood are well developed and ready for assimilation or integration into the community, whereas plenty of people of the part-blood are not as yet in a position to be fully assimilated. In that respect we run into a grave difficulty on the basis of this definition. As to the Minister's proposals relating to the liquor provisions, there are in the areas that he will proclaim Aborigines of the full-blood living together with Aborigines of the part-blood in entirely similar conditions as a group. The Aborigines of the part-blood are not to be subjected to any restriction, but Aborigines of the full-blood who are on the register are to be. We certainly cannot separate them on that basis. The only way we could make some separative restrictive provision would be to define the condition of the people—to say that these are people who are living in primitive or nomadic conditions and they are the people to whom the restrictions shall apply. We cannot do it on the basis of their colour or on the basis of how much Aboriginal blood and how much European blood they have. That is an illogical division, and if it is persisted in I think it will cause much trouble at a later date. I do not think it is necessary to make a division, but if a division is made I do not think this is the proper division. I believe that it is preferable that we should see to it that the restrictions that the Minister believes should be imposed upon certain people in primitive and nomadic conditions should be administered through the ordinary law of the community, as I believe that they can be without any special restrictions of race at all. That being the case, there is no need for this clause, and the Opposition strongly opposes its retention.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works): This clause is vital to the whole Bill, for if we do not define the people to whom it relates, we have no Bill. We are

providing benefits of a special nature for a section of the community, and as I see it the Bill falls to the ground unless there is some definition of the people to whom it applies.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Jenkins, Laucke, Millhouse, and Nankivell, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson (teller), Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, and Mrs. Steele.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan (teller), Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh, and Fred Walsh.

Pair.—Aye—Sir Cecil Hincks. No—Mr. Ralston.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I cast my vote in favour of the Ayes. The question therefore passes in the affirmative.

Clause thus passed.

Clause 5—"Constitution of Board."

Mr. DUNSTAN: I move:

To strike out subclauses (2) and (3).

This is the first of a series of amendments designed to alter the basis of administration of this legislation. As the Bill stands, it is proposed that the Aboriginal Affairs Act will be administered by the board, which will be the effective administrative authority, and the Minister will have some oversight of certain matters that may be referred to him. I see no reason for continuing this method of administration in this or any department. It is undesirable that a department as important as this should have its day-to-day administration committed to a board of part-time persons. It may well be that such a board can be of considerable assistance in advising the Minister on the working of the Act and on proposals to improve the lot of Aborigines, but to say that day-to-day administration must be committed to the board, that the Director must report to it, that it is to give the notices provided in the Act, that it shall administer all reserves and that it shall deal with all the files relating to the 6,000-odd Aborigines in South Australia is not a satisfactory form of administration. Difficulties have been experienced in administration by the Prisons Board, and I cannot see that such difficulties will not recur if the board is to be the administrative authority in the future.

From the point of view of Parliament it is preferable to have a Minister directly responsible to Parliament for the day-to-day administration of the department. It is proper that a Minister should know what is happening, take responsibility for his actions, and be answerable here. It is far better that this should happen than that we should ask questions of the Minister and be told that he will get a report from the Chairman of the board. It is not proposed that the Minister be the Chairman of the board, as required under the old Act, although in practice he has tended not to be. If we are to have the new deal for Aborigines that the Minister has said he believes this Act will be, I believe he should be closely in touch with what is going on in the department and with the individual files. That is not beyond the competence of a Minister. As the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) said, as a big department such as the Education Department is committed to the administration of a Minister responsible to Parliament for the department and for the great deal of detailed administration involved in it, there should be no difficulty about a Minister's administering a department of this kind.

I hope the Minister will be prepared to accept this and subsequent amendments designed to make him the administering authority and the board an advisory authority. The purpose of the amendment is to remove the provision that the board shall be a body corporate and have perpetual succession and a common seal. This will not be necessary if this function is taken over by the Minister (dealt with in a later amendment) and it will not be necessary for judicial notice to be taken of incorporation of the board if in fact it is an advisory authority, which I believe it should be.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Although I do not very much like the proposals this amendment and subsequent consequential amendments entail, I see no real objection in principle except that I do not think it is much of a compliment to the board that it is not to have any executive functions to perform. It would be my desire to appoint a board of capable people; in saying that I am not reflecting on those capable people who have acted on it in the past. Under the Act under which they have worked, they have done a first-class job of administration, but it will be necessary under the new Act to appoint a new board. I hoped that we would attract to it the most competent people with academic and scientific training and practical experience. Reducing the board to a purely advisory authority as proposed by the amendment would not be conducive to

attracting to it the kind of people we would desire to appoint. Apart from that, I think the real reason behind this amendment and the projected amendments is that members of the Opposition think, quite wrongly, that the Minister has from time to time sheltered behind a board and somewhat attempted to avoid his responsibilities to Parliament because of the executive operations of a board. I believe that is the reason behind the amendment, if I have assessed it correctly. However, if the proposals are accepted the Minister must have some power of delegating routine matters from day to day. I think the Opposition's requirements would be satisfied if the Minister, as head of the department, were responsible to Parliament for everything done within the department and were answerable for all actions within the department as Ministers are in respect of operations in other departments.

I do not know whether the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) accepts that, but I believe that is the reason behind the amendment and, if that is so, I am prepared to accept the amendment and the necessary consequential amendments provided some provision is made in the Bill for the Minister to delegate routine matters while retaining the responsibility for any action taken so that he does not escape or avoid any responsibility, but escapes the necessity of having to cross every "t" and dot every "i" or, in other words, so that he, personally, does not have to issue relief and attend to welfare activities, etc. If a provision is inserted in the Bill to make that possible I am prepared to accept the suggestions of the member for Norwood. He has circulated a copy of other amendments that he will later move, but they will be consequential. I suggest that he should signify his agreement on this point so that we shall know where we are going as to his intentions towards the amendment. The new subclause that I foreshadow will be as follows:

16. (5) The Minister may, from time to time, delegate to the Director or any officer of the Department of Aboriginal Affairs such powers and functions as the Minister deems fit.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I am prepared to accept that.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: On the understanding that the member for Norwood is prepared to accept that wording I am prepared to accept his amendment.

Mr. QUIRKE. I enter a word of protest. A contingent notice of motion appears on today's Notice Paper giving the conditions under which the member for Norwood is to move amendments to this Bill. Those amendments have been on members' files for only about 10 minutes, and I do not think that is right. I am sympathetic and I know that this is not a political issue, but we are here to endeavour to do everything we can. The Minister has introduced the Bill and Parliament is adjudicating on something that will affect the interests of the people, and I enter my protest at the late delivery of these amendments. The only member who knows anything about them is the member for Norwood. I am not unsympathetic towards his amendments and I will adjudicate on them, as every honourable member will, according to their merits, but it is distinctly unfair to expect Parliament to deal with these amendments when they have been on members' files for only 10 minutes. In an important matter like this members should have had much more time to peruse these things and to assess them in relation to the Bill introduced by the Minister. Therefore, I enter an emphatic protest, because this has not given members sufficient time.

I wish to do the best I possibly can, but how can we possibly do that in these circumstances. We are now relying on whether the Minister accepts the amendments as the member for Norwood puts them up. I am not antagonistic towards the member for Norwood, and I give him full credit for these amendments, but we should have had them here earlier to enable us to adjudicate on them. What are we going to do now? We have to listen right on the death knock to these things. In future if the honourable member has important amendments like this to embody in a Bill, Parliament should have more time to examine them so that members can individually adjudicate upon them.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I appreciate the Minister's preparedness to accept these amendments and I give an assurance that I entirely agree with the amendment he proposes to move to clause 16. As far as the remarks of the member for Burra are concerned, I regret that members did not have the details of these amendments before this evening. Some difficulty was experienced because in the interim there were some negotiations and representations going on between other parties and between myself and the Minister on the form of the new Bill to be introduced. However, if the member for Burra would read in detail the lengthy speech I delivered to the House in the second reading debate on the original Bill he would find each

one of these amendment specifically outlined there.

Mr. Quirke: This is not the same thing.

Mr. DUNSTAN: The substance of the thing is there, and it is the substance of the amendment the Minister is working out now. I regret that I was unable to have this done earlier. I assure the member for Burra that much work was required to decide what consequential amendments should be made, and I had them on the files as soon as it was humanly possible as far as I was concerned.

Mr. Quirke: I accept your apology.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 6—"Composition of Board."

Mr. DUNSTAN: I move:

After "Governor" in paragraph (*b*) to insert "at least three of whom shall be Aborigines or persons of Aboriginal blood."

When the Minister explained the Bill originally he said he wanted a board consisting of the best qualified persons to carry out the functions of the board and repeated it again today. He pointed out that he did not want restrictions and thought it would be wrong to write in a restriction. He did not see any reason to say that a certain number on the board should be women or Aborigines. If they were qualified he thought they should be appointed. In general, I agree with that. I do not believe, generally speaking, in writing in restrictions, but there is a valid exception here. The Aborigines are concerned that when the board is appointed there shall be on it people of their own race to act in a measure as spokesmen for them. I know the Minister wants to appoint Aborigines to the board and is looking for people with the highest qualifications. I appreciate his views in this matter. If he is unable to find Aboriginal people to satisfy him in regard to qualifications, there should still be Aborigines on the board, which is what the Aborigines want.

In Victoria and New South Wales (I am not sure about Western Australia) there are Aborigines on the boards. I know these Aborigines, and they are people who might not satisfy the Minister as being Aborigines with the highest qualifications. Nevertheless, there is a strong feeling amongst Aborigines there that the persons concerned should be on the board because they want someone who can in a measure act as spokesmen for them. In these circumstances, despite the Minister's views on the subject, which I fully appreciate, I ask that the amendment be accepted.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I ask the Committee to retain the clause as drafted. The honourable member has given me credit for sincerity in this matter, and has accepted my statement that I desire to have Aborigines on the board. I repeat that, and Mr. Miller, the acting head of the department, is now looking for Aboriginal people who would be able to perform the duties of board members. It is a mistake when determining the composition of boards, generally speaking, to stipulate that there shall be specified types of people. It is desired to appoint Aborigines to the board if we can find qualified people, and I think they can be found. I do not believe that the amendment should be accepted and have three of a board of six that are necessarily Aborigines, or Aborigines of good qualification. We should have a board consisting of various people who could contribute in their spheres something of value to the board. It would be wrong to prescribe the type of people to be appointed. The best people available will be appointed.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister considered the situation that might arise if a future Minister is not of the same mind as he is? As there is nothing in the Bill to insist that there shall be people of Aboriginal blood on the board, a different set of circumstances could exist. Will he consider having two Aborigines on the board instead of three? Earlier today I said that in our Bill we suggested a board of eight persons, at least three of whom would be of Aboriginal descent. Under the Bill the board is to consist of seven members, including a chairman.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not think it is necessary to consider that matter. Whilst this Government is in office there will be a Minister with the same characteristics as I have. If that Government is not in office the honourable member may have the opportunity to appoint his own board.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is "That the words proposed to be inserted be inserted". The Ayes have it.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Mr. Chairman, did you put the question correctly?

The CHAIRMAN: The question is "That the words proposed to be inserted be inserted".

Mr. RICHES: I ask the member for Norwood to consider the suggestion of the member for Whyalla. We might be asking for too much in asking for three Aborigines to be on the board, because that would be half the composition of the board. If two were accepted, I would support it, but it is important for members to express themselves in

favour of definite representation by Aborigines on the board. I do not think that the Minister, on reflection, would object, because he said he desires to appoint Aborigines. He expressed complete agreement with the suggestion from this side. The Committee should express the view that there should be Aboriginal representation on the board, but asking for three might be asking too much. I strongly support the suggestion of the member for Whyalla. It would complicate matters if we moved amendments to amendments.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I am prepared to agree to any reasonable proposal such as that, but I do not know whether the Minister is prepared to go that far. I should be happy to go that far if it were a reasonable compromise.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have already stated my position on this matter. I do not need to restate it.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is "That the words proposed to be inserted be inserted".

Mr. LAWN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, previously you put the motion and we voted. There were Ayes and there were no Noes. The Minister then rose—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister rose on a point of order to say that he believed the motion had not been put correctly.

Mr. LAWN: We have now voted a second time.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I put the question and there were the Ayes and there were the Noes, and the Minister rose on a point of order. The member for Stuart subsequently rose—

Mr. LAWN: I am pressing this point. You said you understood the Minister rose on a point of order but, whatever you understood, you permitted the discussion to go on.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister rose on a point of order and put his point. He said he believed that I had put the question incorrectly.

Mr. LAWN: But you did not put it incorrectly.

The CHAIRMAN: Then the honourable member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) wanted to say something.

Mr. LAWN: You admitted that the vote was taken. It had been taken but—

The CHAIRMAN: The voting had not been completed.

Mr. LAWN: I am pressing the fact that the question had been put. It is not a question whether we think you put it to the vote. You said that you understood that the Minister rose on a point of order, but he did not.

The CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

Mr. LAWN: My point of order is that you have allowed the vote to be put twice tonight: once you allowed discussion to take place after you put the vote and now you put the question the second time. I ask you to be consistent.

The CHAIRMAN: I put the question a second time and the Ayes and Noes had both indicated the way they voted. An indication had been given by both sides.

Mr. RICHES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, are you ruling that I cannot be permitted to move for an amendment to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: I called for the Ayes and the Noes. The honourable member did not rise until after the matter had been disposed of.

Mr. RICHES: With great respect, I was on my feet.

The CHAIRMAN: I say I did not see the honourable member on his feet. The question had been put. The honourable member did not rise until the matter had been disposed of.

Mr. Lawn: You didn't see the honourable member on his feet. You were looking at the table.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. DUNSTAN: Have you declared the voting, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! My decision is in favour of the Noes.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan (teller), Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh, and Fred Walsh.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Jenkins, Laucke, Millhouse, and Nankivell, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson (teller), Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, and Mrs. Steele.

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Ralston. No—Sir Cecil Hincks.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. There being an equality of votes, my decision goes in favour of the Noes. The question therefore passes in the negative.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. RICHES moved:

After "Governor" in paragraph (*b*) to insert "at least one of whom shall be an Aboriginal or person of Aboriginal blood."

The CHAIRMAN: It would have been more appropriate to move this amendment earlier, but I am prepared to accept it.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 7 to 12 passed.

Clause 13—"Function of board."

Mr. DUNSTAN: I move:

After "of" first occurring to insert "advising the Minister on the operation of this Act and on measures for".

If this amendment is accepted the clause will read:

The board shall be charged with the duty of advising the Minister on the operation of this Act and on measures for promoting the welfare of Aborigines and persons of Aboriginal blood.

This, of course, flows from the agreement we reached earlier in Committee and is a substantive amendment to give effect to it.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 14—"Funds to be provided by Parliament."

Mr. DUNSTAN moved:

To strike out "board" first occurring and insert "Minister".

Amendment carried.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to the honourable member that the word "board" also appears as the last word of this clause. I do not know whether that requires amending.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I think it does, and I am obliged to you, Mr. Chairman, for drawing my attention to it. I move:

To strike out "board" second occurring and insert "Minister".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 15—"Duties of board."

Mr. DUNSTAN moved:

To strike out "board" first occurring and insert "Minister".

Amendment carried.

Mr. DUNSTAN moved:

In paragraph (*a*) to strike out "board" and insert "Minister".

Amendment carried.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I move:

After "reserves" in paragraph (*b*) to insert "but not so as to alienate any portion of such reserves from use by Aborigines or persons of Aboriginal blood;".

The purpose of this amendment is to ensure that there shall be no alienation of existing reserves or reserves to be declared in the future without legislation. The member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) spoke of the necessity of maintaining some form of proprietary right to Aborigines. This was discussed at some length by other speakers during the second reading debate. We do not propose, by our amendments, to set up any system of proprietary rights such as exists for indigenous populations in the United States of America or in Canada. That would involve us in an extraordinarily complicated property Act at this stage of development of Aborigines, but we do want to guarantee to Aborigines that Parliament will scrutinize every removal of reserves from them to make certain that they receive adequate compensating advantages. What is more, we do not propose that there should be any continuance of the system that is still in operation on at least one reserve of share-farming by people who are not Aborigines.

We believe that reserves that are declared should be maintained solely for the use of Aborigines and that they should not be share-farmed by other people. We had something to say earlier about the system of share-farming at Point Pearce over a long period by people who were not Aborigines when in fact there were Aborigines who were prepared to undertake share-farming agreements on the land in question. That system was reported against as long ago as, I think, 1912, and it was still in operation at the time that it was protested about in 1956 in Parliament by the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) and myself. We were told then that a plan was being prepared by the Agriculture Department for the development of two major reserves and that this system would not be continued for any length of time. However, I understand there is still a European share-farmer on Point Pearce, and there certainly was last year when I was there.

Although there has been some return in revenue to the department from that particular share-farming, we believe that it is undesirable. The last share-farming there was share-farming a particularly difficult piece of land which the management of the station thought would not be suitable for Aboriginal share-farming. At the same time, there are other by-products in native bitterness from share-farming of this kind of a reserve which they consider should be kept for their own use. They have been bitter enough over a long period concerning their deprivation of proprietary rights in land and reserves. They hear tales of what has happened to Aborigines in other States who have been removed from the reserves, and in consequence they believe that reserves should not be used by people other than themselves. In consequence, I believe it is wise to include a provision that the management and regulation of reserves shall not alienate any portion

of reserves from use by Aborigines or persons of Aboriginal blood.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Share-farming has been reduced to such small proportions that it will not embarrass the board in any way in its future operations. I am not aware whether any small leases have a currency beyond the present harvest, but I assume that if such leases are in operation they are legal documents and will not be affected by this proposal. Speaking generally, as an enactment for the future I have no objection to the insertion of these words.

Amendment carried.

Mr. DUNSTAN moved:

In paragraphs (*d*), (*e*), and (*f*) to strike out "its" and insert "his".

Amendment carried.

Mr. DUNSTAN moved:

In paragraph (*f*) to strike out "board" wherever occurring and insert "Minister".

Amendment carried.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I move to insert the following new paragraphs:

(*g*) to promote the social, economic and political development of Aborigines and persons of Aboriginal blood until their integration into the general community;

(*h*) to collect information concerning the regional distribution of Aborigines in South Australia and to promote research into the problems of Aborigines.

I do not intend to move to insert paragraph (*i*), which appears on the amendment sheet. I am informed that the Minister, under his general powers under the Bill, has power to make subsidy payment and to give other assistance to institutions and bodies which assist Aborigines, and under the ruling given by the Speaker this new paragraph, if it were moved, would at least require another appropriation. In these circumstances I think it unnecessary to move that additional paragraph. The Opposition considers that new paragraph (*g*) is necessary, because nowhere else in the Bill is the eventual purpose of the Act prescribed. Such a provision is included in Acts dealing with Aborigines in other States. We think this paragraph should be set forth as the Minister's stated aim. New paragraph (*h*) sets out what we think is a proper function of the department and something that is vital to its work and to the work of people in the community who wish to help achieve the aims of the Minister. It is contained in somewhat similar form in certain other recent enactments in other States, and we think it is a wise further provision to direct the Minister that he should promote research.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I see no objection to this except that I think it is quite unneccesary and that there is not much point in loading an Act with unnecessary verbiage. I point out that clause 13, which we have already amended and passed, charges the board and the Minister with the duty of promoting the welfare of Aborigines and persons of Aboriginal blood. It is inherent in the whole tenor of the proposed legislation that the things the honourable member mentions in his amendment should be done, and it has been and will continue to be included in the policy of the department. I do not oppose the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 16—"Department of Aboriginal Affairs."

Mr. DUNSTAN: I move to insert the following new subclause:

(4) The Minister shall be a corporation sole and on the passing of this Act all property of the Aborigines Board instituted under the Aborigines Act, 1939, shall vest in the Minister.

When the Labor Party's Bill was being prepared I consulted the Parliamentary Draftsman and as a result understood that the Aborigines Board had property vested in it. This Bill makes no provision for the transfer of any property, which I think is a necessary provision. As the Minister will now be the administering authority, he should be constituted a corporation sole, as many Ministers are. As he will have the functions of a corporation sole, he should have vested in him the property that was vested in the Aborigines Board under the old Act.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move to insert the following new subclause:

(5) The Minister may from time to time delegate to the Director or any officer of the Department of Aboriginal Affairs such powers and functions as the Minister deems fit.

This is consequential on other amendments that have been moved and is necessary because the constitution and powers of the board have been changed.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.24 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 18, at 2 p.m.