

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, July 13, 1966.

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

HOUSING AGREEMENT BILL.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

AMENDING FINANCIAL AGREEMENT BILL.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

PARTY APPOINTMENTS.

The SPEAKER: I have to advise the House that I have received the following letter from the Secretary of the Liberal and Country Party in the House of Assembly (Mr. Robin Millhouse):

I write to inform you that today, at a meeting of members of the Liberal and Country Party in the House of Assembly, the resignation of the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, G.C.M.G., M.P., as Leader of the Opposition was accepted. Mr. Hall, M.P., has been appointed Leader of the Opposition in his place. Mrs. Steele, M.P., has been appointed Opposition Whip in place of Mr. Hall. Sir Thomas's resignation and the new appointments are effective from today.

May I take this opportunity to congratulate the new Leader on his appointment. I think he realizes that the responsibility he is taking is a heavy one, and a responsibility that has been discharged in the South Australian Parliament with distinction by those who have previously occupied that position. I believe the Leader of the Opposition contributes greatly to the tenor of debates and sets a pattern for the conduct of the House. I congratulate both the member for Gouger and the member for Burnside on their appointments.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I wish to inform the House that I met His Excellency the Governor and Lady Bastyan at the airport this morning and, on behalf of the Government and the people of South Australia, welcomed them back to resume their duties in this State. Sir Edric, who said that he was pleased to be back, appears to be in good health, although perhaps he has lost a pound

or two in weight. However, Lady Bastyan might have put on a pound or two, although, in my opinion, she looks better for it and does not look so drawn as she did before her trip. I also wish to welcome back the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Hon. G. G. Pearson). I hope that in his travels overseas he found something that will lead him to support the Government's view of the necessity for a natural gas pipeline in this State. I believe people in the State are aware of the importance of natural gas to South Australia.

Sir Thomas Playford has retired from a position I held for about 4½ years, and at least he knows what it is like to be in Opposition. He certainly knew what it was like to occupy the position I now hold, as he held it for 27 years. He did not occupy the position of Leader of the Opposition for long; I do not know whether the extra work as Leader precipitated his retirement or whether he believed that after serving the State for so long he should give himself a chance to pay attention to his home life after his busy public life. Quite apart from Party politics, I believe I express the views of all members and of the people of South Australia in saying that he has a record unequalled in any Commonwealth Parliament in the world, although I understand that a person in Canada is chasing his record and has a couple of years to go to equal it. I forget which province that person lives in, but when I met him he appeared to be in good health and perhaps he will create a new record. The way the retiring Leader has dealt with matters in his public life must commend him to all South Australians, and on behalf of the State I say that his has been an outstanding record of achievements in the interests of not only South Australia but of the whole of Australia. However successful this State's achievements may be, we must still look seriously at various matters, particularly at what development will take place in another State as a result of the diversion of the Snowy River. We must see what opportunities still remain open to us following that diversion. Having paid a tribute to the retiring Leader, I can only hope that, as a back-bencher, he will not be too obstructive. I have given him a fairly good character reference, and I think that in return I can hope he will do what he can to assist the Government. I think all I have said is in his favour, and I now wish him success in the representation of his district.

The honourable member for Gouger (Mr. Hall), Sir Thomas's successor, is a young man who has come up quickly from a back-bencher

to the responsible position of Whip and now to this important position of Leader of the Opposition in this Parliament. The honourable member certainly has youth on his side, and I doubt whether we have yet seen the best of him. However, probably that will come now that he has a position of responsibility that will require him to temper down a little and to exercise more mature judgment. Although I would not forecast what responsibility means to some people, I believe from my own experience in that position, and having got somewhere myself, that we can expect better things from the honourable member because of the responsibilities of his office, and I believe this will benefit not only his Party but the functioning of this Parliament in the interest of the people of this State. I think what is involved is bigger than Party politics. I wish the new Leader every success, and I hope he has a very, very long career in that position!

The honourable member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) is the new Whip of her Party. I have the Government Whip sitting behind me, and I am pleased to say that he has not used his whip on me very much. I believe that co-operation exists between the Parties in this House and that the Opposition Whip and the Government Whip work amicably together in facilitating the business of the House, thus enabling Parliament to function well. I wish the honourable member every success in her position. If I have spoken far too long, Mr. Speaker, I apologize, and I conclude by wishing the Leader of the Opposition every success in the long term.

Mr. HALL: I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your very kind remarks concerning my election to this office and for your reference to Mrs. Steele on her election as Opposition Whip. I thank you, Sir, for your references to our past Leader, Sir Thomas Playford, who has now vacated this position. As Leader of the Opposition, I assure you that you have my co-operation in the conduct of the affairs of this House. Through you, Mr. Speaker, I thank the Premier for his good wishes. He was indeed fulsome in his praise of Sir Thomas Playford, and this praise was well deserved, as we all know of the build-up of industry in South Australia for which he was responsible. I thank the Premier for his personal good wishes. I was somewhat intrigued by his language when he wished me a long term as Leader. He said that he had got somewhere, and that statement has whetted my ambition: I assure him that I am out to get his position.

The Opposition will continue to study closely all Government legislation, and it will oppose as vigorously as ever that with which it disagrees. However, when it can co-operate, the Opposition will do so to the best of its ability.

QUESTIONS

THIRD PARTY INSURANCE.

Mr. HALL: In this morning's *Advertiser* appeared a report of an increase in the rates for third party motor vehicle insurance in Victoria. For the metropolitan area there will be an increase of \$2.35 to \$27.30, and for the country an increase of \$3.10 to \$19.80. Has the Premier knowledge of a forthcoming increase in South Australia in rates for compulsory third party insurance?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I regret that I did not notice the reference in this morning's newspaper to which the Leader has referred. I am unable to inform him on this matter, but I shall ascertain the position as soon as possible and bring down a report probably next week.

HAWKER WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked some time ago concerning the Hawker water supply, which has been in dire straits over the past few years?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Approval was recently given for \$9,300 for the erection of a 30,000-gallon reinforced concrete surface tank and associated pipework, and for the removal of about 9,000 cubic yards of silt from the reservoir catchpits and inlet channels. The department is about to prepare a specification to enable tenders to be called for the tank, and it is intended to try to obtain offers from local contractors for the removal of the silt from the reservoir catchpits and inlet channels.

NORTHERN ROADS.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Can the Minister of Works comment on the roads programme for the northern districts of this State, or on any matter incidental thereto?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: At this stage I wish not to comment on road work, but to refer to an unfortunate happening last evening. It is with profound regret that I report to the House that Mr. J. B. Whitford, a trusted servant and one who had rendered great service to the people of the North, passed away last night. He was working on an inspection at one of the camps, and was found dead this morning in a tent. I am confident that I can express on behalf of all those who knew him my sincere sympathy

to his widow and other relatives. We deeply appreciate the magnificent service he rendered. In due course, I shall convey to his widow in writing our sympathy and appreciation of his services.

MARINO QUARRY.

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Mines a reply to my recent question concerning preventive measures to be taken at the Linwood quarry to control the dust menace at Marino?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Minister of Mines has forwarded the following report received from the Director of Mines:

In the comments below the planned programme is the one prepared on March 23, 1966. As arranged, the new crushing plant has been closed since June 17, in order to carry out the work of covering in or housing of the units. As soon as the work on this plant is completed, the remaining work on the old crushing plant will be done:

1. Old crushing plant:

Planned—

Covering in of:

- (i) The primary crusher house.
- (ii) The rolls section.

Progress—

- (i) In abeyance.
- (ii) The housing has been made, but will not be placed in position until plant closed.

2. New plant:

Planned—

Covering in of:

- (i) The primary crusher.
- (ii) The secondary crushers, where an exhaust system and cyclones are to be installed.
- (iii) No. 2 conveyor.
- (iv) Screens and final bin.
- (v) Scalping plant.
- (vi) 4in. re-crushing plant.

Progress—

- (i) In abeyance.
- (ii) Completed.
- (iii) Completed.
- (iv) Work in progress, about half completed.
- (v) Completed.
- (vi) Work in progress.

In addition an area has been quarried out to provide space for ponds to receive the dust collected by the cyclones in the plant. The concrete floor of the ponds is being laid.

3. Roads:

Planned—

To increase the number of water carts on the roads, where necessary, but also to experiment with oil emulsion on roads, and to confine traffic to narrow strips only.

Progress—

Because of wet weather, no actual progress to report in regard to water carts or oil emulsion spray.

However, another half mile of roads has been bituminized. These roads lead from the crushing plants to the quarry floors or benches.

4. Dumps and open spaces:

Planned—

The use of suitable sprays with water chemicals and oil emulsions.

Progress—

No actual work done owing to damp conditions.

5. Quarry: The company has bought a vapour drilling apparatus to be used on the air-track drills. This apparatus will be used to reduce the dust when the drills are operating in hard rock.

KIMBA SCHOOL.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: About three years ago the Kimba council purchased from the Education Department the amenities on the old Kimba school site at a cost of about \$5,000. That money has been paid to the department by the council, the final payment having been made last April. Although I have asked a similar question of the Minister of Education several times, I understand the project is now in the hands of the department of the Minister of Works. Therefore, can the Minister say when this work will be carried out, so that the amenities that were at the old schoolground may be made available to the children at the new area school?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As the honourable member was good enough to indicate late yesterday afternoon that he might ask this question, I have inquired, and find that the work proposed at the Kimba Area School covers the construction of new pavement, drainage, and chain mesh fencing. A satisfactory price has been obtained from a contractor, and I am pleased to say that I have today approved its acceptance.

POWER BOAT COMMITTEE.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question concerning the report of the Power Boat Committee?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Chairman of the Power Boat Committee reports that the committee has been receiving evidence since January last and has completed taking such evidence from private individuals. A start has been made on hearing the comments of clubs and local government authorities, following which submissions from Government departments will be received and information obtained from interstate sources considered. Because of the difficulties associated with arranging day-time meetings for the five committee

members involved, practically all meetings have been and will be held at night. In these circumstances, the completion of the inquiry will not be as rapid as it might otherwise be, but it is expected that the report of the committee will be available by the end of this year.

FREELING SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: On March 1 the Minister of Education said that tenders would be called in about four to six weeks from the date funds were approved for the erection of new toilets at the Freeling Primary School. Can the Minister say what progress has been made in this matter?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall obtain that information for the honourable member.

EASTWOOD INTERSECTION.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked last week relating to traffic lights at the intersection of Greenhill and Fullarton Roads?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague the Minister of Roads reports that the Highways Department and the Road Traffic Board have approved of a scheme for the installation of traffic lights at the intersection of Fullarton and Greenhill Roads. This scheme has been submitted to the City of Burnside for its consideration, as it is to contribute towards the cost of the lights. It is required also to invoke its powers under the Local Government Act to close a kerb and gutter crossing which is considered essential if the lights are to function in a proper and safe manner. As soon as the City of Burnside has indicated its willingness to take the appropriate action, the installation of the lights can proceed.

SUPERPHOSPHATE.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: No doubt the Premier has been informed that the price of superphosphate has been increased by \$3.70 a ton in the Eastern States, and is aware that the price of this commodity comes under the control of the Prices Commissioner in this State. Can he say whether this matter has been referred to the Prices Commissioner, and, if it has, has he any statement to make on what the price of superphosphate will be in this State, following the Prices Commissioner's recommendation, and when it will become effective?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I believe that the last time this matter was discussed in the House it was stated that the Prices Commissioner had the matter in hand and that,

because of certain matters in regard to the companies concerned (particularly in regard to their balance sheets for the year), nothing might be known about this matter until October. However, in case further information is available I will inquire of the Prices Commissioner and inform the House as soon as possible.

GOMERSAL WATER SCHEME.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about when work is likely to commence on extensions of the water main in the Gomersal area (approved of some time ago) to serve primary producers?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports that a gang is at present laying mains in the Allendale area and is due to complete that job at the end of this week. It is expected that main laying will commence in the Gomersal area next week.

FREELING POLICE STATION.

Mrs. BYRNE: When I inspected the Freeling Police Station on July 9, an offensive septic tank effluent disposal problem was evident. The health officer for the district told me that he had made certain representations to the Police Department regarding this matter. Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary to see whether improvements can be made because residents living near the police station are concerned?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am in a somewhat difficult position. In addition to my other responsibilities I am now Acting Chief Secretary. I will make representations on this matter immediately. However, if the Chief Secretary returns by the end of the week, his report will be made available to the honourable member; if he has not returned, I shall make a report available.

TELEVISION EDUCATION.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: On July 6, I asked the Minister of Education a question regarding the role of television in the education programme of the South Australian Education Department. The Minister replied that on the following day he was to attend a conference of Education Ministers of the various States, and that one item on the agenda was to be a discussion on the role of television in the various State departments. As I have had several interested inquiries on this matter from school committee members in my district, can the Minister now indicate the role of television as an educational medium in departmental schools?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The conference I attended was purely exploratory. The Commonwealth Government made its position clear in regard to the Weeden Report on educational television, and the State Governments made clear what they were doing at present. The press report, issued jointly by the Commonwealth and State Governments, accurately conveyed all that I could say about that conference. The South Australian department has a number of teachers who assist with the Australian Broadcasting Commission's educational television programmes, and their work is carried out in their spare time. No teachers carry out work on educational programmes in Education Department time. I think I am correct in saying that we have between 60 and 80 television sets in schools in South Australia at present; no decision has been made to increase that number. A further conference between the Commonwealth and State Governments will be held to deal with the matters raised by the exploratory conference, one matter being the question of better collaboration between the State Education Ministers (and particularly, the various Education Departments) and the A.B.C. programme managers. I believe that is about all the information I can give to the honourable member at present.

AIR POLLUTION.

Mr. HURST: Has the Premier, representing the Minister of Health, a reply to my recent question regarding air pollution?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The regulations subcommittee of the Clean Air Committee has made considerable progress in drafting regulations for consideration by the Clean Air Committee and the Government. The subcommittee's work is not yet complete, but it is expected that the proposed regulations will be ready for consideration by the Government this year.

GAS.

Mr. HEASLIP: In the past, South Australia has been able to progress because the cheapest manufacturing processes have been available. Yesterday, the Premier said that sufficient gas had been found at Gidgealpa to supply the State's requirements for the next 20 to 25 years. He said also that gas had been found off the coast of Victoria, which he did not intend to use. Yesterday I asked him whether he would change his mind and use that gas if it proved cheaper. As he said that my question was so hypothetical

that he could not answer it, I shall try to make the question quite clear now. If cheaper fuel were available, irrespective of whence it came (whether from Victoria, Western Australia or anywhere else), would the Government use that fuel so that costs to South Australian industries would be cheaper and so that those industries would be enabled to compete with markets in the Eastern States to which this State must provide transport?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: If and when fuels associated with natural gas can be imported into South Australia more cheaply than the gas from South Australian deposits, then the matter will certainly be examined. However, I do not know what terms will be offered, and many complications are associated with the question of a pipeline. Many other things are involved in the transportation of natural gas. I do not know whether it will be shipped from State to State as has been done in other parts of the world. However, if the circumstances to which the honourable member refers do arise, we will examine the position.

TRAILER BINS.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question about third party insurance on trailer bins carting oranges to the packing houses in the Upper Murray?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have the following reply from the Minister of Roads:

Following representations in February, 1963, by the members for Ridley and Chaffey, the Road Traffic Board approved the general exemption of certain special-type trailers, which were used for carrying citrus fruits in large single bulk bins, from the provisions of regulation 7.03 under the Road Traffic Act. This regulation requires trailers to be fitted with mudguards. The exemption was approved on the grounds that it was necessary to use a fork lift truck to unload the large single bin from the trailer and that the forks of the lifting truck would foul the mudguards, if fitted to the trailers. The exemption applied to trailers which were then in use by the growers.

The board requested at the time that consideration be given to a modified design of future trailers so that mudguards could be fitted, and that the speed of the trailers be restricted to 20 m.p.h. Following a request dated January 21, 1965, from Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative Limited, of Berri, for mudguard exemptions for approximately 700 members of its society, two of the board's officers visited the area and inspected a number of trailers concerned. This inspection revealed that the current general practice was to use three smaller bins on the trailer instead of one large bin. These smaller bins are also unloaded by fork-lift trucks, but the fitting of

mudguards would not seriously inconvenience unloading operations. It was also ascertained that suitable quickly-detachable trailer mudguards were available at Waikerie.

In view of the changed circumstances since the board approved the exemption of these vehicles in 1963, the board reviewed this matter on September 9, 1965, and decided to withdraw the exemptions then in force. When advising various co-operative companies of this action, the board intimated that should there be any circumstances which would preclude the fitting of mudguards to the trailers, the individual owners could apply to the board, giving full details to support their request. As a number of trailers are adapted and used for purposes other than the carriage of bulk citrus fruits, and in view of the fact that quickly detachable mudguards can be made, the board does not favour exempting these trailers from the provisions of regulation 7.03.

WAYVILLE INTERSECTION.

Mr. LANGLEY: During the last few months, work on the widening of the Keswick bridge and the Greenhill Road has progressed as far as the intersection of Goodwood and Greenhill Roads, and at this point a policeman has the very hazardous job of controlling the traffic. Will the Minister of Lands ascertain from the Minister of Roads whether a tender for the installation of traffic lights at this intersection has been accepted and, if it has, what is the likely completion date?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take this matter up with my colleague and obtain a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT BILL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question arises out of an answer given by the Attorney-General yesterday to a question asked (obviously a Dorothy Dixier, I think) by the honourable member for Gawler (Mr. Clark). Question time ended before I was able to follow this matter up yesterday. It concerns the Planning and Development Bill and the article written by Mr. Curtis (President of the Chamber of Manufacturers) which appeared in the *Advertiser* yesterday. As the Government (and the Attorney said this in his answer yesterday) is treating this Bill as a Committee Bill, and as it was laid on the table, I assume with the specific object of allowing discussions and representations to be made about it, I ask the Attorney-General why he so bitterly resented Mr. Curtis making public his views on the Bill.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not object to Mr. Curtis making public his views on the Bill, but I do suggest that if he has matters

to put forward in relation to the amendment of the Bill which the Government has suggested that it would consider, then he can hardly expect the Government to view his representations very favourably when he makes a blatant political attack upon the measure.

Mr. Millhouse: Why can't he make his view public?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He can if he wishes, but the other people who have made their views public (and there are some who have spoken publicly at meetings of the Town and Country Planning Association or of the Institute of Valuers) have all done so in a clear and constructive manner, putting forward suggestions for improvement in a constructive way. What Mr. Curtis did, however, was done after having made representations to the Government which he was told would be considered and after he was told that the chamber would be communicated with again and that there were some things in his representations which it was thought could well be given effect to. Before even we had time to tell the chamber what the views of the Government were on these matters, he comes out with something that is nothing other than a blatant political attack on the whole basis of the measure. In these circumstances he can hardly expect that the Government views his attitude as being particularly constructive or co-operative.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I listened with as great attention as I could to the reply given by the Attorney-General on the question of the expression of views by the President of the chamber, and I was perturbed with what I heard, if I understood the Attorney correctly. My understanding of his reply was that, however valid points might be in submissions made to the Government, if the body making them annoyed the Government in the way in which the chamber has done by stating its views in the press, those views would receive short shrift from the Government. I hope that that was not the meaning of the Attorney when he answered my question: I hope that every submission will be received and considered on its merit, irrespective of any extraneous matters. I ask the Attorney whether I misunderstood him, and seek his assurance that he did not intend to convey to this House that points put by way of submission on this or any other Bill would be treated on other than their merits.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member had bothered to read my statements in the press yesterday arising out of

this matter he would have known that before ever Mr. Curtis had published his Party-political attack on the Government—

Mr. Millhouse: Rot!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes it was, as are nearly all his public statements, in fact. Before he had ever done this the Government had already decided to accept certain of the submissions made by the chamber, and I made that perfectly clear; and that situation obtains.

Mr. Millhouse: Why didn't you tell the chamber that?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member had only bothered to read the press report he would have known that. The plain fact was that the chamber had been told that it would be communicated with again. I only had the conference with the draftsman and the Town Planner on Monday morning to go through in detail the submission made both by Mr. Blackburn and by Mr. Gifford, Q.C. It was at that meeting that some amendments were agreed to be proposed to Cabinet for approval. Our attitude on these matters has not changed. I do not think this Government takes any different attitude from that of the previous Government on the way it believes a Government should be treated. I remember many occasions when the former Premier was very annoyed that, when there was a course of negotiations between him and some outside body relating to action by the Government, the outside body should come out with an attack on the Government before agreement had been reached in respect of those negotiations. I believe any Government would resent that. I have known Sir Thomas Playford to express his resentment more than once at that sort of treatment.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Attorney-General outline the Government's intention in regard to further discussion on the Planning and Development Bill in the House? I have been working on some amendments, as has also, I understand, the Attorney-General, and it is rather important that I see in good time the amendments being prepared by the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General also say when the Government's amendments are likely to be ready?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I hope that the Government's amendments to the Bill will be ready before the end of this month. As soon as they are ready they will be placed on members' files, and it is intended to restore the Bill to the Notice Paper as soon as possible

after that. I appreciate that the honourable member will desire as much notice as possible of what the Government intends by way of amendment. The draftsman has my full authority to inform the honourable member of what is proceeding in the way of drafting on these lines, so that he may be well informed in plenty of time to prepare any further amendments he (or any other members of the Opposition) thinks proper. I desire to give as much information as I can, to ensure that when the debate on the Bill takes place the issues are clearly defined and that the matter can be dealt with as expeditiously as possible.

MEADOWS WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. SHANNON: Can the Minister of Works report to the House on investigations that have taken place regarding a water scheme to serve the township of Meadows?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: An investigation into the water potential of the Meadows area, including the possibility of utilizing Mr. Golder's bore as a source of supply for a township water supply for Meadows, has been made by officers of the Mines Department. Two suggestions have been made: (a) to drill a new borehole on the Macclesfield Road to some 200ft. in depth; and (b) to accept Mr. Golder's offer. Suggestion (b) is conditional on a pump test of 48 hours' duration and drilling an observation bore to assess the yield. Mr. Golder has asked in a letter dated July 2 whether his offer for the use of his bore for a township water supply will be accepted. He desires advice on this question by tomorrow. The present position is that approval is being sought for an expenditure of \$1,450 to achieve the Mines Department's suggestion to test Mr. Golder's bore for 48 hours and drill an adjacent observation bore. This work could be commenced in three weeks and, in the meantime, Mr. Golder will be advised. If the test of the bore is acceptable, a scheme and estimates for the township of Meadows will be prepared.

ELWOMPLE WATER SCHEME.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Works be kind enough to read to the House the answer he has for me on the Elwomple water scheme?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports that the Elwomple scheme is a self-contained supply whereby water is pumped from a shallow trench at Moorlands and reticulated to properties in the hundreds of Seymour, Sherlock and Roby. In the planning of the Taillem Bend to Keith scheme, it has always been envisaged that one

of the branch mains from the trunk main would probably link up with the existing Moorlands scheme and continue on to serve additional areas. At this stage, no indication can be given as to when the branch mains are likely to be constructed. A connection to the Moorlands scheme will receive due consideration in conjunction with all other requested extensions when the trunk main, pumping station and tanks are nearly completed.

MOUNT COMPASS WATER SCHEME.

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Works ascertain what progress has been made towards providing a water scheme for Mount Compass?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am unable to give a detailed reply, but I shall obtain a report for the honourable member.

GOVERNMENT COSTS.

Mr. COUMBE: I noticed with interest the reply given yesterday to a question about fees and emoluments to be paid to the Royal Commissioners and officers employed on Commissions and inquiries. Because of the interest in this and associated matters, can the Attorney-General say whether the fees were fixed by the Public Service Commissioner, by the Government, or by some other arrangement?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In relation to Commissioners who are not in any way paid through the Public Service or pursuant to Statute, the fees were fixed by negotiation. All other fees were recommended to the Government by the Public Service Commissioner. In relation to the professional men not paid either under the Public Service Act or special Statute, negotiations proceeded in the same way as the Government negotiates in the case of counsel that it briefs on matters for the Crown. The basis of the fees fixed was the normal fee required by each professional man as a brief fee for work done by him.

POISON.

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked on June 30 about the alleged misuse of the rabbit poison 1080?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My department has no knowledge of the particular incident referred to by the honourable member. It is not an area where the Lands Department is associated in a district council poisoning scheme, and if the reported losses of stock are correct and are the result of the use of 1080, I can only express the view that it is

a serious reflection upon the management practices of some individual. My department has, over the past three years, conducted extensive trials in the use of 1080 poison to control or eradicate rabbits, and currently is associated with several district councils in district rabbit eradication programmes. Officers engaged in these activities are instructed in the importance of ensuring that both stock and wild life are protected to the maximum extent. Extensive and detailed observations have been made both in experimental work and latterly in district schemes. Poisoning experiments were carried out over the entire 11,000 acres of a South Australian water fowl research area which contained over 100 species of birds, and no deaths were observed, nor have losses of wild life been observed in other areas.

It is not claimed that odd individual birds may not be destroyed, but the reported death of Murray magpies is a most unusual happening and conflicts sharply with departmental experience. It is, however, becoming apparent that the destruction of rabbits leads to an improvement in wild life habitats, and reports that a marked build up of individual species is occurring have been received. I reiterate that the Lands Department is conscious of the need to conserve wild life, and whilst using a hazardous material in the field, strives to reduce the hazard to a minimum. Although poison used to control rabbits may occasionally result in the death of an individual bird, it is clear that the longer term effect, by allowing habitat to regenerate, will prove beneficial to the preservation of the various species of wild life. The department stresses the importance of proper techniques in the use and application of 1080, which, if carried out, will avoid stock losses and if such losses do, in fact, occur, it is an indication of faulty use of the poison material.

DIRTY WATER.

Mr. HUDSON: Yesterday, residents living in Warradale, Brighton, and other parts of my district experienced a situation where the water supply became discoloured and unusable, and I understand that many complaints have been submitted to the Engineering and Water Supply Department. I am informed that the closing of the outlet valve at Happy Valley reservoir and certain work being carried out at the booster station at Darlington were probably responsible for a reverse flow and for the rusty appearance of the water. Perhaps it may be possible to provide an early warning to residents when this is likely to happen. This

may be difficult, but with the advent of automatic washing machines the problem of a dirty water supply becomes serious. Many housewives in this area have been caught with an automatic washing machine functioning when this change in the nature of the water takes place and, as a result, clothing is considerably damaged. I have seen clothes which, having been through a washing machine in these circumstances, have gone black, so that considerable expense was involved in restoring them to a useful condition. Will the Minister of Works consult officers of his department to see whether some method can be adopted to avoid these occurrences, or to warn residents when they are likely to occur?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: True, certain works at the inlet are being carried out. However, I am deeply grateful to Television Channel ABS2 and the newspapers for warning residents that a change in the water would occur. It is unfortunate that these incidents occurred, but it is impossible to knock at every door or communicate with each householder. The department did its utmost to ensure that people were aware of this possible happening, and I regret that many residents did not see the newspaper statements or the televised warning.

WATER RESTRICTIONS.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am concerned not so much at receiving discoloured water through the mains as with receiving adequate water during the coming summer. Bearing in mind that the reservoir holdings are low, can the Minister of Works say whether pumping will be resumed soon and whether water restrictions are likely to be imposed during the coming summer?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Many of us have been watching with concern the rainfall in catchment areas, and I think we are aware that the reservoirs have received no appreciable intakes. Therefore, it is intended to commence pumping at off-peak periods within a few days, for we believe that that is essential to continue a sufficient supply and to avoid restrictions in the event of the absence of further appreciable rains in the catchment areas soon. Unfortunately, we may commence pumping and then receive good rains soon afterwards but, nevertheless, we believe that it is better to err on the side of safety, and to provide a continued water supply, rather than to take a chance that may later lead to the imposition of restrictions.

Later:

Mr. HUGHES: Every member regrets that we have had no appreciable rains to supplement our reservoir storages, and pumping will be necessary soon to provide the metropolitan area with water. As I understand that, since answering an earlier question, the Minister has further information, will he indicate the present position?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Since answering the question from the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip), I have received a report from the Director and Engineer-in-Chief, which states:

Following continuous pumping in the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline for eleven months at rates varying to suit the circumstances pumping operations were suspended on June 23. Although up to that time there had been no appreciable natural flow into reservoirs sufficient rain had fallen to saturate the catchment areas and a normal seasonal heavy follow-up rain would have resulted in a substantial intake.

Unfortunately, while rains have occurred they have been intermittent and light and have done little more than maintain the soil in a damp condition.

The capacity of the six metropolitan reservoirs is 23,821,000,000 gallons and the storage fell to a minimum of 5,185,000,000 gallons on May 31. Pumping continued until June 23, when the storage had risen to 5,666,000,000 gallons. Since that date the quantity has increased to 6,113,000,000 gallons.

While there is still a chance that the reservoirs will fill by natural intake by the end of the spring this is by no means certain—in fact past experience has shown that unless substantial intakes are received by the middle of July the chance of filling is not at all promising.

Following our discussion today, arrangements have been made to commence pumping at full off-peak capacity from 7 p.m. on Friday next, July 15. This will be instrumental in delivering 700,000,000 gallons into the metropolitan system by the end of July and 45,000,000 gallons into Warren reservoir. The latter reservoir now holds only 258,000,000 gallons compared with its capacity of 1,401,000,000 gallons.

If the reservoirs receive no substantial intake by the end of July it will be necessary to introduce full-capacity pumping for 24 hours a day.

PHOSPHATE ROCK.

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Agriculture an answer to my recent question about prospecting for phosphate rock in South Australia?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Minister of Mines reports that the importance of locating an indigenous source of phosphate has long been recognized, and the Department of Mines has for many years been active in this matter. Testing of cores and cuttings from

borings in the sedimentary basins in this State has been carried out both by the department and by exploration companies. Several companies have taken out exploration permits for phosphate, and have conducted detailed investigations, including drilling. Some small discoveries have been made, but so far no major deposit of adequate grade has been located. Within recent months exploration permits have been granted for off-shore work. It is not possible to forecast the prospects of success, either on or off-shore, but the search will be continued.

CHEESE.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Agriculture further information in reply to the question I asked on July 6 in regard to the activities of his departmental officers in the promotional campaign for cheese exports?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The staff of the milk products section, Dairy Branch of the Agriculture Department, is as follows: one Milk Products Adviser; two Dairy Factory Inspectors (one Adelaide, one Mount Gambier); and two Field Officers (part-time only). Extension work to dairy factories is carried out on the following lines:

1. Outlining to dairy factory management the desirability of changing over from rinded to rindless cheese, as the majority of oversea markets favour this form of cheddar cheese.

2. When the management of a dairy factory reaches a decision to change, the factory is completely assessed by officers of the section as to the new requirements, rebuilding plans are approved, and advice is given on equipment purchases and placing of equipment in factory, etc.

3. During the changeover period the factory is visited as frequently as possible, department equipment is used to check cheese presses, and advice is given on the wrapping, boxing, stamping and storage of cheese.

4. When the rebuilding and re-equipping is completed the Milk Products Adviser approves alterations as meeting export standards, and this is communicated to the Australian Dairy Produce Board.

5. Follow-up work is carried out, including liaison with Commonwealth Dairy Produce Export Graders stationed in Adelaide and Portland, and faults are rectified.

6. Dairy products are examined to see they meet both chemical and bacteriological standards.

GOODS TRAIN LIGHTS.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yesterday the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) received a reply from the Premier on the possibility of placing lights on the side of goods trains so that they could be more easily identified at road crossings by the drivers of vehicles using the roads at night. Having read the Premier's reply, I agree that in so far as its sets out the technical problems associated with the request it is complete. However, will the Premier take up with the Railways Commissioner an alternative, namely, the use of luminous paint on some small part of each vehicle comprising the train, so that motorists' headlights will reflect a warning colour? In his reply, the Premier said that it was intended to paint these vehicles a light shade of grey which, I agree, would help. Identification marks (the number of the truck, its type, load capacity and so on) are necessary on every truck. I suggest that, instead of these marks being painted in non-reflective paint, a type of paint be used that would reflect some warning to motorists from their cars' headlights. If this suggestion is not acceptable, perhaps some luminous paint could be used on each vehicle. This would go a long way towards achieving what the member for Stirling desires; it might even provide a better warning to motorists. Will the Premier ask the Minister of Transport to take up this matter with the Railways Commissioner to see whether it would be practicable to use this type of paint, as I am sure the result would be beneficial?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will ask the Minister of Transport to consider the matter, and bring down a report as soon as possible.

SKELETON WEED.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: No doubt the Minister of Agriculture is aware that several outbreaks of skeleton weed have occurred on Eyre Peninsula—two between Wirrulla and Nunjirkompta and one in the Cleve district. Can the Minister say whether funds are available for the eradication of this weed, and whether officers of his department are made available to advise local farmers on ways to eradicate it?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Officers of my department are always available to assist in this regard. The honourable member should talk about skeleton weed with the member for Albert who has wide knowledge of the subject and could give much information about it. No funds are made available for the eradication of the weed but money is made available to local councils to help them finance their weeds

officers. We believe that is the best way to give overall assistance because noxious weeds are not restricted to one area, nor is there one type of weed. We get many requests concerning various types of weed in various areas. Recently I had a request from stock owners for the eradication of noogoora burr near Port Augusta. If we made money available in that case we would have to make it available for cases of other weeds in other areas. I think the department has a good system whereby it provides assistance to local councils for their weeds officers, and thus service is given in particular localities.

CITRUS INDUSTRY.

Mr. CURREN: Early this week the Minister of Agriculture attended a meeting of the Australian Agricultural Council in Perth. Can the Minister say whether Commonwealth legislation for the control of the marketing and the production of citrus fruit was discussed and, if it was, what was the attitude of each of the citrus-producing States to legislation similar to that passed by this Parliament last session?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This matter was discussed at the Agricultural Council meeting and was of interest to the council, particularly because of the action in South Australia. As the council was most anxious to obtain all the information it could on the subject, it listened with much interest to my story of the progress of the Citrus Industry Organization Committee in South Australia. I believe Victoria is about to introduce some form of legislation for the control of citrus fruit, but the matter of Commonwealth legislation is still somewhat up in the air. A pleasing feature is that the two principal organizations (the Citrus Growers Federation and the Australian Primary Producers Union) have now agreed on the principle of the type of legislation that should be introduced. Previously there were some differences, and I asked Mr. Sanders of the Citrus Industry Organization Committee whether he would get both organizations together to see whether they could arrive at uniformity. I invited Mr. Kentwell of the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry to come to South Australia in regard to this matter. He attended the Agricultural Council meeting and reported on his visit to South Australia which, apparently, was most fruitful. I believe his visit, during which he discussed the matter with both organizations, was a step towards the introduction of Commonwealth legislation. However, at this stage the matter is still at the discussion stage.

New South Wales has some problems (as I think the members for Ridley and Chaffey would realize) because of the different types of citrus production there. However, that State is interested, particularly in the success, so far, of South Australia's scheme.

TINTINARA POLICE.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Recently, whilst I was in Tintinara, both the council and the local chamber of commerce expressed concern about the difficulty of maintaining law and order in this town, which is 17 miles from Coonalpyn and 22 miles from Keith, at which towns are the nearest policemen. Tintinara has a problem that needs supervision. Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary to inquire about the advisability of permanently establishing a police station in this town?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will take up the honourable member's request with my colleague. I regret that there is trouble in this important town and, if it is at all possible to provide reasonable protection, we will do all we can to provide it.

INSURANCE.

Mrs. STEELE: I have received from a constituent of mine a letter (and he has others of a like nature) containing an account received from a firm of insurance brokers showing his indebtedness in the matter of house owner's contents insurance. The details are given, premiums so much, fire brigade levy 0.25c, stamp duty 0.34c, both of the latter appearing for the first time in this annual account. Burnside (and it is within this municipality that my correspondent resides) contributes \$10,000 or so each year towards the maintenance of the Fire Brigades Board, and now it appears that taxpayers insuring their own property are to be called on to contribute directly to this service. Can the Premier supply answers to the following questions: By whom were underwriters authorized to impose this levy? Has it been levied because the Government is either unwilling or unable to provide the financial grants necessary to maintain the service? Is stamp duty on yearly premiums on every form of insurance valid, in addition to that imposed on each new policy when it is taken out?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: As this is an involved question, I will take the matter up and obtain information for the honourable member as soon as practicable.

BASIC WAGE.

Mr. COURCE: Following the reply given yesterday by the Premier regarding the passing on of the basic wage increase to various persons in industry, will the Premier say whether the Government intends to pass on the \$2 basic wage increase to members of the Public Service, including those temporarily employed?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I cannot give the honourable member an answer today, but as soon as I obtain the information I will bring down a reply.

BLACK FOREST BUILDING.

Mr. LANGLEY: Constituents of mine who drive motor vehicles along Goodwood Road and across the Glenelg tramline have complained recently about the poor condition of a building formerly used by the boy scouts. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Roads to confer with the Municipal Tramways Trust with a view to having this building removed, so that a clearer view may be given to tram and vehicle drivers alike at this busy intersection where, in addition to the tramways crossing, four roads converge?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

HILLS FREEWAY.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have had a letter from a constituent living to the west of Waverley Ridge who enters his property from the Mount Barker Road. My question concerns the extension of the hills freeway, and I think I can best explain it by reading part of the letter this person sent to me. He says he has been informed that the Highways Department intends to close off the feeder road at Measday's Corner for the purposes of the new hills freeway because there are not enough people living in the area to warrant the expenditure of departmental moneys to provide special entrance facilities. His letter continues:

This will force the residents of the area to travel right up the Mount Barker Road to Crafers, negotiate the various by-passes and return back down from Crafers to our homes. I would estimate that this will involve an additional three miles of travel each way so that by road we will be at least as far from Adelaide as is Aldgate. Children will not be permitted to use the bus service as the buses will not be allowed to stop on the freeway. At this time it is proposed to extend the freeway only about a quarter to half a mile down the Mount Barker Road to the west of Measday's Corner.

He says he got that information from an officer of the department. The point he makes

(and the question I ask the Minister of Lands for transmission to the Minister of Roads) is whether it is not possible to avoid this situation arising, either by not extending the freeway quite as far as this man believes it is proposed to extend it, or otherwise to investigate again the situation of people as described by this man if in fact no entrance and exit off the freeway is to be made for their benefit. Will the Minister take this matter up with his colleague?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

GRAPES.

Mr. CURREN: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether any discussion took place at the Australian Agricultural Council on the subject of the wine grapegrowing industry, and does he know of any approaches being made to other State Governments for some form of legislative control in this industry?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The only discussion that took place on this subject occurred when I had the opportunity of replying to the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry, as every Minister had, and I stressed the need for Commonwealth control of this industry. I have been informed by other Ministers that, as yet, no approach has been made to the Commonwealth Government from other States, New South Wales and Victoria being the main ones interested. The Commonwealth was aware of the position in South Australia and I told it of the Royal Commission, as I had done previously, saying that soon we would be appointing an advisory committee with an extension officer to provide advisory services for the future of the wine grape industry in South Australia. I hope that the press statement inviting people to nominate for appointment to this committee and bringing it to the notice of the various organizations concerned will be made this week and that the advisory committee will be set up soon.

CROWN LEASES

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of June 30 regarding the transfer of perpetual leases from companies to individuals?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: There is no delay in my department in reaching and conveying a decision on an application for consent to transfer a Crown lease from a proprietary company to an individual, but the procedure for giving effect to an approval to such a transfer is a lengthy process because

of the necessity for the existing lease to be surrendered and a completely new lease issued. However, at no stage of such a transaction does the calculation of shareholders' equities in the lease cause any delay within the department, because it does not concern itself with this aspect when a company is disposing of property.

REYNELLA SOUTH TRAFFIC.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked yesterday regarding the traffic problem at Reynella South?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No.

CITRUS PACKING.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Last week I raised, by way of question to the Minister of Agriculture, the matter of the attitude or action of the Citrus Industry Organization Committee in informing one of my constituents that he would probably not get a licence to pack citrus fruit because he did not have the equipment that the committee required of him. I gave the Minister privately the constituent's name and asked him to take up the matter. The man has since communicated with me again to say that a representative of the committee called on him several times, first to say that he would probably get a licence, and then to say that the committee had changed its mind and that, if it gave him a licence, "it would have to license all the Greeks," or words to that effect. He is most perturbed about this matter. The Minister will realize that since July 4, last Monday week, this man has not been allowed by law to pack, because he has no licence, and every day that passes means the loss of money to him and the jeopardizing of his business. Will the Minister use his good offices further with the committee with a view to a firm and, I hope, favourable decision being reached on this matter as soon as possible?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I did take up this matter with the Chairman of the committee and received a note from him this morning to the effect that he was going to Melbourne. He said that he would be away for a few days and that this matter would require a decision by the committee. As the committee will not meet until his return, I am sorry that I cannot get information for the honourable member earlier. However, I shall speak to the secretary first thing tomorrow morning to see whether anything can be

done. I appreciate the difficulty of the loss of business and shall endeavour to get further information.

LOXTON TO SWAN REACH ROAD.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Minister of Lands an answer to my question regarding road No. 34 in my district?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, reports that funds are included in the 1966-67 schedule of works to enable the District Council of Loxton to commence the reconstruction of the Nuriootpa to Loxton Main Road No. 34, as referred to by the member. Because of the relatively small amount of traffic on the road, however, it is intended that sealing will proceed progressively over a number of years.

PASKEVILLE-KULPARA ROAD.

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked last week regarding the widening and reshaping of the road between Kulpara and Paskeville and when work is likely to commence?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Roads reports that the departmental construction gang is at present being moved from Port Vincent to Paskeville to commence the widening and reshaping of the Kulpara to Kadina section of the Kulpara to Wallaroo Main Road No. 38. The work is expected to commence within two weeks and be completed in about 18 months.

OPAL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question arises from an answer given me yesterday by the Premier regarding opal and trading in opal in this State, and legislation that the Government intends to bring down on the matter. I asked this question yesterday because I had a note from the Premier to the effect that he had a reply. I was taken aback by the curt and uninformative nature of his answer, which simply was, as I found when I read *Hansard* to interpret it, that amending legislation would be submitted to Parliament soon. There was also a complaint that I had asked the question, apparently, before he was ready to give me an answer. I gathered from reading *Hansard* that the Premier overlooked that he had invited me to seek an answer yesterday and he must have had a more complete answer in his bag but did not bother to get it out.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have previously drawn the attention of honourable members to

the fact that comment is out of order when asking questions. I ask the member to put his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Premier a more complete answer to this question than the one he gave me yesterday?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: First, I tell the honourable member that I always extend this courtesy. If I have in my bag a reply to any member's question, the member concerned is informed. I emphasize that for the information of the member. When I give an answer, I give it exactly in accordance with what is set out in the answer, and I resent any implication that I am withholding anything from the member for Mitcham or from any other member. If affairs are going to reach this stage, I think the only solution will be to ask the member to put the question on notice.

GILES POINT.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yesterday, when answering my question about Giles Point, the Minister of Marine said:

On the evidence tendered to the committee at Yorketown on November 3, 1965, the inability to engage wholly in bulk handling is costing the local farmers about \$670,000 a year and the differential is costing them a further \$240,000 a year. Even if these figures are on the high side, the costs are still very substantial, and I can see no reason why the construction date of the silos should be held back to the construction date of the bulk loading facility. In fact it would be of great advantage if the silos could be built immediately as it would save the local grain producers a great deal of expense in the purchase of grain sacks, twine and sewing costs.

Does that answer imply that the co-operative can go ahead, as there is no reason why it should hold up the building of the facility before the terminal port is available? If that were so, the grain would have to be held before it would be shipped. Will the Minister of Marine seek clarification of this point from the Harbors Board, as this answer means that the co-operative could build a silo somewhere else?

Mr. Jennings: Would you like leave to continue?

The Hon. Frank Walsh: Question!

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will have to ask his question. Honourable members must understand that when they ask permission of the Speaker it includes the indulgence of the House, and when that indulgence is withdrawn the honourable member must ask his question.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I understand that. I am not attacking the Minister, but I am trying to have the position clarified.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will ask his question.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Will the Minister of Marine clarify this position, so that the co-operative can build another silo between now and 1970?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The business of the co-operative is its own, and we do not intend to dictate what it should do. I said that it would save farmers in the area about \$240,000 a year in differential if the silo were built now. We acknowledge that we could not ship grain, but there are other means of transportation. If the co-operative does not want to do it, that is its business.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: That means double handling.

Mr. SHANNON: When the Public Works Committee took evidence at Yorketown on this project an alternative to Giles Point was suggested if an unfavourable report were to be made on that port. I understand that inland silos on Southern Yorke Peninsula were sought by growers in that area in order to save costs. If that alternative were satisfactory, the grain would have to be transported from the inland silos to a port, the same as would happen if silos were built at Giles Point now. Can the Minister say whether this alternative has been considered?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The position outlined by the member for Onkaparinga is my attitude. Money could be saved by building the silo in the same way as it could be saved by building an inland silo. That opportunity is given to the co-operative because we are unable to provide port facilities immediately. If the co-operative wanted to, it could save that money.

HOUSING LOANS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Some lending authorities in this State require applicants to have a certain income before they will lend money to purchase a house. Because the economic conditions in this State are by no means what we would desire (in fact, the outlook is grim), will the Premier consult the various lending authorities on which the Government may have some influence, asking them to review their policy and requirements on income, and ascertaining whether they will liberalize this policy so that all those who can possibly obtain houses will be able to do so?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: If it is possible to obtain this information I shall bring down a report.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 12. Page 428.)

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): Before commencing my general remarks I join with you, Mr. Speaker, and other members who today have offered their congratulations to the new Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Hall). I strongly agree with the Premier's statement that the new Leader is an eminently suitable person to hold that position. It would be no less than a disservice to him, the House and the State as a whole if his position should alter. I believe his ability to continue in his new role will depend on his shifting to a different electoral district, but no doubt in his now exalted position this will not be very difficult for him to do. While the new Leader and I, as respective Party Whips, had to work in co-operation with each other, he was always absolutely and invariably honourable in his undertakings. Despite this, I believe it will be much less like work to be more closely associated with the new Opposition Whip (Mrs. Steele), whom I congratulate on her appointment. I think we all know that members of her sex have certain well-known whipping abilities and tendencies, which now seem to have been acknowledged by her own Party by her appointment as Whip in this House.

I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, which for the second time I do with more sincerity than I have done on any other occasion when I have supported a similar motion. I think one thing that arises from His Excellency's Speech is that His Excellency has excellent advisers. I congratulate the mover of the motion, the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren), and the seconder, the member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill), on the outstanding speeches they made in the important position in which they were put. Both undoubtedly showed the merit and capacity that members on this side of the House have always known them to possess. I share with other speakers the loss Parliament has suffered by the recent death of former members of both Houses. I knew them all, but naturally knew some better than others. The late Mr. Thompson was a very kind and charitable man who had great ability

and assiduity. He was also a great talker. I wonder why some districts develop special talents. It is abundantly clear that members, past and present, from the Port Adelaide District have a tremendous capacity for talk, just as, perhaps, there seems to be a tradition that members for the Port Pirie District are extraordinarily good as tellers of tall stories.

Some members who have already spoken have said that not many of the younger members would have known Mr. Craigie. I do not know to what extent I fit into this category now. However, I assure the House that I knew Mr. Craigie well, because long after he retired (I do not know whether voluntarily or involuntarily) he kept up his great campaign for various kinds of monetary reform. He did this right up to the end of his life. This is no doubt why the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) holds him in such high esteem.

Mr. Quirke: He was a single-taxer.

Mr. JENNINGS: Well, it was one of those fringe financial theories. To his relatives and to the relatives of all other deceased members, I extend my sincere sympathy. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that this is not done in any formal way, because I think we all realize that members of this place live closely together and, despite different political views, naturally develop a certain closeness and affection.

The Lieutenant-Governor's Speech outlines what, after all, is an extremely important and far-reaching legislative programme. It was rather remarkable for not containing references, as did former Speeches prepared by the previous Government, to the Government's taking credit for good seasons and the sunshine but blaming droughts, pestilences and famines on the Almighty. It is obvious from the Speech that Parliament will be very busy, and perhaps many other matters of major importance that were not prepared when the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech was written will be introduced.

I thought that the then Leader of the Opposition made an extremely good speech. I can readily see that it will be difficult for us for a while, because no sooner do we get used to referring to Sir Thomas Playford as the ex-Premier than we have to refer to him as the ex-Leader of the Opposition. I hope that soon we shall have to start calling him the member for Gumeracha. I thought the then Leader, as principal spokesman for his Party, made an extremely good speech. This, of course, has absolutely nothing to do with the fact that he is retiring or that he has

recently had his 70th birthday, or anything of that nature. I thought his speech was constructive, well-balanced and well-founded in many ways. I particularly enjoyed his contribution on the subject of natural gas, which shows, I believe, that even on the eve of his retirement he is vitally interested in the welfare of South Australia, which even his most ardent political opponents over the years have never denied. I wish something similar could be said about those who supported him from the back benches in the past.

The member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) made a long and interesting speech, interrupted only by the snores. However, we must make allowance for the fact that on this occasion he had two lovely black eyes. The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) has always evinced a tremendous interest in the affairs of the Labor Party. We have been suffering from this for many years—indeed, ever since that memorable occasion when he went into the Labor Party Office at the Trades Hall over the plush red carpets and sought to buy a copy of the Labor Party rule book but could not get it. I intend—and I hope this will be neither infectious nor contagious—to take an interest in the affairs of the Liberal Party for a change. This was sponsored by an article in the *News* of Monday, July 4, which states:

South Australian's Liberal and Country League may soon make significant changes to its method of pre-selecting Parliamentary candidates. If proposed changes are accepted, certain loopholes in the constitution will be closed.

The alterations are contained in proposals put forward by the Mitcham District Committee, no less, and the Burnside Young Liberals Branch, which will be discussed at the Liberal and Country League's annual meeting in August from the 2nd to the 4th. It is understood that the amendments arise out of the recent Boothby pre-selection campaign. No wonder the item is put on the agenda from the Mitcham District Committee!

Mr. Ryan: Are you insinuating that it was "crook"?

Mr. JENNINGS: No, but I think there was probably a bit of cooking tried, and one cook was probably found to be more proficient than the other! These proposed changes certainly indicate a lack of trust of members of the Liberal and Country League in each other. The changes provide for a double envelope security system where the vote would be placed in an inner envelope which is placed

inside another envelope for posting or delivery to the returning officer.

Mr. Ryan: Is this on the agenda?

Mr. JENNINGS: I will read out the agenda later. The inner envelope would not be opened until the votes were to be counted—and then, I presume, only in the presence of the security police, or something like that.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: What will they do with the ballot boxes?

Mr. JENNINGS: There was a suggestion that the keys be locked inside the ballot boxes, but they saw a certain impracticability in that.

Mr. Rodda: In that case you would need an invisible man to open them.

Mr. JENNINGS: It is explained that the purpose of this proposed change is to preserve the absolute secrecy of the vote. Advice not to hand the ballot paper to any person but to post or deliver it personally to the returning officer is given. Presumably, that is to make sure he does not tear it up. This is to prohibit the collection of ballot papers by or on behalf of a candidate during pre-selection and to give notice of this prohibition to those voting. The resolution to be discussed at the meeting suggests that a committee be set up to investigate the present system of pre-selection of candidates and suggested alternative methods. This is being taken as a move to allow Party representatives to approach candidates in much the same way as is done by the Australian Labor Party.

I got my copy of the Liberal and Country League agenda without walking over the blue plush carpets of the Liberal Club Building. This is how it reads. I will not bore honourable members with the whole of it. First, there is an address of welcome to the President—which is fair enough. Then there is an address by Mr. Pagan, the Federal President of the Liberal Party of Australia. I have never had the pleasure of meeting this gentleman but I cannot think of a more suitable name for the President of the Liberal Party than "Mr. Pagan"! Then the agenda displays some interesting news. On page 1 there is a note that:

No resolution affecting the principles or political platform shall be declared carried unless supported by at least two-thirds of those who vote on any day—

Mr. Langley: That is the same as the gerrymander.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes. It seems significant that this Party, which is a past master at gerrymandering electoral districts, appears to

be pretty good at it in its own domestic sphere as well. I remind honourable members that this annual meeting is from August 2 to 4. It is no use seeking admission to that meeting, because they do not let in even the press.

Mr. Clark: Why is that?

Mr. JENNINGS: I do not know. I do not know very much about the affairs of the L.C.L. but I can only assume it must be because that Party has something to hide. The Mitcham District Committee, a little further on in this item from the *News*, seeks to insert a new clause:

The collection of ballot papers by or on behalf of any candidate seeking selection is forbidden.

As I said previously, they do not seem to trust each other very much.

Mr. Ryan: That is apparent from their attitude in this House, too.

Mr. JENNINGS: I think it has been made manifest over the last few days with the many shennanigans that have been going on. Apparently, the Burnside Young Liberals Branch wants more influence on some of the committees. They have a motion on the agenda stating:

That lists of members should be available to any financial member of the L.C.L. provided the General Secretary thinks he or she is a fit and proper person to have lists and a payment to recompense the work involved is made.

I should not like the job of the General Secretary of the L.C.L. in deciding, out of the number of people who make requests for some nefarious design of their own, who is a fit and proper person. There is another suggestion, from the drafting committee:

That lists of members may be made available by the General Secretary, at his discretion, to any financial member of the L.C.L. at a charge to be fixed by the Executive.

Mr. Ryan: There would not be many names on that list.

Mr. JENNINGS: That is so. We do not know whether the Burnside Young Liberals have been having any trouble with the President, but there is a further motion:

That circulars may be issued by or on behalf of candidates without requiring the prior consent of the President.

This is peculiar when we have been told in this House over the years that L.C.L. members are responsible to no-one but themselves; that there is no Party dictatorship in that organization. But here, surely, it is obvious that they cannot now issue a circular on behalf of candidates without requiring the prior consent of

the President. That is precisely what they want altered. I shall be scrupulously fair here, as I always am. There is a motion from the Adelaide men's branch:

That this conference supports the Federal Government's general policy in Vietnam.

There is a similar one from the Prospect men's branch. From the Torrens District Committee there is a motion:

That this conference requests that a committee be formed by the Executive to investigate the present system of pre-selection of Parliamentary candidates and to examine alternative methods.

I think they may well do this, in all conscience. The calibre of the candidates selected by the L.C.L. certainly suits us on this side of the House very well indeed. It might, nevertheless, be as well for the welfare of the State if the L.C.L. did examine alternative methods of pre-selection. Then there is a motion from the Blackwood Branch. I do not know whether this branch is in the district of Mitcham.

Mr. Hurst: It is.

Mr. JENNINGS: The motion is:

That the Joint Committee on State Policy be requested to formulate by the end of December 1966 L.C.L. policy on the following topics.

That is what it says: not to amend or enlarge but to "formulate L.C.L. policy on the following topics": electoral reform, education, town planning, and transport. Apparently, the Liberal Party has no policy whatsoever on these matters now, because members are being asked to formulate policy. From the Mount Gambier District Committee:

That a more positive approach be adopted to determine the issues uppermost in the minds of State electors at election time and that more aggressive policies be formulated by the Party and more forcefully presented.

I do not think that is likely to happen. From the Mitcham District Committee—

Mr. Hudson: That's pretty active!

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, indeed.

Mr. Ryan: Did you say this conference would last only a week?

Mr. JENNINGS: These matters are not debated. Immediately the numbers are ascertained, the motion is accepted or rejected, and the members go out to their afternoon tea parties. From the Mitcham District Committee:

That this conference expresses alarm— and this is a good one; I think the member for Mitcham must have drafted this, after the result of the Boothby pre-selection—

at the apparent lack of L.C.L. policy on State issues and requests the Joint Committee on State Policy to consider forthwith the formulation of policy in preparation for the next State election.

Mr. Clark: They must have been sitting in the gallery in the House.

Mr. JENNINGS: From the Unley Young Liberal Branch—

Mr. Langley: Unley!

Mr. JENNINGS: I do not think the honorable member need worry; his confidence will be even greater when he hears this motion:

That this conference is of the opinion that there is a lack of communication between the Government and people of Australia, and that immediate steps should be taken to ensure that the Australian public be better informed on policy and actions of its Government.

That refers to the Australian Government; I hasten to assure the House it is not the South Australian Government. The Burnside Young Liberal Branch is active as well. Although this seems redolent more, I think, of our policy (but not quite as good) than what we have understood is the general *laissez faire* policy of the L.C.L., it urges:

That this conference supports the maintenance of a separate Reserve Bank of Australia with powers necessary for the maintenance of economic stability and development, but expresses concern at the proportionate increase of "fringe banking" activities and urges the Commonwealth Government to take steps to bring such activities under the auspices of the existing central bank authority by recommending to the States that they implement uniform hire-purchase legislation thus ensuring the effective carrying out of central banking and financial policy.

Mr. Hudson: I'll bet that one is discharged!

Mr. JENNINGS: From the Torrens District Committee:

That this conference recommends to the Commonwealth Government that it assumes the financial responsibility for all aspects of teacher training.

This, too, is surely opposite to orthodox Liberal Party thinking on education. Here is a rather sinister one from the Burnside District Committee:

That a deliberate effort be made to inform British migrants of the principles and policy of the Liberal and Country League and enrol them as members, and to inform them of the differences between the Liberal Party in Australia and the Liberal Party in the United Kingdom.

Mr. Hudson: Tell them Liberalism here is dead!

Mr. JENNINGS: I think that should get us a few votes, provided the differences are explained honestly.

Mr. Curren: Is that to be done after the formulating of policy?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, formulating policy is early on the agenda. From the Unley Young Liberal Branch:

That the Federal Government introduce legislation to enable Australians a degree of financial interest in all enterprises established or purchased by oversea investors in Australia. I cannot see that receiving much support.

Mr. Hurst: Are we allowed to attend the conference?

Mr. JENNINGS: Not even the press is allowed in. Everybody knows that right throughout the sessions of the Labor Party conference the press is admitted. From the Burnside Young Liberals:

That the South Australian Constitution should be amended by the repeal of section 12a which prevents a person from being a member of the Legislative Council unless he or she has attained 30 years of age.

Mr. Ryan: They want to extend the exclusive club!

Mr. JENNINGS: This is a leaf out of part of our policy, but what I think is shocking young Liberals somewhat is that—

Mr. Hudson: You have to be an old "fogey" to get there!

Mr. JENNINGS: The Young Liberals are becoming increasingly powerful in the movement, and beginning to realize that whilst people cannot very well be elected to Parliament at, say, 15 years of age, 21 has usually been the recognized age, but it is 30 years for the Upper House in South Australia, although it is patent that no maximum age exists.

Mr. Ryan: Do they say anything about the Legislative Council being a House of Review, or have they forgotten that?

Mr. JENNINGS: I think the L.C.L. wants it to be a house of obstruction, or a legislative abattoirs. From the Light District Committee:

That in view of the number of deaths that have taken place among Senators during the present Parliament, this conference recommends that a ceiling age limit be placed on Senate candidates for endorsement.

Mr. Hudson: That's an evil one, when they start on Senators.

Mr. JENNINGS: I cannot see why Senators are selected, although the reason may be that it is well known that on the death of a Senator he is replaced by the State Parliament. This, I think, is an acknowledgment that the Labor

Government will remain in office in South Australia for many years to come and, as a consequence, could, if it wished, replace any retiring or deceased Liberal Senator with a Labor Senator.

Mr. Clark: I'd be happy to support the member for Light as a Senator.

Mr. JENNINGS: I would be, too, for one reason—to get rid of him! From the Elizabeth Branch (and this is another one that has been borrowed from us):

That tie clips and lapel badges bearing a suitable design be produced for sale to all members of the L.C.L. in South Australia.

Again, from the Elizabeth Branch:

That luminous stickers be produced for rear bumpers of motor cars, etc. These stickers to be sold at normal cost to L.C.L. members and to bear suitable slogans, such as, "Walsh Must Go".

The most amazing speech we have heard so far in the debate was the speech of the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn). I thought this was a particularly ill-reasoned and arrogant speech and came strangely from one who, since he has been a member of this House, has been conspicuous only because of his inconspicuousness. In fact, he resembled a piece of protoplasm more than an animate being in this Chamber, then suddenly he decided overnight that he would become a rabble-rousing, tub-thumping orator.

Mr. Hudson: He is the king maker behind the new Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. JENNINGS: That fits, anyway. He did not make much success of his attempt but, if his display was influenced by the leadership struggle in his Party, he certainly did not improve his chances for promotion, even though before that they were nil. When the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren) was moving this motion, the member for Light quite frequently and rudely interrupted him. During the member for Light's own speech, on many occasions he drew attention to the fact that the member for Chaffey was out of the House. It is unusual for a member to refer to these matters too often, because a member has to be out of the Chamber frequently for other reasons than having a cup of tea. If a member draws attention to this on innumerable occasions I think he is hitting a little below the belt.

I can only subscribe the member for Light's attitude to the member for Chaffey to the fact that recently he was known to be in the Chaffey district endeavouring to secure a candidate to oppose the member for Chaffey. It is not, at all astonishing in the circumstances that

his Party has not yet found a candidate. When the member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan) made his speech in the debate he intended to answer the member for Light. However, when he saw that the honourable member was not in the Chamber, in the honourable Port Adelaide fashion, he put aside his references to the member for Light and waited until he came into the House.

Mr. Hudson: Traditional Labor courtesy.

Mr. JENNINGS: We are courageous in defeat and magnanimous in victory. The member for Light also made a reflection on a trade union official, the Secretary of the Australian Federated Union of Locomotive Enginemen (Mr. Byrne).

Mr. Freebairn: I did not mention him by name, though.

Mr. JENNINGS: May I say that the Secretary of the A.F.U.L.E. is not only an excellent trade union official but also has excellent connections. I contacted Mr. Byrne about this matter and he pointed out that most of the remarks made and recorded in *Hansard* were wildly inaccurate.

Mr. Freebairn: Are you canvassing for him?

Mr. JENNINGS: I am not canvassing for anybody.

Mr. Hurst: Did he read this speech?

Mr. JENNINGS: He is a dedicated man and, as a consequence, feels that he must undertake a certain amount of penance at times. At least he had an advantage over us—he did not have to listen to it. The member for Light pointed out that the union secretary would be better employed putting forward constructive proposals to improve railway services. That aspect is being looked after, because the A.F.U.L.E. has applied to make submissions to the Royal Commission on State Transport Services with the intention of putting forward a summary of the suggestions it made to the railway administration during the life of the previous Government when it was ignored. The railways union is also applying for the right to make submissions to this Commission, and the basic motive of those unions (and any others) is to create a demand for the service of the railways which, in turn, will create a demand for service from railway employees, and, of course, will undoubtedly help the economy of the State at large.

Mr. Ryan: Didn't the member for Light tell us how the railways could put on more trains to improve the services?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes.

Mr. Ryan: His knowledge of railways must be good.

Mr. JENNINGS: I think that when he was a boy he had a toy train set. During this debate we have heard many attacks on the present Government for allegedly not living up to its election promises. We also heard the Government criticized for its rather unfortunate budgetary situation at the moment which we claim, quite justifiably, that we inherited from the previous Government. In 1957, a member on my side of the House had this to say about the Governor's Speech:

Paragraph 8 states:

Preliminary work for the proposed Myponga reservoir is completed and tenders will shortly be called for the construction of the dam . . . Other proposals under investigation include new storage reservoirs at Clarendon, Kangaroo Creek and Smith's Creek on Kangaroo Island.

An examination of previous speeches will prove conclusively that these promises mean nothing. They are not promises of things to come. In 1941, in his policy speech, the Premier promised sewerage for country areas. Nothing happened, but in 1943 the Premier went a step further and promised extensive sewerage schemes for country areas. In 1944, paragraph 12 of the Governor's Speech contained this statement:

Investigations made by my Ministers show that in a number of country towns sewage systems are not only desirable but practicable.

In 1946, His Excellency said:

A Bill will be introduced to authorize the construction of sewerage works in country towns.

We heard nothing more of this subject until 1950 when the Premier, in a policy speech, said that proposals for sewerage at Victor Harbour, Port Pirie, Murray Bridge, Gawler, Port Lincoln, Port Augusta, Bordertown, Naracoorte and Mount Gambier had been referred to the Public Works Committee and that schemes had been completed for Whyalla, Strathalbyn, Balaklava, Kapunda and Eudunda.

That honourable member then pointed out that in the Governor's Speech of 1950 the following appeared:

Sewerage schemes prepared by the Government for Bordertown, Gawler, Murray Bridge, Mount Gambier, Naracoorte, Port Pirie, Port Lincoln, Port Augusta and Victor Harbour have been accepted by the local governing bodies concerned.

The honourable member then pointed out that that was seven years previously and nothing had been done. He then said:

In 1947 we were told of proposals to electrify our suburban railways. In 1950 we were told of a power station on the lower Murray to utilize Moorlands coal.

I do not think that has ever been heard of since. Then, of course, we have on innumerable occasions heard of the bridges to be

built across the Murray. The honourable member goes on:

In 1951 the Governor said: "A site on Myponga Creek has been selected for a reservoir to supply the Noarlunga, Aldinga, Yankalilla, Normanville, McLaren Vale and Wilunga districts." In 1952 he said: "Preliminary investigations are being made and plans are being prepared for additional reservoirs on the Onkaparinga River and on the River Torrens, and for a reservoir at Myponga." In 1953 we had the same old story. In that year His Excellency said: "The geological investigations for additional reservoirs at Kangaroo Creek, Clarendon and Myponga are continuing." In 1954, he said: "Preliminary work in connection with a number of other projects is in hand, including reservoirs at Myponga, Kangaroo Creek and Clarendon."

In 1955 we have something very much the same, for His Excellency's Speech that year contains the following:

Investigations have been continued into the proposals for reservoirs at Myponga, Kangaroo Creek and Clarendon.

The honourable member then went on to say:

I want the House to take notice of the 1956 Speech, in which His Excellency said: "The designs and specifications of the proposed Myponga reservoir have been completed, and tenders for construction of the dam will be invited shortly." This year (1957) His Excellency said: "Preliminary work for the proposed Myponga reservoir is completed and tenders will shortly be called for the construction of the dam."

Mr. Speaker, that covers almost two decades, yet after being here for only 18 months we are told that we are rather tardy about getting our works done. Before I conclude, I wish to draw attention to the fact that South Australia is not in nearly the parlous state that Opposition speakers would have us believe, particularly when our economic position is compared with the position in other States, judging by the reports we get. New South Wales, which now has a Liberal Government (admittedly it has only had it for a brief period), has found that it has had to put up practically every charge since it has been in office. We read about Sir Henry Bolte's critical financial position in Victoria.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: Didn't he have to take certain steps to get a few extra bob?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, by snide and surreptitious means! Even so, he is still in a shocking economic position. Apparently the situation in Victoria is very dangerous regarding hospitals, if the Victorian commentary in the *Advertiser* only a few days ago meant anything, because it showed that the hospital set-up in Victoria was crumbling, that it was bankrupt, and that no future could be seen.

I believe that whilst the States have tremendous responsibilities to look after things that affect them, nevertheless in these days, with uniform taxation and the superimposing of Commonwealth economic considerations on the States, most of the blame for these burdens as they affect all of the States should be laid at the door of the Commonwealth Liberal Government.

I think we might here also take cognizance of the statement by the General Manager of General Motors-Holden's only the other day that unless the enemy got some boost from the Commonwealth Government in the next Budget or even sooner, if it could be arranged, there would be almost mass unemployment in the motor industry. As I said, this Government inherited a most unsatisfactory financial situation. I also point out to the Opposition that the other States run by Governments of its political complexion are in a worse position than we are. Obviously, the motor industry, which is responsible for a tremendous amount of employment throughout Australia, is dependent on purchasing power, and the purchasing power necessary to keep up a high level of employment in this industry can be provided only by the Commonwealth Government. With those few brief references, I once again commend the Lieutenant-Governor's advisers for the excellent Speech that they prepared, and I hope that it presages a year of greater progress for South Australia.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): I do not intend to treat members to a world tour this afternoon or even to say anything about it. However, I express my appreciation to the Government and to the House for giving me leave, without which facility I could not have been away for so long. I appreciate the courtesy extended to me. I wish to say a few words concerning the departure this day from the front benches of my old Leader and colleague, Sir Thomas Playford. I appreciate (as I think all members on both sides of the House did) the comments that were made today by the Premier and by one or two other members regarding the services rendered by Sir Thomas. I consider that, sincere as tributes may be, and in whatever language they may be couched, it will be the historians who will most accurately and fully evaluate the services that Sir Thomas has given to this State. I think that we here at this time stand rather too close to the events of the recent past to be able to appreciate just what

he did during his long tenure of office as Leader of the State.

I was not impressed by the member for Enfield's recital of the things that were not done. I suggest it would have been of more value to the honourable member, if he had wanted to see a pattern for tasks to be attempted and carried out, if he had just looked at the things that had been done. If his Government emulates year by year the degree of progress and development that this State has enjoyed under the former Government and Governments before that, I think South Australia will be in a much happier position than it is in at present.

In the short time since I have returned home I have been shocked to hear from a number of people in responsible positions in business and industry of their apprehension and concern about the trend of economic conditions in this State. I have read that no less a body than the Carpenters Union has seen fit to censure its Government in a motion carried recently, and that suggests to me that there is some deep disquiet on the part of the public over the position into which we are drifting. I have only read the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech briefly and am out of touch with local events, so I do not intend to pursue further the matter of what is contained in the Speech.

I have diverted from my main theme. I consider that Sir Thomas leaves the front bench of this side of the House with a record of achievement that is unlikely to be equalled. I know that he would be the first to protest that this has not been a lone task on his part, and that this is undoubtedly true. However, the people of South Australia have responded to the vigour of his leadership and it has been recognized by industry, right from the primary to the secondary sphere, that he was a leader who created opportunities and climate in which enterprise and initiative could develop, and advantage has been taken of those opportunities.

Throughout the whole area of our economy and field of endeavour in industrial and productive life, everyone has seen the opportunities and has taken advantage of them. The people generally have co-operated in this effort to make South Australia great. I am not referring to any particular class of people. I think the stability of industrial relations in this State over a period of years is a tribute not only to those in management but also to those rendering service in the enterprises in which they have been employed.

It is the Government's duty, prerogative and privilege to condition the economy and the political climate so that people will be encouraged to make their fullest endeavours for their own benefit and, by so doing, for the benefit of the whole community. Sir Thomas has been privileged to see some of his imaginative schemes come to fruition and many works and much development in a wide sphere have been carried out. It bears repeating that the State has grown from a position of dependence to one of independence and to a stage where it is envied by communities in other places. Perhaps what is most important is that Sir Thomas emerges from years of service, responsibility and power with a completely untarnished reputation for integrity. This cannot be said truthfully of many public figures who have occupied positions of power and responsibility for so long.

After all, when we consider the things most important in life, what a person most values is that he has been able to serve his fellow man and complete his course through life with an undiminished reputation for honesty and integrity. Sir Thomas can claim that, although he would be too modest to say it himself, and I consider that that is the highest tribute that can be paid to any man.

When I have become acquainted with matters in the local political sphere, I shall have more to say. I also offer my personal congratulations to Mr. Hall, who has today assumed the position as Leader of my Party. I am sure that, as the Premier has said, he brings to his new position the good wishes of everybody in this House and certainly carries with him the complete accord and good wishes of all members on this side. We expect great things of him and I am sure that he will not disappoint us. So, today we begin a somewhat new era in this House and I am pleased to have been able to express my appreciation of the services that have been rendered by Sir Thomas and my good wishes for the future of his successor.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): I join other members in congratulating the member for Gouger on his appointment as Leader of the Opposition. A young man, he came into Parliament three years after I did. I have not always agreed with his policy or with what he has had to say but, nevertheless, he is Leader of the Opposition and I, as Minister of Agriculture, shall accord him every respect in that position. I trust that he, in turn, because he represents a country district, will on all occasions seek the co-operation I offer him.

This afternoon much has been said, rightly, by way of a tribute to the former Premier and Leader of the Opposition in this State, Sir Thomas Playford. It took me quite a time, when answering questions addressed to me by the Leader, as he was then, to refrain from referring to him as the Premier. In future it will be difficult to refer to him not as the Leader of the Opposition but as the member for Gumeracha, so I ask that I be pardoned if I make that mistake. Customs die hard.

I wish to associate myself with your remarks, Mr. Speaker, and those of the Premier and other members who have spoken today. I have been a member of this House for 10 years and have learned to respect the ability of the member for Gumeracha. I knew him, both as Premier and as Leader of the Opposition, for his ability to look after country districts and matters of primary industry. No-one will deny that he has been a truly great South Australian and Australian. I believe that his image in South Australia has been recognized throughout the world, mainly because of the long period he had in this Parliament. He had an exceptional memory and the experience he built up over the years stood him in good stead when he was Premier, and made him a worthy foe as Leader of the Opposition. I have had cross words with him and he has taken me to task on many occasions, but that is politics. It is accepted in this House, but outside it there is a spirit of goodwill.

I think the new Whip is the prettiest we have had. When I first came into this House the member for Burnside was Government Whip, but he was displaced, as member for Burnside, by the present Whip. I trust she will not share the same fate as the former Whip. I wish her every success in her important position and we know that she will carry out the duties with the dignity that is required.

The Address in Reply debate is a good one. We have had a mixed bag of speeches, but some good comes from each one as every speech is read by officers of the various departments, and information sought is made available. On this occasion the speeches have been of the usual high standard. The member for Burra said that all the speeches made in this House would not ruffle the earth, or words to that effect, and that they need not have been delivered. I do not agree, because the Address in Reply debate enables private members to express their opinions, and the speeches are noted by Ministers and by the various departments. Good results have been obtained from

this. I like to think that, as a private member, I successfully engaged the attention of the Ministers of the day and, from the results, I am sure that this happened. This occurs regardless of the side of the House on which the member sits: That was the situation with the former Government, and it is the same now. Where there is merit in a request, it is granted where practicable.

The mover of the motion, the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren), made an excellent speech. He had studied his subject and spoke about something close to his heart, particularly when dealing with rural matters affecting his district. Since I have been Minister of Agriculture he has kept me busy obtaining answers and solving problems in his district. Good results have been achieved by him, and I congratulate him on the way he represents his district. The member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill), a young man, replaced a well known and well respected member of this House, Mr. Fred Walsh. The member for West Torrens is following in Mr. Walsh's footsteps, and is doing everything he can for his district and the State.

I offer my condolences to those who have lost loved ones since the last session of Parliament. Much has been said about last year's harvest having detrimentally affected the Budget. Opposition members claim that it was an average yield year, but others claim that it was an above-average year. Much depends on where figures are obtained and the length of the period considered. The logical period would be 10 years, but possibly a 5-year period should be taken. The Chief Agronomist, who has access to the records, made the following report available:

The area sown to wheat in South Australia after the war declined until it reached a 20th century low of 1,331,302 acres in 1957-58. During this same period the area sown to barley increased greatly and reached a maximum of over 1,500,000 acres in 1960-61. During the last 6 to 7 years the area sown to wheat has more than doubled to some 2,800,000 acres and the area sown to barley appears to have stabilized at about 1,200,000 acres. This has considerably increased the level of the State cereal harvest as will be seen by the 1960-61 to 1964-65 average production of over 45,000,000 bushels of wheat and 79,500,000 bushels of total grains compared with the 34,400,000 bushels of wheat and 67,600,000 bushels of grain produced on average over the recent 10-year period. The 1965-66 estimated wheat production is above that of the 10-year average but some 5,000,000 bushels below that of the 5-year (1960-61 to 1964-65) period. The combined total of grain estimated to have been produced in 1965-66 at 64,526,000 bushels is more than 3,000,000 bushels below the average production over 10 years and 15,000,000 bushels less than the average of the 5 preceding years.

We should consider the overall grain situation rather than wheat only, because that situation affects the revenue of the Railways Department. I have a long statement showing the figures from 1955-56 to the present year, and I ask permission to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

CEREAL PRODUCTION.

Herewith the yields of the three cereals, wheat, barley and oats for the 10 years, 1955-56 to 1964-65, together with the average production in each cereal, and the three cereals combined, for both the 10-year period above and the five-year period 1960-61 to 1964-65, compared with the Commonwealth Statistician's estimated yield for 1965-66.

(Figures taken from S.A. Statistical Registers.)

S.A. Cereal Production—Previous 10-year Comparison with 1965-66 (estimated).

Year.	Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.	Combined Total.
1955-56	28,891,524	24,597,979	7,280,340	—
1956-57	31,431,547	34,002,876	8,318,296	—
1957-58	14,913,988	17,551,669	3,422,525	—
1958-59	32,032,232	37,664,492	11,992,155	—
1959-60	11,928,966	11,857,192	2,504,497	—
1960-61	46,395,600	42,233,118	11,477,592	100,106,310
1961-62	33,854,157	21,292,421	4,390,899	59,537,477
1962-63	38,338,860	18,004,881	5,770,242	62,113,983
1963-64	53,971,269	24,336,555	9,149,149	87,456,973
1964-65	52,817,049	26,931,735	8,976,907	88,725,691
Average 10 Years (1955-56 to 1964-65)	34,457,519	25,847,292	7,328,260	67,633,071
Average 5 Years (1960-61 to 1964-65)	45,075,387	26,559,742	7,952,958	79,588,087
Estimated 1965-66	39,912,000	19,127,000	5,487,000	64,526,000

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Although we have had years that have been worse than this year (as in 1957 when there was a severe drought, and in 1959, a bad year), production has been down this year, and this adversely affects the State's revenue. We can readily accept the figures I have quoted in that light. It is apparent that in our first year in office we have been at some disadvantage because of decreased yields. I do not have in my possession the actual revenue figures, but I think it must be obvious that they have decreased, as there has been so much less grain to carry.

Mr. Heaslip: Would the decrease be reflected in the last financial year's figures only, or would it carry over into this financial year's figures?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The greater percentage is reflected in last year's figures, but some will carry over to the financial year that has just commenced. Over a five-year period the average wheat yield was 16.53 bushels to the acre, but this year it was 14.6 bushels; the barley average for five years was 19.55 bushels, but this year the yield was only 17.66 bushels; and the average yield for oats was 15.72 bushels, but this year the yield decreased to 12.67 bushels. The average yield to the acre of all grain has been lower, as has been mentioned by some members, and the acreage sown has also decreased.

A few moments ago I paid a tribute to the former Leader of the Opposition, Sir Thomas Playford, but now I must answer some of the things he has said in this debate. He and other members of the Opposition criticized the Government for the few words used in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech in relation to agriculture. They referred to the famous 28 words, or something like that, and said that the short reference meant that this Government was not interested in agriculture. The member for Gumeracha, as Leader of the Opposition, said:

Was there ever a time when His Excellency's Speech gave the primary industries of this State such little notice? Was there ever a time when the Minister of Agriculture was so complacent?

He used the wrong word. The word "complacent", to me, means "apathetic", and I disclaim that I am apathetic towards my position. Certainly, I am modest, and this is reflected in the number of words used, but the short reference does not reflect the attitude of the Government or me as Minister of Agriculture. I am not the only Minister who has been

brief in preparing words for the Governor's Speech. However, I assure the House that I shall not allow this to happen next year and that members will have to stay a little longer to hear the opening Speech. I shall not be so modest about the Government's attitude towards primary industry or about the Government's accomplishments and intentions for the future. The remarks of the member for Gumeracha were noted, and it will not be possible for any member to call me complacent in future. In 1962, when the former Government prepared the Governor's Speech, His Excellency made the following lengthy oration:

Despite excellent opening rains, seasonal conditions during the past year were not good and yields were in general below average, although better than at first anticipated. My Government continues its policy of extending and increasing research and scientific services in all fields of primary production and is doing its utmost to ensure that the best use is made of all available resources in the light of scientific and technical advances. My Government continues to encourage land settlement particularly in relation to areas which in the light of scientific knowledge are capable of economic development.

On that occasion there was rather a brief reference to agriculture, yet I did not accuse the Minister of being apathetic or complacent. In 1963 the number of words was reduced. In that year His Excellency said:

My Government continues its active policy of the provision of scientific services in all fields of primary production. Shearing and wool-classing schools have been established in country centres. Detailed programmes have been continued in connection with the development of recommended wheat varieties. Pasture seed production, weed control, cereal research, and investigation into soil fertility and associated problems have received special attention. That was all that was said. I do not think the Opposition has any reason to complain about the number of words in His Excellency's Speech this year, as it did very little more when it was in office to explain what it intended to do except to suggest that it would carry on in the same fashion.

Mr. Clark: Is the number of words any real indication?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: No, it does not matter. The previous Minister was modest and did not mention all he had done or intended to do.

Mr. Quirke: Apparently all Ministers of Agriculture were modest.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes, and I think it is a good trait. Unfortunately, because of the statements that have been made, I must become a little boastful in referring to some of

the things the Government has done. However, I would not like members to think I was boasting. Rather, I am stating the position. One of the things the member for Gumeracha said was that I did not care very much about the flour industry. He said:

The Minister knows that already one country mill has closed, and I am informed that three other country mills are experiencing grave problems. I am informed, too, that the overseas market for flour today is practically non-existent and that a Victorian firm is at present bringing flour into South Australia and selling it at \$6 a ton below the price fixed by the Prices Commissioner, and yet apparently this creates no problem for anybody.

It was rather odd for him to say these things, because I looked through a docket which went back to 1957 and which showed that Mr. Charlick, a well-known flour miller, waited on the Minister of Agriculture and complained about the situation. However, there is no record of any action having been taken to overcome the position. In fact, the Minister quite rightly stated that it was a Commonwealth matter that he could not do much about. This is nothing new; it has been going on for a long time. I can remember the late Mr. Condon, who was interested in flour milling, referring vociferously to the closing of country mills. When the member for Gumeracha said that the Government was not taking an interest in flour milling, he was just clutching at straws. He said also that I was not interested in the present situation of the apple industry. I deny this, as I have taken a big interest in it. He said:

The apple industry has suffered heavy losses because of a divergence in the grading of apples. Apples which were acceptable to the buyer and on which he would have been prepared to pay a margin were not able to be sent overseas because of this divergence. Dumped crops mean additional costs to primary industry, and primary industries throughout the world are being made to dump their traditional crops. This will add to the cost of primary industry, an increase it cannot afford.

I have been aware of this situation; in fact, it has caused me sufficient concern for me to go into the hills, call at a few of the packing sheds and see the position for myself. I went up there with the inspectors who were allegedly responsible for rejecting the fruit. We examined the situation. I called for reports on this matter. I was told that a petition was pending, to go to the Minister for Primary Industry but, from what I can gather so far, this has not come about.

Recently, Mr. Caldicott, a prominent grower associated with a well-known co-operative in South Australia, went overseas, and, in conjunction with the Agent-General, toured the various areas of Europe making a survey of possibilities for the export of South Australian apples. Before commenting on that, let me say that I have been informed that there will be no surplus of apples this year in South Australia. In fact, it is anticipated that towards the end of the year there will be a shortage. I can appreciate the concern of growers in the hills that the export market could suffer because of lack of supplies this year. I understand that this was one of the main reasons why buyers were contacted by both Mr. Caldicott and Mr. Lance Milne, the Agent-General. I received a report from Mr. Milne, one paragraph of which states:

It seems that, in spite of the disappointments of this season, we have retained our goodwill with these buyers, although the true position here will not be known until next year's offers are made.

He mentioned also in his letter that some people he spoke to agreed that it was no fault of South Australia that there was a shortage this year, that South Australia could not be held responsible for the weather conditions. I hope this will allay the fears of apple growers in the Adelaide Hills and reassure them that everything is being done to assist them in maintaining their overseas market.

Another point made by the Agent-General was that there was some concern about Cleopatras arriving with bitter pit. He said, "Nothing does more harm to the apple industry than for this to happen." If poor quality fruit is exported it does more damage to the industry than not supplying any fruit at all.

Mr. Quirke: That is a difficult one. The pit can develop after the fruit has been packed.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes, fair enough. I realize that this fruit was inspected before it went overseas, but it shows that people will refrain from buying if the quality is poor. It is better for them not to have any fruit at all than to have to accept an inferior article that they will remember in future years.

Much has been said by the member for Gumeracha (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) in this session and in former sessions about the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities' plan. This is something about which I suffered much heart-burning in the early stages but I am pleased to know that it has turned out successfully and that the majority of

egg producers are happy with the scheme; but, because there had been some increase in the amount of the levy this year, the Leader of the Opposition came in again to draw attention to this fact. He tried to make some political capital out of it. However, I am reminded that this C.E.M.A. plan had been a matter for meetings of the Agricultural Council before I became a Minister, and I am told by other Ministers that they were keen for South Australia to join them but they felt that the Minister of Agriculture at that time was being influenced by his Leader to the extent that he was not prepared to come into it. This was borne out by a meeting at Murray Bridge (hostile, as far I was concerned) at which I spoke. Then the Leader of the Opposition spoke, but on that occasion the Minister did not speak. This confirmed the fact that it was mainly the efforts of the Leader in his opposition to this plan that gave the people opposed to the C.E.M.A. plan the opportunity to hold out against it.

I had some figures taken out in respect of this year's position. The bird numbers estimated for this year are 9,300,000. The estimated number for next year is 9,800,000 to 10,000,000, so it can be seen that this scheme has an increased number of birds because, when things are prosperous, this takes place.

There will probably be some deficit on the first year's operations to carry forward into next year, but this cannot be considered unreasonable when one considers the lack of reliable statistics on which to base the last year's estimates. Furthermore, when it is realized that, despite this lack of reliable information, C.E.M.A. was called upon to deal with a production of 135,000,000 dozen eggs, 15,000,000 dozen of which were surplus to local requirements, and the total income from bird levy was \$6,500,000, a probable deficit of \$200,000 to \$300,000 is a fairly good effort. On the credit side, the average price over all grades of eggs which South Australian producers will have received for the year will be approximately 35c a dozen (after allowing for hen levy) compared with 32.9c a dozen in 1964-65.

I come now to the fact that the success of C.E.M.A. so far has led to some expansion in egg production. Estimates for the year ahead indicate a surplus of 22,750,000 dozen, an increase of almost 7,000,000 dozen, or 44.07 per cent. In the face of this, C.E.M.A. had no alternative but to recommend to the Minister for Primary Industry that the commencing

rate of hen levy from July 1, 1966, be 3.5c a fortnight. If maintained throughout the whole year, this will total 91c a bird, but the rate of levy will be kept constantly under review and if circumstances warrant the action, the fortnightly rate can be varied. The misunderstanding that exists in connection with the bird levy is that it has been referred to by some members of this House as a bird tax. Many producers refer to the bird levy as a bird tax, which of course is incorrect.

If it were a tax, the money would go out of the control of the industry and into general revenue, but the whole of the bird levy collected, less administration costs of C.E.M.A., is used to equalize returns to all producers and is, therefore, received back by the producer indirectly. Furthermore, during the past year, on the basis of 15 dozen eggs a bird, the hen levy has cost approximately 4.7c a dozen, whereas in the previous year the pool levy of 4.2c a dozen was paid to the South Australian Egg Board. The only really relevant figure as far as the producer is concerned therefore is the net price received by the producer after payment of bird levy compared with the net price in previous years after the local board levy.

During the speech of the member for Gumeracha, the member for Burnside, by way of interjection, mentioned the high price of eggs this year, and I think that what I am about to say will answer her query. It would be difficult to compare the price to the consumer this year with that of the previous year without a great deal of mathematical calculation. Whilst the maximum wholesale price this year has been 59c compared with 55c the previous year, the grades of eggs are not comparable. Last year, the top grade was an egg weighing 1½oz. and over, whereas this year the large eggs are 2oz. minimum weight. By the same token, the present standard egg is a different weight from that of the previous first quality medium egg. In fact, I think comparisons are impossible, as it would be necessary to calculate the number of eggs previously in first quality medium which exceeded 1½oz. Colonel McArthur, in his recent press release from C.E.M.A., said, in referring to the increased return to producers:

This increase has been possible without major variations in consumer prices as compared with the previous year.

I think that is a reasonable statement. Those figures illustrate that the producer and consumer margins are being maintained,

through the success of C.E.M.A. Despite an increase this year in the levy, the position will even itself out over the next year. Primary production fluctuates according to quantities supplied, but the fact of the slight increase in levy, as well as the fact that a reduction to the consumer will take place this year, will offset the desire to increase production. When discussing this matter at the Agricultural Council, Mr. Giles, representing the egg-producing industry in the Department of Primary Industry, had something similar to say. I think that the C.E.M.A. plan will at least prove to be a step in the right direction. Formerly no unanimity existed between the States; they were often at loggerheads in regard to the two export egg boards existing (the Australian and New South Wales boards). Much bickering occurred, and I believe that blows were almost exchanged on one occasion. However, much more contentment between the various State boards exists today, which will lead to a better understanding of the problem and, in time, to better stabilization arrangements.

If the member for Gumeracha accused me of complacency in regard to margarine and butter production, he was surely jesting, for that is a habit with him. The only person of whom I would take note on this matter would be the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon), for he would know whether I had genuinely taken an interest in dairymen, or not.

Mr. Casey: You've got him on your side.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The member for Onkaparinga is honest, and what he said in this regard would be correct. Soon after I became Minister of Agriculture an interstate firm began to supply margarine outside the quota system, but I know that I cannot advance an argument against that firm's action at this stage because the matter is *sub judice*. I merely point out that an action has been brought against that firm in New South Wales, which is subject to the right of appeal to the Privy Council, and that a similar case exists in this State. The Supreme Court has upheld our action, and we are now awaiting the High Court's decision. I know that at least some honourable members are aware of actions that I, as Minister, and the Government have taken to safeguard the dairying industry.

Whilst in Perth, I saw evidence of much propaganda being circulated from the Murrumbidgee organization, as it was expected that the Agricultural Council would decide the issue

at that stage (although the council deferred decision, again, because the matter was *sub judice*). However, much propaganda has been circulated to members of Parliament and to the public generally to the effect that Murrumbidgee's commodity is fully Australian produced. I think that claim has been adequately answered by the Australian Dairying Industry Council. I need not elaborate on the value of the dairying industry in regard to decentralization. People are often apt to overlook the fact that the dairying industry benefits not only the farmer but is also responsible for the employment of many people in secondary industry. In the metropolitan area 322 people are employed in dairying factories, and 521 in the country. The dairying industry, in fact benefits the State as a whole. In addition to the employment I have mentioned, many people are engaged in the cartage of dairying products from the farm to the factory, and from the factory to the warehouse or the wharf, etc. Claims that margarine is the industry's mainstay are nonsense, although it may contribute some support.

I deny that I have been complacent in regard to primary production and sincerely say that I believe the primary producer would agree. Without wishing to boast, I point out that many primary producers have thanked me for my efforts on their behalf. Soon after this Government came into office we realized the plight of many dairy farmers in New South Wales and, with an appeal from people in the South-East for freighting fodder to New South Wales, the Government readily agreed to pay the full freight from the South-East to New South Wales to alleviate the problem there. Similarly, with drought conditions prevailing in the North of our State, we assisted considerably, whereas the former Government offered no assistance at all. In fact, whereas it was suggested that we pay half the freight costs, we paid the full freight on gift fodder. We were asked, too, whether we would partially remit rents; in fact, we completely remitted them where full de-stocking occurred, and the recipients were indeed grateful. That undoubtedly proves that we are sympathetic towards primary industry. The member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren) and others have referred recently to the citrus industry, and I shall not develop that matter, except to say that the citrus industry today is far more confident than it was a year or so ago. I compliment the committee on its actions and the good public relations it has established by going

amongst the producers, into the packing sheds and so on, and telling producers what the requirements are.

True, there have been complaints. The member for Mitcham has complained on behalf of a constituent of his, as he has a perfect right to do; I will look into the matter. Other members have complained that people in their districts have been deprived of packing licences or of the right to sell in the East End Market. The Chairman of this committee has assured me that, provided people are genuine, there will be no hardship in this way. The problem has been that some people have gone into nearby orchard areas (they have gone into Mypolonga in my district) and purchased oranges on the tree. They take their family out on a weekend, pick into an open truck, bring the oranges to Adelaide and pack them into cases. The quality of oranges has thus not been maintained. This type of thing is to be deplored and should be totally discouraged. I believe these people are feeling the pinch in regard to the licence. However, genuine people will not be affected.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: You cannot have open and orderly marketing at the same time.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: True, we must have some control. The system introduced is that the packing sheds must be licensed and the people selling on the market need to be associated with the South Australian Chamber of Wholesale Fruit and Vegetable Industries. The purpose of this is to ensure that somebody in the East End Market is responsible for maintaining quality. That is reasonable and, provided the Chamber does not restrict genuine people, we shall have no complaints. However, previously we have had people flouting the quality requirements. In order to maintain a good market these people have to suffer occasionally, and, I think, rightly so.

I appreciate the remarks made by the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) with regard to Nelsons and Producers Meat Markets, which is fully owned by the producers. I have tried to encourage it all along the line. I have associated myself closely with the secretary and the two Managing Directors, and at all times we have been able to agree. I think both parties have gained advantage from our association. Only recently, we approved an extension of the Government Produce Department at Light Square for the benefit of this co-operative, and I know it strongly appreciates what has been done. The co-operation I have

had with this organization is shown by the fact that it was prepared to finance the extension, if the Government could not do so immediately. We were able to do the work, which has made it much easier for the co-operative. At all times we have had the respect of Nelsons, and we have had the assistance of the member for Stirling and the directors. Nelsons has provided a service to the primary producers and also to butchers, particularly small butchers of the city area. It is good to know that this firm wishes to enlarge the premises, even after only a year's operation.

I have given much attention to the small seeds industry in the South-East since becoming a Minister. This was a growing industry, which became a large-scale concern only in the last few years. On assuming office, I found that the departmental officers were greatly overworked as they assisted in this industry. They were working day and night, particularly on seed certification. As this did not please me at all, I made direct representation to the Public Service Commissioner and was able to get an additional four research officers to go to the South-East to assist in this work. Also, other officers were employed in the department because we realized the value of this work not only to the South-East but also to other parts of the State, where people were able to obtain seeds and produce more on their properties. Those working in the South-East had one aim and that was to produce at a cheaper price thus enabling new pastures to be opened in other parts of the State more rapidly than would have been the case had the price of seed been too high.

The price of small seed has been reduced so that producers in other areas can improve the fertility of the soil and its carrying capacity. This has already been borne out as this year the number of sheep is about 2,000,000 higher than the number two years ago. Much of this has been brought about because the seed has been produced more cheaply, thus allowing producers in other parts of the State (particularly Eyre Peninsula and the Murray Mallee) to open pastures, build up soil fertility, and increase the stock-carrying capacity. This must benefit the State. I take much pleasure from the fact that I have been closely associated with the people who have provided this service. Recently I was happy to recommend one of these producers for a Harkness scholarship for oversea study of small seeds. This will benefit not only the producer but the whole industry, and such a trip must bear fruit.

I have one criticism of the former Government concerning its apathy towards the conditions of the Agriculture Department. I do not say it was complacent: I say it was apathetic. When I first saw the conditions that employees of the department had to put up with, I was appalled. On assuming office, I went into the Agriculture Department building which, as most people know, is an old factory totally unsuited to the type of work for which it is now being used. Highly paid public servants worked under unsatisfactory conditions. The building is hot in summer and cold in winter; inside it is painted with old whitewash and does not afford any prestige value whatever. I was appalled at the way the former Government let this state of affairs continue. It bragged about what it had done in the way of Government buildings, schools and so on, yet it did nothing to provide facilities for the primary-producing public. How could anybody go into the Agriculture Department building in Gawler Place and be pleased with what he saw? How could people get the best services that should be available to them while these conditions existed?

Mr. Nankivell: It was intended that the department be situated in the new State Government building.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes, and the department looked like being moved by 1970 or later. So much dilly-dallying was not good enough for me: I thought action should be taken. The department will now be established at Northfield, alongside the research building.

Mr. Jennings: It's a good district.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes, and it is well represented. I am sure the move will lift the morale of the officers concerned and raise the prestige of primary industry. I have been told that it is well appreciated by most officers of the department, and I am confident that that is so. Some officers, particularly on the clerical staff, may not want to go out to that area, but the position will adjust itself because people living near there will take their places, and those people will not have to travel so far to their work. It will also have the advantage of providing parking facilities for farmers who come to Adelaide for advice from departmental officers. I am pleased that this will benefit the department considerably.

I deplore the conditions under which officers in the Chemistry Department are working.

This is a shocking building; it was erected in the early days of this State. We know that it was once a State women's prison, and it looks like it. It is no encouragement for people who are highly qualified and people who have a great deal of prestige to work in such a building, and it is no wonder that we lose officers to other States when they have to work under those conditions. The previous Government took no interest in this at all, and it was only recently that this matter was referred to the Public Works Committee for action to be taken. I trust that these people will in future be housed in better premises. The Chemistry Department renders an important service, and its officers are entitled to better conditions.

As we know, money is to be made available by the Commonwealth Government for softwood plantings, and it is hoped that the output will be extended considerably by 1970. When I became Minister of Forests I found that South Australia had been left out in this regard. I was disappointed to see this, and I made strong representations to the Forestry Council to see that we were included in the forestry programme. We have an opportunity for expansion in our South-East and in the Adelaide Hills and, although land is not cheap, its use in this regard is profitable. The revenue of the Woods and Forests Department is very important to this State, so its activities need to be encouraged and expanded. This year we have purchased about 5,000 acres in these two areas, and we are still buying as much land as it is possible and economic to buy, because we consider that the future of South Australia depends to a great degree on afforestation. It is my desire to join in wholeheartedly with the scheme so that we may share in some of the Loan money that will be provided by the Commonwealth Government free of interest for 10 years and possibly 15 years, with the final repayment over 40 years. This will allow us at least to get some return before we start repaying, and this can benefit South Australia and Australia as a whole.

This Government has been accused of forgetting about decentralization, but nothing is further from the truth. This Government when in Opposition was loud in its claim that there was a need for decentralization, and it is still of that opinion. I thank the Premier for his activities in relation to my district. I have said before (and I believe I was supported last night by the member for Ridley) that the Murray District generally was ideally suited

for decentralization, and already this Government has assisted four industries in that district. I think we were fortunate that the Case company became interested, and here I claim some credit through my representations to the company. Its representatives came and discussed this matter with us, and that company is now firmly entrenched in Murray Bridge. The company had the full co-operation of the Premier and his department. I assure the House that if the company needs any assistance the Premier's Department is there to help; it has already helped industry, and it will help more in the future.

Murray Bridge now has a meatworks that started with about eight employees. It has now embarked on an enterprise for export abattoirs. It is employing 40 men at present, and it intends to step this up to at least 135 when it is granted an export licence. Plans are well under way. The Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry has worked in very well with that firm, and it is hoped that it will not be long before plans come to fruition. This shows that the Government is concerned about decentralization. The fact that the Premier's Department was set up should not be ridiculed: if members are interested in the promotion of industries in their districts, they should take advantage of the existence of this department.

I have spoken for much longer than I intended to speak, but I thought I should clarify the Government's attitude towards the primary producers. I thought, too, that I should say something about my own position, particularly as I was accused of being complacent. This I strongly deny. In conclusion, I wish to say that since I have been Minister of Agriculture I have enjoyed my experiences and the associations I have had with all the people engaged in primary industry.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I am sure that Opposition members would not think there had been an Address in Reply debate if I did not refer to some of the matters raised. I assure honourable members that any of the matters raised that have reasonable merit will receive the Government's attention. Of course, members will admit that it would not be possible for any Government to do anything about many of the matters raised in a debate such as this. However, many matters are already being considered. I believe that many district matters can be brought to the notice of the Government by members on both sides.

I associate myself with the remarks that have been made concerning the visit to this State of the Queen Mother, who told me that the function arranged for her at the South Australian Hotel was one of the most enjoyable evenings she had spent on any of her visits. She felt that she was most welcome and was pleased to meet those who were introduced to her. She enjoyed her stay and told me before she left that she would like to spend at least another six days with us. I thought that was a grand tribute to the people of South Australia.

I now refer to paragraph four of the Speech. The late Sir Frank Tennyson Perry was a member of the Parliament for a total period of 23 years. It was with much regret that the Government learned of his passing. Sir Frank's concentration and effort in establishing such an outstanding company as Perry Engineering Company Ltd., together with the work of those associated with him, speaks volumes for industrial achievement in the interests of the State. By his passing we have lost a grand South Australian and an Australian of great distinction. As a result of his organizing capacity and energetic approach the company was able to attract business from far beyond the boundaries of the State. I am sure all members of the Parliament hope that the present management of the company will continue to achieve success in the interests of South Australia and for the benefit of Australia as a whole.

I refer next to the late Sir Richard Layton Butler, a former Premier and Treasurer of the State. Although I was not in the Parliament when he was a member, I recall that during the Second World War Sir Richard was called on to administer the rationing of fuel, and he did a grand job. I pay a tribute for the service he rendered. This work could not have been done so well without his broad outlook and the knowledge he acquired as a member of this House.

I, like other members, was pleased to be associated not only in the Party but in the Parliament itself with the late A. V. Thompson, who was better known as Bert Thompson. He was a big man in stature, but was modest. Above all, he had a big heart, as was revealed by his generosity to other people, particularly in times of stress or strain. He could be depended upon to take part in a debate at any time and always spoke with a sincerity of approach. He could be relied upon to introduce new matter into a debate. Before his retirement from this Parliament he was

a member of a Commonwealth Commission on housing, which made an extensive investigation throughout Australia. His contributions to the deliberations of the House of Representatives were as valuable as his contributions here.

I did not know the late Edward John Craigie as a member of this House but I knew of his activities outside as an authority on single tax. He was interested in the literary society and could always be relied upon to make an interesting contribution in any debate on single tax. I did not know him personally, but I knew of the service he rendered to the South Australian Parliament. The Government has extended sympathy to the families of all these former members, but I could not let the occasion pass without paying a tribute to their work.

Paragraph 5 of the Speech refers to the Premier's Department. When the new Government came to office, it was only to be expected that there might be some hesitancy on the part of the people generally about accepting the Government's attitude on various matters. Undoubtedly, we expected to be under some type of, not suspicion but—

Mr. Clark: Very close scrutiny.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I had no objection to being under that scrutiny. I am pleased that people are not losing interest in extending industry in this State.

Mr. Clark: That is good to hear.

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

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I gave information to the House yesterday about the Premier's Department and its work. Mr. Lloyd Hourigan was the first person appointed Industries Promotion and Research Officer in that department and, after he was appointed Secretary to the Public Works Committee, he was replaced by Mr. Belchamber, who resigned from the Commonwealth Government. The purpose of this appointment was to encourage the establishment of industry in this State. Since I have been Premier, the Secretary of the department (Mr. John White) has required additional assistance, because the work of the department is increasing each week. Splendid co-operation is evident under Mr. White's able administration. Much information has been sought from the department, not only locally but from oversea countries, about possibilities of establishing industries in this State. The way these inquiries are handled, and the quality of the information conveyed, speaks volumes for the attitude of the personnel of this department. Tonight I signed a lengthy

letter containing a reasonable quantity of information concerning a particular industry. This is one of many letters despatched consistently from the department. I expect that eventually results will be obtained, although not perhaps a 100 per cent result.

No industry can be established overnight: it took many months of negotiation, not only by me and officers of my department but by the Housing Trust, before negotiations with Chrysler Aust. Ltd. were successfully concluded. The Highways and Railways Departments were involved in these discussions, too. When Sir Thomas Playford was Premier of this State long negotiations were necessary before an industry could be established and, no doubt, this practice will continue. I am confident of further successes in the establishment of industry in this State. Some may be small and some large: some may be extremely large, and although I shall not nominate any particular industry I am confident that industries will be established during this financial year.

Criticism has been levelled at the Government about the migration position in this State. Last Thursday, the member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne) quoted the numbers of arrivals of nominated migrants in this State. I am not detracting from those figures but, in 1963, 10,447 British nationals arrived in this State as migrants. In 1964 there were 15,839, and in 1965 the total increased to 18,269. For 1963, the total of British nationals, non-British nationals and other settlers was 13,112; for 1964, it was 19,985; and for 1965, it was 22,567. These figures are from the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics and are based on the stated intentions of the arrivals. These figures augur well for future migration to South Australia, as I believe this trend will continue. I do not wish to alter this position, and we should accept these people as citizens of this country, as they will be an asset. However, migration involves Government expenditure, irrespective of which Party is in power, because, in the first instance, accommodation has to be provided. Having provided accommodation, it is only natural that we should also provide schooling, hospitalization and other ancillary matters. In this connection we can expect an expansion of the necessary services, and I hope that will continue.

The present Leader of the Opposition in this debate criticized the attitude adopted about migrants being able in Britain to arrange for housing accommodation on their arrival here. I accepted the challenge made by some

welfare officers associated with the Good Neighbour Council. They told me, "If you want to find hardship, go out into the Modbury and Para Hills areas and ascertain the number of people being charged exorbitant rates of interest for their houses." I did so and, to my surprise, found this to be true, that in many cases immigrants had purchased houses (not Housing Trust houses) and, for a few months after their arrival here, they had been making repayments which they thought were reasonable. Then they found, to their surprise, that they had to arrange for extra temporary finance.

Mr. Heaslip: Why?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Because the terms of their arrangements with the companies had expired.

Mr. Heaslip: They did not get any overtime.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Don't introduce overtime! I am speaking of the agreement to purchase houses: I am not talking of overtime. I am saying that many of these people were under the impression that the agreements they had entered into included arrangements for long-term repayments of mortgages—but that was not so: the repayments were short-term. Probably, they had entered into these arrangements overseas (I do not know) but, when they came here to purchase houses, they discovered that the financial arrangements operated for only a few months. In some cases they were told to go to the Savings Bank, the State Bank or some other lending institution that would arrange for long-term house purchase finance.

Having decided to do this, they then found that they had to compete with those people already here and had to wait their turn. In the meantime in order to secure a roof over their heads they had to accept temporary or emergency financial arrangements—in many cases involving an interest rate of 1 per cent flat a month. Can a man maintain such a high interest rate on a house if the mortgage is for \$8,000, or even more? Of course he can't. Nobody should expect it, but that was the only way for him to secure accommodation. I said, "Very well; let us examine it." The people who waited on me agreed to the conditions I proposed. To the best of my knowledge, they are agreed on a 7½ per cent interest charge on capital expenditure as rent for the houses they intend to purchase as soon as they are able to get a long-term loan. They will pay rent for the property, they will put down a deposit and then they will start their

repayments. I think it is a fairly generous offer. These people have an alternative: they can accept, and then sell the house provided the repayments are reasonably long-term, as in the case of other mortgage agreements executed in this State. They are the conditions that I expect will operate to give these people the opportunity of owning their own houses. I have said repeatedly that I believe that, if young married couples can start off by having a financial interest in a house, it is to their advantage. I shall continue to do the best I can for them. I do not mind being questioned about my attitude on this. If people want to purchase some other house away from Housing Trust accommodation, they are welcome to do so. All I ask is that they have a reasonable chance of getting a long-term loan through either the Savings Bank or the State Bank so that they will be able to own a house after 25 or 30 years.

I hope the House will agree to my amending the Address in Reply. Honourable members are aware that His Excellency the Governor returned this morning to South Australia. Therefore, it is necessary to change slightly the formal wording of the Address in Reply, which has now to be presented to His Excellency the Governor, and not to His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor. Therefore, I move:

(1) In paragraph 1 to strike out "Your Excellency" and insert "His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor".

(2) To insert the following new paragraph—
1a. We warmly welcome Your Excellency's return to South Australia.

(3) In paragraph 3 to strike out "Your Excellency's" and insert "the".

I have already informed the House that I, on behalf of the Government and people of South Australia, met His Excellency at the Adelaide airport this morning. In addition to what I said about His Excellency this afternoon, I am pleased that he and Lady Bastyan have returned to South Australia.

Amendments carried; Address in Reply, as amended, adopted.

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor has intimated that he will be pleased to receive members for the presentation of the Address in Reply at Government House on Thursday, July 14, at 2.10 p.m.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (WATERWORKS AND SEWERAGE) BILL.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Waterworks Act,

1932-1962, and the Sewerage Act, 1929-1962. Read a first time.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill to amend the Waterworks Act, 1932-1962, and the Sewerage Act, 1929-1962, has a twofold object, namely, (a) to amend section 121 of the Waterworks Act to include the Coonalpyn Downs water district, and (b) to amend the Waterworks Act and the Sewerage Act to make provision for the payment of water rates and sewerage rates on a quarterly basis as from July 1, 1967. With regard to the amendment to section 121 of the Waterworks Act the intention is to make special provision for rating in the Coonalpyn Downs water district (which has been recently proclaimed as a water district). In the Taillem Bend to Keith scheme 51 miles of trunk main runs parallel to the railway line, and if rating is not extended across this railway the estimated revenue from the scheme will decrease from \$19,054 to \$12,000, a reduction of about \$7,000, or almost 37 per cent.

When evidence on this scheme was given to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, on the revenue that would be derived from the main it was assumed that legislation would be made to permit rating across the railway. A similar situation arose on Eyre Peninsula when the Tod River trunk main was being constructed. The Waterworks Act was at that time amended by the insertion of the existing section 121 that has the effect of permitting rating across the railway which, in that case, runs alongside the trunk main for almost 200 miles. We are now faced with a similar problem in the Coonalpyn Downs water district. This amendment has become urgent, since the first sections of the scheme are already in operation. Clause 11 accordingly gives effect to the Government's proposals in this regard. With regard to the major amendments contained in this Bill and referred to in paragraph (b) *supra*, the legislative proposal is designed primarily for the convenience of ratepayers, as experience over the last four years has shown to the officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department that many ratepayers are finding it difficult to pay their water and sewerage rates in a lump sum on the due date. This is evidenced by the fact that an increasing number of ratepayers elect to pay by instalments or take advantage of a two-month deferment of rates granted by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. It should also be borne in mind that the department's accounts are rendered and become payable at the same time as council rates, and

this does little to assist the spreading of the financial burden on ratepayers.

The Government, being convinced of the justification for, and the merits in, a system whereby accounts for water and sewerage rates could be paid on a quarterly basis, and realizing that the present accounting system would not be able to handle the increased volume of accounts that would result from a change to quarterly payments, has already installed data processing equipment at the Automatic Data Processing Centre. Investigations by departmental officers have shown, however, that, by reason of the considerable amount of preparatory work that has to be done before the new system of rendering accounts and collecting payments on a quarterly basis can operate, it will not be possible to introduce such a system in this State until July 1, 1967. Although the current practice overseas, particularly in America, is for accounts to be rendered throughout the year on a monthly, bi-monthly or quarterly basis, this State is, I understand, the first in Australia to introduce legislation to enable water and sewerage rates to be paid on a quarterly basis. I am, however, informed that the principal water supply authorities in certain other States are considering the introduction of a system enabling payments throughout the year.

Before the new system can come into operation it is necessary that the existing Waterworks and Sewerage Acts be amended so that the changeover to payments on a quarterly basis will have legislative authority. I now deal with the proposed amendments in detail in the order in which they appear in this Bill. By clause 3, section 66 of the Waterworks Act is amended to enable the Minister to make an assessment for the purposes of this Act on January 1, 1967, and on January 1 in each succeeding year. The assessment, unless lawfully altered, will come into force on July 1, 1967, and on July 1 in each succeeding year, and will remain in force until the end of that financial year. If the assessment is altered, the altered assessment shall be regarded as having come into force from the commencement of that financial year. The object of those provisions is to enable time for the hearing of appeals against assessments to be made between the making of the assessment and the coming into force of the assessment in any year.

In subclause (4) provision is made for the Minister to direct by notice in the *Government Gazette* that the assessment in force on the last day of any year shall continue in force during the whole of the next financial year.

Subclause (5) provides that, until the assessment made on January 1, 1967, comes into force, the assessment in force at the commencement of this legislation shall be the assessment for the purposes of this Act. Subclauses (6), (7) and (8) are concerned with the Corporation of the City of Adelaide assessment. Subclause (6) enables the Minister to make such an assessment on July 1 in each year and to adopt either wholly or in part the assessment made by, or by the authority of, the Corporation of the City of Adelaide. Under existing legislation, the Minister and the corporation both make their assessments as at July 1 of any year, and by virtue of section 68 of the Act the Minister may adopt either wholly or in part any assessment in force made by any municipal or district council. It has long been the practice for the Minister to adopt the assessment then in force made by the Corporation of the City of Adelaide. This thus avoids unnecessary duplication of assessments in a complex and detailed municipal area. The Government wishes to continue this practice under the changed circumstances.

In clause 4, which amends section 69 of the Waterworks Act, opportunity has been taken to confer upon the Minister power to have access to and to inspect land and premises within any water district. At present his power is limited to the inspection of rate books, assessment books and other books relating to the assessment of any land or premises. It is considered by Government that this additional power is both logical and necessary for the proper administration of this Act.

Clause 5 amends section 73 of the Waterworks Act, and its intention is to permit the Minister to re-assess any land or premises which have undergone any change by reason of the erection, alteration or demolition of any building, or the subdivision or resubdivision of any land or for any other reason. Under the existing legislation the assessment is only varied on the first day of July in each year, and any variation in the state of the property during the year is not taken into account. The amendment to section 73 of the Waterworks Act also authorizes the Minister to alter not only an assessment in force but also an assessment to come into force in pursuance of the amendments proposed in section 66 of the Act.

Clause 6, which amends section 82 of the Waterworks Act, is designed to make clear that the Minister may make and levy water rates on all lands or premises comprised in any assessment made under this Act in force on July 1

in each year. It is not at all clear what the expression "the said assessment" in existing section 82 (1) is intended to refer to. This subsection as redrafted clarifies the basis on which rates will be levied on any assessment whether it is an assessment made under section 66 or adopted thereunder or on a new or amended assessment made under section 73 of the Act.

Clause 7, which amends section 86 of the Waterworks Act, is designed to show the period of consumption to which the rates levied are to be applied for rebate purposes. For a proper understanding of this amendment perhaps I should explain that at present meters are read twice yearly—the first reading having no significance except that it is useful for the purpose of advising ratepayers what their consumption is up to the date of that reading, and for checking to see if the meters are operating efficiently. It is the final reading that matters, as this is the reading that determines the quantity of water consumed in excess of the quantity entitled to be consumed. The present practice is to commence reading in March and to finish by June 30 in any year. Under the new proposed system of quarterly accounts the final reading will commence in January and finish by June 30. The further amendment contained in this clause is to delete the reference to "through any one service and meter". The reason for this is that many properties are now supplied by more than one service, and water consumption through such services is aggregated and offset against water rates payable on the whole property.

Clause 8 (a) amends section 90 of the Waterworks Act by deleting the reference to the Second Schedule. The effect of this will be that the section will apply to country lands water districts referred to in Part VI of the Act as well as township water districts. This is considered to be desirable in the interests of consistency and uniformity with regard to the imposition of water and construction rates. The clause further lays down in paragraph (b) thereof that water rates shall be payable in respect of land and premises within any water district from the first of the next following payment day mentioned in or prescribed in pursuance of section 94 of the Act according to the scale in force at the time such rates become payable. It may be remarked in this connection that the effect of this provision will be that there will be a slight reduction in rates charged but this reduction is expected to be offset by the amount of excess water charge if excess water is consumed.

Clause 9 is the important provision in this Part, for it repeals section 94 of the Act and enacts that all water rates and minimum charges for water supplied by measure under agreement shall be payable by equal payments on July 1, October 1, January 1 and April 1 in each year instead of on July 1 in each year as at present proclaimed pursuant to section 94. In other words, it introduces a payment of rates on a quarterly basis instead of the existing annual basis. However, the Governor has power to change these payment days by proclamation as in existing section 94.

By clause 10, section 104 of the Waterworks Act is repealed and re-enacted. The intention of the new section is to ensure that the construction rate payable under Part VI of the Act shall be payable and recoverable in the same manner as water rates are payable and recoverable under Part V of the Act, thus achieving uniformity as between the collection of water rates and the collection of construction rates. Part III deals with amendments to the Sewerage Act. I do not propose to deal in detail with the amendments covered by each clause in this Part, for the amendments to the Sewerage Act have the same effect with regard to sewerage rates as the amendments in the Waterworks Act have with regard to water rates. The reasons for the amendments to both Acts are substantially the same. I consider, therefore, that it will be sufficient for me to point out the amendments to the Sewerage Act and compare them with amendments already explained as regards the Waterworks Act.

Clause 13, which repeals section 61 of the Sewerage Act, has the same effect with regard to sewerage rates, and is amended for the same reasons that clause 3 amends section 66 of the Waterworks Act with regard to water rates. Clause 14 amends section 69 of the Sewerage Act, and has the same effect with regard to sewerage rates and is amended for the same reason that clause 5 amends section 73 of the Waterworks Act with regard to water rates.

Clause 15, which amends section 70 of the Sewerage Act, has the same effect with regard to sewerage rates. This section is amended for the same reason that clause 4 amends section 69 of the Waterworks Act with regard to water rates.

Clause 16, which amends section 74 of the Sewerage Act, has the same effect with regard to sewerage rates, and is amended for the same reason that clause 6 amends section 82 of the Waterworks Act with regard to water rates. Clause 17, which amends section 78 of the

Sewerage Act, has the same effect with regard to sewerage rates, and is amended for the same reason that clause 8 (apart for the amendment that has the effect of bringing country water districts into line with town water districts) amends section 90 of the Waterworks Act with regard to water rates. Clause 18, which amends section 79 of the Sewerage Act, has the same effect with regard to sewerage rates, and is amended for the same reason that clause 9 amends section 94 of the Waterworks Act with regard to water rates.

Mr. CUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

REGISTRATION OF DOGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education) moved:

That the Registration of Dogs Act Amendment Bill, 1965, be restored to the Notice Paper as a lapsed Bill pursuant to section 57 of the Constitution Act, 1934-1965.

Motion carried.

HOUSING AGREEMENT BILL.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to approve an agreement between the Commonwealth of Australia and the States of Australia in relation to housing and for other purposes.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to approve a draft Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement negotiated in Adelaide earlier this year with the Commonwealth and to authorize the Treasurer to enter into, execute and carry out the agreement. Clause 2 of the Bill so provides, while clause 3 applies sections 3 and 4 of the Housing Agreement Act, 1956, to the agreement executed pursuant to that Act as amended by the 1961 agreement and the proposed new agreement. Clauses 4 and 5 are machinery clauses empowering the Treasurer to provide for expenses incurred by the State under the amended agreement, clause 16 (2) of which refers to expenses in providing finance for home builders. Clause 5 enables the Treasurer to make advances to the Home Builders' Account up to \$500,000, subject to payment of interest at the current Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement rate

and, as in 1961, is included so that approvals of loans from the Home Builders' Account can be continued without deferments if the account appears likely to run temporarily into deficit.

I have outlined the formal provisions of the Bill and now deal with the proposed agreement, the text of which appears in the schedule. As honourable members are aware, the existing housing agreement expired on June 30 last. The new agreement will in fact extend the existing agreement for a period of five years, with certain amendments agreed to at a conference of Commonwealth and State housing authorities and officers held in March of this year. Clause 2 of the amended agreement provides for the extension of the definition of "member of the Forces" so as to include those persons who served on "special service" in South Vietnam or Malaysia, or in another area declared to be a "special area" for the purposes of repatriation and War Service Homes benefits. Clauses 3, 4, 5 and 6 extend the operation of the main agreement for a further period of five years.

Clause 7 of the new agreement deletes the subclause of clause 11 of the existing agreement providing that, unless the Commonwealth and the appropriate State Minister agree, advances may not be used to erect outside the inner metropolitan area blocks of flats exceeding three storeys in height. The States considered this provision to be unduly restrictive, and the Commonwealth agreed to its deletion. Clause 8 of the new agreement proposes amendments to clause 13 of the existing agreement. Under the existing agreement there is some doubt whether the States may use advances to erect service dwellings in accordance with the approved scales and standards. The amendment removes these doubts.

Clause 9 of the new agreement inserts additional provisions in the existing clause 16 to ensure that people in rural areas of certain States are not deprived of the benefits of the Home Builders' Account provisions because no building or housing societies operate in their areas. The amendment will permit such a State to allocate, during the next five years, an agreed portion of the moneys available in the Home Builders' Account to a Government lending institution for lending to persons seeking to buy or build houses in rural areas. As far as South Australia is concerned, persons in rural areas have always had at least equal access to Home Builders' Account moneys as have people in the metropolitan area. The greater part of Home Builders' Account money is allocated each year through the State Bank,

which is, of course, in a position to handle housing finance in rural areas and ensure that those areas are under no relative disability whatever.

The existing housing agreement has been of great benefit. Acceptance of the new agreement will mean an extension of these benefits for a further five years. During the conference of Commonwealth and State Ministers of Housing at which the agreement was negotiated, the attention of the Commonwealth Minister, Senator the Honourable Dame Annabelle Rankin, was drawn to the necessity of additional Commonwealth funds being made available for inner suburban redevelopment, and also for the Commonwealth to provide additional funds through this agreement specifically for the proper housing of elderly people. I think it is fair to say that the Commonwealth Minister was impressed with the necessity for such works and she undertook to consider the representations made by the States. No provision for such is included in the agreement now presented for approval but, in the event of the Commonwealth's agreeing to assist in such matters, this matter would be handled in a supplementary agreement.

Mr. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

AMENDING FINANCIAL AGREEMENT BILL.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to ratify and approve an agreement made between the Commonwealth of Australia and the respective States of Australia, and for other purposes.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This is a short Bill, the sole purpose of which is to ratify and approve of the necessary amendment to the Financial Agreement between the Commonwealth and States following upon the introduction of decimal currency in February last. The agreement has been executed by the Prime Minister and the Premiers of all the States and requires formal approval and ratification by Parliament. It will be seen that the amendments relate solely to the substitution of decimal currency equivalents for amounts in the old currency in

relevant parts of the principal agreement as amended from time to time.

Mr HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST BILL.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to establish an Aboriginal Lands Trust, to define the powers and functions thereof, for purposes incidental thereto and for other purposes.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill, with some amendments, is similar to that introduced last year. As I then said, it takes a significant step in the treatment of Aboriginal people not only in this State but in Australia. The Aboriginal people of this country are the only comparable indigenous people who have been given no specific rights in their own lands. The Maoris, the Eskimos, the American Indians all had treaty rights and ownership and control of lands in their countries. The Aboriginal people in this State, as elsewhere, have had certain areas of land reserved for Aborigines, but these have been Crown lands not owned or controlled by the Aboriginal people and from which they could be removed. It is not surprising that Aborigines everywhere in this country have been bitter that they have had their country taken from them and been given no compensatory rights to land in any area.

I intend to trace the history of Aboriginal land rights in South Australia, because on examination it is clear that Aborigines were wrongfully deprived of their just dues. We must, as far as we can, right the wrongs done by our forefathers. The Letters Patent Under the Great Seal of the United Kingdom erecting and establishing the province of South Australia and fixing the boundaries thereof, dated February 19, 1836, contained the following proviso:

Provided always that nothing in these our Letters Patent contained shall affect or be construed to affect the rights of any Aboriginal natives of the said province to the actual occupation or enjoyment in their own persons or in the persons of their descendants of any lands therein now actually occupied or enjoyed by such natives.

While the commissioners of the Wakefield scheme in South Australia were empowered by the Act constituting the colony to declare all the lands of the colony, except portions required for roads and footpaths, to be open to purchase by British subjects, and to make regulations for the surveying and sale of such lands at such prices they from time to time might deem expedient, and to pay the whole of the cash proceeds into an Immigration Fund, the commissioners informed the House of Commons that for the purpose of securing to the natives their proprietary right to the soil, wherever such right might be found to exist, special instructions were given to the Colonial Commissioner in which it was laid down as a principle that of the colonial lands placed by Parliament at the disposal of the commissioners, no portion which the natives might possess in occupation or enjoyment should be offered for sale until ceded by the natives to the Colonial Commissioner. That officer was required to furnish the Protector of Aborigines with evidence of the faithful fulfilment of the bargains or treaties which he should effect with the Aborigines, and it was made the duty of the latter not only to see that such bargains or treaties were faithfully executed but also to call upon the Executive Government of the colony to protect the natives in the undisturbed enjoyment of those of their lands of which they should not be disposed to make voluntary transfer.

It was further ordained that such transfer should be considered as involving a stipulation on the part of the purchasers that the Aboriginal parties thereto should be permanently supplied with the means of subsistence and with moral and religious instruction. It was proposed that such lands as might be ceded by the natives to the commissioners should be sold under the condition that for every 80 acres the purchaser would pay for four-fifths or 64 acres only; the conveyance to be made subject to a stipulation that at the expiration of a term of years the land so conveyed should be divided into five equal parts, one of these parts, or 16 acres, to be resumed as a reserve for the use of Aborigines, and the remaining four parts, or 64 acres, to remain with the proprietor as his freehold, the proprietor in possession being allowed the first choice of two of the five parts, the Protector to select the reserve out of the remaining three. The purpose of this was to ensure that the cost of development of the land would lie not with the Aborigines but with the proposed purchaser, and that upon the land reverting to the

Aborigines it would revert in developed form. The general instructions to the Resident Commissioner by the commissioners in London include the following provisions concerning the native inhabitants of the province:

His Majesty's government having appointed an officer whose especial duty it will be to protect the interests of the Aborigines, the commissioners consider it unnecessary to do more than give you a few general instructions as to the manner in which they are desirous that your own proceedings, with regard to the native inhabitants, should be regulated.

You will see that no lands, which the natives may possess in occupation or enjoyment, be offered for sale until previously ceded by the native to yourself.

You will furnish the Protector of the Aborigines with evidence of the faithful fulfilment of the bargains or treaties which you may effect with the Aborigines for the cession of lands; and you will take care that the Aborigines are not disturbed in the enjoyment of the lands over which they may possess proprietary rights, and of which they are not disposed to make a voluntary transfer.

On the cession of lands, you will make arrangements for supplying the Aboriginal proprietors of such lands not only with food but with shelter, and with moral and religious instruction. With this view, you will cause weather-proof sheds to be erected for their use, and you will direct that the Aborigines be supplied with food and clothing in exchange for an equivalent in labour.

The means for effecting these objects will be left for your arrangement with the Protector of the Aborigines; but you will bear in mind the necessity for a strict regard to economy. One means by which extensive benefits may probably be conferred on the Aborigines at a

small cost, will be to afford them gratuitous medical assistance and relief.

If such an arrangement should appear to you desirable, you will apply to the Governor to give the necessary instructions to the colonial surgeon.

Some two years after the founding of the province, the Secretary of the South Australian Association observed in a report to England:

No legal provision by way of purchase of land on their behalf or in any other mode has yet been made, nor do I think with proper care it is at all necessary.

This remark augured ill for the scheme which had been suggested and, in fact, it never got off the ground, since the Aborigines laid no claim to proprietorship rights of the kind existing in the European society which had now invaded South Australia. Only certain small areas of land were set aside for Aborigines and these not in a developed state. From the earliest times in South Australia it was considered that Aborigines should be subject to some kind of "protection", except in a very few instances, and freehold title to land was not given to the Aboriginal people, but certain Crown lands were reserved for the use of Aborigines. Many of these reserves are small. Certainly they could not form a living area in the agricultural or pastoral sense for an Aboriginal family. The following is a list of the Aborigines' reserves in South Australia, their area, whether they are occupied, whether they are manned by department officers or by missions, and, where occupied, the approximate numbers of the populace:

Aboriginal Reserves.

Reserve.	Hundreds.	Acreage.	Remarks.
Baroota	Baroota	109	Occupied by Aborigines
Berri	Paringa	21	Unoccupied by Aborigines
Bonney	Bonney and Glyde	1,618	Occupied by Aborigines
Boundary Bluff	Baker	96	Unoccupied by Aborigines
Brinkley	Seymour	46	Occupied by Aborigines
Campbell Point	Baker	250	Unoccupied by Aborigines
Ceduna	Bonython	49	Unoccupied by Aborigines
Dodd Landing Point	Baker	90	Unoccupied by Aborigines
Goat Island	Glyde	16	Unoccupied by Aborigines
Mallee Park	Lincoln	20	Unoccupied by Aborigines
Mannum	Youngusband	‡	Unoccupied by Aborigines
Marree	(Suburban to town)	7	Occupied by Aborigines
Moonta	Walleroo	18	Unoccupied by Aborigines
Murat Bay (Duck Ponds)	Bonython	610	Occupied by Aborigines
Needles Island	Glyde	60	Unoccupied by Aborigines
Oodnadatta	(Out of hundreds)	660	Occupied by Aborigines
Parachilna	Parachilna	20	Unoccupied by Aborigines
Point McLeay No. 2	Baker	3,338	Unoccupied by Aborigines
Poonindie	Louth	314	Unoccupied by Aborigines
Rabbit Island	Glyde	138	Unoccupied by Aborigines
Snake Island	Glyde	80	Unoccupied by Aborigines
Streaky Bay	Ripon	26	Unoccupied by Aborigines
Swan Reach	Fisher	155	Unoccupied by Aborigines
Wellington East	Seymour	48	Unoccupied by Aborigines
Wellington West	Brinkley	132	Unoccupied by Aborigines
Fowlers Bay	Caldwell	‡	Unoccupied by Aborigines

The above reserves are not manned by staff.

Manned Aboriginal Reserves and Missions.

Reserves.	Hundreds. ¹	Acreage.	Population.
Coober Pedy	Out of Hundreds	500	+250—300 in district.
Gerard	Katarapko	4,848	140
Koonibba	Catt O'Loughlin	2,000	180
North West	Out of Hundreds	17,676,800	+314
Point McLeay No. 1	Baker	2,716	130
Point Pearce	Kilkerran	13,591	306
Davenport	Davenport	200	437
Missions.	Hundreds.	Area.	Population.
*Yalata	Bice	1,127,247	+350
	Caldwell	acres or	
	Lucy	1,761 sq.	
	May	miles.	
	Sturdee		
	Trunch and		
	Out of Hundreds		
**Ernabella		862 sq.	+340
		miles.	
***Nepabunna	—	36 sq.	81
		miles.	

* Staffed by the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Australia.

** Staffed by the Presbyterian Board of Missions.

*** Staffed by the United Aborigines Mission.

+ Subject to fluctuation because of transients.

¹ Subdivision of county or shire, having its own court.

In due course the Governor obtained power—at some times simply by recommendation of Executive Council, at others by resolution of both Houses of Parliament—to declare by proclamation any Crown lands to be reserved for Aborigines or to alter the boundaries of any reserve or to abolish any reserve. He also had power to acquire land and allot it for Aborigines but the occupancy was to be subject to conditions prescribed by regulation. In fact, little land was acquired or allotted to Aborigines. Under the Crown Lands Act, the Governor obtained power to lease to any Aboriginal native, or the descendant of any Aboriginal native, any Crown lands not exceeding 160 acres in area for any term of years, upon such terms and conditions as he thought fit, and by proclamation to reserve any Crown lands for the use and benefit of the Aboriginal inhabitants of the State. There are very few special Aboriginal leases under the Crown Lands Act. Some Aborigines have obtained freehold title, war service land settlement blocks, or the like, in the same way as other members of the community.

In comparatively recent times, only two large acquisitions of land for the use of Aborigines have been made. One is of the Yalata Station, now run by the Lutheran Mission, on the West Coast, to which the Aborigines from the Ooldea Soak transferred. The other is of the Gerard Mission area, an area of some 5,000 acres, including 1,000 acres of excellent irrigable land on the bank of the River Murray, near Winkie.

Each of these areas is Crown land, as is the case with other reserves. In the north-west of the State, the arid pastoral country, there was of course reserved a very large area, forming the South Australian portion of the Central Aborigines Reserve. The remaining areas in this part of the State have been split up into pastoral leases, and the only right of Aborigines in those areas is to wander freely on pastoral leases, provided they do not interfere with installations or improvements. Aborigines did acquire certain specific rights by legislation to take game out of season but, as may be seen from what I have said, no land rights comparable with those granted to many other indigenous peoples were ever ensured for the Aboriginal people of South Australia, despite the instructions and the published good intentions of the founders of the province.

Given the fact that Aborigines' reserves on Crown lands in other parts of Australia have at times been disposed of to the disadvantage of Aboriginal people, that Aborigines widely have come to know, understand, and in many cases accept the attitudes of the European community as to proprietary rights in land, and that they feel extremely bitter that provision was not made for them, the Government of South Australia determined that it would ensure title in the existing land to the Aboriginal people, provided they could manage these lands themselves, and, where possible, give them some extra title in land as some form of possible compensation, limited though it

might be, for the failure to carry out the original proposal of the Commissioners. In addition, it was felt that in due course further areas, useful for Aborigines, could be acquired and title provided to the Aboriginal people.

The Government, therefore, proposes to ensure land rights to Aborigines in this State, but to go further, and, as a matter of specific compensation to the Aboriginal people, to ensure to them control of mineral rights in any lands held as Aboriginal lands beyond those given to other citizens. It was essential for us to avoid the difficulties that have arisen in the United States of America, Canada and New Zealand concerning land rights for the indigenous people, for constitutional difficulties, fragmentation of title, and difficulty of calculation of inheritance of tribal assets have beset the administrations. Careful consideration to all these problems was given before the present plan embodied in the Bill was formulated. The Bill creates an Aboriginal Lands Trust consisting entirely of members who are Aborigines or persons of Aboriginal blood within the meaning of the Aboriginal Affairs Act. At the outset the trust will consist of three members nominated by the Governor. To these it is proposed to transfer all unoccupied reserve lands in the State and all occupied reserve lands not supervised either by the Government or by a mission when the residents of those lands indicate that they wish the lands to be held by the trust.

Thereafter, reserve lands in the supervised reserves may be transferred, apart from the administration buildings and staff homes, to the trust when the Aborigines Council established on these reserves pursuant to the Aboriginal Affairs Act indicates that it wishes the reserve lands to be held by the trust. At such time, the council may recommend to the Governor the appointment of a member to represent it on the trust board, and the Governor may appoint the recommended Aboriginal to the board. The reserve councils, elected by reserve residents of three months' standing and more, are now functioning on an informal basis on the reserves. They will, however, shortly be constituted formally by regulation under the Aboriginal Affairs Act and given specific rights and titles, which it is clear from their period of informal operation they can and will discharge effectively. It will be possible for the trust board to negotiate with particular reserve councils for the development of these reserves, and to run separate reserve accounts if that seems to them best.

The Secretary of the trust board will be the Director of Aboriginal Affairs. The Minister of Aboriginal Affairs may use the officers of his department for work for the trust in his discretion, but the trust may also employ its own officers, who will not be members of the Public Service. The Minister may grant or lend money to the trust from moneys provided by Parliament for Aboriginal welfare in South Australia, and the trust is to hold all moneys received by it for development of trust lands or the acquisition of further lands or for assistance to Aborigines in relation to trust lands. The trust may exercise its own discretion as to development of the lands but may alienate the land only with the consent of the Minister. The Minister's consent is not to be withheld if he is satisfied that the benefits and value of the land being alienated are being preserved to the Aboriginal people so that the purposes of the trust are carried out. The Governor may by proclamation transfer any Crown lands or any other lands reserved for Aborigines to the trust. Some additional lands are necessary for Aborigines in South Australia, and it is hoped that in due course these may be provided to the trust; but, of course, the Governor will make a proclamation only upon the recommendation of the Minister of Lands.

The plan of having a trust for the whole of the Aborigines of South Australia will provide a flexibility that will avoid the difficulties experienced in other countries, which I outlined. As the trust must report publicly and have its books audited by the Auditor-General, sufficient public surveillance of its duties can be ensured. I know that there are Aborigines in South Australia with the necessary qualifications and abilities properly to discharge the functions of the trust board, and I am confident that South Australia in taking this step is doing something of significance, not only here but for the whole of the Commonwealth. As originally introduced, the Bill provided that neither the Mining Act nor the Mining Petroleum Act should apply to lands transferred to the Lands Trust, except in so far as it was recommended that they should by the trust board itself. This would have given to the Aborigines of South Australia a pre-eminent right to minerals beyond those given to holders of freehold title elsewhere in the State.

The Government had three purposes in doing this. The first was that indigenous peoples elsewhere in the world have, under treaty, been given such pre-eminent mineral rights. American and Canadian Indians and Indians in Alaska have been able, in consequence, to

provide for their people very considerable sums arising from the advantageous contracts made with companies or organizations seeking to exploit minerals on their lands. Only last week there was published in America a review of the very great advantages that have accrued to certain Alaskan Indians in this way. Because of the costs of development and provision of employment for Aborigines in the tribal areas in South Australia, this provision could be a very real basis, upon the discovery of worthwhile minerals or oil or gas, of providing a viable economy in the area. Secondly, this provision of pre-eminent mineral rights would be some small compensation for the failure to provide the Aboriginal people of South Australia with the lands which, according to letters patent and the instructions to the resident commissioners of the province, they were to have been provided with on the founding of the province. Thirdly, it would ensure that Aborigines would not be treated as have Aborigines elsewhere in Australia simply as people to be moved about without specific rights to their tribal areas. The happenings in Queensland and the Northern Territory have aroused fears by Aboriginal people throughout Australia that they will have lands removed from them for mineral exploitation, regardless of their rights or wishes.

The exising held from the Central Reserve of a portion of that reserve on the Western Australian side of the border has lead to very considerable fears (and justifiable fears) by Aboriginal people. The Government wishes to put this matter beyond doubt. So far as the Aboriginal Affairs Board was aware (and the Government acted upon its beliefs when the Bill was first introduced), no mining rights of any kind existed over Aboriginal reserves in South Australia. There had been certain mining rights in respect of nickel granted in respect of the North-West Reserve, which had expired. When the Bill was introduced it was discovered, as a result of representations made by mining companies, that in fact under the previous Government oil exploration leases had been granted over all Aboriginal reserves in South Australia, except the northern half of the North-West Reserve, and all of these reserves so covered by oil exploration leases were in leases containing much other land. The Government was thus committed by its predecessors to the maintenance of these leases, and naturally could not jeopardize the oil exploration programme undertaken.

The Aboriginal Affairs Board was shocked and horrified to discover that without reference

to it rights in respect of Aboriginal reserves, which had been stated publicly did not exist, had been granted, but the Government was constrained to see that existing oil exploration rights were honoured, and so the Bill is now presented in an amended form to see that existing rights are maintained. However, the Government has sought to do the most that it can in this area, since the rights it sought to give Aborigines have been cavalierly disposed of, without reference to the Aboriginal Affairs Board, and the provisions of the Bill now provide that in the event of a discovery being made, pursuant to existing oil exploration leases, on an Aboriginal reserve, all royalties will be paid to the trust board, if the trust is holding the land, and not to the Government.

I now turn to detailed consideration of the clauses of the Bill. Clause 5 of the Bill constitutes the Aboriginal Lands Trust in the usual form. Clause 6 provides for a membership of at least three members with provision for the appointment of up to nine additional members upon the recommendation of Aboriginal reserve councils each of which may recommend only one member at any one time. An important provision in subclause (1) is that each member of the trust is to be an Aboriginal or person of Aboriginal blood. The term of office is three years and a member is eligible for re-appointment for one more consecutive period. Subclause (4) provides for the filling of vacancies. Clauses 7, 8 and 9 provide for casual vacancies, remuneration of the members and the validity of the acts of the trust in the usual form. Clause 10 provides for meetings at which the chairman or acting chairman is to have both a deliberative and casting vote. Subclause (3) provides that no meeting of the trust may be held in the absence of the secretary who, by clause 14, is the Director of Aboriginal Affairs. In his absence or if he is unable to act another officer of the department may be appointed by the Minister to act in his place.

Clause 11 provides for the quorum at meetings; clause 12 provides that the trust is not to be a department of the Government or to represent or except when so authorized to be an agent or servant of the Crown. Clause 13 provides for the making of annual reports to be laid before Parliament. Clauses 14 and 15 deal with the secretary and staff of the trust, clause 14 providing that the Director of Aboriginal Affairs is to be the secretary, and clause 15 enabling the trust to appoint officers and employees on terms approved by the

Minister. Clause 16 empowers the Governor by proclamation to transfer to the trust any Crown lands (on the recommendation of the Minister of Lands or the Minister of Irrigation) or other lands reserved for Aborigines, but in the case of reserves such a transfer can be made only with the consent of a reserve council if one has been constituted. Subclause (2) makes special provision that all metals, minerals, oil and gas shall pass to the trust and that the Mining Acts shall not apply unless the Governor by proclamation applies the provisions of those Acts with or without modification. Such a proclamation can be made only on the recommendation of the trust or of both Houses of Parliament. The Government believed that an occasion may arise when an obvious and valuable find could be obstructed by the trust unreasonably, and in those circumstances Parliament should have power by resolution of both Houses to insist that the Mining Act apply. However, even when it applies, it will apply with the reservation of royalties to the trust board.

Subclauses (4) and (5) deal with mining. No new lease or licence for mining may, after the commencement of the Bill, be granted over reserves, but existing leases and licences are preserved, subject to the payment of royalties to the trust. Likewise, no fresh leases or licences are to be issued after the transfer of lands other than reserves to the trust. These provisions are designed to secure to Aborigines the benefit of minerals and oils on trust lands and reserves. Subclause (6) of clause 16 empowers the trust to sell, lease, mortgage or deal with lands vested in it but only with the consent of the Minister which is not to be withheld unless the Minister is satisfied that the dealing fails to preserve the benefits and value of the land to the Aboriginal people of the State. Subclause 6 (b) enables the trust to develop lands vested in it. Subclause (7) prohibits dealings with leases or licences granted by the trust without the Minister's written consent.

Clause 17 provides that the moneys of the trust subject to administrative costs are to be held and used for the development and improvement of the trust lands and for the purposes of clause 18. Clause 18 enables the trust, with the Minister's approval, to grant technical or other assistance or advance moneys to Aborigines and persons of Aboriginal blood or recognized Aboriginal groups for such purposes in connection with trust lands as the trust thinks fit. There is a proviso that members of the trust cannot obtain assistance or grants,

nor can any of their relatives except with the Minister's consent. Clauses 19 and 20 deal with financial arrangements and annual audit of the trust's accounts by the Auditor-General.

I wish now to refer to certain objections recently raised to this proposal. It was suggested that there were two reasons for not now proceeding with the Aboriginal Lands Trust proposal, one of which was announced in the Governor's Speech last year, and about which already much public information has been given. The first of these reasons was that it was alleged that insufficient was known in South Australia of the problems of Aborigines, that, therefore, we should cure the situation in this Parliament by having a Select Committee of the Parliament investigate the problems of Aborigines, and that this should be done before an Aboriginal lands trust proposal be proceeded with. I cannot think of any more ill-considered proposal than that.

The problems of the Aboriginal people of fitting into a materialistic community such as our own—they having a highly developed and anti-materialist culture which was developed to an extraordinarily high degree, according to the anthropologists, over a period of 18,000 years—their problem of fitting into the kind of society that now surrounds them is an extraordinary one; it involves a myriad of complex problems. There is a vast amount of literature on this subject; it is not a subject that can be simply dealt with by a Select Committee. Here, in South Australia, we have the whole Aboriginal problem in microcosm; we have people still living in semi-nomadic tribal conditions, and people completely assimilated into the community. We have every stage of social change in between. There is no short or simple solution to the problems of integration of Aboriginal people into this community, and this Government would not suggest for one moment that the Aboriginal Lands Trust Bill was an answer to the problems of the Aborigines. It is not.

However, it copes with one real facet of the Aboriginal problem in a way which has been carefully thought out, which is recommended by the Aboriginal Affairs Board, widely supported throughout this community, and acclaimed by all the research officers that I know of working in the Aborigines' field (and I know most of them). How could a Select Committee of this House, investigating Aboriginal problems, find an answer to this particular problem? Much research work has been done. If honourable members desire further information about any facet of this

proposal, the Government will be happy to supply it and make available its officers for inquiry. The particular problem dealt with in the second reading explanation is clear. It is known that Aboriginal people are bitter; it is not surprising that they are, for they have been deprived of the rights which, on the founding of the province, it was stated publicly they would have, and which the people of England were assured they would get.

It is not surprising that Aborigines have grave fears that what lands at the moment are reserved for their benefit may be removed from them in cavalier fashion, for that has recently happened elsewhere in Australia. Constantly throughout Australia, where one meets groups of Aborigines who are concerned about the rights of their people, one meets the cry: "Our land has been taken from us; what is the compensation you have given us in return—where are our lands?" There is a simple answer to that. We should be doing something to provide that they do have their lands, and the form of administration that has been set up here is one that has been carefully worked out to cope with the problems that have arisen in the administration of indigenous peoples' lands in comparable countries to our own.

The second criticism made of the proposal was that it does not directly provide for the large and growing urban population that is of Aboriginal blood. It is quite true that the Lands Trust does not, at this stage, directly provide for people who are no longer living on reserves, but it certainly provides opportunities of obtaining lands for such of those people as want to return to the land. Let us make it clear that only a small proportion of those Aborigines who seek urban existence ever want to take up land. Most of them do not want to take up land. Amongst the Aborigines there is a constant drift to urban existence as there is in the rest of the community and, therefore, we cannot force them into a rural existence that they do not see as their own future and where no reason exists why they should see it as their future. However, the Bill will certainly provide that, where there are Aborigines who do seek to obtain land and to develop and work it, they will have an opportunity to do so. All the administrative provisions are in the Bill to allow that to take place. The Government intends that additional areas should be provided beyond those at present reserved for Aborigines so that it is possible for this to be done.

Therefore, I point out to honourable members that objections raised to this measure are not

well considered. The Aboriginal Lands Trust proposal will not replace the welfare and training programmes already initiated by the Government following on those initiated by the previous Government. However, it will provide areas of land for Aborigines, titles for Aborigines, and a feeling upon the part of Aborigines that at least they are getting their just dues, which were so unjustly taken from them over a century ago. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is an important measure not only from the point of view of the development of Aborigines in South Australia but from the point of view of the moral stature of the Australian people as a whole. I believe it is a vital measure for this House, and the Government commends the Bill to members accordingly.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

MURRAY BRIDGE BY-LAW: MOTOR BOATS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): I move:

That by-law No. 46 of the Corporation of the Town of Murray Bridge, in respect of the control of motor boats and water skis in the Murray River within the limits of the boundary of the Corporation of the Town of Murray Bridge, made on July 19, 1965, and laid on the table of this House on June 21, 1966, be disallowed.

I have the following explanation from the council concerning this by-law:

Council owns extensive riverfront abutting the defined controlled area of the river which land is used as a reserve for the public and from which land row boats are launched, the public swim and fish and the usage in this way is increasing and council desires to control the speed of motor boats in this area which is half the width of the river for the safety of the public.

At the outset, I should say that I have no objection to the purpose of the by-law, which I think is entirely proper and is to be commended. My only objection is to the definition of the area to which it applies. I do not know how such a definition could be accepted by anyone who looked at it at all critically, but I am quite sure no magistrate would ever convict anybody for non-compliance with the by-law. I have been told that already some difficulty has arisen in respect of the metropolitan beaches. I have not had an opportunity to check that information, and no doubt the Attorney will say whether it is correct. However, I understand that the definition has been considered by magistrates to be too vague, and that the by-law has had to be

altered. Let me read the definition to honourable members so that they may attempt to work out what it means:

In this by-law "the controlled area of the river" means the following portion of the River Murray, namely, bounded on the north-east by the centre of the River Murray, on the south-east by a line extending south-west from the centre line of the river to the bank of the river and distant four chains north-westerly from the north-western end of Long Island Bird Sanctuary and on the north-west by a line extending south-west from the centre line of the river to the bank of the river and distant 10 chains north-westerly from the north-western side of piers in the road traffic bridge across the River Murray except for a laneway between the bank and the centre line of the river extending north-westerly for a distance of five chains from a line being the north-easterly prolongation of the north-western boundary of section 30.

I can find no definition of what is the centre of the river. In one instance the distance is from piers of the road bridge, but from which piers? If we used different piers we would get a totally different direction. Obviously, this definition should be referred back to the Murray Bridge corporation so that it can give the public some way of knowing just what is the area that is to be protected. So that these matters may be looked at by the corporation, and so that it can arrive at a definition that is at least partly intelligent to the public who have to live under the by-law, I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

MILLICENT BY-LAW: TIMBER TRANSPORT.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): I move:

That by-law No. 28 of the District Council of Millicent, in respect of the securing and fastening of logs and sawn timber to vehicles, made on January 11, 1966, and laid on the table of this House on June 21, 1966, be disallowed.

There is a defect in the by-law to which the motion refers, and an amendment is needed. Certain district councils in the South-East have been concerned because accidents might result from the carriage upon vehicles of logs not properly secured. Conferences have been held and the councils have passed by-laws for the proper securing of loads. I do not object to the motive behind the by-law. However, the terms used in framing it are so wide that they almost prevent the carriage of timber unless it is either winched to the vehicle by a chain or steel rope. The by-law reads:

No person shall drive on any road a vehicle on which logs or sawn timber are carried unless he complies with the following conditions:

The load is secured to the vehicle by a chain or steel wire rope the strength of which ensures that: (i) the load and every part thereof remains in or upon the vehicle throughout such carriage . . . (ii) no part of the load projects beyond the bounds of such chain or steel wire rope so as to be likely to injure any person or damage any property . . . The chain or steel wire rope used pursuant to the provisions of this by-law is fastened with the aid of a load binder or winch.

A carpenter could not carry a piece of timber 5ft. long inside a buckboard unless the timber was tied with a steel wire rope attached to a winch. Obviously, that was not intended. I understand that the Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee has already referred this by-law and similar by-laws back to the councils concerned and I am informed that some of the councils have already taken action to amend the provisions. I ask leave to continue my remarks so that the necessary amendment to the by-law may be made.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

BEACHPORT BY-LAW: TIMBER TRANSPORT.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): I move:

That by-law No. 21 of the District Council of Beachport in respect of the securing and fastening of logs and sawn timber to vehicles, made on February 9, 1966, and laid on the table of this House on June 21, 1966, be disallowed.

My arguments in respect of this motion are similar to those advanced concerning the by-law of the District Council of Millicent on the securing and fastening of logs and sawn timber to vehicles. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

MOUNT GAMBIER BY-LAW: TIMBER TRANSPORT.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): I move:

That by-law No. 11 of the District Council of Mount Gambier, in respect of the securing and fastening of logs and sawn timber to vehicles, made on December 17, 1965, and laid on the table of this House on June 21, 1966, be disallowed.

My arguments in respect of this motion are similar to those advanced concerning the by-law of the District Council of Millicent on the securing and fastening of logs and sawn timber to vehicles. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I move:

That in the opinion of this House the work of the Premier's Department in attracting new industries to this State has been ineffective, and that as a matter of urgency, and with a view to providing more energetic and vigorous promotion of industrial expansion and the exploitation of the natural resources of the State, a Department of Development, to be the sole responsibility of a Minister, be set up without delay.

I do this because the Opposition is concerned with the recent downturn in the State's economy; with the slowing down of the general development of the State; and with the Government's apparent inertia and lack of initiative about industrial expansion in this State. I take this action deliberately to bring forcibly to the notice of the Government and of the people of this State that no new major industries are being attracted to this State. Consequently, this State is being outbid by

other States and is falling behind in its efforts in this direction.

The Opposition believes that the time has come for a full-scale debate on this question, in order to focus public attention on what we believe is the way the present Government, instead of developing the State fully as it should, and instead of providing a stimulus to industry to establish here, is frittering away its chances, time and money (and this is public money), by chasing shadows. Instead of displaying initiative and a positive, practical, forthright manner in grappling with this problem, the Government is displaying ineptitude. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.19 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, July 14, at 2 p.m.